

# SAMPLING

From the 2014 Blue Book Final Installment

By the time we gather in Springfield for NITC 2016, debaters will have assembled a brief book that will be the most valuable asset. Imagine entering NITOC with a binder of evidence briefs for every imaginable case in the country, specifically written for NITOC?

The following is a sampling of the 2014 Red Book Final Installment. Be sure to register and be a part of the action that will bring you success at NITOC!

**[REGISTER TODAY](#)**

[MonumentPublishing.com/NITC](http://MonumentPublishing.com/NITC)

# Table of Contents

NEGATIVE BRIEF: Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP).....	1
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ALGAE BIOFUEL / CO2 REDUCTION .....	7
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ALGAE BLOOM IN GULF OF MEXICO.....	13
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ALGAE BLOOM RESEARCH .....	22
NEGATIVE BRIEF: AQUACULTURE EXPANSION .....	26
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ARCTIC OFFSHORE OIL BAN .....	31
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ARCTIC OIL DRILLING SAFETY / WELL CONTROL PLAN.....	39
NEGATIVE BRIEF: BOTTOM TRAWLING by “Coach Vance” Trefethen .....	51
NEGATIVE BRIEF: CORAL MPAs .....	66
NEGATIVE BRIEF: COREXIT – good .....	77
NEGATIVE BRIEF: DELTA SMELT / HR1927 / TURN ON THE PUMPS / CALIFORNIA IRRIGATION WATER...	85
NEGATIVE BRIEF: DOLPHINS IN NAVY – WE NEED THEM .....	90
NEGATIVE BRIEF: DREDGING / HR3080 .....	97
NEGATIVE BRIEF: EXECUTIVE ORDER 13547 / NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY – good, don’t repeal it.....	98
GENERIC NEG: FISHERIES ARE FINE.....	114
NEGATIVE BRIEF: FISHING SUBSIDIES (ALL) ENDED – COUNTERPLAN: END ONLY CAPACITY-ENHANCING SUBSIDIES.....	119
NEGATIVE BRIEF: FISHING SUBSIDIES (ALL) ABOLISHED – STRAIGHT-UP NEG STRATEGY (no Counterplan) .....	127
NEGATIVE BRIEF: FISHING SUBSIDIES (FUEL) ENDED – bad idea .....	139
NEGATIVE BRIEF: FORAGE FISH / LENFEST PROGRAM.....	149
NEGATIVE BRIEF: FRACKING MORATORIUM .....	158
NEGATIVE BRIEF: FUKUSHIMA RADIATION .....	168
NEGATIVE BRIEF: GULF FISHERIES FAIRNESS ACT .....	174
NEGATIVE BRIEF: GENETICALLY MODIFIED SALMON BAN / PEGASUS ACT .....	182
NEGATIVE BRIEF: GMO SALMON LABELING.....	200
NEGATIVE BRIEF: GOMEX.....	212
NEGATIVE BRIEF: HAWAII MPA (Marine Protected Area).....	226
NEGATIVE BRIEF: HYDROKINETIC ENERGY.....	229
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ICEBREAKERS .....	240
NEGATIVE BRIEF: INVASIVE SPECIES / BALLAST WATER / NATIONAL AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES ACT...	250
NEGATIVE BRIEF: ITQ / IFQ / CATCH SHARES.....	262
NEGATIVE BRIEF: JAPANESE WHALING .....	280
NEGATIVE BRIEF: JONES ACT REPEAL - bad idea.....	283
NEGATIVE BRIEF: LAW OF THE SEA TREATY .....	292
NEGATIVE BRIEF: LIONFISH.....	304
NEGATIVE BRIEF: LOUISIANA COASTAL RESTORATION CANCELED – bad idea .....	320

