1AC Affirmative

Topic

Resolved: The United States ought to prohibit the extraction of fossil fuels from federal public lands and waters.

Definitions

To "prohibit fossil fuel extraction"

Green 18 London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). Green, Fergus (2018) The logic of fossil fuel bans. Nature Climate Change, 8. pp. 449-451. ISSN 1758-678X DOI: 10.1038/s41558-018-0172-3
http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/88114/1/Green_Fossil%20Fuel%20Bans_Accepted.pdf BZ

A **fossil fuel ban** is here defined as a constitutional, legislative or executive prohibition [ban] on the exploration, production, [&] supply, transportation, intermediate processing, or consumption of a type of fossil fuel (coal, oil, or natural gas), the construction of infrastructure for any such purpose (for instance, oil pipelinefs, coal-fired power stations), or the financing of any such activity. This definition covers bans that prohibit only a subset of the relevant activity, such as new activities. For example, a state commitment to "prohibit the construction of new coalmines within its jurisdiction from 1 January 2019" would qualify as a fossil fuel ban based on this definition.

And according to

Wilderness Society no date Wilderness Society, nonprofit greatly involved in conservation lawmaking and wilderness protection, directly responsible for protection of 111 million acres of wilderness, no date, What do we mean by public lands, https://www.wilderness.org/sites/default/files/media/file/Module%201.pdf (accessed 10/14/23)

Public lands are areas of land and water that today are owned collectively by U.S. citizens and managed by government agencies. Public lands are different from private lands, which are owned by an individual, a business or another type of non-governmental organization. Although public lands are now considered to be owned collectively by United States citizens, these lands include ancestral homelands, migration routes, ceremonial grounds, and hunting and harvesting places for Indigenous Peoples who have been forcibly removed. We specify "United States citizens" in the definition of public lands because although undocumented people living in the U.S. and noncitizens have a connection to land and use public lands, because of their citizenship status, they are not included in the formal decision-making process through their right to vote. Certainly, noncitizen advocates in the NGO or academic sectors can be influential in the public lands conversation.

Framework

We value morality.

This is achieved with a criterion of maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer 3 reasons:

1] Stopping mass pain and death is our highest priority, even if we are unsure of what criterion to use. We can't debate ethics unless our wellbeing and survival are first ensured.

2] Because the topic says "the U.S. ought to prohibit fossil fuels" we know we're talking about government action. Policies must consider what benefits us as a whole and equal society.

3] Wellbeing explains why we value things at all. The reason why other frameworks matter is because it improves our wellbeing.

Contention 1 – Climate Change

Both extracting and using fossil fuels harm our environment, contributing to a quarter of all pollution.

McKinnon et al. 23. Taylor McKinnon, Jeremy Nichols, Brittany Miller. The Center for Biological Diversity is a national, nonprofit conservation organization with more than 1.7 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered species and wild places. *Biden Administration Rejects Calls to Phase Out Oil, Gas on Public Lands by 2035*. June 29, 2023. https://biologicaldiversity.org/w/news/press-releases/biden-administration-rejects-calls-to-phase-out-oil-gas-on-public-lands-by-2035-2023-06-29/ BZ

WASHINGTON— Responding to a lawsuit by conservation groups, the Biden administration has officially rejected a rulemaking petition from more than 360 U.S. climate, Indigenous and conservation groups to phase[ing] out oil and gas extraction on public lands by 2035. Conservation groups sued the Department of the Interior in April to compel a response to the petition after the agency had ignored it for more than a year. As intended, the lawsuit forced that response. The Department's only rationale for denying the petition was that it has "insufficient resources" to initiate the requested rulemaking. Scientific conclusions reached since the petition was filed in 2022 show that wealthy countries must end oil and gas extraction by 2031 to **maintain a likely chance of avoiding the harms of warming 1.5 degrees Celsius. "Leaving the fossil fuel industry in control of the oil and gas spigot is an appalling abdication of climate leadership on public lands,"** said Taylor McKinnon of the Center for Biological Diversity. "To claim that the Biden administration doesn't have the resources to take real climate action on federal fossil fuels is vacuous and beyond hypocritical. This is the definition of lip service. The administration acknowledges the urgency to address climate change and meanwhile avoids every opportunity to take meaningful action on the fossil fuels under its control." The Bureau of Land Management's response cites several ongoing or upcoming rulemakings that envision piecemeal changes to the management of oil and gas on public lands, none of which aim to restrict production consistent with decline curves necessary to avoid warming 1.5 degrees Celsius. Most of these proposed regulatory changes were already mandated by the Inflation Reduction Act, which envisions another decade of oil and gas leasing, making these regulatory changes virtually superfluous. "It's beyond disappointing that the administration has opted to deny our petition and hide behind other rulemaking efforts that are likely to prove ineffective in the long run in this code-red climate moment," said Hallie Templeton, legal director for Friends of the Earth. "The U.S. and the world need bold action to phase out fossil fuels. We will keep fighting and holding federal officials accountable." The Biden administration's response comes as it touts "all-time high" federal oil production amid a cascade of new fossil fuel approvals like the massive Willow project in Alaska's Western Arctic. These projects defy U.N. calls to end new oil and gas development and Biden campaign promises to end new drilling on public land. **The [U.S.] administration has failed to propose any policies to align the [decrease] federal fossil fuel[s] programs with the decline curves necessary to avoid warming beyond 1.5 degrees Celsius.** "The Department of the Interior continues to bend over backward to accommodate the fossil fuel industry," said Jeremy Nichols, climate and energy program director for WildEarth Guardians. "If the Department would actually take comprehensive and meaningful steps to aid our nation's transition away from oil, gas and coal, and truly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, it would save them time and money and [avoid] help spare this country the costly consequences of climate change." Federal data shows the Biden administration has approved 6,430 permits for oil and gas drilling on public lands in its first two years, outpacing even the Trump administration's first two years. More than half those permits were in the Permian Basin, where per-well emissions of methane pollution are among the highest in the country and permitting accelerated from 2021 to 2022. The Administrative Procedure Act requires federal agencies to initiate rulemaking or provide a substantive response to rulemaking petitions within a reasonable timeframe. Plaintiff groups dropped their lawsuit this week after compelling the administration's response and are now evaluating the legal adequacy of the substance of the response. Background Avoiding heating the planet beyond 1.5 degrees Celsius requires ending new investment in fossil fuel projects and phasing out production to keep as much as 40% of already developed oil and gas fields in the ground. At the COP26 summit in Glasgow, Biden called climate change "an existential threat to human existence" and pledged to cut U.S. emissions by up to 51% over the next nine years. **Fossil fuel production on public lands causes about a quarter of U.S. greenhouse gas pollution.** Peer-reviewed science estimates that

[meanwhile,] a **nationwide** federal fossil fuel leasing **ban would reduce carbon emissions by 280 million tons per year**, ranking it among the most ambitious federal climate policy proposals in recent years. [Additionally,] Oil, gas and coal extraction uses mines, well pads, gas lines, [&] roads and other infrastructure that destroys habitat for wildlife, including threatened and endangered species. Oil spills and other harm from offshore drilling have done immense damage to ocean wildlife and coastal communities. Fracking and mining also **pollutes watersheds and waterways that provide drinking water to [for] millions** of people. Federal fossil fuels that have not been leased to industry contain up to 450 billion tons of potential climate pollution; those already leased to industry contain up to 43 billion tons.

Additionally, American environmental policy limits pollution greatly, inspiring international climate action

Sarinsky & Howard 21. Max Sarinsky is a senior **attorney** at the Institute for Policy Integrity at **New York University School of Law**. Peter Howard is the **Economics Director** at the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. Yes, Curbing U.S. Fossil Fuel Extraction Does Reduce Climate Pollution. The Regulatory Review. Nov 29, 2021. https://www.theregreview.org/2021/11/29/sarinsky-howard-curbing-fossil-fuel-extraction-reduce-climate-pollution/ BZ

To be fair, reductions in domestic fossil-fuel supply do result in partial substitution, because additional supply from other locations meets demand. But that substitution is far from total: research shows that the effect is only about 50 percent, meaning that **eliminating one barrel from domestic oil supply decreases global supply by roughly half a barrel.** And this 50 percent figure could be further reduced through border adjustments or other efforts to account for climate change in U.S. trade policy. Although reducing domestic fossil-fuel extraction will not solve climate change by itself, it can make a tangible dent in global emissions. This maxim is more broadly true of U.S. climate leadership. History shows that American policies to reduce[s] climate pollution drive real climate progress by spurring reciprocal foreign emission reductions. **For instance, Obama[s]-era climate policies helped to prompt China's most meaningful climate commitments [to the climate].** And after the Biden Administration committed to halve U.S. emissions by 2030, many countries—including Japan, Canada, and Brazil—significantly strengthened their own pledges. In contrast, when America [gave up] abdicated its climate leadership [under] during the Trump Administration and rolled back key measures to reduce emissions, a period of little international progress ensued. A recent study shows that **Every ton of climate pollution that the United States pledged to reduce[s] has resulted in [causes] foreign nations pledging to reduce their emissions by over six tons in return.** When the United States transitions away from fossil fuels, geopolitical and market adjustments make clean energy more competitive globally.

And, if we don't prevent climate change, we face extreme warming and global extinction.

Krosofsky 21, Andrew Krosofsky is a writer and **environmental journalist** for Green Matters, a media company covering awareness and solutions around the climate crisis. Krosofsky, Andrew. "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction." Green Matters, Green Matters, 11 Mar. 2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction. BZ [v2.0]

Life on this planet has gone through many extinction-level events over time. Most of these phenomena were caused by natural, cataclysmic forces beyond the control of any of the lifeforms existing at that time. The current cataclysmic forces are anything but natural and they are well within our control. The question is not, "will global warming cause extinction?"— it's, "how can we prevent that inevitability from happening?" Will global warming cause extinction? Eventually, yes. Global warming will invariably result in the mass **extinction of millions of different species, humankind included.** In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet. Global warming causes a number of detrimental

effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term. **Extreme weather patterns are** shifting climates across the globe, **eliminating habitats and altering the** landscape. As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced. Then, of course, there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. What species will go extinct if global warming continues? The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that **more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050.** By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. Will global warming cause humanity's extinction? We won't try and sugarcoat things, humanity's own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species has just under a decade left to get our CO_2 emissions under control. **If we don't cut** those **emissions by half** before 2030, **temperatures will rise to** potentially **catastrophic levels.** It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but **it will mean less food, [and]** less **water,** and increased hardship across the world — **especially in low-income areas** and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires. It's difficult to calculate the numbers in these cases or to assess precisely what risks we will all be facing, but this is because we have never experienced anything like it before.

Contention 2 – Renewable Energy

Fossil fuels still dominate the US economy, but the Aff can replace them with renewable energy [like wind and solar].

Milman 22. Oliver Milman – the **Guardian** US environmental reporter. Fri 11 Mar 2022 02.00 EST 'Defining moment': how can the US end its dependency on fossil fuels? https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/mar/11/us-fossil-fuel-dependency-climate-joe-biden-oil-russia BZ

"The clean energy tax credits and other provisions would really catalyze the industry and achieve significant reductions," said Orvis, who has calculated that the support for **wind, solar and electric** cars would slash **US oil demand**, [&] make 70% of the [US] electricity [will] grid run on clean [renewable] energy and ensure that about half of vehicle sales are electric by 2030. Wind and solar grew at the fastest rate in US history last year. The ailing coal industry could be phased out "fairly easily" within a decade, according to Orvis, although **further federal, state and city standards and incentives are required to cut pollution f**rom buildings, manufacturing and the remaining car fleet, promote energy efficiency and to install heat pumps in place of gas-fired furnaces. "The sooner we start that transition will determine how fast we can go," Orvis said. "**Every day we don't start the transition** [to renewable energy] we are subject to the **price swings** [and pollution] from fossil fuels that we are clearly subject to now."

But:

[a] **The U.S. is allowing *fossil fuel extraction on public land* INSTEAD of *developing clean renewable energy*, even if there's nothing to drill on that land.**

Shea & Mirza 22. Rowland-Shea holds a master's degree in geography from The George Washington University where she focused on urban sustainability and green space issues and served as the teaching assistant for the university's Introduction to Sustainability course. She is the Director for Public Lands at American Progress. The Oil Industry's Grip on Public Lands and Waters May Be Slowing Progress Toward Energy Independence. JUL 19, 2022. Jenny Rowland-Shea and Zainab Mirza. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-oil-industrys-grip-on-public-lands-and-waters-may-be-slowing-progress-toward-energy-independence/ BZ

But what is **the current balance of U.S. public lands and waters**? The evidence is clear: Currently, oil and gas development is prioritized above all other land uses. For example, of all lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, 90 percent are open to oil and gas leasing.2 Offshore, more than half the outer continental shelf is open to oil and gas development. In fact, oil and gas [are] is being prioritized not only on lands where fossil fuel resources are plentiful but also on [public] lands that the Department of the Interior (DOI) has determined have low or even **no drilling potential** for oil and gas resources. **Leasing [Extracting fossil fuels] on these low-potential lands is not just shutting out land uses such as recreation and conservation; it is also affecting the United States' transition to homegrown renewable energy.**3 A new Center for American Progress analysis finds that **77 percent—more than 78 million acres—of valuable renewable energy lands in western states are in areas with low oil and gas potential, but these lands are still prioritized for oil and gas** leasing.

Furthermore, they say that:

Shea & Mirza 22. Rowland-Shea holds a master's degree in geography from The George Washington University where she focused on urban sustainability and green space issues and served as the teaching assistant for the university's Introduction to Sustainability course. She is the Director for Public Lands at American Progress. The Oil Industry's Grip on Public Lands and Waters May Be Slowing Progress Toward Energy Independence. JUL 19, 2022. Jenny Rowland-Shea and Zainab Mirza. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-oil-industrys-grip-on-public-lands-and-waters-may-be-slowing-progress-toward-energy-independence/ BZ

Take all low-potential lands for oil and gas off the table for fossil fuel leasing Companies—and the federal government—can predict fairly accurately where and to what degree lands will yield developable oil and gas. Therefore, lands without reasonable expectations of producing economically viable oil or gas should not be available for companies to lease. Sen. Catherine Cortez Masto (D-NV) and Rep. Susie Lee (D-NV) have introduced legislation, the End Speculative Oil and Gas Leasing Act, that would do exactly this.22 **Prohibiting oil and gas leasing on public lands** that are determined at the planning stage to have low or no potential for development **would allow those lands to be reprioritized for other uses, such as renewable energy development, conservation, or recreation.** Reform the broken oil and gas program from top to bottom The federal oil and gas program has long been broken.23 The program—which the Government Accountability Office has considered "high risk" for more than a decade—is full of loopholes, subsidies, and outdated policies that are meant to put the oil and gas industry first and U.S. public lands and communities last.24 For too long, this broken system has caused taxpayers to lose out on billions of dollars in additional revenue while prioritizing corporate profits and allowing the oil and gas industry to stockpile millions of acres of unused leases.

The full ban may extend across 11 years. We will immediately start by banning low potential fossil fuel public lands to make way for renewable energy, until full prohibition in 2034:

Stancil 2023. Education B.A. **Political Science** and Global Studies, concentration: Development and Social Justice; minors in Environmental Studies and Hispanic Studies, Pacific Lutheran University, 2013. Groups Vow to Sue Biden for Ignoring Demand to End Drilling on Public Lands KENNY STANCIL Mar 16, 2023. https://www.commondreams.org/news/biden-ignored-petition-phase-out-fossil-fuels-public-lands BZ

"**The climate deadline to end oil and gas extraction in the U.S. is 2034, and the natural place to start is on land the federal government controls**," said one advocate. "It's pathetic that legal action is needed to force the administration to act." Three environmental groups on Thursday filed a 30-day notice of their intent to sue the Biden administration for refusing to respond to a petition to wind down fossil fuel extraction on public lands and waters. Signed by a coalition of more than 360 progressive advocacy organizations, the January 2022 petition submitted to President Joe Biden and Interior Secretary Deb Haaland provides a framework to slash federal oil and gas production by 98% by 2035 using long-dormant provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act, Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and the National Emergencies Act. Research published after the petition was submitted shows that wealthy countries must end oil and gas production entirely by 2034 to give the world a 50% chance of meeting [This meets] the Paris agreement's more **ambitious goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C—beyond which the climate** emergency's impacts will grow increasingly deadly, especially for the world's poor who have done the least to cause the crisis.

[b] AND: aside from increasing land for renewables:

Sarinsky & Howard 21. Max Sarinsky is a senior attorney at the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. Peter Howard is the Economics Director at the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. Yes, Curbing U.S. Fossil Fuel Extraction Does Reduce Climate Pollution. The Regulatory Review. Nov 29, 2021. https://www.theregreview.org/2021/11/29/sarinsky-howard-curbing-fossil-fuel-extraction-reduce-climate-pollution/ BZ

The notion of perfect substitution violates basic supply-and-demand principles. Fossil-fuel companies want to extract[ion] from federal lands mainly because it is a cheap supply option. **If such leasing became less available**, fossil-fuel ***producers*** would have to turn to more expensive alternatives**[:], causing fossil-fuel consumption to fall[s] and renewable[s] substitutes to become more competitive.** Given its vast market power, the federal government could level the playing field for sustainable fuels if it **prioritized** conservation, recreation, and renewable energy production **on federal lands and waters** rather than tying up so much land in fossil-fuel extraction. That is why, after the federal government justified coal leasing in 2010 on the grounds that it would have no climate impacts due to perfect substitution, a federal appeals court unanimously rejected the

approval. The three-judge panel, including one judge appointed by President Ronald Reagan, described perfect substitution as “irrational” and “contrary to basic supply and demand principles.”

Additionally: Renewables are better – they’re faster to build than decade-long fossil fuel approvals

Tierney & Bird 20. *Setting the Record Straight About Renewable Energy*. By Susan Tierney (executive director of the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council. Dr. Tierney has a Ph.D. in Regional Planning from Cornell.) and Lori Bird (worked for the U.S. Department of Energy’s Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and for Hagler Bailly Consulting. She holds a master's degree in environmental studies from Yale University’s School of the Environment and a B.A. in economics and environmental studies from Indiana University.). May 2020. https://www.wri.org/insights/setting-record-straight-about-renewable-energy BZ

Wind and solar projects can operate for decades and can be developed more rapidly than other generation sources. All power plants and their components have a “useful life” before they need replacement or repair. The useful **lifespan of renewable facilities can exceed two decades.** Wind turbines, for example, are estimated to last for about 20 years, and photovoltaic systems often remain operational from 25 to 40 years. In some instances, as large wind turbines become more efficient and economic, equipment turnover has been accelerated. In these cases, smaller turbines have been replaced earlier than they might otherwise have been by larger, more efficient turbines, to substantially increase electricity production at existing sites. Furthermore, **renewable energy facilities can typically be deployed more rapidly than fossil fuel plants.** While solar and onshore wind farms normally **take less than two years to build, gas-fired power plants usually take as many as four years to become operational**, and can also require construction of gas pipeline infrastructure.

There are 2 resulting impacts to renewables:

1] Firstly, Public land renewables HELP the economy and prevent climate change

Springer & Daue 2020 [Nikki Springer, Ph.D., Yale Center for Business and the Environment and Alex Daue, The Wilderness Society, 05-2020, "Key Economic Benefits of Renewable Energy on Public Lands," Yale Center for Business and the Environment, https://www.wilderness.org/sites/default/files/media/file/CBEY_WILDERNESS_Renewable%20Energy%20Report_0.pdf]/Kankee

GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION The avoided carbon dioxide gas (CO2) emissions from renewable energy use when compared to electricity generation from the burning of fossil fuels also offers economic benefits. As detailed in Appendix 7, through 2019, the solar projects operating on **public lands** have resulted in an estimated total of **11.39 million** metric tons of avoided CO2 emissions. This is roughly **equivalent** to taking over **2.4 million** passenger vehicles off the road for one year.38 While estimates of the avoided CO2 emissions from the wind and geothermal projects operating on public lands were not readily available, they have also contributed **significant** benefits in avoided CO2 emissions. The Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is a leading tool for quantifying the climate impacts of proposed federal actions. As described by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, the SCC is "an estimate, in dollars, of the long term damage caused by a one ton increase in carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in a given year; or viewed another way, the benefits of reducing CO2 emissions by that amount in a given year. The SCC is intended to be a comprehensive estimate of climate change damages that includes, among other costs, the changes in net agricultural productivity, risks to human health, and property damages from increased flood risks."39 The current central estimate of the social cost of carbon (SCC) is roughly $50/metric ton in 2019 dollars. Using this estimate, the cumulative **total estimate of the avoided CO2 emissions** from solar projects operating on public lands have a SCC **value of** over $**544 million [in emissions]** through the end of 2019 (see Appendix 7). SPOTLIGHT ON NEVADA

2] The US is heavily dependent on imports making us vulnerable to other countries. Only renewable energy can solve dependency

Newman 22 Newman, Rick. "The Myth Of US 'energy Independence'." Yahoo Finance. March 07, 2022. Web. https://news.yahoo.com/the-myth-of-us-energy-independence-223017557.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guccounter=2, October 10, 2023.

The United States is not **oil-independent** With regard to oil, the main component in gasoline, the U.S. consumes more than it produces, and has for decades. Flatly stated, the United States is not oil-independent, and hasn't been since the early days of oil production. There has been a big increase in U.S. oil output since 2008, due largely to the advent of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking. Fracking has downsides, including possible environmental damage from toxic chemicals used in the process and intrusive drilling operations in areas where there had never been oil or gas operations before. Still, it has catapulted the United States into pole position as the world's top oil producer. U.S. oil production in 2019, the most recent peak, was 140% more than in 2008. That surge in domestic output has narrowed the gap between the amount of oil we produce and consume—but the gap was huge to start with and **Americans still burn 38% more oil than U.S. drillers produce**. The second chart above shows the difference over time. As with oil, natural gas production has soared during the last decade, since fracking helps tap natural gas deposits, too. U.S. production of natural gas first exceeded consumption in 2017, and the gap has widened since then. In mathematical terms, you could say we're natural-gas independent, because we produce more than we consume. The third chart above shows that. Coal, not surprisingly, has declined as a U.S. energy source, because it's one of the dirtiest forms of energy. We do produce more coal than we consume, however, with the rest exported to other countries. So you could say the United States is coal-independent, too. That's in the fourth chart above. Here's another confusing claim: America is a net oil exporter. This is true, if you include oil and refined oil products such as gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. U.S. exports of oil and oil products exceeded imports in 2020 and 2021, again, largely because of the fracking surge. But in terms of raw crude, **the U.S. has long been a net importer**—importing than we export—and still is. Net imports are a lot smaller than they used to be, because of the surge in U.S. production. Yet we still rely on oil from Canada, Mexico, the Middle East and many other places to meet U.S. demand for gasoline and other finished products. Energy markets are complex and, in the United States, at least, driven mostly by private-sector decisions rather than government diktat. The American president can't control oil output the way Russian President Vladimir Putin or the Saudi ruling family can. Producers decide how much oil to drill, and whom to sell it to, based on the profit motive. Since 2015, when President Obama changed the rules to allow the export of U.S. crude, American drillers can sell oil wherever in the

world they can legally get the best price. 'In the real world, energy independence doesn't exist' It might seem logical to use all the oil produced in the United States to meet domestic needs, and only import what's necessary after that. But open markets ungoverned by any national energy policy don't work that way. It's not as easy to transport oil as it is canned goods or airplane passengers, since there are many limitations on where pipelines and oil-laden railways can run. Most U.S. oil comes from five states—Texas, North Dakota, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Alaska—and producers want to sell it where costs are lowest. It can be cheaper to export Texas oil through ports such as Galveston or Corpus Christi, for instance, than to ship it to refiners on the East Coast. "Sometimes it's a lot cheaper to get cargo from Rotterdam to the East Coast than to push it from Texas," oil analyst Dan Dicker of The Energy Word explained to Yahoo Finance in 2020. "It can be immensely cheaper to take oil from the Middle East than from our wells in West Texas. In the real world, energy independence doesn't exist." Hardly any country can shut itself off from the global oil market and enjoy cheaper prices purely because of bounteous domestic supplies. Saudi Arabia may be one exception, but when a shock threatens supply anywhere it pretty much raises prices everywhere. That's why the disruption of oil supplies from Russia, the world's third-largest producer, has sent U.S. oil prices close to $120 per barrel and gas prices above $4 per gallon, even though the United States imports very little Russian oil. Virtually every oil producer is selling into the same market, at whatever price global supply and demand determines. There have been some calls to prohibit U.S. producers from exporting oil, as was the case before 2015. But that wouldn't necessarily lower U.S. gasoline prices. The key factor is how much oil U.S. firms produce, which the government doesn't get to decide. If Washington limited U.S. producers' ability to sell oil profitably to foreigners, drillers wouldn't produce the same amount of oil and sell it for less profit, or no profit, to American refiners. If shut off from some profitable markets, they'd probably produce less and make sure they keep profit margins up. Some analysts think a ban on oil exports would be such a disincentive to drill that U.S. pump prices might even go up. **One thing that could genuinely make the United States energy independent is the robust development of renewable energy** sources such as wind and solar. That type of energy is harder to store, which makes it less suited to shipping and selling in distant markets. Solar energy can travel long distances across high-transmission power lines, but it can't be stored in a barrel or canister, the way oil and natural gas can. Batteries are a form of storage, but they're not fully developed, which makes wind and solar best as regional energy sources for the foreseeable future.