NEGATIVE BRIEF: MAGNESIUM.....	329
NEGATIVE BRIEF: MARINE MAMMALS PROTECTION ACT REPEAL.....	336
NEGATIVE BRIEF: MEXICO COOPERATION ON OFFSHORE OIL / TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBONS AGREEMENT.....	341
NEGATIVE BRIEF: NAVY SONAR.....	349
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL IMPORTS – Not a problem.....	358
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL DRILLING BAD – GENERIC .....	362
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL DRILLING - GOOD.....	369
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL DRILLING IN THE ARCTIC – BAD .....	379
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL DRILLING INCREASE HR2231.....	383
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL DRILLING HR2231 TITLES 1 & 2 ONLY .....	391
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL DRILLING OCS 2012-2017 PLAN.....	399
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OIL SEEP DRILLING .....	400
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OFFSHORE OIL LIABILITY .....	403
NEGATIVE BRIEF: OMEGA (ALGAE TO GENERATE OIL) .....	411
NEGATIVE BRIEF: PEBBLE MINE CLOSURE – bad idea .....	415
NEGATIVE BRIEF: RAMP ACT (Port dredging).....	425
NEGATIVE BRIEF: REGIONAL CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCILS (RCAC) .....	433
NEGATIVE BRIEF: SEA GRASS / OCEAN ACIDIFICATION.....	437
NEGATIVE BRIEF: SEABED MINING IN USA-2 .....	447
NEGATIVE BRIEF: SEAWEED HARVESTING / HOUSES.....	462
NEGATIVE BRIEF: SEISMIC SURVEY BAN .....	468
NEGATIVE BRIEF: SHARK FIN .....	476
NEGATIVE BRIEF: SHARK ITQ.....	485
NEGATIVE BRIEF: STORM WATER RUNOFF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP).....	493
NEGATIVE BRIEF: STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE (SPR) ADD OFFSHORE OIL.....	497
NEGATIVE BRIEF: THAILAND SHRIMP / HUMAN TRAFFICKING .....	502
NEGATIVE BRIEF: URANIUM FROM THE SEA.....	510
NEGATIVE BRIEF: WATER CHESTNUTS/NUTRIA .....	519

# **NEGATIVE BRIEF: Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)**

by “Coach Vance” Trefethen

## **TOPICALITY**

### **1. Not a “resource”**

#### **Definition: A resource is:**

*Merriam Webster Online Dictionary copyright 2014 <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resource>*

: something that a country has and can use to increase its wealth

: a supply of something (such as money) that someone has and can use when it is needed

: a place or thing that provides something useful

#### **Violation: Albatrosses are not a resource. They have no significant economic value**

*Prof. Robin W. Doughty, Virginia Carmichael 2011. (Doughty - Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography and the Environment, College of Liberal Arts, Univ. of Texas-Austin) The Albatross and the Fish: Linked Lives in the Open Seas*

*<http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vj7->*

*[http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vj7-&sig=kNiYmBuMZbBB0DuVdiIHKpXo7vg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=VzKzU8DcJ8qs0QXJkIGQDg&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ACAP%20albatrosses%20fail&f=false](http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vj7-&sig=kNiYmBuMZbBB0DuVdiIHKpXo7vg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=VzKzU8DcJ8qs0QXJkIGQDg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ACAP%20albatrosses%20fail&f=false)*

interlocking whole, or as individuals with more local and immediate concerns seemingly unrelated to the whole. The albatross is not a commonly observed seabird, and most of us will never see one. It has no directly significant economic value, although ecotourism boosts its imputed economic value. Yet against all odds, significant efforts and resources are now being expended on saving these birds from extinction because many people, including artisanal and commercial

## **INHERENCY**

**Although not a member, the US is already extensively involved with ACAP**

**Impact: The Affirmative must prove with evidence what is the significant incremental benefit of voting in ACAP meetings, as opposed to all the existing participation we are doing now.**

*NOAA 2012. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) (ethical disclosure on the date: the article is undated, but refers to events that happened in 2012, so we know it was written no earlier than 2012)*  
*[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/agreements/global\\_agreements/acap.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/agreements/global_agreements/acap.pdf)*

Nations and Regional Economic Integration Organizations may participate in ACAP as either Parties or Observers. The United States, via NOAA Fisheries, the U.S. Department of State, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, has participated in ACAP meetings as an Observer due to its interest in seabird conservation and its status as a Range State under ACAP. NOAA Fisheries participates on the established Seabird Bycatch Working Groups as an invited expert and has been attending since this group’s first meeting in 2007. This participation has granted the United States influence over some ACAP proceedings, although only full Parties have voting rights and the ability to Chair any of ACAP’s working groups or propose amendments to the Agreement. The United States is pursuing accession to the Agreement.

## HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

### Black-footed albatross is not endangered

*US Fish & Wildlife Service 2011. Endangered Species Listing Not Warranted For the Black-footed Albatross 6 Oct 2011*  
<http://www.fws.gov/pacificislands/news%20releases/BAFL%2012%20month%20finding%20nr100611.pdf>

“Although at this time we believe the scientific information shows the black-footed albatross does not warrant listing as an endangered or threatened species, we encourage the public to continue to submit any new information concerning the status of or threats to the species,” said Loyal Mehrhoff, field supervisor for the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office. “New information will help us monitor the status of the species and encourage conservation efforts.” Three options were considered by the Service during the petition review: (1) listing the black-footed albatross throughout its range, (2) listing the Hawaiian breeding population of the black-footed albatross as a Distinct Population Segment (DPS), or (3) listing the Japanese breeding population of the black-footed albatross as a DPS. Although the Service determined that both populations meet the criteria to be considered for listing under the Act as a DPS, the Service also found that listing is not warranted for either the Hawaiian breeding population or the Japanese breeding population of the black-footed albatross.

## SOLVENCY

### 1. ACAP fails. Costs exceed benefits and the whole process has bogged down. Even its advocates are disheartened.

*Prof. Robin W. Doughty, Virginia Carmichael 2011. (Doughty - Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography and the Environment, College of Liberal Arts, Univ. of Texas-Austin. ) The Albatross and the Fish: Linked Lives in the Open Seas*  
[http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vf7-&sig=kNiYmBuMZbBB0DuVdiIHKpXo7vg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=VzkzU8DcJ8qs0QXJkIGQDg&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ACAP%20albatrosses%20fail&f=false](http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vf7-&sig=kNiYmBuMZbBB0DuVdiIHKpXo7vg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=VzkzU8DcJ8qs0QXJkIGQDg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ACAP%20albatrosses%20fail&f=false)

ACAP to draw on and surpass. But ACAP hasn't fulfilled its promise, and many of its proponents are disheartened.

The chief players in the Southern Hemisphere are on board, and now that Brazil has come in, the set of range states is complete. Australia continues to play a leading role, but in general, governments have not engaged in or committed themselves to the ACAP program. The agreement's costs to date have exceeded its benefits, but perhaps that was unavoidable for a start-up agreement. But after six years of being in force, it is not unrealistic to expect that ACAP's benefits begin exceeding or at least balancing costs. Some member countries have sent lawyers as their representatives instead of scientists or fishers or government and nongovernmental officials skilled in negotiating and in developing effective strategic plans. As a result, things have bogged down. ACAP has failed so far to interest Northern Hemisphere governments. France and Spain have

## 2. No value added. ACAP adds nothing to existing efforts to save the albatross

*Prof. Robin W. Doughty, Virginia Carmichael 2011. (Doughty - Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography and the Environment, College of Liberal Arts, Univ. of Texas-Austin. ) The Albatross and the Fish: Linked Lives in the Open Seas*

[http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vf7-&sig=kNiYmBuMZbBB0DuVdiHKpXo7vg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=VzkzU8DcJ8qs0QXJkIGQDg&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ACAP%20albatrosses%20fail&f=false](http://books.google.fr/books?id=aiHGPjzjFOgC&pg=PT279&lpg=PT279&dq=ACAP+albatrosses+fail&source=bl&ots=K4z474Vf7-&sig=kNiYmBuMZbBB0DuVdiHKpXo7vg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=VzkzU8DcJ8qs0QXJkIGQDg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ACAP%20albatrosses%20fail&f=false)

Many people are disappointed in ACAP's failure to add value or force to the preexisting yet incomplete structure for albatross conservation. It appears that ACAP has not yet been able imaginatively or strategically to take the position of leadership, authority, and support its framers designed for it. Only by figuring out how to move into that capstone position can ACAP integrate, reinforce, and extend the efforts already being made to reduce bycatch by nations, regional fishery management bodies, fishers and trade associations, and nongovernmental organizations.