Now is the PERFECT TIME to stop fossils and move to renewables: Ukraine war proves FF prices are extremely volatile

Shea et al. 22. Rowland-Shea holds a master's degree in geography from The George Washington University where she focused on urban sustainability and green space issues and served as the teaching assistant for the university's Introduction to Sustainability course. She is the Director for Public Lands at American Progress. MAR 10, 2022. 5 Reasons Why the United States Can't Drill Its Way to Energy Independence. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/5-reasons-why-the-united-states-cant-drill-its-way-to-energy-independence/ BZ

Vladimir Putin's unjustified attack on Ukraine has upended the global fossil fuel market. The United States and its allies have responded with devastating sanctions, including a recent action from President **Joe Biden to ban Russian oil, natural gas, and coal** imports to the United States. **Because international energy markets have been tied to fossil fuels for decades, this ban could result in higher gas prices for American[s] households and supply disruptions for our European allies. The solution to this price crunch is a swift and urgent transition to clean [renewable] energy—not more leasing, drilling, or investments in the same volatile fuel sources that are contributing to the current energy crisis.** Despite the oil and gas industry's vigorous and incorrect public relations campaigns aimed at convincing people that their opportunism to drill more is a legitimate policy solution, the United States is already the world's largest producer of oil and gas. Domestic oil production is at 90 percent of America's all-time, pre-pandemic high, and the United States is producing more than twice as many barrels of oil per day as it produced in 2008. But energy independence won't be found at the bottom of a well. We can never be energy independent while we rely on a fuel source that is both controlled by the global market and highly susceptible to international conflict and manipulation by autocratic regimes. The fossil fuel industry's wish list—more taxpayer subsidies, more land opened for dirty drilling, and fewer environmental and health safeguards—will not help people struggling with the price of gas today. But granting them free rein will lock the United States **into decades of higher and more volatile energy prices**; higher toxic emissions; and greater climate destruction. Now is the time for the United States to finally achieve real energy security by reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. The oil and gas industry already has plenty of land and ocean ready to be used The oil industry can decide to produce more oil whenever it wants. In fact, the oil industry already possess more than 9,000 approved—but unused—drilling permits on federal lands. Nearly 5,000 of those permits were approved in 2021 alone—the highest figure since the second Bush administration. 9,000 Approved permits to drill that are unused by the U.S. oil and gas industry The number of permits already approved is about six times the average number of wells drilled annually in the past five years. Over the past 10 years, permits and wells drilled have followed a similar trajectory—except for now, when permits have increased and wells drilled have decreased. The oil industry has all it needs to increase production but has chosen to profiteer off the current crisis rather than act. Industry CEOs are profiting hand over fist while average families suffer Meanwhile oil and gas executives are raking in windfall profits while consumers suffer at the pump. Last year, four of the major oil companies—Shell, Chevron, BP, and ExxonMobil—posted record profits, totaling $75 billion. In the fourth quarter alone, ExxonMobil was bringing in $97 million dollars in profit every day. The reason that U.S. oil companies

haven't increased production is simple: They decided to use their billions in profits to pay dividends to their CEOs and wealthy shareholders and simply haven't chosen to invest[ed] in new oil production. According to Bloomberg, "U.S. oil companies generally have been reluctant to pump more, preferring to steer cash flows back to investors instead of spending it on new drilling that could flood the world with cheap crude." The oil industry is sitting on 10 years' worth of unused leases The oil industry already has at least 10 years' worth of unused leases at its disposal. They are only producing oil or gas on roughly half of the area they have already leased. There are nearly 14 million acres onshore and more than 9 million acres offshore that are currently under lease but are not being used for oil production. At least one-quarter of these unused leases are sitting on lands that the Bureau of Land Management has deemed to have a medium or high potential for oil. What's more, only 10 percent of U.S. oil and gas production occurs on federal lands and waters, limiting the federal government's ability to impact leasing decisions—the other 90 percent is done on state and private resources. **New oil projects won't bring down prices or increase supply in the short term** Nothing on the industry wish list is a silver bullet to solve the short-term crisis. According to the Government Accountability Office, on average, **it takes more than four years for companies to begin producing [drilling] on the federal lands they lease. Offshore production takes even longer, as it takes at least two to three years to build the needed rigs.** This delay is not due to drilling permit review, which—at most—takes fewer than 200 days. Even oil and gas industry executives themselves are saying it: Launching more oil and gas projects now will have no effect on short-term global energy markets. The United States is now in the era of extreme fossil fuel energy: The opportunities that exist for big new oil projects are not fast, not safe, and are not long-term solutions. Projects such as ConocoPhillips' Willow in the Western Arctic; calls to drill the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; or ultradeep offshore drilling are several years if not a decade away from producing oil and only set the country up to continue on the unstable path of a fossil-fuel-dependent future. 23 million Acres of lands and waters leased to industry but not being used for oil production 4+ The number of years, on average, it takes to begin producing oil and gas after leasing $75 billion Record profits posted by Shell, Chevron, BP, and ExxonMobil in 2021 The bottom line is that [fossil fuel] investments today—whether in fossil energy or renewables—[affect us] are about our energy systems in a **decade** [later]. **Now is the time to invest in [renewables] the energy [to] system that will make the United States truly energy independent. Renewables are winning the free market For the long-term transition, the market is pointing away from new drilling investments and toward renewables.** Take this latest example: In November 2021, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management held the largest oil and gas lease sale to date and offered 80 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico. The sale has since been rejected by the courts, but the sum of high bids was $192 million—just $25 per acre—and about 97 percent of the bids were uncontested. Compare that to 488,000 acres in the New York Bight region offered for potential wind energy development in February, which drew competitive winning bids from six companies totaling approximately $4.37 billion—about $9,000 per acre. Conclusion The United States—and the world—cannot drill its way out of oil price volatility or into real energy independence. Energy prices are high because fossil fuels are a global market **highly influenced by conflicts around the world**. Increasing leasing and permitting rates even beyond their current historically high levels won't change that, but it will lock the United States into fossil fuel dependence for decades to come. For true energy independence, for lower energy prices, and for our own health and well-being, we must urgently invest in clean energy.

And: even the expectation of oil scarcity causes war.

Klare '13 [Michael T., The Nation's defense correspondent, is **professor emeritus of peace and world-security** studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, D.C. His newest book, All Hell Breaking Loose: The Pentagon's Perspective on Climate Change, will be published this fall. 2013. "How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion," https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/] brett | recut

Brace yourself. You may not be able to tell yet, but according to **global experts** and the US intelligence community, the earth is already shifting under you. Whether you know it or not, you're on a new planet, a resource-shock world of a sort humanity has never before experienced. Two nightmare scenarios—a global scarcity of vital resources and the onset of extreme climate change—are already beginning to converge and in the **coming decades** are likely to produce a tidal wave of **unrest rebellion competition** and **conflict**. Just what this tsunami of disaster will look like may, as yet, be hard to discern, but experts warn of **water wars** over contested river systems, global food riots sparked by soaring prices for life's basics, mass migrations of climate refugees (with resulting anti-migrant violence) and the breakdown of social order or the **collapse of states**. At first, such mayhem is likely to arise largely in Africa, Central Asia and other areas of the underdeveloped South, but in time, **all regions** of the planet will be affected To appreciate the power of this encroaching catastrophe, it's necessary to examine each of the **forces** that are combining to produce this future **cataclysm Resource Shortages and Resource Wars** Start with one simple given: **the prospect of future [energy] scarcities** of vital natural resources, including **energy**, water, land, food and **critical minerals.** This in itself would guarantee **social unrest geopolitical friction** and **war**. It is important to note that **absolute scarcity** doesn't have to be on the horizon in any given resource category for this scenario to kick in A lack of adequate supplies to meet the needs of a growing, ever more urbanized and industrialized global population is enough. Given the wave of extinctions that scientists are recording, some resources—particular species of fish, animals and trees, for example—will become less abundant **in the decades to come**, and may even disappear altogether. But key materials for modern civilization like **oil**, uranium and copper will simply prove harder and more costly to acquire **lead**ing to **supply bottlenecks** and **periodic shortages** Oil—the single most important commodity in the international economy—provides an apt example. Although global oil supplies may actually grow in the coming decades, many experts doubt that they can be expanded sufficiently to meet the needs of a rising global middle class that is, for instance, expected to buy millions of new cars in the near future. In its 2011 World Energy Outlook, the International Energy Agency claimed that an anticipated global oil demand of 104 million barrels per day in 2035 will be satisfied. This, the report suggested, would be thanks in large part to additional supplies of "unconventional oil" (Canadian tar sands, shale oil and so on), as well as 55 million barrels of new oil from fields "yet to be found" and "yet to be developed." However, many analysts scoff at this optimistic assessment, arguing that **rising production costs for energy that**

will be ever more difficult and costly to extract[ion], **environmental opposition, warfare, corruption and other impediments will make it extremely difficult to achieve increases** of this magnitude. In other words, even if production manages for a time to top the 2010 level of 87 million barrels per day, the goal of 104 million barrels will never be reached and the world's major consumers will face virtual, if not absolute, scarcity. Water provides another potent example. On an annual basis, the supply of drinking water provided by natural precipitation remains more or less constant: about 40,000 cubic kilometers. But much of this precipitation lands on Greenland, Antarctica, Siberia and inner Amazonia where there are very few people, so the supply available to major concentrations of humanity is often surprisingly limited. In many regions with high population levels, water supplies are already relatively sparse. This is especially true of North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East, where the demand for water continues to grow as a result of rising populations, urbanization and the emergence of new water-intensive industries. The result, even when the supply remains constant, is an environment of increasing scarcity. Wherever you look, the picture is roughly the same: supplies of critical resources may be rising or falling, but rarely do they appear to be outpacing demand, producing a sense of widespread and systemic scarcity. However generated, **a perception** of scarcity—or imminent scarcity—regularly leads to anxiety, resentment, **hostility** and contentiousness This pattern is **very well understood**, and has been evident **throughout human history**. In his book Constant Battles, for example, Steven LeBlanc, director of collections for Harvard's Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, notes that many ancient **civilizations** experienced higher levels of warfare when faced with resource shortages brought about by population growth, crop failures or persistent drought. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller Collapse, has detected a similar pattern in Mayan civilization and the Anasazi culture of New Mexico's Chaco Canyon. More recently, concern over adequate food for the home population was a significant factor in **Japan**'s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and **Germany**'s invasions of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Union in 1941, according to Lizzie Collingham, author of The Taste of War. Although the global supply of most basic commodities has grown enormously since the end of World War II, analysts see the persistence of resource-related conflict in areas where materials remain scarce or there is anxiety about the future reliability of supplies. Many experts believe, for example, that the fighting in **Darfur** and other war-ravaged areas of **North Africa** has been driven, at least in part, by competition among desert tribes for access to scarce water supplies, exacerbated in some cases by rising population levels. "In Darfur," says a 2009 report from the UN Environment Programme on the role of natural resources in the conflict, "recurrent drought, increasing demographic pressures, and political marginalization are among the forces that have pushed the region into a spiral of lawlessness and violence that **has led to 300,000 deaths** and the displacement of more than two million people since 2003." Anxiety over future supplies is often also a factor in conflicts that break out over access to oil or control of contested undersea reserves of oil and natural gas. In 1979, for instance, when the Islamic **revolution in Iran** overthrew the Shah and the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington began to fear that someday it might be denied access to Persian Gulf oil. At that point, President Jimmy Carter promptly announced what came to be called the Carter Doctrine. In his 1980 State of the Union Address, Carter affirmed that any move to impede the flow of oil from the Gulf would be viewed as a threat to America's "vital interests" and would be repelled by "any means necessary, including military force." In 1990, this principle was invoked by President George H.W. Bush to justify intervention in **the first** Persian **Gulf War**, just as his son would use it, in part, to justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Today, it remains the basis for US plans to employ force to stop the Iranians from closing the Strait of Hormuz, the strategic waterway connecting the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean through which about 35 percent of the world's seaborne oil commerce passes. Recently, a set of resource conflicts have been rising toward the boiling point between **China** and its neighbors in Southeast Asia when it comes to control of offshore oil and gas reserves in the **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea. Although the resulting naval clashes have yet to result in a loss of life, a strong possibility of military escalation exists. A similar situation has also arisen in the **E**ast **C**hina **S**ea, where China and Japan are jousting for control over similarly valuable undersea reserves. Meanwhile, in the South Atlantic Ocean, Argentina and Britain are once again squabbling over the Falkland Islands (called Las Malvinas by the Argentinians) because oil has been discovered in surrounding waters. By all accounts, resource-driven potential conflicts like these will only **multiply** in the years ahead as demand rises, supplies dwindle and more of what remains will be found in disputed areas In a 2012 study titled Resources Futures, the respected British think-tank Chatham House expressed particular concern about possible resource wars over water, especially in areas like the Nile and Jordan River basins where several groups or countries must share the same river for the majority of their water supplies and few possess the wherewithal to develop alternatives. "Against this backdrop of tight supplies and competition, issues related to water rights, prices, and pollution are becoming contentious," the report noted. "In areas with limited capacity to govern shared resources, balance competing demands, and mobilize new investments, tensions over water may erupt into more **open confrontations**." Heading for a Resource-Shock World Tensions like these would be destined to grow by themselves because in so many areas supplies of key resources will not be able to keep up with demand. As it happens, though, they are not "by themselves." On this planet, a second major force has entered the equation in a significant way. With the growing reality of climate change, everything becomes a lot more terrifying. Normally, when we consider the impact of climate change, we think primarily about the environment—the melting Arctic ice cap or Greenland ice shield, rising global sea levels, intensifying storms, expanding desert and endangered or disappearing species like the polar bear. But a growing number of experts are coming to realize that the most potent effects of climate change will be experienced by humans directly through the impairment or wholesale destruction of habitats upon which we rely for food production, industrial activities or simply to live. Essentially, climate change will wreak its havoc on us by constraining our access to the basics of life: vital resources that include food, water, land and energy. This will be devastating to human life, even as it significantly increases the danger of resource conflicts of all sorts erupting. We already know enough about the future effects of climate change to predict the following with reasonable confidence: * Rising sea levels will in the next half-century erase many coastal areas, destroying large cities, critical infrastructure (including roads, railroads, ports, airports, pipelines, refineries and power plants) and prime agricultural land. * Diminished rainfall and prolonged droughts will turn once-verdant croplands into dust bowls, reducing food output and turning millions into "climate refugees." * More severe storms and intense heat waves will kill crops, trigger forest fires, cause floods and destroy critical infrastructure. No one can predict how much food, land, water and energy will be lost as a result of this onslaught (and other climate-change effects that are harder to predict or even possibly imagine), but the cumulative effect will undoubtedly be staggering. In Resources Futures, Chatham House offers a particularly dire warning when it comes to the threat of diminished precipitation to rain-fed agriculture. "By 2020," the report says, "yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%" in some areas. The highest rates of loss are expected to be in Africa, where reliance on rain-fed farming is greatest, but agriculture in China, India, Pakistan and Central Asia is also likely to be severely affected. Heat waves, droughts and other effects of climate change will also reduce the flow of many vital rivers, diminishing water supplies for irrigation, hydro-electricity power facilities and nuclear reactors (which need massive amounts of water for cooling purposes). The melting of glaciers, especially in the Andes in Latin America and the Himalayas in South Asia, will also rob communities and cities of crucial water supplies. An expected increase in the frequency of hurricanes and typhoons will pose a growing threat to offshore oil rigs, coastal refineries, transmission lines and other components of the global energy system. The melting of the Arctic ice cap will open that region to oil and gas exploration, but an increase in iceberg activity will make all efforts to exploit that region's energy supplies perilous and exceedingly costly. Longer growing seasons in the north, especially Siberia and Canada's northern provinces, might compensate to some degree for the desiccation of croplands in more southerly latitudes. However, moving the global agricultural system (and the world's farmers) northward from abandoned farmlands in the United States, Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Argentina and Australia would be a daunting prospect. It is safe to assume that climate change, especially when combined with growing supply shortages, will result in a significant reduction in the planet's vital resources, augmenting the kinds of pressures that have historically led to conflict, even under better circumstances. In this way, according to the Chatham House report, climate change is best understood as a "threat multiplier…a key factor exacerbating existing resource vulnerability" in states already prone to such disorders. Like other experts on the subject, Chatham House's analysts claim, for example, that climate change will reduce crop output in many areas, sending global food prices soaring and triggering unrest among those already pushed to the limit under existing conditions. "Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heat waves and floods, will also result in much larger and frequent local harvest shocks around the world….These shocks will affect global food prices whenever key centers of agricultural production area are hit—further amplifying global food price volatility." This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of civil unrest. When, for instance, a brutal heat wave decimated Russia's wheat crop during the summer of 2010, the global price of wheat (and so of that staple of life, bread) began an inexorable upward climb, reaching particularly high levels in North Africa and the Middle East. With local governments unwilling or unable to help desperate populations, anger over impossible-to-afford food merged with resentment toward autocratic regimes to trigger the massive popular outburst we know as the Arab Spring. Many such explosions are likely in the future, Chatham House suggests, if current trends continue as climate change and resource scarcity meld into a single reality in our world. A single provocative question from that group should haunt us all: "Are we on the cusp of a new world order dominated by struggles over access to affordable resources?" For the US intelligence community, which appears to have been influenced by the report, the response was blunt. In March, for the first time, Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper listed "competition and scarcity involving natural resources" as a national security threat on a par with global terrorism, cyberwar and nuclear [weapons] proliferation. "Many countries important to the United States are vulnerable to natural resource shocks that degrade economic development, frustrate attempts to democratize, raise the risk of regime-threatening instability, and aggravate regional tensions," he wrote in his prepared statement for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. "Extreme weather events (floods, droughts, heat waves) will increasingly disrupt food and energy markets, exacerbating state weakness, forcing human migrations, and triggering riots, civil disobedience, and vandalism." There was a new phrase embedded in his comments: "resource shocks." It catches something of the world we're barreling toward, and the language is striking for an intelligence community that, like the government it serves, has largely played down or ignored the dangers of climate change. For the first time, senior government analysts may be coming to appreciate what energy experts, resource analysts and scientists have long been warning about: the unbridled consumption of the world's natural resources, combined with the advent of extreme climate change, could produce a global explosion of human chaos and conflict. We are now heading directly into a resource-shock world.

Aff Rebuttal CARDS

General

AT Energy Security

1] Renewables solve, no conflict over them compared to with fossil fuels, and renewable energy-independency

2] See Shea and Mirza 2022 – takes A DECADE to approve new FF mining on public lands. Approval processes, forms, tax files, building oil rigs, employing workers takes YEARS to do, so no energy security. Could've done renewables in the meantime.

AT Off-Shoring

1] Turn: Neg abandons US climate leadership, and other countries will keep polluting – at its most basic: staying true to the symbolic act itself is crucial. US is doing all it can to lower emissions and other countries will follow, so we'll have tighter env. regs in those places too. Companies won't have choices to offshore, and Aff solves climate.

2] Offshoring is harder – costs go up, so Aff deters pollution

Shea et al. 22. Rowland-Shea holds a master's degree in geography from The George Washington University where she focused on urban sustainability and green space issues and served as the teaching assistant for the university's Introduction to Sustainability course. She is the Director for Public Lands at American Progress. MAR 10, 2022. 5 Reasons Why the United States Can't Drill Its Way to Energy Independence. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/5-reasons-why-the-united-states-cant-drill-its-way-to-energy-independence/ BZ

New oil projects won't bring down prices or increase supply in the short term Nothing on the industry wish list is a silver bullet to solve the short-term crisis. According to the Government Accountability Office, on average, **it takes more than four years for companies to begin producing on the federal lands they lease. Offshore production takes even longer, as it takes at least two to three years to build the needed rigs.** This delay is not due to drilling permit review, which—at most—takes fewer than 200 days. Even oil and gas industry executives themselves are saying it: Launching more oil and gas projects now will have no effect on short-term global energy markets.

3] EVEN IF offshoring happens, there will still be a net decrease in emissions

Stockholm Environment Institute 18 Stockholm Environment Institute. "Opening Public Lands And Waters To Fossil Fuel Extraction Could Have Major Climate Consequences." Stockholm Environment Institute. February 22, 2018. Web. October 08, 2023.

The study – published today in Climatic Change – found that a ban on new and renewed leases for fossil fuel production on U.S. public lands and waters could reduce global CO2 emissions by 280 million tons annually by 2030. That is equivalent to about 5% of U.S. emissions, a reduction that would represent substantial progress toward U.S. and global climate goals. These findings highlight flaws in federal environmental reviews that often simply assume that every barrel of oil not produced in the U.S. will be produced elsewhere. The study comes as the Interior Department considers opening up most federal waters in the Atlantic, Pacific and Arctic to new drilling. "[However] Our models show that **each barrel of U.S. oil left undeveloped leads to** about a **halfbarrel drop in global oil consumption**," said Pete Erickson, an SEI senior scientist who coauthored the study. "In the long term, the smart choice –for the climate and the economy – is to phase down oil and gas production, not ramp it up." SEI researchers specifically examined the policies proposed in the "Keep It in the Ground Act," as introduced in Congress in 2015 and 2016. The latest version was introduced at the beginning of the current Congress by Sens. Jeff Merkley (D-Ore.) and Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.). The study confirmed that the bill's policies would have a substantial benefit in reducing global emissions – and thus help meet the Paris Agreement goal of keeping warming below 2°C. Key findings include: Restricting future lease issuance and renewal could lead to a 37 percent reduction in U.S. federal fossil fuel production in 2030. That decline would lead to slightly higher fuel prices – prompting added production from other sources – but the net effect would still reduce CO2 emissions by 280 million metric tons in 2030. Limiting new federal coal leases would cost about $20 per ton of CO2 in 2030, well within the range of costs associated with other options for reducing emissions. Limiting new federal oil leases would help limit carbon lock-in. Most oil extracted from federal lands comes from large, capital intensive offshore oil fields that – once built – will continue pumping oil almost regardless of price. For that reason, limiting new offshore oil could protect against future economic losses and 'stranded assets'. State-level action in Western States could yield global climate benefits. The study's results show that limiting oil and coal production in a halfdozen states would effectively limit global CO2 emissions. The findings could also help inform the environmental review of projects that affect future fossil fuel supply. Currently, reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act often assume that any oil not produced in the U.S. would be produced elsewhere. But SEI researchers found that assumption is not supported by economic principles. In other words,

every ton of coal or barrel of oil left in the ground would result in a drop in global consumption and a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions. “Our findings help cast aside the irrational belief in perfect substitution or, as some have called it, ‘whack-a-mole’. In most cases, leaving coal or oil resources undeveloped will lead to global CO2 benefits,” said Michael Lazarus, co-author of the study and director of SEI’s U.S. Center.

4] It’s harder and expensive to shift overseas – Aff deters fossil fuel supply, encouraging people to opt for clean energy.

Sarinsky & Howard 21. Max Sarinsky is a senior **attorney** at the Institute for Policy Integrity at **New York University School of Law**. Peter Howard is the **Economics Director** at the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. Yes, Curbing U.S. Fossil Fuel Extraction Does Reduce Climate Pollution. The Regulatory Review. Nov 29, 2021. https://www.theregreview.org/2021/11/29/sarinsky-howard-curbing-fossil-fuel-extraction-reduce-climate-pollution/ BZ

With experts worldwide calling on governments to transition away from fossil fuels to prevent catastrophic levels of climate change, the Biden Administration is in the midst of reconsidering the federal government’s oil, gas, and coal leasing programs. Reforms to these programs could bring U.S. energy policy closer in line with climate reality by reducing the extraction of fossil fuels from public lands. Predictably, **the fossil-fuel industry** and its allies have opposed these reforms. These groups have dredged up old government analyses to **argue that restricting domestic energy supply will shift production overseas, purportedly removing business from the United States while doing nothing to solve the climate problem.** The logic goes that, because fossil fuel extraction will continue in other countries, the United States should keep making money from extraction while the world burns. This argument has been coined by experts as “perfect substitution.” But this climate nihilism has been widely debunked for violating basic economics. Federal courts have repeatedly rejected analyses that **relied on perfect substitution to** justify[s] irresponsible levels of extraction. Policymakers should not take the argument seriously but should instead be guided by rigorous science and economics in shaping domestic policies to reduce emissions and address climate change. **The notion of perfect substitution violates basic supply-and-demand principles. Fossil-fuel companies want to extract** from federal lands mainly because it is a cheap **supply option. If [extracting on federal lands] such leasing became less available, fossil-fuel producers would have to turn to more expensive alternatives, causing fossil-fuel consumption to fall and renewable substitutes to become more competitive.** Given its vast market power, the federal government could level the playing field for sustainable fuels if it prioritized conservation, recreation, and renewable energy production **on federal lands and waters** rather than tying up so much land in fossil-fuel extraction. That is why, after the federal government justified coal leasing in 2010 on the grounds that it would have no climate impacts due to perfect substitution, a federal appeals court unanimously rejected the approval. The three-judge panel, including one judge appointed by President Ronald Reagan, described perfect substitution as “irrational” and “contrary to basic supply and demand principles.”

AT Private Land

1] Neg can't solve for private land either: this is purely a public land FF debate. Aff lowers pollution on public lands + pollution overall w/ our international influence arg. We shud ask how Neg solves climate change

2] Even if u do care: US action spills over to private lands in other countries – inspires global action according to Sarinsky and Howard 2021

C1 Climate – Extra

Fossil fuel leases from public lands are driving the shale boom and increasing climate emissions, making it impossible to solve global warming.

Biber and Diamond 21 [Eric Biber, Edward C. Halbach Jr. Professor of Law at UC Berkeley, and Jordan Diamond, Professor of Law at UC Berkeley and Executive Director at the Center for Law, Energy & the Environment at UC Berkeley, "Keeping It All In The Ground?" Arizona Law Review, https://arizonalawreview.org/pdf/63-2/63arizlrev279.pdf]/Kankee

Beginning in 2017, the Trump Administration opened **millions** of acres of federal onshore and offshore lands to oil and gas leasing.9 Environmental groups have challenged many of these new leases, in some cases winning court-ordered pauses of leases in sensitive areas (including partial overturning of BLM's new field guidance).10 But in February 2020, the DOI celebrated a **record** of over one **billion** barrels of oil produced from federal leases in 2019.11 While the "Leave It in the Ground" movement has to date primarily focused on termination of future fossil fuel leasing of federal lands, millions of acres are already subject to existing leases that allow private companies to extract coal, oil, and natural gas—a situation exacerbated by the Trump Administration, but predating it. While the quantity of fossil fuels on leased lands is dwarfed by the amount that remains on unleased lands, 12 existing leases contribute a **significant** portion of U.S. fossil-fuel production and greenhouse gas emissions. In 2017, active onshore and offshore leases produced 2.2 million barrels of crude oil per day (nearly **24%** of total U.S. production), 4,328 billion cubic feet of natural gas per year (13% of total U.S. production), and 333 million short tons of coal (**43%** of total U.S. production).13 In 2014, the direct and indirect **emissions from the fossil fuels extracted from federal lands** produced the equivalent of 1,279 million metric tons of carbon dioxide, an average of **23%** of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from 2005–2014.14 This is a large portion of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions; full exploitation of the fossil fuels from these existing leases could make it **impossible** for the United States to meet its **commitments** to reduce greenhouse gas emissions sufficient to restrict climate change to less than 2° Celsius warming.15 There is significant uncertainty associated with these estimates and projections. However, it is clear that fossil-fuel production on federal lands contributes **significantly** to total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions; and if even roughly accurate, these statistics raise the question of whether termination of existing fossilfuel **leases on federal lands** might be **necessary** to achieve target U.S. reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Answering that question requires determining whether, and to what extent, the federal government has the legal authority to terminate existing fossil-fuel leases. The remainder of this Article focuses on that discrete question. We begin by analyzing the ability of Congress to pass legislation to terminate existing fossil-fuel leases and what (if any) compensation might then be owed to leaseholders. We then turn to the more difficult question of whether, under existing law, the President and the DOI could terminate existing offshore and onshore fossil-fuel leases.16 We also examine what remedies might be available to leaseholders to seek judicial review or court-ordered compensation for administrative actions to terminate leases. We conclude by briefly identifying the questions that must be addressed to determine whether—even if there is legal authority to terminate leases—such termination is a wise policy choice.

SUPPLY-SIDE ban good [+ renewables]

Supply side bans on extraction are key to providing incentive for firms to invest in renewable technology.

Paul and Moe ’23 [Mark* and Lina**; March; *Rutgers University, Climate and Community Project. **Rutgers University, Climate and Community Project; climate + community project, “An Economist’s Case for Restrictive Supply Side Policies: Ten Policies to Manage the Fossil Fuel Transition,” https://www.climateandcommunity.org/_files/ugd/d6378b_6f4e6bc38aa74051ac435c1fe9d96624.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1ZCHKMME2CxJb6hqEtKIeuiAe4VGhxdl4PIfOsFs-7yYHa8SFEt8I6pgU]

When one adopts a dynamic view of the economy, the importance of restrictive supply-side policies—and their complementary nature vis-à-vis demand-side policies—is even more robust. For example, supply-side policies have proven important in spurring innovation; once there is a policy environment with clear policy certainty, firms invest in research and development to meet the moment and maintain profitability.30 Furthermore, as Richard York’s investigation of the historic rise in fossil fuels as a substitution for whale oil has shown, simply expanding renewables (or energy substitutes) will be insufficient to eliminate fossil fuel use, as people may increase consumption as energy becomes cheaper or more abundant (a phenomenon known as the Jevons or green paradox). Outright bans on supply are essential to realizing benefits from technological innovation—in this case, from policies that increase the deployment of clean and **renewable technology**. Together, supply- and demand-side policies can **reduce emissions** from both a consumption and extraction standpoint and do so in ways that minimize the shortfalls of using either policy in isolation. Outright bans on supply are essential to realizing benefits from technological innovation—in this case, from policies that increase the deployment of clean and renewable technology. Together, supply- and demand-side policies can reduce emissions from both a consumption and extraction standpoint and do so in ways that minimize the shortfalls of using either policy in isolation.

AT Minimal Impact / MarketSim

Circular logic: "We won't hurt the climate much, let's keep doing it" – they keep extracting until there is 101% no return and we're doomed to global warming extinction

Sarinsky & Howard 21. Max Sarinsky is a senior **attorney** at the Institute for Policy Integrity at **New York University School of Law**. Peter Howard is the **Economics Director** at the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. Yes, Curbing U.S. Fossil Fuel Extraction Does Reduce Climate Pollution. The Regulatory Review. Nov 29, 2021. https://www.theregreview.org/2021/11/29/sarinsky-howard-curbing-fossil-fuel-extraction-reduce-climate-pollution/ BZ

The argument should have died there, but it did not. With perfect substitution off the table, **the U.S.** Department of the Interior developed an economic model—known as MarketSim—finding near-perfect substitution. Using this model, the Interior Department concluded that, although reducing extraction on federal lands does reduce consumption, this reduction is exceedingly small due to substitution effects. Using this model, the Obama, Trump, and now Biden Administrations have moved forward with major extraction plans after the Interior Department claimed that these fossil-fuel projects would barely budge—or, in many cases, even decrease—total greenhouse gas emissions. But two federal courts recently rejected major leasing plans relying on this model, which was based on several faulty inputs. For instance, in Center for Biological Diversity v. Bernhardt, the defendants' environmental impact statement, which was based on the MarketSim model, **completely ignored impacts on foreign energy consumption, falsely assuming that consumption abroad would be unaffected by a reduction in global supply.** As the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit explained last year, this error helped produce the model's "counterintuitive result." Although the Interior Department has recently attempted to correct the error identified by the Ninth Circuit, the MarketSim model suffers from other key shortcomings that overstate substitution effects. Most notably, the model effectively disregards the long-term **growth of solar and wind energy** by assuming that global oil and gas consumption would continue unabated f**or the next 70 years.** This premise is incompatible with global efforts to mitigate climate change. In essence, the government assumed that nothing would be done to combat climate change and then used that premise to justify climate-damaging policies. This self-fulfilling pessimism is not a reasonable basis for government decision-making.

Federal public lands and waters make up a quarter of the U.S.

Vincent et al. 2020. Carol Hardy Vincent (Specialist in Natural Resources Policy); Laura A. Hanson (Senior Research Librarian); Lucas F. Bermejo (Research Assistant). *Federal Land Ownership: Overview and Data*. This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. Updated February 21, 2020 https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R42346.pdf BZ

The federal government owns roughly 640 million acres, **about 28% of the** 2.27 billion acres of **land in the United States.** Four major federal land [is] management agencies administer 606.5 [600] million acres of this land (as of September 30, 2018). They are the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and National Park Service (NPS) in the Department of the Interior (DOI) and the Forest Service (FS) in the Department of Agriculture. A fifth agency, the Department of Defense (excluding the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), administers 8.8 million acres in the United States (as of September 30, 2017), consisting of military bases, training ranges, and more. Together, the five agencies manage about 615.3 million acres, or 27% of the U.S. land base. Many other agencies administer the remaining federal acreage. The lands administered by the four major agencies are managed for many purposes, primarily related to preservation, recreation, and development of natural resources. Yet the agencies have distinct responsibilities. The BLM manages 244.4 million acres and the FS manages 192.9 million acres under similar multiple-use, sustained-yield mandates that support a variety of activities and programs. The FWS manages 89.2 million acres of the U.S. total, primarily to conserve and protect animals and plants. In FY2018, the NPS managed 79.9 million acres in 417 diverse units to conserve lands and resources and make them available for public use. The 8.8 million acres of DOD lands are managed primarily for military training and testing.

AT Need Fuel Right Now

Giving FF companies public land won't guarantee energy: they purposely watch fuel prices rise while families suffer [we need renewables – less volatile prices]

Shea et al. 22. Rowland-Shea holds a master's degree in geography from The George Washington University where she focused on urban sustainability and green space issues and served as the teaching assistant for the university's Introduction to Sustainability course. She is the Director for Public Lands at American Progress. MAR 10, 2022. 5 Reasons Why the United States Can't Drill Its Way to Energy Independence. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/5-reasons-why-the-united-states-cant-drill-its-way-to-energy-independence/ BZ

Industry CEOs are profiting hand over fist while average families suffer Meanwhile oil and gas executives are raking in windfall profits while consumers suffer at the pump. Last year, four of the major oil companies—Shell, Chevron, BP, and ExxonMobil—posted record profits, totaling $75 billion. In the fourth quarter alone, ExxonMobil was bringing in $97 million dollars in profit every day. The reason that U.S. oil companies haven't increased production is simple: They decided to use their billions in profits to pay dividends to their CEOs and wealthy shareholders and simply haven't chosen to invest[ed] in new oil production. According to Bloomberg, "U.S. oil companies generally have been reluctant to pump more, preferring to steer cash flows back to investors instead of spending it on new drilling that could flood the world with cheap crude." The oil industry is sitting on 10 years' worth of unused leases The oil industry already has at least 10 years' worth of unused leases at its disposal. They are only producing oil or gas on roughly half of the area they have already leased. There are nearly 14 million acres onshore and more than 9 million acres offshore that are currently under lease but are not being used for oil production. At least one-quarter of these unused leases are sitting on lands that the Bureau of Land Management has deemed to have a medium or high potential for oil. What's more, only 10 percent of U.S. oil and gas production occurs on federal lands and waters, limiting the federal government's ability to impact leasing decisions—the other 90 percent is done on state and private resources.

AT FF Job Loss

1st] FF job loss inevitable due to automation and labor being replaced by technology, and 2nd] Clean energy creates more jobs, because of climate-focused policies and investments

Knight 23. Prior to joining the CCE team, Rick completed a 40-year career in energy and pollution control research at the Gas Technology Institute, retiring in 2016 as an Institute Engineer. Rick was one of the first CCL members in the Chicago area in 2011, founded the Chicago Southwest chapter in 2012, and served as a State Coordinator from 2015 to 2018. He received a B.S. in chemistry from the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1975. How clean energy creates more jobs. Rick Knight, March 8 2023. https://citizensclimatelobby.org/blog/policy/how-clean-energy-creates-more-jobs/ BZ

Question: Does making fossil fuels more expensive eliminate jobs? Answer: No. **Cutting fossil fuel emissions actually puts more people to work than business as usual at comparable wages.** Map of clean energy jobs vs fossil fuels jobs Fossil fuel employment has been shrinking for years, **mainly because of mechanization, not regulation.** For example, in 1980, producing 100 tons of coal per hour required 52 miners; by 2015 that number dropped to 16. Even though more coal was being mined, coal mining lost 58 percent of its jobs between 1980 and 2015. According to the 2019 U.S. Energy & Employment Report, in 2018 there were 2.4 million jobs in clean energy generation and energy efficiency, compared to half that many in fossil energy production. Even without a price on carbon, installers and service technicians for solar and wind are forecast to grow 11 to 13 times faster than the U.S. average. Also, **the vast majority of energy sector jobs, such as electricians, power plant operators, riggers, etc., are needed for both fossil and non-fossil energy.** Our country will still need energy, whether it comes from low- or zero-carbon sources or from the old polluting sources of the past. Today, the energy technologies of the future create more well-paying jobs per energy dollar spent, and will continue to do so even as the new technologies mature. Consider that renewable electricity is already cost-competitive with fossil-generated power in many locations, and it becomes even clearer that investment dollars will continue to flow to the generation resources that create the most jobs. And it's not just renewable energy jobs! A 2017 study of a carbon tax in British Columbia that reroutes most revenue to taxpayers showed that, over a six-year period, job gains in labor-intensive sectors like health care outweighed job losses in energy-intensive sectors like air travel. There were more employment opportunities with the carbon tax than without it. In a nutshell: **Clean energy and energy efficiency actually puts more people to work, at comparable wages, than continued fossil fuel extraction.** If a carbon fee is part of the policy portfolio and revenue is used for carbon cash-back payments to households, this also stimulates job growth in businesses outside the energy sector. Deeper dive: One of the reasons climate action is difficult is that incumbent industries that extract and/or depend on fossil fuels find it easy to argue that strong climate policy will kill jobs. That's an argument that plays on emotion, but it's not really supported by facts. The past: Fossil fuel employment has been shrinking for years, mainly because of mechanization, not regulation. For example, in 1980, producing 100 tons of coal per hour required 52 miners; by 2015 that number dropped to 16. Between 1980 and 2015, even though more coal was being mined, coal mining lost 58 percent of its jobs. This clearly debunks any claim that some kind of government-run "war on coal" is responsible for lost jobs in that industry. The present: **The 2022 International Energy Agency report cited above shows that, worldwide, clean energy already provides[ing] half of all energy jobs, and that opportunities in climate-friendly sectors "represent the highest employment creation potential."** In North America, the clean energy proportion is slightly higher at 51% of energy jobs. This metric does not include vehicle manufacturing because, as the IEA report itself puts it, "EVs could be roughly as labour-intensive across the entire value chain." Focusing on the U.S., the 2019 U.S. Energy & Employment Report lists **2.39 million jobs in clean energy generation and energy efficiency versus 1.23 million – half as many – in fossil energy production.** Another 1.36 million energy jobs were in cross-cutting sectors like transmission, distribution, and energy storage which are technically independent where the energy comes from. In 2020, CCL Research Coordinator Jerry Hinkle wrote a blog post on this topic. One study he cited compared the wages and benefits of clean energy jobs in the U.S. to the national average as well as to those in the fossil fuel industry. It showed that median wages for clean energy careers were 25% higher than the national median and are more likely to come with health and retirement benefits than the rest of the private sector. Salaries in clean energy were comparable to fossil fuel job salaries. The future: **As for future U.S. job growth prospects, installers and service technicians for solar and wind are forecast to grow 11 to 13 times faster than the U.S. average. Also, the vast majority of energy sector jobs, such as electricians, power plant operators, riggers, etc., are needed for both fossil and non-fossil energy.** And those growth forecasts do not account for increased ambition in climate policy, such as robust

carbon pricing, which would surely accelerate the demand for [renewable energy] workers that support a clean transition. So what about carbon pricing?: Jerry Hinkle's blog post also cited a study where Harvard and Tufts University economists, using a World bank dataset, measured the impact of carbon pricing in 31 European countries over the prior 30 years. While those policies caused employment to shift away from industries that pollute more, they increased them in the emerging clean energy economy. Far from being "job killers," **the net effect on employment growth was slightly positive, particularly in the early years.** Further on carbon pricing, British Columbia was one of the first jurisdictions to explore a carbon tax that reroutes most revenue to taxpayers (via tax credits in this case.) A 2017 study of this policy showed that, over a six-year period, job gains in labor-intensive sectors like health care outweighed job losses in energy-intensive sectors like air travel. There were more employment opportunities with the carbon tax than without it. Bottom line: Every objective line of evidence shows that a transition from fossil energy to renewable and low-carbon energy will maintain both the quantity and quality of careers in the energy sector. This finding also holds true when clean energy growth is stimulated with carbon pricing, especially if the revenue is shared with households.

Alt causes: The FF industry is removing workers by the hundreds of thousands with automation – Neg is worse for unemployment.

Aronoff 21. Kate Aronoff is a staff writer at The New Republic. Kate Aronoff / April 5, 2021.
https://newrepublic.com/article/161937/fossil-fuel-companies-job-killers BZ

A recent analysis from the Norwegian research firm Rystad Energy, published last week, finds that "robotic drilling systems can potentially reduce the number of roughnecks required on a drilling rig" by 20 to 30 percent over the next decade, translating to hundreds of thousands of jobs lost and billions of dollars saved worldwide. In the United States, Rystad Energy predicts that could mean the permanent loss of 140,000 jobs. In the past year, tumult in the oil industry has led to a rash of bankruptcies, consolidations, and layoffs. While the price of oil is starting to rebound, a study released by Deloitte last fall found that some 70 percent of the 107,000 jobs lost between March and August 2020 may not return, and those that do are likely to be weighted toward white-collar office work. Across mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction—a U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics category that also includes support services—unemployment now stands at 15 percent. As of last month, **the sector had the highest sectoral rate of unemployment in the country.** Executives, contrary to lobbyists' portrayal of the industry as generous job creators, are eager to let automation take its course, accelerating those trends. In March, at CERAWeek—an annual conference for the oil and gas industry—Chevron CEO Mike Wirth excitedly described how Covid-19 had accelerated the company's workforce shrinkage. "We had directional drilling going on in people's homes, where just a couple of years ago we had to have somebody on a rig that was controlling the drill bit. That had been moved to a drilling support center centralized in Houston, and we were able to quickly move that actually to individual employees' homes," he said. "There's been a great acceleration of technologies that had begun to be available to our business, but there was perhaps a bit of reluctance to see them accelerate into use. And now we had no choice.… That will be one of the lasting impacts that I think will be very positive." Fossil fuel companies are generally happy to take federal money and lay off employees anyway. A study from Bailout Watch finds that 77 oil and gas companies that got a total of $8.2 billion worth of stimulus-related tax breaks last year laid off 16 percent of their combined workforce, totaling 58,000 people. Marathon Petroleum—which raked in $2.1 billion in pandemic tax breaks—got approximately $1 million for each of the 1,920 workers it laid off. As was predicted to happen at the start of the pandemic, bigger producers with more resilient balance sheets are snapping up shakier competitors. In the year's fourth multibillion consolidation, reported by Reuters on Thursday, Pioneer Natural Resources bought the privately held firm DoublePoint Energy for $6.4 billion. But long before the novel coronavirus, his companies had been rapidly automating their operations, contracting with supposedly climate-conscious companies like Microsoft and Amazon to pump out more oil with fewer people via cloud-computing technology.

AT Carbon Tax CP

1] Perm DB – Neg not unique to implementing

2] Carb tax alone is not enough to stop climate change – it's a quick fix + doesn't truly stop pollution.

3] ff companies make so much money already that the tax wont even dent them, they'll keep polluting – the CP's small tax FAILS to deter emissions

4] Ending fossil fuel leases on federal lands will be more effective than other policies at reducing climate change – influences other nations

Cushman 16 Cushman, Jr., John. "Fossil Fuels On Federal Lands: Phase-Out Needed For Climate Goals, Study Says." Inside Climate News. May 03, 2016. Web. October 08, 2023.

By comparison, other policies would be much less effective. For example, across-the-board regulations on emissions from the whole oil and gas industry would cut emissions just 13 million tons, and methane leakage restrictions on oil and gas operations **on federal lands just 5 million tons, the study said**. **The Stockholm institute's work builds on recent projections of emission pathways toward the international goal of keeping warming below 2 degrees Celsius, such as one published in the journal Nature and another published by the International Energy Agency. In Paris, negotiators called for an even more ambitious goal, 1.5 degrees. The study compared those approaches to the current U.S. Energy Department's energy outlook, which assumed no new restrictions beyond the Clean Power Plan, and saw energy production growing 11 percent by 2040.** "**Between them, these studies suggest that to be consistent with a 2 degree Celsius goal, the U.S. would need to cut aggregate fossil fuel production by 40–44 percent from current levels by 2040**," **the Stockholm paper found**. One big unknown: how much a unilateral step by **the federal government to phase out [stopping] leasing would influence other nations**. If the rest of the world barrels down the business-as-usual path, the U.S. change might have less effect, the authors said. If it inspires others to raise their ambitions, it might have even more impact than this study forecasts.

5] Carbon tax causes economic harm with no environmental benefit

Loris 19 Nicholas Loris, Deputy Director of Thomas A. Roe Institute, 2019, Why the Carbon Tax Would Backfire on America, https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/why-the-carbon-tax-would-backfire-america (accessed 10/21/23)

Analysts at The Heritage Foundation used the U.S. Energy Administration Information's energy model to estimate the effects of a carbon tax to reduce carbon dioxide emissions as aggressively as possible between now and 2040. According to the model's results, a carbon tax would cause: A peak employment shortfall of more than 1.4 million jobs. A total income loss of more than $40,000 for a family of four. [and] An aggregate **g**ross **d**omestic **p**roduct loss of more than $3.9 trillion. Increases in household electricity expenditures of 12% to 124%. Even worse, the burden would be heaviest on low-income families who spend a higher portion of their budget on energy costs. Some carbon tax proposals acknowledge this and offer rebates from the tax revenue collected. But even if a rebate check compensates low-income families for their higher energy bills, it won't undo the damage they'll incur from paying more for groceries, clothes, health care, and everything else they buy because of the increased cost of energy for all those providers. Some supporters talk of returning the tax revenue to the people in various ways, but not without taking some kind of cut for their own special interests, whether for green energy projects or new infrastructure. Then there's the bureaucratic nightmare of implementing a new tax. Acknowledging that a carbon tax would harm American businesses and U.S. competitiveness, carbon tax proponents suggest enacting a border adjustment tax for imported goods from countries where no carbon pricing exists. Others propose to eliminate environmental regulations in exchange for a carbon tax. Administering border taxes on goods imported from countries without carbon taxes "would be enormously complex, requiring an estimate of the tax-equivalent value of the given policies under examination," said resident American Enterprise Institute scholar Benjamin Zycher. And the administrative state would be empowered to make decisions micromanaging the economy via tax policy. Supporters argue a carbon tax is worth it despite

the costs, but it's not clear it would do much to benefit the climate. No doubt, carbon dioxide emissions would decline—if you tax something, you'll get less of it. But the impact on global temperatures would be negligible by the end of the century, even if you assume the most catastrophic scenario. It's also highly unlikely a carbon tax would be faithfully applied to everyone, Zycher pointed out, because various interest groups will influence which businesses are subject to the tax and other countries are likely to implement alternative policies that subsidize solar and wind energy instead of taxing carbon. Carbon taxes are a cure worse than the alleged disease: They have a minimal impact on emissions and will do next to nothing to affect climate change. In the end, they hurt the very citizens they are **intend**ed to help.

AT: carbon CAPTURE CP

Carbon capture exacerbates climate change, particularly because the counterplan sustains fossil fuel extraction.

Drugmand 21 Drugmand, Dana. "Confronting The Myth Of Carbon-free Fossil Fuels: Why Carbon Capture Is Not A Climate Solution." Environmental Working Group. April 22, 2021. Web. https://www.ewg.org/news-insights/news/confronting-myth-carbon-free-fossil-fuels-why-carbon-capture-not-climate October 08, 2023.

The world is confronting a climate emergency. Avoiding climate catastrophe requires immediate and dramatic reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that are possible only with a significant investment of public resources in proven mitigation measures, beginning with eliminating fossil fuel use and halting deforestation. Carbon capture and storage, or CCS, and carbon capture, utilization and storage, or CCUS, will not address these core drivers of the climate crisis or meaningfully reduce greenhouse emissions, and should not distract from real climate solutions. Carbon capture and storage technologies are not only unnecessary to the rapid transformation required to keep warming under 1.5 degrees centigrade, they also delay that transformation, providing the fossil fuel industry with a license to continue pollutin. This brief argues that carbon capture and storage: Does not remove carbon from the atmosphere, and it worsens the climate crisis when used to boost oil production. Has not been proven feasible or economic at scale and can only contain a fraction of source emissions. Prolongs dependence on fossil fuels and delays their replacement with renewable alternatives. Creates environmental, health and safety risks for communities saddled with CCS infrastructure, such as pipelines and underground storage. CCS isn't carbon negative, or even carbon neutral CCS and CCUS refer to processes that collect or "capture" carbon dioxide generated by high-emitting activities – such as coal- and gas-fired power production or plastics manufacturing – and then transport those captured emissions to sites where they are either used for industrial processes or stored underground.[1] CCS does not remove carbon from the atmosphere, although it is often erroneously conflated with "carbon dioxide removal" or "negative emission" technology. At best, CCS prevents some emissions caused by the combustion of carbon-based fuels from reaching the atmosphere – provided that the captured gases are not later released. In practice, however, CCS masks the harmful carbon emissions from the underlying source, enabling that source to continue operating rather than being replaced altogether, while creating additional risks, impacts and costs associated with the CCS infrastructure itself. Moreover, the injection of captured carbon into oil wells to enhance oil recovery – the most pervasive use of CCS today – exacerbates global warming by boosting oil production and prolonging the fossil fuel era.[2]

AT Native Land [AT neg]

The resolution does not include native lands. The aff is simply exploiting the oppression of natives as a way to win the debate round when in fact it doesn't even apply. Don't let them win by taking advantage of settler oppression.

Department of the Interior 17 US Department of the Interior, 8/19/17, What is a federal Indian reservation?, https://www.bia.gov/faqs/what-federal-indian-reservation (accessed 11/9/23)

In the United States there are three types of reserved federal lands: military, public, and Indian [native]

Indigenous nations across the United States have demanded government action on climate change & fossil fuel extraction.