## 3. Wrong hemisphere.

### ACAP treaty text says it is designed to save Southern Hemisphere birds

*ACAP treaty preamble 2012. Quotation is from the 2012 edition of the ACAP treaty file:///C:/Users/HP/Downloads/ACAP\_Agreement\_Amended\_MoP4\_2012\_e1.pdf*

**CONVINCED** that the conclusion of a multilateral agreement and its implementation through coordinated, concerted actions will contribute significantly to the conservation of Southern Hemisphere albatrosses and petrels and their habitats in the most effective and efficient manner;

### Most albatrosses & petrels live in the southern hemisphere. Not much the US can do about that...

*Official website of the Agreement on Conservation of Albatrosses & Petrels 2010. "Getting the wind up: why are there more albatross and petrel species in the southern hemisphere?" <http://www.acap.aq/index.php/en/news/news-archive/23-2010-news-archive/522-getting-the-wind-up-why-are-there-more-albatross-and-petrel-species-in-the-southern-hemisphere>*

There are far more species of albatrosses and petrels of the order Procellariiformes in the southern hemisphere than in the north. This holds true for ACAP-listed species, with only three of the 29 listed albatrosses and petrels occurring in the northern hemisphere. A recently published paper in the journal *Global Ecology and Biogeography* addresses this observation by adding wind to other forms of environmental energy resources (e.g. those derived from temperature and primary productivity) and of ocean extent to consider the large-scale distribution of procellariiform species richness. The paper, authored by Richard Davies of the UK's University of East Anglia, along with colleagues in South Africa and the UK, concludes that wind energy is a significant factor, probably related to the long-distance foraging for patchy resources undertaken by albatrosses and petrels, including when breeding.

**Albatrosses live in the Southern hemisphere, especially near Antarctica. What can the US do about that?**

*British Antarctic Survey copyright 2012. Albatrosses* [http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about\\_antarctica/wildlife/birds/albatross.php](http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about_antarctica/wildlife/birds/albatross.php)

Albatrosses cover huge distances when foraging for food, even during breeding, with the foraging ranges of most species covering thousands of square kilometres of ocean. Wandering albatrosses (*Diomedea exulans*) range from sub-tropical to Antarctic waters on trips covering up to 10,000 km in 10–20 days. Outside the breeding season, most species migrate long distances, some (like wandering and grey-headed albatrosses) travelling right round the Southern Ocean. Whilst at sea, birds can travel 1000km in a single day, with one grey-headed albatross recorded as circumnavigating Antarctica in just 46 days.

**South Georgia (British territory near Antarctica) fisheries are the source of the problem – what can the US can do about it?**

*Merco Press, South Atlantic News Agency 2014. “South Georgia grey-headed albatross added to the 'endangered species' list” 14 Jan 2014* <http://en.mercopress.com/2014/01/14/south-georgia-grey-headed-albatross-added-to-the-endangered-species-list>

South Georgia is home to around half the global population of breeding grey-headed albatross and the rapid rate of decline in numbers in the South Georgia colonies of grey-headed albatross is a major contributing factor to the birds being newly listed as ‘Endangered’. Bird numbers have been declining very rapidly over three generations (90 years); the major driver of declines is likely to be incidental mortality when the birds come into contact with longline fisheries outside of the South Georgia area.

**Albatrosses live in “South Georgia”, an island in the Southern hemisphere**

*British Antarctic Survey copyright 2012. Albatrosses* [http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about\\_antarctica/wildlife/birds/albatross.php](http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about_antarctica/wildlife/birds/albatross.php)

The four species breeding at South Georgia represent all three of the southern hemisphere genera. Only one, the black-browed albatross (*Thalassarche melanophris*), breeds annually, occurring in large colonies on hillsides, taking 5.5 months from egg laying to chick fledging, feeding its chick on a diet mainly of krill, and to a lesser extent fish and squid. This is obtained chiefly from the shelf waters around South Georgia and the South Orkney Islands. After breeding, birds migrate to South African waters.

**Where is “South Georgia”? nowhere near Atlanta. It’s a remote island near Antarctica in the south Atlantic**

*South Georgia & Sandwich Islands official website, copyright 2013. “The Island”*  
[http://www.sgisland.gs/index.php/%28h%29the\\_island?useskin=](http://www.sgisland.gs/index.php/%28h%29the_island?useskin=)

South Georgia lies between 35.47' to 38.01' west and 53.58' to 54.53' south within the Polar Front being surrounded by the ice cold waters that flow up from Antarctica(South Georgia is at about the same latitude relative to the South Pole as the North of England is to the North Pole). The tip of South America, Tierra del Fuego is 2,150 kilometres to the west. The Falkland Islands are closer, but still 1,390 kilometres away to the west. The mountain ranges and the precipitous southern coast shield the northern facing bays from the fierce prevailing winds and depressions that roar in from the Drake Passage to the west and Antarctica to the south.

**4. Can't solve the root cause: illegal fishing. It's already illegal to do illegal fishing, so the AFF plan can't make it any more illegal than it already is.**

**Cross-apply under inherency: Status Quo is already taking measures**

*British Antarctic Survey copyright 2012. Albatrosses [http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about\\_antarctica/wildlife/birds/albatross.php](http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about_antarctica/wildlife/birds/albatross.php)*

Much of the damage is caused by illegal fishing, which accounts for many thousands of deaths each year. However a range of measures are currently in force to try to reduce the number of albatrosses being killed. These include weighting of lines so they sink quickly, retention of offal on board so that birds are not enticed to the vessel in the first place, setting lines at night, and setting up bird-scaring or 'tori' lines — made up of brightly-coloured streamers to startle seabirds.

**5. Just recommendations. The US can read the websites and get the information without joining ACAP. And who says issuing recommendations will solve anything?**

*United Nations Environmental Program 2009. (ethical disclosure about the date: the article is undated and the web page is copyrighted 2004; however, the article internally refers to events that happened in 2009, so we know this is when it was written) "Convention on Migratory Species" [http://www.cms.int/species/acap/acap\\_bkrd.htm](http://www.cms.int/species/acap/acap_bkrd.htm)*

The Agreement recognises that there are existing international instruments that contain conservation measures relevant to albatrosses and petrels, such as the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and the FAO International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries. It also recognises the importance of building co-operative and coordinated working relationships with these and other organisations. For example, ACAP sees it can play an important role within Regional Fishery Management Organisations – by providing information on the distribution of albatrosses and petrels and their potential overlap with fishing effort, and by recommending appropriate mitigation measures that may be adopted to reduce seabird bycatch. In these ways, ACAP aims to ensure that existing international efforts are complemented and not duplicated.



## DISADVANTAGES

### 1. Federal deficits

**Link: ACAP membership would cost \$140,000 / year**

*NOAA 2012. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) (ethical disclosure on the date: the article is undated, but refers to events that happened in 2012, so we know it was written no earlier than 2012)*  
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/agreements/global\\_agreements/acap.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/agreements/global_agreements/acap.pdf)

ACAP's current annual budget for 2013 is AU \$696,310, based upon ACAP's membership fee schedule, which assigns dues (up to a maximum of 22%), proportionally based upon nations' GDPs. Options for simplifying the scale of contributions are being discussed intersessionally. As the United States is currently not a member, it does not pay dues at this time. However, it is estimated that joining ACAP would require the United States to pay membership dues of approximately U.S. \$140,000 annually.