Silverman 21 (Ellie Silverman, 10-11-2021, "Indigenous activists come to D.C. with a message for Biden: Declare a national climate emergency," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2021/10/11/indigenous-protest-dc-climate-change/ //awaters)

Casey Camp-Horinek, a tribal elder from White Eagle, Okla., and environmental ambassador for the Ponca Nation, marched in the front of a crowd of hundreds headed toward the White House on Monday and held up her fist. The 73-year-old — wearing a hat that said "Pipeline Fighter" — was among the leaders and members of Native American tribes from across the country who came to Washington for five days of protests that began Monday. The rallies are part of People vs. Fossil Fuels demonstrations by a coalition of groups known as Build Back Fossil Free, which is demanding that the Biden administration take more extreme actions to curb carbon-producing fossil fuel projects at a time when scientists say the world needs to sharply cut greenhouse gas emissions. The coalition's name is a nod to President Biden's "Build Back Better" agenda. "We are going to put our bodies on the line there. If we have to be arrested in order to call attention to what the crisis is and that we need a climate emergency declared, we'll do that," Camp-Horinek said. "There's been 500 years of people coming into a territory where all things were interdependent and functioning to a time of crisis, where even Biden's great-grandchildren won't survive if something doesn't change." At times, tensions rose between protesters and police outside the White House, but the demonstration was largely peaceful. People sang, danced and prayed, holding signs that said, "Water is alive," alongside cardboard cutouts of fish and birds on Pennsylvania Avenue. U.S. Park Police warned the demonstrators three times that they would risk being arrested if they did not disperse. Most of them moved into Lafayette Square, but about 156 remained, Sgt. Roselyn Norment, a U.S. Park Police spokesperson, said in a statement. Police escorted those protesters to a nearby tent. They were issued citations for obstructing traffic and then released, Norment wrote. About 40 minutes after protesters were told to move away from Pennsylvania Avenue, Secret Service officers converged on Erica Jones, 41, an enrolled member of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe who lives in Ramsey, Minn., as she cried out for help. They handcuffed her, and she fell to the ground, crying that she was a mother and didn't want to die. Shortly after, police released her on the sidewalk, and she cried on the shoulder of another protester. Jones said in an interview that she had thrown an orange toward police and believes that prompted the police action. Secret Service did not immediately respond to a request for comment. Protesters also pushed against metal fences and yelled at the Park Police and Secret Service officers across from them. "Didn't y'all just have an insurrection?" one protester yelled over a megaphone, referencing the Jan. 6 riot at the Capitol and criticizing the police presence on Monday. However, most of the demonstration centered on Indigenous leaders, who say they've been ignored for too long. They argue that they have been effective stewards and protectors of the land — preserving biodiversity and leading the front-line fights against pipelines and drilling around their reservations — but that they are still forced to experience the devastating effects of the Earth's warming

up close. U.S. Secret Service officers attempt to hold fencing as demonstrators push against it during the People vs. Fossil Fuels rally on Oct. 11. (Eric Lee for The Washington Post) This week, they're demanding that Biden stop approving fossil fuel projects and declare a national climate emergency.

C2 Rebuild Renewables

Renewables Good – Laundry List

So, why do renewables matter? The UN gives 6 benefits of renewables

No date. United Nations. Renewable energy – powering a safer future. https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/raising-ambition/renewable-energy BZ

- **A.** **Doesn't pollute** [clim change]
- **B.** **Common**
- **C.** **Cheap** [prices falling]
- **D.** **Healthier**
- **E.** **Create jobs** [via investment]
- **F.** Good for **long term** [**econ**, energy **security**]

[1] Renewable energy sources – which are available in abundance all around us, **provided by the sun, wind, [&] water, waste, and heat from the Earth – are replenished by nature and emit little to no greenhouse gases or pollutants into the air.** Fossil fuels still account for more than 80 percent of global energy production, but cleaner sources of energy are gaining ground. About 29 percent of electricity currently comes from renewable sources. **Here are five reasons why accelerating the transition to clean energy is the pathway to a healthy, livable planet today and for generations to come.** GIF with information about renewable energy 1. **[2]** Renewable energy sources are [is plentiful,] all around us About 80 percent of the global population lives in countries that are net-importers of fossil fuels -- that's about 6 billion people who are dependent on fossil fuels from other countries, which makes them vulnerable to geopolitical shocks and crises. In contrast, renewable energy sources are available in all countries, and their potential is yet to be fully harnessed. The International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) estimates that 90 percent of the world's electricity can and should come from renewable energy by 2050. Renewables offer a way out of import dependency, allowing countries to diversify their economies and protect them from the unpredictable price swings of fossil fuels, while driving inclusive economic growth, new jobs, and poverty alleviation. 2. **[3]** Renewable energy is cheaper Renewable energy actually is the cheapest power option in most parts of the world today. Prices for renewable energy technologies are dropping rapidly. The cost of electricity from solar power fell by 85 percent between 2010 and 2020. Costs of onshore and offshore wind energy fell by 56 percent and 48 percent respectively. Falling prices make renewable energy more attractive all around – including to low- and middle-income countries, where most of the additional demand for new electricity will come from. With falling costs, there is a real opportunity for much of the new power supply over the coming years to be provided by low-carbon sources. Cheap electricity from renewable sources could provide 65 percent of the world's total electricity supply by 2030. It could decarbonize 90 percent of the power sector by 2050, massively cutting carbon emissions and helping to mitigate climate change. Although solar and wind power costs are expected to remain higher in 2022 and 2023 then pre-pandemic levels due to general elevated commodity and freight prices, their competitiveness actually improves due to much sharper increases in gas and coal prices, says the International Energy Agency (IEA). 3. **[4]** Renewable energy is healthier According to the World Health Organization (WHO), about 99 percent of people in the world breathe air that exceeds air quality limits and threatens their health, and more than 13 million deaths around the world each year are [from] due to avoidable environmental causes, including air pollution. The unhealthy levels of fine particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide originate mainly from the burning of fossil fuels. In 2018, air [this] pollution from fossil fuels caused $2.9 trillion in health and economic costs, about **$8 billion a day [in health costs].** Switching to clean sources of energy, such as wind and solar, thus helps address not only climate change but also air pollution and health. 4. **[5]** Renewable energy creates jobs **Every dollar of investment in renewables creates three times more jobs than in the fossil fuel industry.** The IEA estimates that the transition towards net-zero emissions will lead to an overall increase in energy sector jobs: while about 5 million jobs in fossil fuel production could be lost by 2030, an estimated 14 million new jobs would be created in clean energy, resulting in a net gain of 9 million jobs. In addition, energy-related industries would require a further 16 million workers, for instance to take on new roles in manufacturing of electric vehicles and hyper-efficient appliances or in innovative technologies such as hydrogen. This means that a total of more than **30 million jobs could be created in clean energy**, efficiency, and low-emissions technologies by 2030. Ensuring a just transition, placing the needs and rights of

people at the heart of the energy transition, will be paramount to make sure no one is left behind. 5. [And lastly,] **[6]** Renewable energy makes economic sense About $5.9 trillion was spent on subsidizing the fossil fuel industry in 2020, including through explicit subsidies, tax breaks, and health and environmental damages that were not priced into the cost of fossil fuels. In comparison, about $4 trillion a year needs to be invested in renewable energy until 2030 – including investments in technology and infrastructure – to allow us to reach net-zero emissions by 2050. The upfront cost can be daunting for many countries with limited resources, and many will need financial and technical support to make the transition. But **investments in renewable energy will pay off.** The reduction of pollution and climate impacts alone could save the world up to $4.2 **trillion** per year by 2030. Moreover, efficient, reliable renewable technologies can create[ing] a system less prone to market shocks and improve[ing] resilience and energy security by **diversifying power supply options**. Learn more about how many communities and countries are realizing the economic, societal, and environmental benefits of renewable energy.

Renewables = FAST

1] Renewables are picking up pace, we just need to support it with more on federal public lands [see 2nd contention]

2] Renewables already on track

Milman 22. Oliver Milman – the **Guardian** US environmental reporter. Fri 11 Mar 2022 02.00 EST 'Defining moment': how can the US end its dependency on fossil fuels? https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/mar/11/us-fossil-fuel-dependency-climate-joe-biden-oil-russia BZ

"The clean energy tax credits and other provisions would really catalyze the industry and achieve significant reductions," said Orvis, who has calculated that the support for **wind, solar and electric** cars would slash **US oil demand**, [&] make 70% of the [US] electricity [will] grid run on clean [renewable] energy and ensure that about half of vehicle sales are electric by 2030. Wind and solar grew at the fastest rate in US history last year. The ailing **coal industry could be phased out "fairly easily" within a decade**, according to Orvis, although **further federal, state and city standards and incentives are required to cut pollution f**rom buildings, manufacturing and the remaining car fleet, promote energy efficiency and to install heat pumps in place of gas-fired furnaces. "The sooner we start that transition will determine how fast we can go," Orvis said. "**Every day we don't start the transition** [to renewable energy] we are subject to the **price swings** [and pollution] from fossil fuels that we are clearly subject to now."

Renewables structures like solar panels last decades – a few REMs last a lifetime, and are faster to build than decade-long fossil fuel approvals

Tierney & Bird 20. *Setting the Record Straight About Renewable Energy*. By Susan Tierney (executive director of the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council. Dr. Tierney has a Ph.D. in Regional Planning from Cornell.) and Lori Bird (worked for the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and for Hagler Bailly Consulting. She holds a master's degree in environmental studies from Yale University's School of the Environment and a B.A. in economics and environmental studies from Indiana University.). May 2020. https://www.wri.org/insights/setting-record-straight-about-renewable-energy BZ

Wind and solar projects can operate for decades and can be developed more rapidly than other generation sources. All power plants and their components have a "useful life" before they need replacement or repair. The useful **lifespan of renewable facilities can exceed two decades.** Wind turbines, for example, are estimated to last for about 20 years, and photovoltaic systems often remain operational from 25 to 40 years. In some instances, as large wind turbines become more efficient and economic, equipment turnover has been accelerated. In these cases, smaller turbines have been replaced earlier than they might otherwise have been by larger, more efficient turbines, to substantially increase electricity production at existing sites. Furthermore, **renewable energy facilities can typically be deployed more rapidly than fossil fuel plants.** While solar and onshore wind farms normally **take less than two years to build, gas-fired power plants usually take as many as four years to become operational**, and can also require construction of gas pipeline infrastructure.

FF take 10 years of approvals [refer to Shea & Mirza]. Faster to build renewables:

UK Renewables. https://renewablesfirst.co.uk/renewable-energy-technologies/windpower/windpower-learning-centre/how-long-will-the-whole-project-take/#:~:text=For%20a%20typical%20single%20500,shortened%20to%20around%20a%20year.

For a typical single 500 kW wind turbine project [is a] it would be reasonable to assume a project duration of two years, broken down as shown on the chart below. For a medium-wind turbine such as the 55 kW Endurance E-3120, the wind turbine project timeline can be shortened to around a year.

AT sun not shining, no REMs [AT Renewables Unreliable]

FF supplies can be cut any time – proof in Ukraine Russia war

2 more responses: [Renewables are limitless, and their power can be stored:]
[1] Renewable[s] energy contributes to energy reliability because there are no limits to the amount of wind, solar, [&] water, and geothermal power that Earth provides. **Renewable energy generates about 20% of U.S. electricity, and that amount is growing.** The U.S. Department of Energy funds research and development of technologies to leverage these resources at low cost to achieve a 100% clean electricity sector by 2035. **[2] Energy storage technologies can ensure energy reliability** by storing renewable energy for use whenever it is needed, such as during a power outage. Energy efficiency also supports energy reliability by helping ensure energy use and the electricity grid are well managed.

[According to Govn't Office of Energy Efficiency] & Renewable Energy. https://www.energy.gov/eere/energy-reliability

Renewables structures like solar panels last decades – a few REMs last a lifetime, and are faster to build than decade-long fossil fuel approvals

Tierney & Bird 20. *Setting the Record Straight About Renewable Energy*. By Susan Tierney (executive director of the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council. Dr. Tierney has a Ph.D. in Regional Planning from Cornell.) and Lori Bird (worked for the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and for Hagler Bailly Consulting. She holds a master's degree in environmental studies from Yale University's School of the Environment and a B.A. in economics and environmental studies from Indiana University.). May 2020. https://www.wri.org/insights/setting-record-straight-about-renewable-energy BZ

Wind and solar projects can operate for decades and can be developed more rapidly than other generation sources. All power plants and their components have a "useful life" before they need replacement or repair. The useful **lifespan of renewable facilities can exceed two decades.** Wind turbines, for example, are estimated to last for about 20 years, and photovoltaic systems often remain operational from 25 to 40 years. In some instances, as large wind turbines become more efficient and economic, equipment turnover has been accelerated. In these cases, smaller turbines have been replaced earlier than they might otherwise have been by larger, more efficient turbines, to substantially increase electricity production at existing sites. Furthermore, **renewable energy facilities can typically be deployed more rapidly than fossil fuel plants.** While solar and onshore wind farms normally **take less than two years to build, gas-fired power plants usually take as many as four years to become operational**, and can also require construction of gas pipeline infrastructure.

REMs are ABUNDANT

Borenstein 2023. SETH BORENSTEIN. January 27, 2023. Study: Enough rare earth minerals to fuel green energy shift. AP News. https://apnews.com/article/science-green-technology-climate-and-environment-renewable-energy-141761657a8e7a5627a0e49e601dd48e

The world has enough rare earth minerals and other critical raw materials to switch from fossil fuels to renewable energy[,] to produce[ing] electricity and limit[ing] global warming, according to a new study that counters concerns about the supply of such minerals. With a push to get more electricity from solar panels, wind turbines, hydroelectric and nuclear power plants, some people have worried that there won't be enough key minerals to make the decarbonization switch. Rare earth minerals, also called rare earth elements, actually aren't that rare. The U.S. Geological Survey describes them as a "relatively abundant." They're essential for the strong magnets necessary for wind turbines; they also show up in smartphones,

computer displays and LED light bulbs. This new study looks at not only those elements but 17 different raw materials required to make electricity that include some downright common resources such as steel, cement and glass. A team of scientists looked at the materials — many not often mined heavily in the past — and 20 different power sources. They calculated supplies and pollution from mining if green power surged to meet global goals to cut heat-trapping carbon emissions from fossil fuel.

AT Renewables Mining [POLLUTION, LABOR, etc]

1] Renewable structures last years, while fossil fuels require CONSTANT mining all the time, polluting and harming people

Nuccitelli 22. Dana Nuccitelli. Dana Nuccitelli is an environmental scientist and climate journalist with a Master's Degree in physics. He has written about climate change since 2010 for Skeptical Science, for The Guardian from 2013 to 2018, and since 2018 for Yale Climate Connections. In 2015 he published the book 'Climatology versus Pseudoscience', and he has also authored ten peer-reviewed climate studies, including a 2013 paper that found a 97% consensus among peer-reviewed climate science research that humans are the primary cause of global warming. Citizens' Climate Lobby. Posted on November 2, 2022. https://citizensclimatelobby.org/blog/blog/are-clean-technologies-and-renewable-energies-better-for-the-environment-than-fossil-fuels/ BZ

The short answer to this question is that fossil fuels require much more mining and drilling than clean energy technologies. Today the world mines **8 billion tons of coal every year**, whereas the clean energy transition is estimated to require around **3.5 billion tons of minerals in total over the next three decades.** A December 2021 paper by Rice University researchers sought to answer this question in detail. Among clean energy technologies, wind turbines in particular require a considerable amount of minerals per amount of energy produced, as illustrated in the chart below from the International Energy Agency. Are clean technologies and renewable energies better for the environment than fossil fuels?; a bar graph showing the minerals used in the construction of each clean energy and fossil fuel technology But that chart only illustrates the minerals needed to construct the power plants. Once a wind turbine or solar panel is constructed, no further mining is needed. Their fuel (**wind and sunshine) is provided by nature**. **Fossil fuels, on the other hand, require ceaseless mining or drilling to obtain new fuel to burn.** For example, nearly 8 billion tons of coal were mined, and over 4 billion tons of crude oil were extracted from the ground in 2020 alone globally. That's more than the 2.6 billion tons of iron ore mined for making steel, which dwarfs all other minerals mining, as illustrated in the graphic below. For comparison, the World Bank estimates that a pathway to meet the Paris targets would require close to 3.5 billion tons of minerals in total over the next three decades.

2] EVEN IF u assume renewable mining will pollute more, tech will offset the reduction in fossil fuel use

Borenstein 2023. SETH BORENSTEIN. January 27, 2023. Study: Enough rare earth minerals to fuel green energy shift. AP News. https://apnews.com/article/science-green-technology-climate-and-environment-renewable-energy-141761657a8e7a5627a0e49e601dd48e

But the increase in carbon pollution from more mining will be more than offset by a huge reduction in pollution from heavy carbon emitting fossil fuels, Hausfeather said.

3] Renewables structures like solar panels last decades – a few REMs last a lifetime, and are faster to build than decade-long fossil fuel approvals

Tierney & Bird 20. *Setting the Record Straight About Renewable Energy*. By Susan Tierney (executive director of the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council. Dr. Tierney has a Ph.D. in Regional Planning from Cornell.) and Lori Bird (worked for the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and for Hagler Bailly Consulting. She holds a master's degree in environmental studies from Yale University's School of the Environment and a B.A. in economics and environmental studies from Indiana University.). May 2020. https://www.wri.org/insights/setting-record-straight-about-renewable-energy BZ

Wind and solar projects can operate for decades and can be developed more rapidly than other generation sources. All power plants and their components have a "useful life" before they need replacement or repair. The useful **lifespan of renewable facilities can exceed two decades.** Wind turbines, for example, are estimated to last for about 20 years, and photovoltaic systems often remain operational from 25 to 40 years. In some instances, as large wind turbines become more efficient and economic, equipment turnover has been accelerated. In these cases, smaller turbines have been replaced earlier than they might otherwise have been by larger, more efficient turbines, to substantially increase electricity production at existing sites. Furthermore, **renewable energy facilities can typically be deployed more rapidly than fossil fuel plants.**

While solar and onshore wind farms normally **take less than two years to build**, **gas-fired power plants usually take as many as four years to become operational**, and can also require construction of gas pipeline infrastructure.

4] Oil and gas are worse for Human Rights: oil spills, environmental harms exacerbating climate change, more mining meaning more forced labor.

A2 Liquid Natural Gas [LNG] as a Bridge Fuel

1] New FF investments take years to approve – decades even. Aff better for energy – now we start renewables. [shia and mirza 22]

2] False sense of security – we think we're solving climate change so we pollute more with nat gas. Net worse for climate

3] Liquid Natural Gas reliance creates fossil fuel lock-in and KILLS renewables for investment – turns any chance of solving climate change.

4] LNG is NOT necessary as a bridge fuel, renewable costs are decreasing

UN 23. United Nations Environment Programme, 12 January 2023, "Is natural gas really the bridge fuel the world needs?", https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/natural-gas-really-bridge-fuel-world-needs

It all depends on the speed of the transition, which science tells us must be rapid to avoid the worst consequences of climate change. A long or slow transition away from other fossil fuels and which requires lots of investment in gas infrastructure would make for a bad bridge. In many countries natural gas has already replaced coal as the fuel of choice for electricity production, with climate and air quality benefits. The rapid decrease in the cost of solar, wind and other renewable energy technologies makes these an even better alternative than gas in more and more locations. Where gas has a special role in the energy transition is as a back up to a renewable-based power system because gas boilers can be turned on almost instantly while starting up a coal-fired power plant takes much longer. There's a lot of research and deployment of energy storage technologies so this role for gas will diminish.

AT FF Revenue FUNDS Renewables

1] While the Aff fully replaces and eliminates FF pollution in favor of renewables, Neg still pollutes coz you're still drilling EVEN IF ur adding some renewables. It's not like you're taking that new pollution out of the air either

2] Neg can't prove for sure that FF revenue will be spent to renewables. In fact, they'll KEEP REINVESTING IN FF TO KEEP MAKING MONEY and NEVER spend on renewables.

AT BioD Loss [renewables]

Renewables on public lands don't harm biodiversity and help solve climate change

Sullivan 23 [Meghen Sullivan, JD Candidate at the American University Washington College of Law, "Using Federal Public Lands to Model a New Energy Future: Why the Biden Administration Should Prioritize Renewable Energy Development on Public Lands," Sustainable Development Law & Policy, https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1723&context=sdlp]/Kankee

III. "Smart" Planning Mitigates Multiple-Use Concerns and Conserves Agency Resources Land management agencies can mitigate many of the multiple-use conflicts associated with RE development with strategic planning and siting. DOI agencies, including the BLM, have already done so.28 Specifically, BLM revised their siting and environmental assessment approach for solar and wind development from a case-by-case to a regional approach in the 2012 Western Solar Plan (WSP). This "**smart**" approach incorporates the **best** available science from federal and state agencies, project developers, and the public to identify and assess pre-screened, priority development sites known as designated leasing areas, or "DLAs."29 BLM has designated 700,000 acres of priority DLAs, which are identified using three criteria: (1) excellent solar or wind resources; (2) proximity to existing or planned transmission and highway corridors; and (3) lower environmental, social, cultural and recreational impacts.30 Other principles of this "smart" approach also includes **avoiding** development in areas of high-quality wildlife habitat, wilderness-quality lands, areas of tribal and cultural resources, and offsetting or minimizing unavoidable impacts.31 Additionally, BLM has developed Regional Mitigation Strategies for several of the DLAs, which help anticipate impacts of development within DLAs and recommend a mitigation fee to help pay for **conservation**, habitat **protection**, and **restoration**.32 Therefore, this plan identifies and avoids **fragile** and **at-risk** habitats on federal lands in favor of better alternative locations, such as contaminated former agricultural or industrial sites.33 Moreover, because these areas have been pre-screened, site assessment and environmental review of individual projects can be built upon, or "tiered," based upon the regional assessment,34 drastically expediting review requirements and saving precious time and resources. IV. Conclusion & Recommendations Successful adaptation to climate change will require public land agencies to focus management on the system goals of organic legislation. To start, the Biden Administration should continue to invest in implementing "smart" planning via DLAs by designating DLA's for wind and solar based on the PEIS completed as part of the 2016 Rule. Additionally, Biden should establish a program for designating geothermal-specific DLA's.35 Moreover, the Biden Administration should tap into the underutilized geothermal36 potential on public lands and facilitate this by extending the categorical exemption enjoyed by certain oil and gas wells to advanced geothermal projects that require similar infrastructure.37 Ultimately, while siting largescale renewable energy projects on public lands has the potential to implicate species habitat or other environmental values, the overall threat of climate change poses a much greater risk to the environment.

AT Energy Security / Conflict [Rus-Ukr]

1] Better than FF conflict. FF is perishable, while renewable energy can be found worldwide + produce unlimited power once you acquire the starting materials.

2] Transition to renewables is the only way to create energy security---public lands and waters hold a unique 'first-step' opportunity.

TWS '23 [The Wilderness Society; August 12; American non-profit land conservation organization that is dedicated to protecting natural areas and federal public lands in the United States. They advocate for the designation of federal wilderness areas and other protective designations, such as for national monuments; The Wilderness Society, "More drilling on public lands & waters will ultimately hurt our safety and security," https://www.wilderness.org/articles/blog/more-drilling-public-lands-waters-will-ultimately-hurt-our-safety-and-security]

Renewable energy is the **only path** to independence and a livable planet Major oil and gas **companies** made a record-breaking $200 billion dollars in 2022, fully doubling their profits from the previous year. They continue to rake in massive **profits** in 2023 while quietly **back**ing away from their **climate pledges** and while Ukraine continues to grapple with war and the **U**nited **S**tates continues to face **high energy prices**. At the same time, the oil and gas industry is claiming—wrongly—to have the **solution**: **more drilling**. The **A**merican **P**etroleum **I**nstitute (API), a trade association, is especially pushing for more domestic fossil fuel production, particularly on **public lands**. Here's what's wrong with this so-called solution: furthering our **dependency** on fossil fuels won't actually solve our **security** and energy issues. It will eventually make them **worse**. What industry spokespeople and their lobbyists forgot to mention is that relying on **fossil fuels** is actually **dangerous**—and always has been. Oil and gas companies have shown repeatedly that they will always **prioritize** making **money** over our safety, health and national security. They, and their CEOs, will always put their own **interests** ahead of the public's, even if that means enabling **aggressive foreign actors**. Oil and gas companies have shown repeatedly that they will always prioritize making money over our safety, health and national security. For the same reason, we will **never** drill our way to **lower** energy **prices**. Fossil fuel markets are notoriously **unstable**, largely based on **profit**, **global supply** and **demand** assumptions. Price **spikes** based on speculation are **routine**ly passed on to everyday people at the gas pumps. **More drilling** on public lands would do **very little** to change these dynamics and bring down costs. More drilling on private lands could take months, if not years, to have an effect. **Wars** and other **destabilizing events** also highlight this volatility. The U.S. has recently banned **Russian energy** imports as a stance against the war in **Ukraine**. While these commodities contribute a small slice of the country's energy portfolio—roughly 8 percent in 2021—it shows the **unpredictability** of relying on this type of energy. <<TEXT CONDENSED, NONE OMITTED>> And that's not all. Perpetuating a fossil fuel economy will lead to a slew of other problems. Over 40% of the world's population is "highly vulnerable" to climate impacts and 14% of species are at risk of extinction. First of all, continuing to burn oil, gas, and coal will only further the climate crisis that is already devastating communities and wildlife. The United Nations recently warned that over 40 percent of the world's population is "highly vulnerable" to climate impacts and 14 percent of species are at risk of extinction. And let's not forget: fossil fuels—the remains of plants and animals that died hundreds of millions of years ago—will run out. By the time your grandkids or great-grandkids are old enough to pay utility bills, we might be looking at the end of the nation's natural gas reserves as we know them. Just imagine the instability that will cause at home and abroad--unless we put in the work right now to ramp up cleaner, more reliable solutions. Clean, renewable energy is the safest future A much safer bet for our communities, climate, and maintaining peace is investing in renewable energy. Renewable energy sources like wind, sunlight and geothermal will never run out. With current technology, it's already possible to take a huge bite out of our fossil fuel dependence solely using responsible renewable energy production on public lands. What's more, renewables don't contribute to climate change, as they generate practically zero climate pollution. European countries have taken note of all these benefits amid the war in Ukraine. Germany and Britain have promised to slow down the building of gas reserves and expand renewable energy development. While they can't afford to abruptly cut off foreign oil and gas supplies, they know they have to start today to achieve a more sustainable tomorrow. <<PARAGRAPH BREAKS CONTINUE>> Public lands hold an **opportunity** While oil and gas companies and their allies in Congress have been **pressur**ing President **Biden** to increase drilling on public lands and waters, the president should follow Europe's call and **double down** on **renewables** instead. President **Biden** has actually issued **33 percent** more drilling permits in his first year than **Trump** did in the equivalent time period and has continued to hold **lease sales** for fossil fuel development. Meanwhile, his administration has been surprisingly sluggish at approving permits for new renewable energy projects. The president could be using **public lands** as the **first big step** in a responsible, fair and necessary **transition away** from fossil fuels.