**Link: Participating in ACAP will require trips to Australia. That's where the headquarters of ACAP is**

*United Nations Environmental Program 2009. (ethical disclosure about the date: the article is undated and the web page is copyrighted 2004; however, the article internally refers to events that happened in 2009, so we know this is when it was written) "Convention on Migratory Species"* [http://www.cms.int/species/acap/acap\\_bkrd.htm](http://www.cms.int/species/acap/acap_bkrd.htm)

The Agreement ACAP, negotiated under the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), was opened for signature in Canberra, Australia on 19 June 2001. It entered into force on 1 February 2004. The Interim Secretariat is located in Hobart, Australia. As a CMS Agreement, ACAP focuses on any species, subspecies or population of the albatrosses and petrels listed in Annex 1. It currently covers 19 species of albatrosses and seven species of petrels of the avian order Procellariiformes.

**Link: Every dollar spent on ACAP to talk about albatrosses that live near Antarctica could have been used to reduce the federal deficit.**

**Impact: Higher deficits hurt the economy**

*Dr William Gale and Benjamin Harris 2011. (Gale - PhD in economics, Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-director of the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center; former assistant professor in the Department of Economics at UCLA, and a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers under President George H.W. Bush; Harris - master's degree in economics from Cornell University and a master's degree in quantitative methods from Columbia University; senior research associate with the Economics Studies Program at the Brookings Institution) "A VAT for the United States: Part of the Solution"*  
[http://www.taxanalysts.com/www/freefiles.nsf/Files/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf/\\$file/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf](http://www.taxanalysts.com/www/freefiles.nsf/Files/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf/$file/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf)

But even in the absence of a crisis, sustained deficits have deleterious effects, as they translate into lower national savings, higher interest rates, and increased indebtedness to foreign investors, all of which serve to reduce future national income. Gale and Orszag (2004a) estimate that a 1 percent of GDP increase in the deficit will raise interest rates by 25 to 35 basis points and reduce national saving by 0.5 to 0.8 percentage points of GDP.

# NEGATIVE BRIEF: ALGAE BIOFUEL / CO2 REDUCTION

by Luke Sides

See also Neg brief on OMEGA PLAN

## STRATEGY NOTES

This case is structured on the idea that carbon dioxide is bad and that spending money on algae biofuel will help. There are two main arguments and one smaller argument: Significance, saying that CO2 is actually not a problem in fact we don't have enough. Solvency, saying that biofuels don't help the environment, in fact they hurt it. And finally, links to a federal deficit DA. Algae biofuel is \$150/Gallon. That is really expensive compared to the 3\$/Gallon of regular fuel.

## HARMS/SIGNIFICANCE

### CO2 Too Low

*Pierre L. Gosselin 2013 (received an Associate Degree in Civil Engineering at Vermont Technical College and a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Arizona in Tucson), "Atmospheric CO2 Concentrations At 400 PPM Are Still Dangerously Low For Life On Earth", May 17 2013, NoTricksZone, [brackets added], <http://notrickszone.com/2013/05/17/atmospheric-co2-concentrations-at-400-ppm-are-still-dangerously-low-for-life-on-earth/>*

With atmospheric CO2 concentrations reaching the 400 ppm [parts per million] level, the media and a number of alarmist scientists have set off the mega-alarm bells, claiming "record high levels" of CO2 had been reached, and that the planet is on the verge of an overdose. This is based purely on ignorance of the Earth's history. Worrying that 400 ppm is too high is like worrying about your fuel tank overflowing when it reaches the 1/8 mark during filling. From a historical perspective, an atmospheric CO2 concentration of 400 ppm is actually almost scraping the bottom of the barrel. Over the Earth's history, atmospheric CO2 concentrations have ranged from 180 ppm to 7000 ppm, see Figure 1 below. On that scale we are in fact today barely above the Earth's record lows.