3] Renewable energy is efficient and faces less risks like war

Krane and Idel 21. Jim Krane [Jim Krane, **Ph.D.**, is the Wallace S. Wilson Fellow **for Energy Studies at Rice University**'s Baker Institute for Public Policy in Houston] and Robert Idel [Baker Institute Center for Energy Studies, Houston, Texas, USA]. December 2021.

More transitions, less risk: How renewable energy reduces risks from mining, trade and political dependence.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2214629621004035

Abstract The transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy systems involves enormous decreases in materials, mining, and political risk. Since renewable systems need no fuel, [and] they depend on trade only for the acquisition of materials and components during construction. **Once the system is operating, no trade is required to sustain it.** Therefore renewable energy production is not exposed to the political risks that plague fossil fuel production and shipments, such as interdiction, embargo[s], [or] civil war, labor actions, and other disruptions. Despite such benefits, an emerging perspective in the US public discourse makes the opposite case, arguing that a buildout of renewable electricity would exacerbate supply risks, mining intensity, and import dependence. This paper's findings challenge such assertions. We demonstrate that installing just 1 GW of wind capacity to replace coal on a grid like that in Texas reduces total mining by 25 million tonnes over 20 years. Even if the world increased 12-fold the annual global production of all rare earths, lithium, cobalt, and even copper, the metals produced would comprise just 3% of 2020 world coal production. Over two decades, **five times more power would be produced by mining an equivalent amount for wind rather than coal.** Since transition materials requirements are so comparatively small, reduced international trade volumes mean a large measure of political risk falls away. Current practices for securing energy systems that require constant fuel deliveries thus offer little relevance for renewables.

AT "Yes Renewables, BUT NOT on Public Land"

Renewable tech must happen on public lands/waters – phase out FF while providing enough space for development

Shea & Mirza 22. Rowland-Shea holds a master's degree in geography from The George Washington University where she focused on urban sustainability and green space issues and served as the teaching assistant for the university's Introduction to Sustainability course. She is the Director for Public Lands at American Progress. The Oil Industry's Grip on Public Lands and Waters May Be Slowing Progress Toward Energy Independence. JUL 19, 2022. Jenny Rowland-Shea and Zainab Mirza. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-oil-industrys-grip-on-public-lands-and-waters-may-be-slowing-progress-toward-energy-independence/ BZ

Of course, not all lands should be used for energy development—be it oil or renewables—and the concept of balance with recreation, wildlife, conservation, and subsistence needs must be met. However, **to meet President Joe Biden's climate goal of reaching net-zero carbon emissions by 2050 and to break the economy's ties to oil price volatility, the United States will need to site renewable energy projects on an estimated 145 million acres, much of which will need to be [on] public lands and waters.**10 The country is well under that target, and the prioritization of the oil and gas industry—even when the potential for oil and gas is low—is just one factor standing in the way.

AT SQ Renewables Working

Transition to renewables is happening soon, but it's coming too late to stop climate change as of now. We need the Aff

Lundgren '23 [Kari; October 10; Reporter for Bloomberg; Bloomberg, "Peak in Energy Emissions as Too Slow for Net Zero Goal," https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-10-10/looming-peak-in-energy-emissions-seen-too-slow-for-net-zero-goal#xj4y7vzkg]

Global energy-related emissions should **peak** next year — marking a key point for the **renewables transition** — but the shift will be **too slow** to meet 2050 net-zero targets, DNV said.

In the **five years** to 2022, renewables met just over **half** of new energy **demand**, with **fossil-fuel** usage still **growing** in absolute terms, the Norwegian risk management company said in a report. Limiting global warming to 1.5C looks less likely than ever, it said.

"Globally, the energy **transition** has **not started**, meaning that we are still adding more fossil fuels to the energy mix," DNV Chief Executive Officer Remi Eriksen said in an interview. "**Record emissions** from fossil energy are on course to move even higher next year."

<<TABLE OMITTED>>

Russia's invasion of **Ukraine** and knock-on **supply disruptions** raised fossil-fuel prices and prompted more investment in **new** oil and gas **projects**. That drew greater attention to energy security, prompting governments to focus on locally sourced supply, DNV said. And while there has been a strong green push in Europe and North America, **coal**-fired **generation** is seen rising in nations like India.

The fallout of the war in Ukraine has also **undermined** natural gas's role as a **bridging fuel**, Eriksen said. Gas **supplies** that once flowed to Asia are now being **diverted** to Europe, meaning countries such as China, Pakistan and Indonesia are also burning more coal.

Still, the energy **transition** is expected to take hold in the **coming years**, according to DNV.

Extra

Define “Pub Lands”

“Federal public lands and waters”

Parris 18 Aer Parris is a Staff Writer for REI – BA in Philosophy at U of Pittsburgh. SEPTEMBER 7, 2018

https://www.rei.com/blog/hike/your-guide-to-understanding-public-lands BZ

In the broadest sense, they’re areas of land that are open to the public and managed by the government. You can think of it as land you own (and share with everyone else in the United States). There are three types of government that manage public lands: federal, state and local. Remember, public lands aren’t just national parks—your state and local city parks count, too. And there’s a difference among them. **Federal public lands are held in trust for all Americans and the goal is to manage the land for the long-term health of both the land and citizens**, according to The Conservation Alliance. Many federal agencies manage public lands for multiple uses, from recreation to timber, but in some form or another every American has a say in how these places get used. For states, it’s hard to generalize. For some lands, there’s no requirement to involve citizens in public land management decisions. To better understand our public lands, it’s important to know how they were established. In the late 1700s, according to the Public Lands Foundation, the U.S. government claimed millions of acres of land from the Native Americans. At the same time, the government claimed land previously settled by Mexico, Canada, Russia, Spain, France and England. It was in 1781 that New York state gave the federal government all of its “unsettled” land west of the colony to the Mississippi River. In just over 20 years, all land west of the colonies followed suit and was considered public domain. Eventually the government acquired 1.8 billion acres, most of which were later transferred to individuals, corporations and states to create things like schools, railroads and ranches. The late 1800s brought about “a preservation and conservation movement,” according to a Congressional Research Service report. President Lincoln deeded Yosemite Valley to the state of California for a public park in 1864. And in 1872, President Grant signed a law making Yellowstone the first national park in the nation. Over the next 100-plus years, 59 strictly regulated national parks followed, as well as a myriad of other public lands with differing designations. Today there are four major federal agencies that manage around 610 million acres of public land held by the U.S. government: Bureau of Land Management (BLM): 248 million acres or 10.5 percent of all land in the country U.S. Forest Service (USFS): 193 million acres or 8.5 percent of the country U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): 89 million acres or 3.9 percent of the country National Park Service (NPS): 84 million acres or 3.7 percent of the country

Renewables Growing / Zheng 23

Fossil fuels still dominate, but we can fully replace them with good policy, with clean renewable energy.

Clean, sustainable, renewable energies are growing [like solar, wind, and hydropower] Zheng in January this year. March Zheng, writer for Earth.org. The State of the US Renewable Energy Market: A Preliminary Analysis for 2022. BY MARCH ZHENG. JAN 30TH 2023. https://earth.org/us-renewable-energy-market/ BZ

Today, fossil fuels (coal, natural gas, petroleum, etc.) still account for nearly 81% of total US energy consumption, while the remaining energy outputs are through renewables. **Yet, positive initiatives and supporting policies on an international scale have contributed to speeding up the development of renewable energy**, which is now on track **to** overtake coal and **become the largest source of global electricity in perhaps 3 years' time.** For reference, renewables generated 19.5% of the US's net electricity production, while coal plants generated 19.3% and nuclear plants 19.7%. Electricity net generation refers to the "amount of gross electricity generation a generator produces minus the electricity used to operate the power plant". Renewables are not as far off as many people would believe, and [are] clearly has the potential to be more efficient. **The US** generates more renewable electricity than [other countries] Germany, Japan, and the UK combined. **Thus**, the US **plays** an [is] important role in the global initiative to gradually transition out of fossil fuels. According to early estimates, the global market size of renewable energies is expected to reach two trillion USD by 2030. The US renewable energy market in 2022 was valued at US$269 billion. The International Energy Agency (IEA) also expects renewables to become the largest source of global electricity by 2025. With US revenues from fossil fuels responsible for $138 billion annually, the amount is expected to fall given the infrastructure and cost improvements in renewable energy as well as further government policies to decrease the reliance on fossil fuels. For electricity generation, solar and wind are the fastest and most popular methods Supporting renewable energy initiatives in local jurisdictions and implanting them within our lives if it is cheaper and more practical to do so are all actions we can control as individuals. Technology will continue to cut the costs of renewable energy infrastructures, and this decade is showing a lot of promise for this continued growth trajectory.

1NC Negative

Negative

Topic

I negate the topic

[Resolved: The United States ought to prohibit the extraction of fossil fuels from federal public lands and waters.]

Definitions

To "prohibit fossil fuel extraction"

Green 18 London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). Green, Fergus (2018) The logic of fossil fuel bans. Nature Climate Change, 8. pp. 449-451. ISSN 1758-678X DOI: 10.1038/s41558-018-0172-3
http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/88114/1/Green_Fossil%20Fuel%20Bans_Accepted.pdf BZ

A **fossil fuel ban** is here defined as a constitutional, legislative or executive prohibition [ban] on the exploration, production, [&] supply, transportation, intermediate processing, or consumption of a type of fossil fuel (coal, oil, or natural gas), the construction of infrastructure for any such purpose (for instance, oil pipelines, coal-fired power stations), or the financing of any such activity. This definition covers bans that prohibit only a subset of the relevant activity, such as new activities. For example, a state commitment to "prohibit the construction of new coalmines within its jurisdiction from 1 January 2019" would qualify as a fossil fuel ban based on this definition.

And according to

Wilderness Society no date Wilderness Society, nonprofit greatly involved in conservation lawmaking and wilderness protection, directly responsible for protection of 111 million acres of wilderness, no date, What do we mean by public lands, https://www.wilderness.org/sites/default/files/media/file/Module%201.pdf (accessed 10/14/23)

Public lands are areas of land and water that today are owned collectively by U.S. citizens and managed by government agencies. Public lands are different from private lands, which are owned by an individual, a business or another type of non-governmental organization. Although public lands are now considered to be owned collectively by United States citizens, these lands include ancestral homelands, migration routes, ceremonial grounds, and hunting and harvesting places for Indigenous Peoples who have been forcibly removed. We specify "United States citizens" in the definition of public lands because although undocumented people living in the U.S. and noncitizens have a connection to land and use public lands, because of their citizenship status, they are not included in the formal decision-making process through their right to vote. Certainly, noncitizen advocates in the NGO or academic sectors can be influential in the public lands conversation.

Framework

We value morality.

This is achieved with a criterion of maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer 3 reasons:

1] Stopping mass pain and death is our highest priority, even if we are unsure of what criterion to use. We can't debate ethics unless our wellbeing and survival are first ensured.

2] Because the topic says "the U.S. ought to prohibit fossil fuels" we know we're talking about government action. Policies must consider what benefits us as a whole and equal society.

3] Wellbeing explains why we value things at all. The reason why other frameworks matter is because it improves our wellbeing.

Contention 1] is the Economy

The economy is fragile but recovering today. Fossil fuel stability is at the center of the issue

Rappeport and Cohen 2023 Alan Rappeport and Patricia Cohen, NYT Reporting from the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Marrakesh, Morocco., October 10, 2023, Fragile Global Economy Faces New Crisis in Israel-Gaza War, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/10/business/economy/global-economy-israel-gaza-war.html (accessed 10/20/23)

The International Monetary Fund said on Tuesday that the pace of the global economic recovery is slowing [with], a warning that came as a new war in the Middle East threatened to upend a world economy already reeling from several years of overlapping crises. The eruption of fighting between Israel and Hamas over the weekend, which could sow disruption across the region, reflects how challenging it has become to shield economies from increasingly frequent and unpredictable global shocks. The conflict has cast a cloud over a gathering of top economic policymakers in Morocco for the annual meetings of the I.M.F. and the World Bank. Officials who planned to grapple with the lingering economic effects of the pandemic and Russia's war in Ukraine now face a new crisis. "Economies are at a delicate state," Ajay Banga, the World Bank president, said in an interview on the sidelines of the annual meetings. "Having war is really not helpful for central banks who are finally trying to find their way to a soft landing," he said. Mr. Banga was referring to efforts by policymakers in the West to try to cool rapid inflation without triggering a recession. Mr. Banga said that so far, the impact of the Middle East attacks on the world's economy was more limited than the war in Ukraine. That conflict initially sent oil and food prices soaring, roiling global markets given Russia's role as a top energy producer and Ukraine's status as a major exporter of grain and fertilizer. "But if this were to spread in any way, then it becomes dangerous," Mr. Banga added, saying such a development would result in "a crisis of unimaginable proportion." Oil markets are already jittery. Lucrezia Reichlin, a professor at the London Business School and a former director general of research at the European Central Bank, said, "The main question is what's going to happen to energy prices." Ms. Reichlin is concerned that another spike in oil prices would pressure the Federal Reserve and other central banks to further push up interest rates, which she said had risen too far too fast. As far as energy prices, Ms. Reichlin said, "we have two fronts, Russia and now the Middle East." A plume of gray smoke billows on the horizon behind a view of a city. Smoke rising from bombings of Gaza City and its northern borders by Israeli planes. Credit...Samar Abu Elouf for The New York Times Pierre-Olivier Gourinchas, the I.M.F.'s chief economist, said it was too early to assess whether the recent jump in oil prices would be sustained. If it is, he said, research shows that a 10 percent increase in oil prices would weigh down the global economy, reducing output by 0.15 percent and increasing inflation by 0.4 percent next year. In its latest World Economic Outlook, the I.M.F. underscored the fragility of the recovery [global economy]. It maintained its global growth outlook for this year at 3 percent and slightly lowered its forecast for 2024 to 2.9 percent. Although the I.M.F. upgraded its projection for output in the United States for this year, it downgraded the euro area and China while warning that distress in that nation's real estate sector is worsening.

Banning extraction of fossil fuels will immediately harm the US economy

Chamber of Commerce 16 US Chamber of Commerce's Institute for 21st Century Energy, What If Energy Production Was Banned on Federal Lands and Waters?, https://www.globalenergyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/2019-07/er-offlimits-16.pdf (accessed 10/16/23)

However, this new study paints a starkly different picture. In fact, we find that restricting or eliminating production of oil, natural gas and coal on federal lands would carry significant and wide-ranging negative economic consequences. Federal lands currently account for roughly 24 percent of our nation's oil, natural gas, and coal production. Development of these resources, while dwarfed by massive production increases on private and state-controlled acreage, has substantially contributed to the recent energy development renaissance that the United States has experienced and has made a meaningful and positive impact by lowering energy prices for consumers and dramatically reducing energy imports from abroad. Instituting a ban on future

federal-lands leasing and stopping the current production of these resources would increase energy prices for consumers by removing low-cost resources from the available supply stream. The impact would be immediate and severe to the U.S. economy, leading to the loss of hundreds of thousands of American jobs, and robbing the 3 federal government and primarily Western states of potentially billions of dollars in revenues in the form of lost royalties. All told, our analysis finds that stopping energy production on federal lands and waters would result in: • The loss of nearly a quarter of the nation's current production of coal, oil and natural gas • The loss of more than $11.3 billion per year in annual royalties and rental fees for federal and state governments;7 • Over $70 billion in annual U.S. GDP threatened; and • The loss of more than 100,000 direct jobs associated with energy development on federal lands (both onshore and offshore), impacting another 280,000 indirect and induced jobs across the broader economy Several U.S. states and regions would be disproportionately affected by a cessation in federal-lands energy development. Among them: • Wyoming would lose 32,600 jobs (13,300 direct, 19,300 indirect and induced) and almost $900 million in annual royalty collections (2015), representing about 20 percent of the state's education-related expenditures. • New Mexico would lose 24,300 jobs (10,000 direct, 14,300 indirect and induced) and $496 million in annual royalty collections (2015), representing eight percent of the state's total General Fund revenues; • Colorado would lose 50,000 jobs (15,300 direct, 34,700 indirect and induced), and as much as $125 million in annual royalty collections (2015); and • Along the Gulf Coast, the loss of 39,000 direct jobs associated with Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas development, and the loss of another 71,000 indirect and induced jobs across the broader Gulf Coast economy -- on top of $28 million in lost annual state royalty collections (2015). Our report also includes an analysis of the potential impacts associated with imposing a ban on future federal lands energy leases, keeping intact, for now, the ability of existing lease-holders to continue production. In the end, our analysis finds that the economic impact would be about the same under Scenario 2, if just delayed slightly over time as existing production falls off and is not replaced by new development activities owing to the ban on the issuance of future leases

Additionally, with Russia-Ukraine and Israel-Hamas, US fossil fuel production is the only thing avoiding a global energy crisis – Aff's ban will cause world recession

Daly, climate reporter, October 19, 2023 Matthew Daly, climate change reporter for the Associated Press, October 19, 2023, Long lines at gas pump unlikely, but Middle East crisis could disrupt oil supplies, https://abcnews.go.com/Business/wireStory/long-lines-gas-pump-middle-east-crisis-disrupt-104165519 (accessed 10/20/23)

The Israel-Hamas war is "definitely not good news" for oil markets already stretched by cutbacks in oil production from Saudi Arabia and Russia and expected stronger demand from China, the head of the International Energy Agency said. Markets will remain volatile, and the conflict could push oil prices higher, "which is definitely bad news for inflation," Fatih Birol, executive director of the Paris-based IEA, told The Associated Press. Developing countries that import oil and other fuels would be the most affected by higher prices, he said. International benchmark Brent crude traded above $91 a barrel on Thursday, up from $85 per barrel on Oct. 6, the day before Hamas attacked Israel, killing hundreds of civilians. Israel immediately launched airstrikes on Gaza, destroying entire neighborhoods and killing hundreds of Palestinian civilians in the days that have followed. Fluctuations since the attack pushed oil prices as high as $96. The price of oil depends on how much of it is getting used and how much is available. The latter is under threat because of the Hamas-Israel war, even though the Gaza Strip is not home to major crude production. One worry is that the fighting could lead to complications with Iran, home of some of the world's largest oil reserves. Its crude production has been constrained by international sanctions, but oil is still flowing to China and other countries. "In order to get a sustained move (in prices), we really would need to see a supply disruption," said Andrew Lipow, president at Lipow Oil Associates, a Houston-based consultant. Any damage to Iranian oil infrastructure from a military strike by Israel could send prices jumping globally. Even without that, a shutdown of the Strait of Hormuz that lies south of Iran could also shake the oil market because so much of the world's supplies goes through the waterway. Until something like that happens, "the oil market is going to be like everyone else, monitoring the events in the Middle **East," Lipow said. [However] One reason 1970s-style gas lines are**

unlikely: [is] U.S. oil production is at an all-time high. The U.S. Energy Information Administration, an arm of the Energy Department, reported that American oil production in the first week of October hit 13.2 million barrels per day, passing the previous record set in 2020 by 100,000 barrels. Weekly domestic oil production has doubled from the first week in October 2012 to now. "The energy crisis of 1973 taught us many things, but in my mind, the most critical is that **American energy strength is a tremendous source of security, prosperity and freedom around the world**," said Mike Sommers, president and CEO of the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. oil industry's top lobbying group. In a speech Wednesday marking the 50th anniversary of the 1973 oil embargo, Sommers said current U.S. production contrasts sharply with "America's weakened position during the Arab oil embargo.'' He urged U.S. policymakers to heed what he called the lessons of 1973. "We cannot squander our strategic advantage and retreat on energy leadership," said Sommers, who has repeatedly criticized President Joe Biden's policies restricting restricting new oil leases as part of Biden's efforts to slow global climate change. "With an unstable world, **war in Europe [&], war in the Middle East**, and energy demand outstripping supply, energy security is on the line,'' Sommers said in a speech at the Hudson Institute, a Washington think tank. "American oil and gas are **needed now** more than ever,'' Sommers said. "Let's take to heart the lessons we learned from 1973 and avoid sowing the seeds of the next energy crisis.''

And: oil scarcity causes war. US fossil fuels are the only thing between human survival and destruction.

Klare '13 [Michael T., The Nation's defense correspondent, is **professor emeritus of peace and world-security** studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, D.C. His newest book, All Hell Breaking Loose: The Pentagon's Perspective on Climate Change, will be published this fall. 2013. "How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion," https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/] brett | recut

Brace yourself. You may not be able to tell yet, but according to **global experts** and the US intelligence community, the earth is already shifting under you. Whether you know it or not, you're on a new planet, a resource-shock world of a sort humanity has never before experienced. Two nightmare scenarios—a global scarcity of vital resources and the onset of extreme climate change—are already beginning to converge and in the **coming decades** are likely to produce a tidal wave of **unrest rebellion competition** and **conflict**. Just what this tsunami of disaster will look like may, as yet, be hard to discern, but experts warn of **water wars**, over contested river systems, global food riots sparked by soaring prices for life's basics, mass migrations of climate refugees (with resulting anti-migrant violence) and the breakdown of social order or the **collapse of states**. At first, such mayhem is likely to arise largely in Africa, Central Asia and other areas of the underdeveloped South, but in time, **all regions** of the planet will be affected. To appreciate the power of this encroaching catastrophe, it's necessary to examine each of the **forces** that are combining to produce this future **cataclysm**. **Resource Shortages and Resource Wars** Start with one simple given: **the prospect of future [energy] scarcities** of vital natural resources, including **energy**, water, land, food and **critical minerals.** This in itself would guarantee **social unrest geopolitical friction** and **war**. It is important to note that **absolute scarcity** doesn't have to be on the horizon in any given resource category for this scenario to kick in. A lack of adequate supplies to meet the needs of a growing, ever more urbanized and industrialized global population is enough. Given the wave of extinctions that scientists are recording, some resources—particular species of fish, animals and trees, for example—will become less abundant **in the decades to come**, and may even disappear altogether. But key materials for modern civilization like **oil**, uranium and copper will simply prove harder and more costly to acquire, **lead**ing to **supply bottlenecks** and **periodic shortages**. Oil—the single most important commodity in the international economy—provides an apt example. Although global oil supplies may actually grow in the coming decades, many experts doubt that they can be expanded sufficiently to meet the needs of a rising global middle class that is, for instance, expected to buy millions of new cars in the near future. In its 2011 World Energy Outlook, the International Energy Agency claimed that an anticipated global oil demand of 104 million barrels per day in 2035 will be satisfied. This, the report suggested, would be thanks in large part to additional supplies of "unconventional oil" (Canadian tar sands, shale oil and so on), as well as 55 million barrels of new oil from fields "yet to be found" and "yet to be developed." However, many analysts scoff at this optimistic assessment, arguing that **rising production costs (for energy that will be ever more difficult and costly to extract[ion]), environmental opposition, warfare, corruption and other impediments will make it extremely difficult to achieve increases** of this magnitude. In other words, even if production manages for a time to top the 2010 level of 87 million barrels per day, the goal of 104 million barrels will never be reached and the world's major consumers will face virtual, if not absolute, scarcity. Water provides another potent example. On an annual basis, the supply of drinking water provided by natural precipitation remains more or less constant: about 40,000 cubic kilometers. But much of this precipitation lands on Greenland, Antarctica, Siberia and inner Amazonia where there are very few people, so the supply available to major concentrations of humanity is often surprisingly limited. In many regions with high population levels, water supplies are already relatively sparse. This is especially true of North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East, where the demand for water continues to grow as a result of rising populations, urbanization and the emergence of new water-intensive industries. The result, even when the supply remains constant, is an environment of increasing scarcity. Wherever you look, the picture is roughly the same: supplies of critical resources may be rising or falling, but rarely do they appear to be outpacing demand, producing a sense of widespread and systemic scarcity. However generated, a **perception** of scarcity—or imminent scarcity—regularly leads to anxiety,

resentment, **hostility** and contentiousness. This pattern is **very well understood**, and has been evident **throughout human history**. In his book Constant Battles, for example, Steven LeBlanc, director of collections for Harvard's Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, notes that many ancient **civilizations** experienced higher levels of warfare when faced with resource shortages brought about by population growth, crop failures or persistent drought. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller Collapse, has detected a similar pattern in Mayan civilization and the Anasazi culture of New Mexico's Chaco Canyon. More recently, concern over adequate food for the home population was a significant factor in **Japan**'s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and **Germany**'s invasions of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Union in 1941, according to Lizzie Collingham, author of The Taste of War. Although the global supply of most basic commodities has grown enormously since the end of World War II, analysts see the persistence of resource-related conflict in areas where materials remain scarce or there is anxiety about the future reliability of supplies. Many experts believe, for example, that the fighting in **Darfur** and other war-ravaged areas of **North Africa** has been driven, at least in part, by competition among desert tribes for access to scarce water supplies, exacerbated in some cases by rising population levels. "In Darfur," says a 2009 report from the UN Environment Programme on the role of natural resources in the conflict, "recurrent drought, increasing demographic pressures, and political marginalization are among the forces that have pushed the region into a spiral of lawlessness and violence that **has led to 300,000 deaths** and the displacement of more than two million people since 2003." Anxiety over future supplies is often also a factor in conflicts that break out over access to oil or control of contested undersea reserves of oil and natural gas. In 1979, for instance, when the Islamic **revolution in Iran** overthrew the Shah and the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington began to fear that someday it might be denied access to Persian Gulf oil. At that point, President Jimmy Carter promptly announced what came to be called the Carter Doctrine. In his 1980 State of the Union Address, Carter affirmed that any move to impede the flow of oil from the Gulf would be viewed as a threat to America's "vital interests" and would be repelled by "any means necessary, including military force." In 1990, this principle was invoked by President George H.W. Bush to justify intervention in **the first** Persian **Gulf War**, just as his son would use it, in part, to justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Today, it remains the basis for US plans to employ force to stop the Iranians from closing the Strait of Hormuz, the strategic waterway connecting the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean through which about 35 percent of the world's seaborne oil commerce passes. Recently, a set of resource conflicts have been rising toward the boiling point between **China** and its neighbors in Southeast Asia when it comes to control of offshore oil and gas reserves in the **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea. Although the resulting naval clashes have yet to result in a loss of life, a strong possibility of military escalation exists. A similar situation has also arisen in the **E**ast **C**hina **S**ea, where China and Japan are jousting for control over similarly valuable undersea reserves. Meanwhile, in the South Atlantic Ocean, Argentina and Britain are once again squabbling over the Falkland Islands (called Las Malvinas by the Argentinians) because oil has been discovered in surrounding waters. By all accounts, resource-driven potential conflicts like these will only **multiply** in the years ahead as demand rises, supplies dwindle and more of what remains will be found in disputed areas. In a 2012 study titled Resources Futures, the respected British think-tank Chatham House expressed particular concern about possible resource wars over water, especially in areas like the Nile and Jordan River basins where several groups or countries must share the same river for the majority of their water supplies and few possess the wherewithal to develop alternatives. "Against this backdrop of tight supplies and competition, issues related to water rights, prices, and pollution are becoming contentious," the report noted. "In areas with limited capacity to govern shared resources, balance competing demands, and mobilize new investments, tensions over water may erupt into more **open confrontations**." Heading for a Resource-Shock World Tensions like these would be destined to grow by themselves because in so many areas supplies of key resources will not be able to keep up with demand. As it happens, though, they are not "by themselves." On this planet, a second major force has entered the equation in a significant way. With the growing reality of climate change, everything becomes a lot more terrifying. Normally, when we consider the impact of climate change, we think primarily about the environment—the melting Arctic ice cap or Greenland ice shield, rising global sea levels, intensifying storms, expanding desert and endangered or disappearing species like the polar bear. But a growing number of experts are coming to realize that the most potent effects of climate change will be experienced by humans directly through the impairment or wholesale destruction of habitats upon which we rely for food production, industrial activities or simply to live. Essentially, climate change will wreak its havoc on us by constraining our access to the basics of life: vital resources that include food, water, land and energy. This will be devastating to human life, even as it significantly increases the danger of resource conflicts of all sorts erupting. We already know enough about the future effects of climate change to predict the following with reasonable confidence: * Rising sea levels will in the next half-century erase many coastal areas, destroying large cities, critical infrastructure (including roads, railroads, ports, airports, pipelines, refineries and power plants) and prime agricultural land. * Diminished rainfall and prolonged droughts will turn once-verdant croplands into dust bowls, reducing food output and turning millions into "climate refugees." * More severe storms and intense heat waves will kill crops, trigger forest fires, cause floods and destroy critical infrastructure. No one can predict how much food, land, water and energy will be lost as a result of this onslaught (and other climate-change effects that are harder to predict or even possibly imagine), but the cumulative effect will undoubtedly be staggering. In Resources Futures, Chatham House offers a particularly dire warning when it comes to the threat of diminished precipitation to rain-fed agriculture. "By 2020," the report says, "yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%" in some areas. The highest rates of loss are expected to be in Africa, where reliance on rain-fed farming is greatest, but agriculture in China, India, Pakistan and Central Asia is also likely to be severely affected. Heat waves, droughts and other effects of climate change will also reduce the flow of many vital rivers, diminishing water supplies for irrigation, hydro-electricity power facilities and nuclear reactors (which need massive amounts of water for cooling purposes). The melting of glaciers, especially in the Andes in Latin America and the Himalayas in South Asia, will also rob communities and cities of crucial water supplies. An expected increase in the frequency of hurricanes and typhoons will pose a growing threat to offshore oil rigs, coastal refineries, transmission lines and other components of the global energy system. The melting of the Arctic ice cap will open that region to oil and gas exploration, but an increase in iceberg activity will make all efforts to exploit that region's energy supplies perilous and exceedingly costly. Longer growing seasons in the north, especially Siberia and Canada's northern provinces, might compensate to some degree for the desiccation of croplands in more southerly latitudes. However, moving the global agricultural system (and the world's farmers) northward from abandoned farmlands in the United States, Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Argentina and Australia would be a daunting prospect. It is safe to assume that climate change, especially when combined with growing supply shortages, will result in a significant reduction in the planet's vital resources, augmenting the kinds of pressures that have historically led to conflict, even under better circumstances. In this way, according to the Chatham House report, climate change is best understood as a "threat multiplier…a key factor exacerbating existing resource vulnerability" in states already prone to such disorders. Like other experts on the subject, Chatham House's analysts claim, for example, that climate change will reduce crop output in many areas, sending global food prices soaring and triggering unrest among those already pushed to the limit under existing conditions. "Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heat waves and floods, will also result in much larger and frequent local harvest shocks around the world….These shocks will affect global food prices whenever key centers of agricultural production area are hit—further amplifying global food price volatility." This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of civil unrest. When, for instance, a brutal heat wave decimated Russia's wheat crop during the summer of 2010, the global price of wheat (and so of that staple of life, bread) began an inexorable upward climb, reaching particularly high levels in North Africa and the Middle East. With local governments unwilling or unable to help desperate populations, anger over impossible-to-afford food merged with resentment toward autocratic regimes to trigger the massive popular outburst we know as the Arab Spring. Many such explosions are likely in the future, Chatham House suggests, if current trends continue as climate change and resource scarcity meld into a single reality in our world. A single provocative question from that group should haunt us all: "Are we on the cusp of a new world order dominated by struggles over access to affordable resources?" For the US intelligence community, which appears to have been influenced by the report, the response was blunt. In March, for the first time, Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper listed "competition and scarcity involving natural resources" as a national security threat on a par with global terrorism, cyberwar and nuclear [weapons] proliferation. "Many countries important to the United States are vulnerable to natural resource shocks that degrade economic development, frustrate attempts to democratize, raise the risk of regime-threatening instability, and aggravate regional tensions," he wrote in his prepared statement for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. "Extreme weather events (floods, droughts, heat waves) will increasingly disrupt food and energy markets, exacerbating state weakness, forcing human migrations, and triggering riots, civil disobedience, and vandalism." There was a new phrase embedded in his comments: "resource shocks." It catches something of the world we're barreling toward, and the language is striking for an intelligence community that, like the government it serves, has largely played down or ignored the dangers of climate change. For the first time, senior government analysts may be coming to appreciate what energy experts, resource analysts and scientists have long been warning about: the unbridled consumption of the world's natural resources, combined with the advent of extreme climate change, could produce a global explosion of human chaos and conflict. We are now heading directly into a resource-shock world.

Contention 2] is Climate Change

The US is currently on path to cut emissions

White House in August this year The White House, August 16, 2023, FACT SHEET: One Year In, President Biden's Inflation Reduction Act is Driving Historic Climate Action and Investing in America to Create Good Paying Jobs and Reduce Costs, https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/08/16/fact-sheet-one-year-in-president-bidens-inflation-reduction-act-is-driving-historic-climate-action-and-investing-in-america-to-create-good-paying-jobs-and-reduce-costs/ (accessed 10/18/2023)

Just twelve months after the law was signed, it is already having a significant impact on American workers and families, and is delivering for underserved communities and those that have been too often left behind. Outside groups estimate the Inflation Reduction Act's clean energy and climate provisions have created more than 170,000 clean energy jobs already, companies have announced over $110 billion in clean energy manufacturing investments in the last year alone, the law is delivering billions of dollars to protect communities from the impacts of climate change, and millions of seniors are saving money because their insulin is capped at $35 per month. Today, to mark the anniversary of the Inflation Reduction Act, the Biden-Harris Administration is releasing a new feature on Invest.gov that highlights stories of how the Inflation Reduction Act and Bidenomics are making a difference for Americans in all 50 states and U.S. territories. Bidenomics is the President's vision for growing the economy from the middle out and bottom up, including by investing in America, creating good-paying union jobs, and lowering cost for American families. In the 12 months since the Inflation Reduction Act was signed into law: The private sector has announced more than $110 billion in new clean energy manufacturing investments, including more than $70 billion in the electric vehicle (EV) supply chain and more than $10 billion in solar manufacturing. Since the President was elected, the private sector has announced approximately $240 billion in new clean energy manufacturing investments. Investments in clean energy and climate since the Inflation Reduction Act was signed into law have created more than 170,000 jobs, and the law is projected to create more than 1.5 million additional jobs over the next decade according to estimates by outside groups. Public and private sector investments driven by the Inflation Reduction Act and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law are expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 1 billion tons in 2030. The Administration has already awarded over a billion dollars to help communities become more resilient and protect them from the disastrous impacts of climate change, including drought, heat, and extreme weather. American families [will] are projected to save $27-38 billion on their electricity bills from 2022-2030 relative to a scenario without the Inflation Reduction Act, according to new data released by the Department of Energy today. Nearly 15 million people are saving an average of $800 per year on their health insurance premiums, the nation's uninsured rate has reached an historic low, and millions of seniors on Medicare are paying less in out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs—including insulin, which is capped at $35 per month. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is strengthening enforcement against wealthy tax cheats and increasing recoveries from delinquent millionaires—while improving customer service for law-abiding taxpayers, including cutting phone wait times from 28 minutes last tax season to 3 minutes this year. LARGEST CLIMATE INVESTMENT IN HISTORY The Inflation Reduction Act is the most ambitious investment in combating the climate crisis in world history. Today, the Department of Energy (DOE) released an updated study affirming the transformative climate progress driven by the Inflation Reduction Act and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. DOE estimates that the two laws will cut U.S. greenhouse gas emissions by up to 41 percent below 2005 levels by 2030. Together with additional actions being taken by federal, state, and local governments as well as the private sector, the United States is now on a path to achieve President Biden's ambitious goal of cutting emissions 50-52 percent below 2005 levels by 2030 and reaching net-zero emissions by no later than 2050. This is consistent with external researchers, who project that U.S. greenhouse gas emissions will fall 43-48 percent below 2005 levels by 2035 **thanks to laws already [happening] on the books**. The Inflation Reduction Act is accelerating progress to meet America's climate goals, build a clean energy economy, and strengthen energy security: The Department of Energy has estimated that the Inflation Reduction Act and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law will lead to greenhouse gas emissions reductions of approximately 1 billion tons in 2030. The Department of Energy found that the Inflation Reduction Act and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law are driving significant new clean electricity generation, enabling the United States to potentially reach **80 percent clean electricity by 2030**. U.S. electricity generation from wind is expected to triple and solar generation is expected to increase seven- to eight-fold by 2030, according to Department of Energy estimates. Over the next seven years, we expect twice as much wind, solar, and battery deployment as there would have been without the Inflation Reduction Act.

This means a global energy emissions peak by 2025

Jolly, financial reporter, 2022 Jasper Jolly, financial reporter for the Guardian, 2022 Carbon emissions from energy to peak in 2025 in 'historic turning point', says IEA https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/oct/27/carbon-emissions-to-peak-in-2025-in-historic-turning-point-says-iea (accessed 10/18/23)

Carbon emissions from energy [will] to peak in 2025 in 'historic turning point', says IEA The IEA said planned investments in green energy in response to the crisis meant that – for the first time – government policies would lead to demand for polluting fossil fuels peaking this decade. The agency

cited notable contributions from the US Inflation Reduction Act, the EU's emissions reduction package, and actions by Japan, South Korea, China and India

Not only WILL emissions stop growing, but they MUST by 2025 to solve climate change

United Nations 2022 UN, 4-1-2022, UN climate report: It's 'now or never' to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees, https://news.un.org/en/story/2022/04/1115452, 10-12-2022

To limit global warming[,] to around 1.5C (2.7°F), the IPCC report insisted that global greenhouse gas **emissions would have to peak "before 2025 at the latest**, and be reduced by 43 per cent by 2030".

Thus, as proven by my evidence, the US is on track to solve climate change: the safest option is to stick with today's status quo policies, rather than mess around with the Aff's plan

Even if you don't believe that, there are 3 reasons why the Aff fails at solving climate change, making it worse in fact.

Reason 1 is offshoring

Banning fossil fuel extraction in U.S. public lands will cause offshoring, where companies move to less environmentally strict countries to extract, increasing global emissions

Byers, VP of US Energy Chamber, 2022 Dan Byers. "Greater U.S. Energy Production Is Needed To Reduce Reliance On Authoritarian Regimes." U.S. Chamber of Commerce Global Energy Institute. April 05, 2022. Web. https://www.globalenergyinstitute.org/greater-us-energy-production-needed-reduce-reliance-authoritarian-regimes (Accessed October 10, 2023)

It's also important to recognize that encouraging responsible U.S. energy production can be a net positive for the environment. Because supply side policies that restrict domestic production do not reduce global energy demand [&], they do not lead to lower emissions. Instead, they **simply shift production to foreign countries that** typically **have lower environmental standards.** This creates the counterintuitive reality of production restrictions **leading to higher emissions**. In fact, the National Ocean Industries Association has detailed how U.S. offshore production is an emissions asset, not a liability, citing a 2016 analysis by the Obama Administration determining that ending lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico would increase emissions: "U.S. GHG emissions would be higher if BOEM were to have no lease sales…emissions from substitutions are higher due to exploration, development, production, and transportation of oil from international sources being more carbon intensive." Moreover, according to Wood Mackenzie, offshore deepwater production carried out in areas such as the Gulf of Mexico has the lowest GHG emissions of all sources of oil in the world. Recently released data from the International Energy Agency's Global Methane Tracker supports this conclusion. As shown in the chart below, IEA estimates that the methane intensity of **oil and gas** production in Russia is 30 percent higher than in the United States. E[e]missions in Iran are 85% higher [than the US] for each unit of energy produced, and Venezuela is off the charts at 652% higher. Therefore, a comprehensive approach to enhanced energy security through **increased domestic production will not undermine climate goals**. We know that free economies are clean economies, and we should therefore aggressively pursue low-carbon alternatives that wean U.S. dependence on fossil fuels, while also recognizing the climate and security benefits of relatively low-GHG [pollution] energy production [in the] here on U.S. soil

Reason 2 is Renewables Land

The new climate bill requires fossil fuel leases before public land is offered to renewable energy development - Aff kills public land renewables

Gross 22 [Samantha Gross, Director of the Brookings Energy Security and Climate Initiative and Fellow at the Brookings Foreign Policy, Energy Security and Climate Initiative, 08-04-2022, "The climate bill's oil and gas provisions are a worthwhile tradeoff," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-climate-bills-oil-and-gas-provisions-are-a-worthwhile-tradeoff/]/Kankee

Senators Chuck Schumer and Joe Manchin shocked Washington on July 27 by announcing that they had reached a deal on a climate bill. Dubbed the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, the bill includes $369 billion in spending on climate action. If passed, it would be the most important climate legislation in U.S. history and would be a key step toward the United States achieving the emissions reduction goal that U.S. President Joe Biden presented at the Glasgow climate summit in November 2021. As you would expect, the bill has been getting a ton of attention, some of it frustratingly misleading. It represents a compromise designed to get all 50 Democratic senators on board and includes some provisions intended to be helpful to fossil fuel producers. Most notably, it **requires** the U.S. Department of the Interior to [lend] lease **2 million** acres in federal lands onshore and 60 million acres offshore each year for oil and gas development (or whatever acreage the industry requests, whichever is smaller). These quotas **must** be met to allow federal leasing for onshore and offshore renewables development, respectively. Climate benefits vastly outweigh oil and gas leasing There is a certain irony in pairing new oil and gas development – a key cause of climate change – with development of renewable energy – a key solution. And as you might expect, some in the environmental movement are howling. "It's self-defeating to **handcuff** renewable energy development to massive new oil and gas extraction," said Brett Hartl, government affairs director at the Center for Biological Diversity, also calling the bill "a climate suicide pact." In an online statement, a senior scientist at 350.org called the bill a "sham" and said that it "contained so many giveaways to the fossil fuel industry" that it "turns all of the gains in addressing the climate crisis into a moot point."

Following this law is proving how public land renewables ARE HELPING the economy and prevent climate change TODAY, offsetting fuel pollution

Springer and Daue 20 [Nikki Springer, Ph.D., Yale Center for Business and the Environment and Alex Daue, The Wilderness Society, 05-2020, "Key Economic Benefits of Renewable Energy on Public Lands," Yale Center for Business and the Environment, https://www.wilderness.org/sites/default/files/media/file/CBEY_WILDERNESS_Renewable%20Energy%20Report_0.pdf]/Kankee

GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION The avoided carbon dioxide gas (CO2) emissions from renewable energy use when compared to electricity generation from the burning of fossil fuels also offers economic benefits. As detailed in Appendix 7, through 2019, the solar projects operating on **public lands** have resulted in an estimated total of **11.39 million** metric tons of avoided CO2 emissions. This is roughly **equivalent** to taking over **2.4 million** passenger vehicles off the road for one year.38 While estimates of the avoided CO2 emissions from the wind and geothermal projects operating on public lands were not readily available, they have also contributed **significant** benefits in avoided CO2 emissions. The Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is a leading tool for quantifying the climate impacts of proposed federal actions. As described by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, the SCC is "an estimate, in dollars, of the long term damage caused by a one ton increase in carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in a given year; or viewed another way, the benefits of reducing CO2 emissions by that amount in a given year. The SCC is intended to be a comprehensive estimate of climate change damages that includes, among other costs, the changes in net agricultural productivity, risks to human health, and property damages from increased flood risks."39 The current central estimate of the social cost of carbon (SCC) is roughly $50/metric ton in 2019 dollars. Using this estimate, the cumulative total estimate of the avoided CO2 emissions from solar projects operating on public lands have a SCC value of over $**544 million [in emissions]** through the end of 2019 (see Appendix 7). SPOTLIGHT ON NEVADA

Reason 3 is Economy

Economic shocks caused by a ban on the extraction of fossil fuels prevents us from solving the Aff's impacts

Kassab 17 Hanna Samir Kassab, Springer International Publishing (assistant professor on international relations),February 07, 2017, "Prioritization Theory And Defensive Foreign Policy: Systemic Vulnerabilities In International Politics." https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-319-48018-3 (accessed 11/12/21)

Furthermore, this work recognizes the importance of self-determination and economic development. These are not inherently bad things. Self-determination recognizes the right of a state as represented by its people to live out the destiny of their own choosing. Economic development, even from this Western modernist perspective, recognizes the value of human life and seeks to protect it through the proper and efficient allocation of resources. However, if peoples choose to withdraw into a closed community, it is their right to do so. Yet the problem remains: states and peoples are now more interconnected than ever. And so instead of remaining insular, everyone in the world has an interest to ensure the proper functioning of the international system and the tackling of the world's problems such as global warming, the diffusion of disease and other negative public outcomes. Such matters bind the autonomy and sovereignty of peoples together in the universal need for survival. Final Words When we study International Relations from the point of view of distribution of capabilities, scholars miss other aspects of the discipline. A state's behavior is carried out to survive against the systemic vulnerabilities described in this book. Power, driven by economic development, is the tool for neutralizing these vulnerabilities, so as to protect individuals living inside the state. Power can be considered a laundry list of resources (Waltz 2010) meant to achieve invulnerability from sources of threat. Whether from competitor states or disease and cyber-attacks, the role of power is to enhance the state's survival ability against the odds: to decrease vulnerability. Since resources are necessary to increase resilience to threats, they are the antidote to vulnerability, and the root of power to achieve invulnerability is the economy: economic development is thus the cure for vulnerability. The stronger, more advanced the economy, the more resilient it will be to exogenous shock in the ways described. Economic gains can be transformed into power in military terms, but also provide the necessary infrastructure to deal with health, cyber, environmental and other shocks and destabilization. Since power is tied to economic matters, economic vulnerabilities can significantly impede power and a state's ability to deal with [these] threats. The financial crisis in 2008 damaged the European Union and much of the Caribbean because of their dependence on the USA. The falling price of oil is decreasing global aggregate demand as Russians do not have as much to spend. This has occurred during a period of Russian expansionism and while Eastern Europe is concerned about Russia's military might, it must recognize the power of the world economy in terms of punishing this sort of action. Waltz focused on the distribution of capabilities as a means toward security. I look at world politics as the struggle to correct vulnerabilities in order to remain secure. Military power cannot solve such vulnerability. Enhancing invulnerability will come through economic development in a modernist perspective but threats will never be truly neutralized until all states in the system are economically developed. The economy, with all its sensitivity and vulnerability, is a source of instability for all actors.

Impact: Clim Change

And, if we don't prevent climate change, we face extreme warming and global extinction within a decade.

Krosofsky 21, Andrew Krosofsky is a writer and **environmental journalist** for Green Matters, a media company covering awareness and solutions around the climate crisis. Krosofsky, Andrew. "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction." Green Matters, Green Matters, 11 Mar. 2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction. BZ [v2.0]

Life on this planet has gone through many extinction-level events over time. Most of these phenomena were caused by natural, cataclysmic forces beyond the control of any of the lifeforms existing at that time. The current cataclysmic forces are anything but natural and they are well within our control. The question is not, "will global warming cause extinction?"— it's, "how can we prevent that inevitability from happening?" Will global warming cause extinction? Eventually, yes. Global warming will invariably result in the mass **extinction of millions of different species, humankind included.** In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet. Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term. **Extreme weather patterns are** shifting climates across the globe, **eliminating habitats and altering the** landscape. As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced. Then, of course, there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. What species will go extinct if global warming continues? The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that **more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050.** By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. Will global warming cause humanity's extinction? We won't try and sugarcoat things, humanity's own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species has just under a decade left to get our CO_2 emissions under control. **If we don't cut** those **emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to** potentially **catastrophic levels.** It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but **it will mean less food, [and]** less **water,** and increased hardship across the world — **especially in low-income areas** and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires. It's difficult to calculate the numbers in these cases or to assess precisely what risks we will all be facing, but this is because we have never experienced anything like it before.

Neg Rebuttal CARDS

General

Offshoring Extension

aff completely misses how stopping FF on pub land causes offshoring

They're not doing anything except increasing pollution thru [3 reasons] - they miss the wholistic picture

Foreign countries have:

1] Lower env standards – sometimes none, e.g. in deep sea with little regulations. Pollute as much as they want, once established

2] Cheaper labor in many other countries

3] Examples: Prohibiting extraction on public lands doesn't change our energy demands- we still depend on fossil fuels. Instead, corporations move to other countries to drill with worse regulations – this makes warming and labor concerns worse.

Shah 06, Anup Shah, Corporations and Worker's Rights, May 28, 2006, Global Issues, http://www.globalissues.org/article/57/corporations-and-workers-rights, 10/3/19 IKK

A meeting in Oslo suggests that the current model of the Markets and Globalization may not be the way to go. This is because when **it comes to a country trying to impose some environmental** or societal considerations and **legislation on multinational corporations, they just move to a country where the** rules and **regulations aren't as strict**. **One reason that this situation arises is because of the flaed structural adjustment programs which force developing nations to continuously cut back in order to export more at a cheaper rate and race to the bottom**. **Take the following as examples** (by no means exhaustive!): **Coca Cola in Zambia**. They have closed their operations there due to disagreements about tax exemptions. Another example is how the **tobacco industry** is now **moving on to Asia** as sales in USA and Europe decline and the US settlements do nothing to prevent this. **India is one example where there is tremendous increase in smoking**, and smoking related illnesses and death. (This link also provides some information and statistics about this issue.) **Nike**, as mentioned above, as well as many other retail companies, **use cheap labor in South East Asia, where they can get away from the tighter enforcement and regulations of USA and Europe**. **Phillips-Van-Huesen have been criticized for closing a factory in Guatemala because the workers tried to form a union to protect their basic rights**. A report by three human rights organizations revealed the details. It reveals how the company closed a factory in order to destroy the union and profit from lower wages by sweatshop contractors in Guatemala. You can see the full report at the Americas.org web site linked to from here. In April 2002, as Alternet.org reports, Levi Strauss & Company, "a brand practically synonymous with the U.S.A., decided to shutter virtually all domestic production and shift its manufacturing overseas." Earlier, in 1992, **the Washington Post had exposed Levi's exploitation of Chinese prison labor to make jeans** and throughout the 90s, various apparel companies had been accused of various forms of exploitation and sweatshop labor in poorer countries. Levi's tried to introduce a code of standards, but it seems that Levi's too has been feeling the competition pressure and in order to maximize profits and reduce costs, now also feels compelled to join the herd, so to speak, and go for cheaper labor costs.

Production bans cause the US to buy / import fossil fuels from other countries, who will drill EVEN MORE, increasing pollution

Gross 20 [Samantha Gross (Fellow – Foreign Policy, Energy Security, and Climate Initiative). January 2020. "The United States can take climate change seriously while leading the world in oil and gas production". Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-united-states-can-take-climate-change-seriously-while-leading-the-world-in-oil-and-gas-production/. Accessed 10/17/2023] // Sully

Yet cutting back domestic oil and gas production without an equally ambitious **focus on demand** will just **increase U.S. imports**, rather than reduce consumption. The United States could lose the economic advantages of its oil and gas production without a commensurate reduction in GHG emissions. In fact, such an outcome could actually **increase global emissions**, depending on how replacement fuels are produced and the emissions produced in transporting them to the United States. We must remember that climate change is a global problem and that the measure that matters is global GHG emissions. Any "solution" that reduces U.S. emissions, but **increases global emissions, is no solution at all**. Fossil fuel companies are a politically expedient enemy, but the hard work of actually reducing GHG emissions requires a focus on nearly **every sector** of the economy. I propose that the United States enact policies that **reduce the use** of fossil fuels without carbon capture and storage, ensure that oil and gas produced in the United States have the **lowest GHG emissions possible**, and prepare for the **eventual decline of domestic oil and gas production** through policies that will help affected communities through the transition. I'm not advocating for less ambitious climate policy, but for policy that focuses its efforts on the **demand and emissions side** of the ledger. Our government should **let economics determine** how much oil and gas is produced in the United States. When **demand-focused policies**, like a carbon tax or efficiency standards, make U.S. fuels **uncompetitive**, their production will **naturally decline**. Falling costs for renewable energy are helping to push fossil fuels out of electricity generation, but oil and gas are harder to replace in other uses. Policy and research will be needed to encourage the transition in the most challenging sectors. The United States has a **unique opportunity** to lead the world not only in **reducing GHG emissions**, but in **leveraging a dynamic energy industry** in the process. This paper describes how to do just that. The case for continuing U.S. oil and gas production Eliminating U.S. oil production **faster than U.S. demand declines** would result in **additional oil imports**. (The United States has so much natural gas production and resources that large-scale natural gas imports are difficult to imagine.) Oil is a fungible commodity, produced in countries around the world with varying levels of environmental standards and GHG emissions. Many of these sources are **less regulated** than those in the United States and some inherently require **more energy in their production**, resulting in greater emissions of GHGs **and** other pollutants than production here in the United States. Importing more fuel would also increase **distances of oil transportation**, increasing associated GHG emissions. One could argue that reducing U.S. oil and gas production would increase global oil and gas prices and thus decrease their use globally. This might be true for a while, but the global oil market has a history of strong price swings, as high prices bring out more production that sends prices crashing down again. It's unlikely that decreased U.S. production would keep prices high enough for long enough to significantly decrease global demand. Climate change and GHG emissions are global problems—the measure that matters is global emissions, no matter where in the world they occur. Moving production and re-arranging markets to reduce the emissions within or attributable to the United States doesn't help if we merely **export those emissions to other places.**

AT US Clim Leadership [Squo China solves]

1] Every country for themselves – no one will follow the US, EVERYONE WILL BE BUSY IN FIGHTING IN RESOURCE WARS FOR FF DUE TO SUPPLY SHORTAGES [Neg Contention 1].

2] STATUS QUO SOLVES. US climate leadership not key – if US climate leadership lags, China will fill in, with help from the EU and Canada.

Savage 19 – Luiza Ch. Savage is the executive editor for growth at POLITICO "The U.S. left a hole in leadership on climate. China is filling it" Politico, August 15th, 2019, https://www.politico.com/story/2019/08/15/climate-china-global-translations-1662345 // rose

Call it the China climate paradox.

Often considered the bogeyman of global climate diplomacy, China is making greater and faster strides than expected away from fossil fuels — becoming the world's largest investor in solar and wind technology and boasting more jobs in solar energy than in coal-mining. It's all part of a longterm economic strategy to dominate in critical technologies.

The torrid pace and unprecedented scale of China's investments in clean energy are driven in part by local concerns about toxic air quality. China remains the world's leading emitter of greenhouse gases, accounting for roughly 30 percent of global carbon dioxide pollution.

But the moves are giving China a growing leadership role on the world stage — precisely at a time when Washington's voice is becoming less relevant thanks to President Donald Trump's announced plan to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris climate agreement, according to interviews with POLITICO's Global Translations podcast.

"China wants to be the leader in the clean energy economy," said Barbara Finamore, Asia director for the Natural Resources Defense Council. "Some people say that China was slow to catch up with the Industrial Revolution and kind of lagged behind, perhaps until recently, in the dot-com revolution, but it saw the potential to lead the clean energy revolution from the start — and it's determined to lead."

Critics of the Paris agreement in the Trump administration have complained that China's pledges would still allow the country to increase emissions for more than a decade, while they contend that cuts in U.S. emissions promised by the Obama administration would hurt economic growth. And they point out that the U.S., which accounts for the second-largest share of world emissions — 15 percent — has already cut its CO2 emissions over the past decade, although that decline was largely the result of power producers switching to cheaper natural gas from coal rather than being driven by U.S. climate policy.

But for Chinese President Xi Jinping, clean energy investments are not just about fighting climate change and cleaning up some of the world's dirtiest air — but about economic competitiveness. Beijing has used hardball tactics in its quest to dominate cutting-edge technology that are among the drivers of the current Washington-Beijing trade war. They have ranged from forced intellectual property transfers and requirements that foreign companies enter into local joint ventures to heavy state subsidies for solar panels that have made it the world's leading global supplier, undercutting prices of non-subsidized competitors.

China is responsible for a third of wind turbines and solar panels in the world — and its investments have had the side effect of driving down the global price of solar and wind technologies by nearly three-quarters in the last decade, Finamore said.

These efforts have allowed China to reduce the share of coal in its overall energy mix from 80 percent to 60 percent, she said, after having grown coal use by double digits for a decade. (By contrast, coal accounts for less than 30 percent of the U.S. energy mix, according to the Energy Information Administration.) And the NRDC published a report in January suggesting that if China continues to fully implement the policies that it already has in place to cut coal consumption — and ramps up its energy efficiency efforts — the nation could cap its coal consumption by as early as next year.

China has also pursued electrification at an eye-popping pace. It now has almost half the world's electric vehicles, half the world's charging infrastructure, and 99 percent of the world's electric buses, according to Finamore. "It has brought the cost of electric vehicle batteries down by two-thirds in just five years, to the point where electric vehicles can become cost-competitive with your gas-guzzling car," Finamore added.

"China has installed more renewable capacity than any other country in the world," said Jonathan Pershing, who was a special envoy for climate change under the Obama administration. America's failure to tackle renewable energy on a national scale has longterm economic implications, said Pershing, now a program director at the Hewlett Foundation.

"We are not choosing to do very many of these things at scale, and others are," he said. "Those kinds of questions are going to be what will dictate the future in terms of economic competitiveness. And it will not just be because of climate change. It will be because that's where the world is going. That's where technology is moving. And if you're not playing in that space, you're not going to be a winner."

Alongside aggressive green investments, China has also retooled its climate diplomacy. While the U.S. pulls back, China is taking its seat at the leadership table. When the Paris climate agreement was negotiated in 2015, China was criticized for its demand to be treated like a developing country — and to be allowed to continue to increase its emissions before beginning to decrease them by 2030.

Now it appears emissions will peak sooner than that — and China is a participant in the so-called Major Economic Forum, in which ministers from leading countries work together to maintain momentum and common understanding in climate talks. The Forum had been run by the U.S., but Canada stepped in once the U.S. pulled out.

"China has come a long way in moving from a climate resister to a strong supporter of the Paris agreement and global climate governance," Finamore said. "And what people don't realize is how fast things have changed."

Canada's minister of environment and climate, Catherine McKenna, described stepping up to fill the vacuum after the U.S. pulled out and holding a meeting of top ministers from the EU and China last June.

"That was tough because it was right after the U.S. had announced their position — but we brought folks together and it's important that we keep China very engaged at the table. I think they certainly believe in climate action and they see the opportunity, and we need them at the table and the European Union," she said. "I think that's a very positive thing that **even without the leadership of the United States** — which was extraordinary under the Obama administration — **internationally we're all moving forward including working with the E.U. and China**," she said.

They have no US key warrants – China is a bigger emitter and has just as much organizational infrastructure as we do, which means they don't have a reason the US being a climate leader is any better than any other country.

3] Domestic and global action fails – even if the US eliminated all of its emissions, it would be a drop in the bucket AND no follow-on.

Rossetti 19 [Philip Rossetti, former Director of Energy at the AAF, "Primer: No Country Can Fix Climate Change on Its Own," 05/20/19, *American Action Forum*, https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/primer-us-cant-fix-climate-change-on-its-own/, EA + Justin]

The global nature of climate change is a fundamental component of the climate change challenge, yet rarely plays the central role in policymaking. Instead, politicians' climate proposals are invariably focused primarily on domestic policies. That focus is natural, since Congress has little reach beyond America's shores on this issue, but **it has created a misleading perception that domestic policies alone could have a meaningful impact** on the future costs from climate change.

In fact, **even the most dramatic domestic climate policy would have only a small impact on the problem**. The United States has contributed the most to global warming historically, but the United States emits only a small share of current global emissions—about 16 percent of carbon dioxide and just over **14** percent of total greenhouse gasses—and that percentage is shrinking every year. Other nations, especially developing ones, are growing rapidly, using more energy—and therefore emitting more greenhouse gases.

The reality of rising global emissions means that dramatic policies such as **the Green New Deal would barely affect the climate outlook. Even if the United States**' domestic policies **were to eliminate all of its emissions by 2050, global emissions would still rise**, all else being equal.

The Challenge of Global Action

The solution to a global collective action problem requires global cooperation. Unfortunately, this **cooperation has traditionally been hard to muster**, and it is easy to see why. **Western powers built their hegemony on industrialization** and its accompanying carbon emissions. **Still-developing nations are contributing the most to projected greenhouse gas emissions, and that includes the world's largest emitter** (China). Developing nations do not want to forgo the benefits of industrialization that Western powers have already reaped, but the idea that China and other rapidly growing nations would not have an equal burden is a non-starter for the United States. That dynamic contributed significantly to the ultimate failure of the Kyoto Protocol.

Attempts at a more inclusive treaty, a la the Paris Agreement, **have failed to get enough concessions to reach any climate targets. Foreign powers**, particularly rapidly growing ones such as China, **are reticent to adopt policies that might constrain their growth and handicap their power**—especially considering that some relationships (e.g. U.S.-China) are becoming **increasingly adversarial.**

Climate change is fundamentally a global collective-action problem: Each country has the incentive to let the others make the painful cuts while reaping the benefits at home of emitting greenhouse gases. Put another way, the domestic benefit of carbon-emitting activities outweighs the costs, since the costs are global. **The problem is a classic "prisoners' dilemma."**

AT Native Land

1] The resolution ***does not*** include native lands. The aff is simply exploiting the oppression of natives as a way to win the debate round even tho it doesn't even apply to the topic. Don't let them win by taking advantage of settler oppression.

Department of the Interior 17 US Department of the Interior, 8/19/17, What is a federal Indian reservation?, https://www.bia.gov/faqs/what-federal-indian-reservation (accessed 11/9/23)

In the United States there are three types of reserved federal lands: military, public, and Indian [native]

2] Can't say something is true for ALL native people. Some want drilling, others don't, so keeping that option open is key. Aff's blanket ban for ALL lands forecloses revenue and jobs desperately needed

Melchior 15 [Jillian, Fellow at the Independent Women's Forum and writer for National Review, "New fracking regs hurt Native Americans," Bismark Tribune Accessed 7/5/21 ProQuest provided by UMICH Library, Ing] (edited to mitigate offense)

Last summer, as President Barack Obama visited the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in Cannon Ball, he called the economic and educational hardships faced by Native Americans a moral call to action. The president has claimed he will write a new chapter by keeping promises to Native Americans, but sadly, his administrations recent regulations deny Native Americans economic opportunities they sorely need. Consider the Department of the Interior last week released top-down regulation of fracking on tribal lands, which the federal government holds in trust. These redundant rules leave American Indians at a competitive disadvantage, quashing a huge opportunity for economic growth. Tribal lands host an outsized and grossly underdeveloped share of energy resources. As the Washington Times recently noted, About 25 percent of the nations onshore oil and gas reserves rest underneath tribal lands, but those lands account for roughly 5 percent of U.S. production. Development of these resources could change the lives of American Indians. The Council of Energy Resource Tribes estimates the energy resources on tribal lands could be worth as much as $1.5 trillion. In addition to raising revenue, energy development would also create good jobs, even for workers with little education. Native Americans [who] desperately need this sort of economic boost. More than one in four live in poverty, according to the Pew Research Center. Their high school graduation rates linger at 17 percent below the national average. Even as the economic recovery continues, native people continue to experience roughly double the unemployment rate of the nation. Nonetheless, the federal governments dysfunctional relationship with tribes has crippled [destroyed] energy development, according to a February 2014 report by the Property and Environment Research Center. On Indian lands, companies must go through at least four federal agencies and 49 steps to acquire a permit for energy development, compared to as few as four steps off reservations, writes the reports author, Shawn Regan. The effect of this complicated bureaucracy is to raise the cost of entering into resource development agreements with tribes or individual Indians. Under the management of the federal government, tribal fossil fuel sales dropped 21 percent between 2003 and 2013, according to the Energy Information Administration. On state and private lands, they grew 34 percent during the same time period. Native Americans know that the federal government is stifling their energy development and economic growth. Testifying to Congress last April, James Mike Olguin, the acting chairman of the Southern Ute Indian Tribal Council, denounced the unacceptable, bureaucracy-driven delays in federal approval of mineral leases and drilling permits. Olguin described how, on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, tribes watched their non-Indian neighbors get rich from mineral resource development, as their Indian lands remained unleased and undrilled month after month while awaiting federal approval and permitting. He decried the punitive effect of those delays on the poorest individuals and communities in the U.S. Likewise, the National Congress of American Indians recently wrote that it urges Congress and the Administration to remove barriers to the deployment of these energy resources that offer immense benefits to tribes, Native citizens, surrounding communities, and the American economy. But instead of loosening the red tape restraining energy development on tribal lands, the Obama administration tightened the bonds. The Department of the Interior issued new regulations on hydraulic fracturing that apply only to federal and Indian lands, not state or private property. Energy developers who are considering exploration on Indian lands know that they will face new requirements on wastewater disposal, well construction and disclosure. Why bother with the added hassle and expense? Already, states have led the way in create[ed]ing sensible fracking regulation. They know their residents, environment and economies better than the federal government does, and theyve crafted policies to match the unique needs of their state. [Native] American[s] Indians should have the chance to do the same on their lands. The Department of the Interiors new fracking regulations make it harder for American Indians to compete and to have their shot at the American dream. Unless the Obama administration reconsiders, tally this down as just one more broken promise.

Native American lands have potential to produce energy and increase quality of life for many Indigenous groups that want it

Catenacci 22. Thomas Catenacci is a **politics writer** for Fox News Digital. Native American tribes dependent on fossil fuel resources rip Biden admin for double standard. By Thomas Catenacci Fox News Published October 3, 2022 2:00am EDT. https://www.foxnews.com/politics/native-american-tribes-dependent-fossil-fuel-resources-rip-biden-admin-double-standard

Native American tribes that rely on fossil fuel production across the nation reiterated their demand that the Biden administration allow them to develop[ing] the resources on their lands. Tribal leaders and energy experts contacted by Fox News Digital **criticized efforts to restrict oil, gas and coal production even as those resources sustain thousands of Native Americans's way of life.** The Department of the Interior has repeatedly expressed support for boosting tribal sovereignty for Indigenous tribes, but has also pursued a climate agenda limiting fossil fuel production on federal lands and waters. "Air, water and energy are so foundational to our economy. I believe in the right that all property owners have to develop what belongs to them in any way that they want," Daniel Cardenas, the chairman of the National Tribal Energy Association and a member of the Pit River Tribe, told Fox News Digital in an interview. "That's why it's important to fight for. To make sure it doesn't get taken away." Coal leasing A dragline excavator moves rocks above a coal seam at the Spring Creek Mine in Decker, Montana, in 2013. The mine is operated by the Navajo Transitional Energy Company. Roughly 20% of the nation's total oil and natural gas reserves, 30% of domestic coal reserves west of the Mississippi River and additional natural minerals — altogether worth about $1.5 trillion — are on Native American lands, according to a 2014 study from think tank Property and Environment Research Center (PERC). **However, about 86% of Indigenous land with energy and mineral resource potential remain undeveloped and just 3% of domestic oil production comes from tribal land.** "Resource tribes depend on the development of their resources to create better tomorrows for our children," Conrad Stewart, the director of energy and water for the Crow Nation of Montana, told Fox News Digital in an interview. "It was basically a mandate in Indian policy to establish and develop our resources." The Crow Nation's coal and resource assets are worth an estimated $27 billion, likely making it among the largest coal owners worldwide, according to PERC. Still, the tribe's unemployment rate is far higher than the national average and its annual return on coal is less than 1%.

Indigenous energy production is a viewed as act of self determination

Necefer 15 ***Bracketed for racialized language** (Len Necefer, assistant professor with joint appointments with the American Native American Studies program & the Udall Center for Public Policy at University of Arizona), et al. "Energy development and Native Americans: Values and beliefs about energy from the Navajo Nation." Energy Research & Social Science 7 (2015): 1-11.)

Many [Native American] tribes, including the Navajo, have experienced a tumultuous history of energy development on their lands. Determined and managed primarily by outsiders, many argue that this development has been unreflective of native cultural values, which maintain that ecological systems are sacred and foundational to the integrity of social systems [5], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23]. Consequently, **past energy development on the Navajo Nation has left a legacy of long-lasting ecological damage, adverse health effects, and profound feelings of helplessness and violation** among tribal citizens due to the nature of the exploitation of their lands [21], [22], [23]. In recent years federal policy has changed to grant tribes greater autonomy over management of their natural resources. **Measures have been taken to expedite the development of energy resources on [Native American] lands with the dual objectives of economic development and self-determination [24]. For example, in 2005 the U.S. Congress passed the Native American Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act, allowing tribal governments to lease and develop energy resources on tribal lands without final approval from the U.S**. Department of the Interior [24]. **Tribal governments**, including the Navajo Tribal Council, increasingly **view the development of their rich energy resources by and for the benefit of the tribes as an important**

expression of true self-determination [20]. These governments now face a conundrum in managing energy development: continue with the status quo development that is unreflective of cultural values but has provided some economic benefit for the tribal government, or advance a new energy development paradigm more reflective of cultural values while ensuring positive economic outcomes. Previous work suggests that successful energy resource development on [Native American] lands cannot be isolated from the cultural context in which it exists, and that communal concerns should come first (e.g., environmental protection, cultural integrity), while other metrics such as economic efficiency may come second [25]. Furthermore, **history suggests that, if not supported by the public, energy projects on tribal lands can face many obstacles to their successful implementation and long-term viability. For example, the proposed 1500 MW Desert Rock Power Plant that promised to provide 600 long-term jobs and approximately $50 million in annual revenue for the Navajo Nation, failed dramatically due to strong local opposition** [26]. Points of conflict included: pressure from the Navajo Nation Government on grazing-rights holders to sign over their land leases, increased air pollution from a third power plant in the region, and concerns about long-lasting impacts on land and water resources from coal mining [27], [28]. **Thus it is important to note that the "success" of energy development projects for [Native American] nations is not only measured by employment and revenue. It is also equally measured by the fulfillment of political and social sovereignty, cultural protection, and protection of the environment** [20]. A new energy development paradigm that includes community input to be reflective of cultural values could promote public acceptance and thus the long-term viability of energy projects on tribal lands resulting in much-needed economic development. **This paradigm would also support tribes' goals of self-sufficiency, self-determination, and political sovereignty** [17], [18], [19], [29]. Finally, participatory processes of **resource management** have additional merits as the very process of identifying cultural values **can reveal indigenous knowledge that may provide valuable insights into how to manage energy resources in more sustainable ways.**

AT River Rights [of Nature]

1] NSDA rules don't allow outside of topic. They're proposing natural river rights ALONGSIDE ban ff on pub land. Highly unpredictable, I cant prep against it, not fair and not relevant. Next, ppl propose building a space station alongside banning FF, or destroy US government alongside banning FF

[but we'll address the content as well…]

2] In giving rights to nature, aff is creating new law that is barely relevant to constitutions / country norms, thus will also get little support from people in order to actually work in large countries. There's a reason why Rights of Nature isn't commonly known and large polluters like Eur/China/US aren't adopting it. Clearly their method isn't working today, whereas climate policy is.

3] It's dangerous when we remove direct responsibility from humans to right their climate destruction. RoN allows us to sue/defend nature in court, but you can still lose to large corporations who money-dump on lawyers. Instead of being satisfied with the right to sue for environment, we need to focus on existing env policy.

Noah Sachs, U of Richmond Law 2023.
https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2678&context=law-faculty-publications
Noah M. Sachs University of Richmond - School of Law

In arguing that RoN [rights of nature] is a wrong turn for environmental law and policy, I am not suggesting that humans should dance blindly into oblivion, degrading nature's life-support systems with no check on our actions. We have already exceeded planetary boundaries and are transforming the planet to the detriment of our species and others.226 Limits on human destruction of nature are essential. **The limits should be imposed through existing frameworks of law, not through novel approaches that grant enforceable legal rights to living organisms and non-living things.** Within a set of legal institutions established and run by humans, **the guardrails on humans must ultimately be self-defined and self-imposed – by humans. Will we humans limit ourselves to address the environmental crisis? In the past, we have successfully used law to limit destruction of nature.** Law has limited property rights, regulated extractive industries, and controlled human freedom of action over nature, and law can do so in the future. **The United States has enacted controls to protect[ed] wetlands, waterways, airsheds, endangered species, and wilderness areas.** It is hardly necessary to document the dozens of federal laws and hundreds of state laws that have placed limits on private property and imposed significant costs on industry to achieve environmental protection.227 This record belies the notion that "only rights can provide the full protection which natural entities need to guard their intrinsic value."228 Far more work is still needed, **particularly in the energy, building, and transportation sectors.** Limiting human impacts on nature, and especially controlling greenhouse gas emissions, is the defining project of this century. The roadblocks to stronger environmental protection in the coming decades are political and economic, not conceptual.229 In other words, **a fundamental re-orientation of law is not necessary to address the environmental crisis. Legislators already have laws to** reduce fossil fuel consumption, limi**t toxic chemical production, transform transportation, increase environmental enforcement, impose pollution limits and taxes, adjust burdens of proof, and protect species and habitat. In contrast**

to novel rights-based approaches, all of these measures fit comfortably within U.S. constitutional traditions. An open, transparent system of law, with elected officials determining the limits of human impacts on nature, is the only viable path forward.

AT: growth and climate incompatible

Empirics prove, GDP can grow while emissions drop

Ritchie 21 Hannah Ritchie, Deputy Editor and Science Outreach Lead at Our World In Data, 2021, Many countries have decoupled economic growth from CO2 emissions, even if we take offshored production into account, https://ourworldindata.org/co2-gdp-decoupling (accessed 10/20/23)

But this relationship no longer holds true at higher incomes. Many countries have managed to achieve economic growth while reducing emissions. They have decoupled the two. Take the UK as an example. It is shown in the chart. This chart shows the change in GDP and annual CO2 emissions per capita since 1990. We see that the UK's GDP has increased a lot over the last 30 years, while its emissions have fallen. You can also see the data without per capita adjustments. It's not just the UK. Many other countries have achieved this decoupling. Using "+ Add country" button on the chart, you can see this for yourself. France, Germany, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Italy, Czechia and Romania are some examples of countries where we see this. More countries have managed to decouple more recently. Emissions in the US, for example, increased substantially in the 1990s. This means that its emissions today are still higher than in 1990. But if we look at the change since 2000 [you can do this by adjusting the time-slider on the bottom of the chart] we see a large drop in emissions alongside a rise in GDP. It's only over the last 20 years that this decoupling has started to happen.

AT Renewables

1] IRA means FF need to be mined BEFORE renewables allowed [see "Reason 2 is Renewables Land”]

AT FAST Renewable Transition [SV turn]

1] If we ban fossil fuels and immediately move to renewable energy, resource conflicts will erupt as said in our contention 1

2] Fast renewable transition is disastrous. We can't store the electricity on a large scale yet. Hence, we need to stick with Neg's status quo gradual transition and use FF in the meanwhile

Ehrman 19 [Monika U. Ehrman, Associate Professor of Law & Faculty Director at the Oil & Gas, Natural Resources, and Energy Center at the University of Oklahoma College of Law, 05-2019, "A Call for Energy Realism: When Immanuel Kant Met the Keep it in the Ground Movement," Utah Law Review, https://dc.law.utah.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=ulr]/Kankee edited

In applying concepts of realism to the energy debate, two types of realism will be applied in this Article. The first application is the Merriam-Webster definition of realism: "the concern for fact or reality and rejection of the impractical and visionary." 180 This Article refers to this notion of Energy Realism as Pragmatic Energy Realism. In this application, prohibiting the extraction and development of hydrocarbons creates short and long-term problems in American economy and infrastructure. Advocates for the Movement fail to prioritize the critical importance of petroleum hydrocarbons to the U.S. industrial and social infrastructure, economy, and political stability. The main challenge to a **sudden transition away from [fossil fuels] petroleum is lack of a replacement energy source with the same abundance, reliability, and affordability.** Renewable energy sources are a promise-filled future that require in**dustrial electric power storage**—capacity—before they can replace combustible hydrocarbons. Withdrawing hydrocarbons poses several challenges to the daily reality of American energy use. First, the present energy consumption portfolio is composed largely of petroleum hydrocarbons, which provide a majority of the supply for the power generation and transportation sectors.181 Current sources of renewable energy are unable to replace these uses.182 Second, petroleum production generates large revenues for federal, state, and local governments.183 Removing these revenue streams would create budget deficiencies. Replacing those critical revenue streams would require high taxation of the replacement renewable systems, an almost certain fiscal death knell. Finally, withdrawal from domestic petroleum supplies would almost certainly require the United States to rely on foreign sources of petroleum supplies in the interim period—however lengthy—while renewable sources scale up and become capable of replacing domestic petroleum sources. This reliance harms U.S. global interests and elevates geopolitical risk. The Keep it in the Ground Movement is premised on a notion that eliminating hydrocarbons from the American energy portfolio will automatically trigger supply shift from those hydrocarbon sources to renewable sources. However, the United States is a hydrocarbon-based economy; there is simply not enough renewable supply to meet the current energy demands.185 **Renewable energy** sources, such as wind and solar, produce electrical power when wind turns a turbine or the Sun heats water, generating steam, which turns a turbine. These energy sources produce power that must be transmitted immediately to the power grid [BUT]because [we] of the lack of industrial-grade electrical storage. In other words, **we cannot yet store [renewable-generated] electricity generated by many renewable sources;186 unlike [fossil fuels] natural gas or coal, where the chemical energy is stored within the resource.** These resources may be kept, respectively, in storage reservoirs and pipelines or in railcars. Without industrialgrade electrical capacitance to store energy produced by renewable sources such as solar and wind, there is not a soon-to-be-realized reality in which renewables can supply the current demand for energy.

3] FF alleviates poverty. Sudden renewable transition spikes up prices and is inaccessible to those without electric appliances [i.e. trad stoves not microwaves, fire lamps not bulbs]

Ehrman 19 [Monika U. Ehrman, Associate Professor of Law & Faculty Director at the Oil & Gas, Natural Resources, and Energy Center at the University of Oklahoma College of Law, 05-2019, "A Call for Energy Realism: When Immanuel Kant Met the Keep it in the Ground Movement," Utah Law Review, https://dc.law.utah.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=ulr]/ BZ

- has carb tax good stuff @ end

C. Solving Energy Poverty Unless the Movement broadens its base, it risks alienating a large segment of the American population that lives in energy poverty. Energy poverty is defined as the state where households spend more than 6–10% of their income on energyrelated expenses.308 **A majority of Americans far below poverty are spending about 35% of their income on energy-related expenses.309 Such energy poverty renders this population unable to have reliable or affordable access to energy in the typical form of electric power (e.g., light) and heat.** For many Americans, deciding whether to pay the power bill or the gas bill over the grocery bill and other necessities is a daily choice. **Natural gas and coal, because of their prevalence and ability to cycle quickly for electric power generation, offer the opportunity to break cycles of energy poverty.** Movements such as Keep it in the Ground often inadvertently ignore those suffering in energy poverty by exasperating a quick transition to renewables, which may further **aggravate** [hurt those in poverty] **this fiscal situation**. In global studies of energy poverty, a lack of energy or lack of reliable or affordable energy results in "unmet basic needs and depressed economic and educational opportunities that are particularly pervasive among women, children, and minorities."310 The Movement needs to ensure it addresses these voiceless populations to assure them of basic energy needs. This address could take the form of a shifting in ideology away from a 100 percent reliance on renewable energy to the working with technology providers and utilities to ensure that access to affordable energy is provided to households in energy poverty. If the Movement chose to support a **carbon tax** effort, it could do so knowing that those already suffering from energy poverty are not likely to suffer from the further ill-effects of a tax burden. The U.S. Department of the Treasury supports the idea that Americans at the lower end of the income spectrum—about 70% of the population—would benefit from the Council's proposal, discussed above, because they are lower consumers of energy.311 Finally, the Movement has incredible benefits: promotion of low greenhouse gas emissions; a heightened or new awareness of climate change and the effect of hydrocarbon combustion; and serving as a catalyst for change within the environmental community. This demonstrated passion and enthusiasm should continue, but with an acknowledgement of our energy reality.

So, why do renewables matter? The UN gives 6 benefits of renewables

No date. United Nations. Renewable energy – powering a safer future. https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/raising-ambition/renewable-energy BZ

- **A.** **Doesn't pollute** [clim change]
- **B.** **Common**
- **C.** **Cheap** [prices falling]
- **D.** **Healthier**
- **E.** **Create jobs** [via investment]
- **F.** Good for **long term** [**econ**, energy **security**]

[1] Renewable energy sources – which are available in abundance all around us, **provided by the sun, wind, [&] water, waste, and heat from the Earth – are replenished by nature and emit little to no greenhouse gases or pollutants into the air.** Fossil fuels still account for more than 80 percent of global energy production, but cleaner sources of energy are gaining ground. About 29 percent of electricity currently comes from renewable sources. **Here are five reasons why accelerating the transition to clean energy is the pathway to a healthy, livable planet today and for generations to come.** GIF with information about renewable energy 1. **[2]** Renewable energy sources are [is plentiful,] all around us About 80 percent of the global population lives in countries that are net-importers of fossil fuels -- that's about 6 billion people who are dependent on fossil fuels from other countries, which makes them vulnerable to geopolitical shocks and crises. In contrast, renewable energy sources are available in all countries, and their potential is yet to be fully harnessed. The International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) estimates that 90 percent of the world's electricity can and should come from renewable energy by 2050. Renewables offer a way out of import dependency, allowing countries to diversify their economies and protect them from the unpredictable price swings of fossil fuels, while driving inclusive economic growth, new jobs, and poverty alleviation. 2. **[3]** Renewable energy is cheaper Renewable energy actually is the cheapest power option in most parts of the world today. Prices for renewable energy technologies are dropping rapidly. The cost of electricity from solar power

fell by 85 percent between 2010 and 2020. Costs of onshore and offshore wind energy fell by 56 percent and 48 percent respectively. Falling prices make renewable energy more attractive all around – including to low- and middle-income countries, where most of the additional demand for new electricity will come from. With falling costs, there is a real opportunity for much of the new power supply over the coming years to be provided by low-carbon sources. Cheap electricity from renewable sources could provide 65 percent of the world's total electricity supply by 2030. It could decarbonize 90 percent of the power sector by 2050, massively cutting carbon emissions and helping to mitigate climate change. Although solar and wind power costs are expected to remain higher in 2022 and 2023 then pre-pandemic levels due to general elevated commodity and freight prices, their competitiveness actually improves due to much sharper increases in gas and coal prices, says the International Energy Agency (IEA). 3. **[4]** Renewable energy is healthier According to the World Health Organization (WHO), about 99 percent of people in the world breathe air that exceeds air quality limits and threatens their health, and more than 13 million deaths around the world each year are [from] due to avoidable environmental causes, including air pollution. The unhealthy levels of fine particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide originate mainly from the burning of fossil fuels. In 2018, air [this] pollution from fossil fuels caused $2.9 trillion in health and economic costs, about $8 billion a day [in health costs]. Switching to clean sources of energy, such as wind and solar, thus helps address not only climate change but also air pollution and health. 4. **[5]** Renewable energy creates jobs Every dollar of investment in renewables creates three times more jobs than in the fossil fuel industry. The IEA estimates that the transition towards net-zero emissions will lead to an overall increase in energy sector jobs: while about 5 million jobs in fossil fuel production could be lost by 2030, an estimated 14 million new jobs would be created in clean energy, resulting in a net gain of 9 million jobs. In addition, energy-related industries would require a further 16 million workers, for instance to take on new roles in manufacturing of electric vehicles and hyper-efficient appliances or in innovative technologies such as hydrogen. This means that a total of more than **30 million jobs could be created in clean energy**, efficiency, and low-emissions technologies by 2030. Ensuring a just transition, placing the needs and rights of people at the heart of the energy transition, will be paramount to make sure no one is left behind. 5. [And lastly,] **[6]** Renewable energy makes economic sense About $5.9 trillion was spent on subsidizing the fossil fuel industry in 2020, including through explicit subsidies, tax breaks, and health and environmental damages that were not priced into the cost of fossil fuels. In comparison, about $4 trillion a year needs to be invested in renewable energy until 2030 – including investments in technology and infrastructure – to allow us to reach net-zero emissions by 2050. The upfront cost can be daunting for many countries with limited resources, and many will need financial and technical support to make the transition. But **investments in renewable energy will pay off.** The reduction of pollution and climate impacts alone could save the world up to $4.2 **trillion** per year by 2030. Moreover, efficient, reliable renewable technologies can create[ing] a system less prone to market shocks and improve[ing] resilience and energy security by **diversifying power supply options**. Learn more about how many communities and countries are realizing the economic, societal, and environmental benefits of renewable energy.

AT SLOW Renewable Transition

1] NSDA rules – it's not in the topic

2] We're playing the long game: all you're doing is extending these impacts over a long period of time – still see offshoring and worse climate policies on Aff side

AT Renewables [impact Turn]

Renewable energy transition is not feasible now---laundry list.

Chatur '19 [Harshit; August 15; Utility finance executive; Utility Dive, "Why 100% renewables isn't feasible by 2050," https://www.utilitydive.com/news/why-100-renewables-isnt-feasible-by-2050/560918/] Michael

Transitioning U.S. electricity supply resources to 100% **renewables** means the end of power production from fossil fuel-based power plants such as coal, natural gas and oil. Nuclear, though carbon free, is also often targeted for resource reductions given waste disposal, the carbon footprint of fuel processing and safety hazards.

In recent years, federal, state and local **politicians** have increasingly introduced policies for **ambitious** renewable projects, including tax benefits, minimum portfolio standards, appliance and automobile efficiency standards, zoning and building codes, and many other economic policies. Policies also often create **barriers** or **costs** for fossil-fuel based power plants.

While renewable supply resources are an **important** and **growing part** of the portfolio, 100% renewable power **is not feasible** today in the United States. Following are a few reasons why 100% renewable power resources will not be feasible for the next few decades.

1. Solar and wind renewable energy resources are **not controllable** sources of power

Renewables are essentially "**uncontrollable**" supply resources. When the **sun** isn't **shining**, solar panels do not produce energy. When the **wind** isn't **blowing**, turbines do not produce either. **Diminished conditions**, including shading, clouds and dust for solar and light breezes for wind power all reduce energy production from renewable assets to **levels** below the installed capacity.

Dispatch of **fossil fuel**-based power plants, on the other hand, can **easily** be **controlled**, ramped up and down as needed and hence fossil plants offer great reliability, i.e., power can be produced when needed. The same is simply **not possible** with solar and wind power plants.

2. Solar and wind installed **capacity** (MW)

When designing power resources, one distinguishes between **generation** energy and **capacity**. Generation energy refers to **actual power** production, often measured in megawatt-hours (MWh) or kilowatt-hours (kWh), whereas capacity refers to **maximum** electricity **output** under given conditions, often measured in megawatts (MW) or kilowatts (kW).

Installed **capacity** of 100 MWs of **gas-fired** power plants produces **many times** the electricity energy (MWh) of the same 100 MW of **solar or wind** power resources. **Fossil plants** can and do operate with capacity factors of **80%-90%**. **Solar and wind** power plants average capacity factors are about **20%-25%**, primarily because wind and solar energy is **not available** all the time. This means, to produce the same amount of power as generated by a fossil power plant, we need **4-5 times** the installed capacity of wind or solar **capacity**.

3. Storage technology must continue to **evolve**

One might argue solar or wind power can and should be stored using batteries for use when the sun is not shining, or the wind is not blowing. However, today, **storage tech**nologies are **expensive** and can only store power for **short durations**. Most large batteries can store power for two to six hours. Further, safety, **environmental hazards** and **durability** aspects of batteries continue to be tested and evolve. System size also needs to be **scale**d **up** so that part of total capacity can be used to supply power real-time and part can charge batteries.

4. Initial capital **cost** ($/kWh) of renewables **is high**

Over the last decade, **initial** capital **costs** of solar, wind and storage have declined significantly. However, they are still **expensive** compared to new fossil fuel-based power plants such as natural gas. Building a combined cycle gas-fired power plant costs around **$1000**/kW whereas solar and storage could cost in the range of $1500/kW to **$2000**/kW and a wind power plant could cost up to **$4000**/kW. The operational cost of solar and wind plants is, however, much lower compared to gas and this makes total Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE) for renewables comparable or even lower than gas.

5. **Grid** transformation will be **expensive**

The U.S. power **grid** is a **centralized system** where huge quantities of power are produced at large power plants and transmitted through **transmission lines** to distribution systems then on to end-users. **Renewable power** generation has the potential to be much **more distributed** and require a **very different grid** to maintain system reliability and resilience. With a mix of renewables, storage and demand response systems, the electric grid must be much **smarter**, **flexible** and **secure** to meet the challenges of newer technologies, along with variable and distributed generation. Transforming the electric grid for these issues will also be **expensive**. Utility-scale renewables such as offshore wind, if located away from demand zones, could further increase transmissions costs.

More

Renewables Neg

We can replace fossil fuels in 3 years – environmentally clean and renewable energies are growing [like solar, wind, and hydropower]

Zheng 23. March Zheng, writer for Earth.org. The State of the US Renewable Energy Market: A Preliminary Analysis for 2022. BY MARCH ZHENG. JAN 30TH 2023. https://earth.org/us-renewable-energy-market/ BZ

Today, fossil fuels (coal, natural gas, petroleum, etc.) still account for nearly 81% of total US energy consumption, while the remaining energy outputs are through renewables. **Yet, positive initiatives and supporting policies on an international scale have contributed to speeding up the development of renewable energy, which is now on track to overtake coal and become the largest source of global electricity in perhaps 3 years' time.** For reference, renewables generated 19.5% of the US's net electricity production, while coal plants generated 19.3% and nuclear plants 19.7%. Electricity net generation refers to the "amount of gross electricity generation a generator produces minus the electricity used to operate the power plant". Renewables are not as far off as many people would believe, and clearly has the potential to be more efficient. **The US** generates more renewable electricity than [other countries] Germany, Japan, and the UK combined. **Thus**, the US **plays** an important role in the global initiative to gradually transition out of fossil fuels. According to early estimates, the global market size of renewable energies is expected to reach two trillion USD by 2030. The US renewable energy market in 2022 was valued at US$269 billion. The International Energy Agency (IEA) also expects renewables to become the largest source of global electricity by 2025. With US revenues from fossil fuels responsible for $138 billion annually, the amount is expected to fall given the infrastructure and cost improvements in renewable energy as well as further government policies to decrease the reliance on fossil fuels. For electricity generation, solar and wind are the fastest and most popular methods Supporting renewable energy initiatives in local jurisdictions and implanting them within our lives if it is cheaper and more practical to do so are all actions we can control as individuals. Technology will continue to cut the costs of renewable energy infrastructures, and this decade is showing a lot of promise for this continued growth trajectory.

Politics

Most Americans support climate action

Matei 22, journalist. Adrienne Matei is a Vancouver-based writer and editor with over 10 years of experience in culture-oriented journalism. M.A. Journalism ('19) Columbia University, New York. Recipient of the 2019 Pulitzer Fellowship in Arts Criticism. B.A. English Lit ('13) McGill University, Montreal. Matei, Adrienne. "Polling Shows That US Voters Favor Climate Bills – Yet Assume Fellow Americans Don't | Adrienne Matei." The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 1 Sept. 2022, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/sep/01/us-voters-assume-fellow-americans-dont-favor-climate-bills. BZ

America is polarized, but a new study has revealed one issue on which the nation is surprisingly united [on]: mitigating climate change. Yet Americans themselves underestimate the US population's concern for the state of the climate and support for major climate mitigation policies – by a whopping 80–90%, according to researchers from Boston College, Princeton University and Indiana University Bloomington. In a peer-reviewed article, researchers shared the results of a nationwide survey of 6,000 Americans, for which participants were asked to estimate the percentage of Americans who were "at least somewhat concerned about climate change". Participants also estimated the percentage of Americans they thought supported specific climate policies including carbon taxes for fossil fuel companies, renewable energy mandates, building renewable energy projects on public lands, and a Green New Deal. Regardless of political orientation, education, age, race, media preferences and income, the study found all Americans vastly underestimate how much their compatriots care about climate change and support green policies. "Climate policy and concern about climate change are much more prevalent than you think in the US," one of the study's authors, Gregg Sparkman, told Scientific American. "And virtually everyone in the country seems to greatly underestimate how popular climate policy is and to underestimate how concerned their fellow Americans are about climate change." Despite polls by Yale's Program on Climate Change Communication showing that a "supermajority" of 66–**80% of Americans support these climate policies**, the average American estimates that only a minority of 37–43% of the public are down for the eco cause. Republicans proved especially pessimistic about how much people care about climate change, though virtually half of Republicans are pro-climate policies, says Sparkman. In truth, the issue of securing a livable future appears to enjoy bipartisan support. It turns out that the feeling of being alienated in one's concern for the environment is as widespread as it is unfounded. In fact, this study captures a phenomenon known as "pluralistic ignorance", a shared misconception of the thoughts and behaviors of others. In this case, pluralistic ignorance results in what the authors call a "false social reality" in which many of us perceive that others aren't willing to take action on climate issues, and overestimate how many Americans are indifferent to, or in denial of, climate change. Ending the misconception that most Americans don't care about climate change and truly appreciating how popular eco-friendly policies are could give such measures valuable momentum and support, and encourage politicians to pursue greener agendas. Moreover, understanding that there's nothing fringe about caring about the environment could help people feel more confident discussing their green politics with peers. The perception that **people are unified in the desire for pro-climate legislation** is a powerful thing – it becomes easier to take action when we know that people actually support collective solutions.

This is supported by a Yale study. Yale. "Voters Will Support pro-Climate Candidates with Pledges, Time, and Money." Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, 27 July 2014, https://climatecommunication.yale.edu/publications/voters-will-support-pro-climate-candidates-with-pledges-time-and-money/. BZ

Millions of registered voters1 would sign a pledge to **vote for**, would work for, or would give money to candidates who share their views on global warming – if asked to by a person they like and respect. This suggests that global warming could become a more prominent electoral issue if campaigns engage and mobilize this potential "issue public." Willingness to Pledge One in four registered voters (27%) thinks global warming is happening, is worried about it2, and would "definitely" (7%) or "probably" (20%) sign a pledge to vote only for candidates who share his or her views on global warming. This translates to more than 10 million3 registered voters who would definitely sign a pledge and more than 30 million who would probably sign one, for a total of about 41 million. Democrats are the most likely to say they would do so (10% definitely; 41% in total). Some Independents would also sign such a pledge (10% definitely; 18% in total), and some Republicans say they would as well (2% definitely; 11% in total). Willingness to Volunteer About one in six (17%) registered voters thinks global warming is happening, is worried about it, and would "definitely" (2%) or "probably" (15%) volunteer time to elect a candidate because the candidate shares his or her views on global warming. This translates to an estimated 3 million registered voters who would definitely volunteer their time and about 23 million who would probably volunteer. Democrats are the most likely to say they would volunteer (4% definitely; 31% in total). Some Independents would also volunteer their time to elect such a candidate (3% definitely; 11% in total), and some Republicans say they would as well (4% probably would). Willingness to Donate Further, about one in six registered voters (16%) thinks global warming is happening, is worried about it, and would "definitely" (2%) or "probably" (14%) donate money to a candidate because the candidate shares his or her views on global warming. This translates to approximately 3 million registered voters who would definitely donate money and about 21.5 million who would probably give to a political candidate. Again, Democrats are the most likely to donate money (5% definitely; 29% in total). Some Independents would also donate money to a candidate who shares their views on global warming (1% definitely; 5% in total), and some Republicans say they probably would do so as well (5%). Image for Voters Will Support Pro-Climate Candidates With Pledges, Time, and Money EnlargePermalink Taken together, these results indicate that there are millions of registered American voters willing to pledge their **vote and support pro-climate action candidates with their time and money.**

Policy affects marginal piece of land

Eaton 21 – WSJ energy reporter (Collin, "Biden's Order to Freeze New Oil Drilling on Federal Land: What You Need to Know," Wall Street Journal, Jan 27, 2021, ProQuest)

Q: How much of America's oil-and-gas production happens on federal lands? A: **Most U.S. oil-and-gas drilling now takes place on state or private land, so the freeze only directly affects a fraction of total production. Output from onshore federal land comes to roughly 9% of the U.S. total.** Still, the federal government owns large swaths of land companies use for oil-and-gas drilling. Such a policy would heavily impact energy producing states such as New Mexico and Wyoming, which together have almost 53.8 million acres of federal land, according to the Congressional Research Service.

1NC Theory

Theory – Must Specify Fed Pub Land

Interpretation: debaters must specify the type of federal public land they are prohibiting fossil fuel extraction on

Violation: they don't specify the land

The lands can range from wildlife protection to military to monuments – defining the land type and agency avoids confusion and conflict

Denver Library 2019. Written by Ross on September 26, 2019. The Denver Public Library has a large Western History collection, which began under the direction of City Librarian Malcom G. Wyer and includes 600,000 photographs, 3,700 manuscript archives, 200,000 cataloged books, pamphlets, atlases, maps, and microfilm titles as well as a collection of Western fine art and prints. https://www.denverlibrary.org/blog/research/ross/land-your-land-public-lands BZ

September 28 is National Public Lands Day: a nationwide day of volunteer service and free admission to public lands. Whether you want to volunteer or just visit, **there are plenty of public lands to choose from** in the western United States: national forests and grasslands, national parks, wilderness areas, wildlife refuges, vast Bureau of Land Management (BLM) areas, and more. As the map to the left shows, the vast majority of public lands in the contiguous United States are federally-owned lands in the western states stretching from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. Almost half (46.9 %) of the land in these states is federal land, and most of that is publicly accessible to part-owners like you and me. For someone like me, who grew up in the southeast--where the landscapes are less dramatic and more likely to have "No Trespassing" signs--the abundance of public land in the west seems like an endless gift. It's why I live here. But federal ownership of public lands [are] in the west is also a source of controversy (library card required). One issue in the news recently is that the BLM headquarters is moving from Washington, DC to Grand Junction, Colorado. Supporters of the move point out that BLM lands are entirely in the west, so it makes sense to have the headquarters here. Detractors say the move is part of an effort to weaken the BLM's mission of ensuring that grazing, mining, and other extractive activities on its lands are done sustainably. Another controversy is about whether the federal government should own all this western land in the first place. Some people argue that most federal lands should be transferred to the states or sold to the public. These controversies can sometimes lead to armed conflict, as with the standoffs in Nevada and Oregon between the Bundy family (and their allies) and the federal government. Public lands can be confusing as well as controversial. **Federal public lands are maintained by multiple agencies with differing missions**, and there are also public lands at the state and local level, like state parks and Denver's city and mountain parks. Public lands, especially in the west, can be a confusing patchwork of areas with very different rules and goals. **On many BLM and Forest Service lands, you can ride off-road vehicles, shoot guns, and camp by the side of the road. But you wouldn't want to try that in a national park [or], and you certainly wouldn't want to try on a military installation.** Area 51 might be publicly owned, but it certainly isn't publicly accessible. To clear up this confusion, let's start with some basic questions: who manages federal public lands, for what purposes? While lands owned by state and local governments count as public lands, let's focus on the federal lands. Most **publicly-accessible federal lands are managed by four agencies**: National Park Service: National Parks like Yosemite and Rocky Mountain National Park are the best-known public lands. According to its mission statement, "The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations." While the NPS administers large, famous national parks, it also administers a wide variety of other units, like National Rivers, National Historic Sites, and National Trails. As some of these names suggest, these may be focused more on conserving cultural features like historic battlefields than natural features. In any case, the National Park system is focused on preservation and visitation by the public, so they can be rather crowded, with strict rules to keep the crowds from ruining things for the next generation. Fish and Wildlife Service: This agency manages the National Wildlife Refuge System, which is not as well-known as the National Park System, but actually covers more land (though much of it is in Alaska). Originally established to help preserve migrating waterfowl, wildlife refuges are for the preservation of plants and animals, and aren't generally the tourist attractions that National Park Service

sites are. But many of them do allow various kinds of public access and recreation. In the Denver area, the FWS manages the Rocky Flats and the Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuges, as well as the tiny Two Ponds National Wildlife Refuge in Arvada. Bureau of Land Management: The BLM is the biggest landowner in the west, with over 245 million acres--1/10th of the land area of the United States. BLM lands are managed for "multiple use", which means they are used for grazing, mineral extraction, and timber harvesting in addition to recreation and preservation. They don't have the kinds of tight regulations you find in places like national parks and wilderness areas, so you're likely to run into people shooting and riding off-road vehicles on BLM land. The great thing about BLM lands is they allow dispersed camping, which means you can generally stop and camp in most areas--not just developed campsites. That's nice within a few hours of Denver, because developed campsites are often full. U.S. Forest Service: While the three agencies above are parts of the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service is part of the Department of Agriculture. It's not surprising, then, that the national forests they administer are managed for multiple use, with timber harvesting being as much a goal as outdoor recreation. However, most of the national forests in Colorado are full of hiking trails and campsites, and many of them have scenery just as impressive as most national parks. Dispersed camping is also allowed in most areas. Two other types of public land to know are wilderness areas and national monuments. National monuments are similar to national parks in that they preserve unique natural or cultural features. But they aren't quite the same. First, some of them are run by agencies other than the National Park Service. In Colorado, for example, the NPS runs Colorado National Monument, but the BLM and Forest Service jointly manage Brown's Canyon National Monument. Another difference is that, while national parks can only be created by Congress, national monuments can be created by presidents, under the authority of the Antiquities Act. This has been **another source of controversy around public lands, because some people believe national monuments recently created by Presidents Clinton and Obama are too large.** Bear's Ears National Monument in Utah, for example, was significantly shrunken by President Trump. Wilderness areas are created by Congress, under the the Wilderness Act of 1964, which states that a wilderness is "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain". **Wilderness areas are meant to be truly wild, and activities on them are tightly restricted.** For example, you can't take motorized vehicles or even mountain bikes into them. Like national monuments, wilderness areas may be managed by different agencies.

Standards

1] Shiftiness - 1AR clarification delinks neg positions like the Offshoring, Politics, or Econ DAs by saying those aren't their interpretation of *federal public lands*. Wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash.

2] Real World - Policy makers will always specify key terms of the plan. Absent spec, people can circumvent the Aff's policy since there is no delineated way to define, which means there's no way to actualize any of their solvency arguments.

Paradigm issues

Drop them, because a] deter future abuse and b] you'd drop your whole advocacy anyways.

Competing interps— a] reasonability invites judge intervention and b] you can't be reasonably topical: it's yes/no.

No RVIs: a] Logic, you don't win for being topical; b] Baiting, encourages abuse to bait T.

1NC theory first – I was only abusive cuz they were