### CO2 Dangerously Low

*Pierre L. Gosselin 2013 (received an Associate Degree in Civil Engineering at Vermont Technical College and a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Arizona in Tucson), "Atmospheric CO2 Concentrations At 400 PPM Are Still Dangerously Low For Life On Earth", May 17 2013, NoTricksZone, [brackets added], <http://notrickszone.com/2013/05/17/atmospheric-co2-concentrations-at-400-ppm-are-still-dangerously-low-for-life-on-earth/>*

That 400 ppm [parts per million] is actually dangerously low is a fact the alarmists keep avoiding and suppressing. Below 150 ppm, plant-life dies off on a massive scale. The Earth actually came very close to that point many times over the last 2 million years during the ice ages. At the bottom of the last ice age just 20,000 years ago, life on the planet literally teetered on the brink when CO2 fell to a level of just 180 ppm. Do we really want to live on the brink of extinction?

## **CO2 Levels Safer When Higher**

*Pierre L. Gosselin 2013 (received an Associate Degree in Civil Engineering at Vermont Technical College and a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Arizona in Tucson), "Atmospheric CO2 Concentrations At 400 PPM Are Still Dangerously Low For Life On Earth", May 17 2013, NoTricksZone, [brackets added], <http://notrickszone.com/2013/05/17/atmospheric-co2-concentrations-at-400-ppm-are-still-dangerously-low-for-life-on-earth/>*

Note that at high CO2 concentrations, such as 800 ppm [parts per million], plants thrive. But as CO2 levels fall off, growth rates really start to plummet once they fall below 500 ppm. History shows that the Earth sustains much more life, i.e. is much greener and fruitful, when CO2 levels are higher, i.e. in the vicinity of 1000 ppm. No one disputes that man's activities have helped to increase atmospheric CO2 concentration, and it should not be in dispute that plants and life on the planet are thankful that man has done so. At 400 ppm, the planet is a safer place to be and will be even safer at 1000 ppm.

## **Today we're in a CO2 famine – far below historic levels**

*Marc Morano 2009 (Former communications director for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee), "Scientist Tells Congress: Earth in 'CO2 Famine' - Increases 'Will Be Good For Mankind'", February 25, 2009, U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, (brackets in original) [http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord\\_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437)*

Award-winning Princeton University Physicist Dr. Will Happer declared man-made global warming fears "mistaken" and noted that the Earth was currently in a "CO2 famine now." Happer, who has published over 200 peer-reviewed scientific papers, made his remarks during today's Environment and Public Works Full Committee Hearing entitled "Update on the Latest Global Warming Science." "Many people don't realize that over geological time, we're really in a CO2 famine now. Almost never has CO2 levels been as low as it has been in the Holocene (geologic epoch) – 280 (parts per million - ppm) – that's unheard of. Most of the time [CO2 levels] have been at least 1000 (ppm) and it's been quite higher than that," Happer told the Senate Committee.

## **Propaganda**

*Marc Morano 2009 (Former communications director for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee), "Scientist Tells Congress: Earth in 'CO2 Famine' - Increases 'Will Be Good For Mankind'", February 25, 2009, U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, [http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord\\_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437) (brackets in original)*

"Earth was just fine in those times," Happer added. "The oceans were fine, plants grew, animals grew fine. So it's baffling to me that we're so frightened of getting nowhere close to where we started," Happer explained. Happer also noted that "the number of [skeptical scientists] with the courage to speak out is growing" and he warned "children should not be force-fed propaganda, masquerading as science."

## **CO2 Increase Not Cause For Alarm**

*Marc Morano 2009 (Former communications director for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee), "Scientist Tells Congress: Earth in 'CO2 Famine' - Increases 'Will Be Good For Mankind'", February 25, 2009, U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, [http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord\\_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437)*

"I believe that the increase of CO2 is not a cause for alarm and will be good for mankind," Happer told the Committee. "What about the frightening consequences of increasing levels of CO2 that we keep hearing about? In a word, they are wildly exaggerated, just as the purported benefits of prohibition were wildly exaggerated," he explained. "At least 90% of greenhouse warming is due to water vapor and clouds. Carbon dioxide is a bit player," he added. "But the climate is warming and CO2 is increasing. Doesn't this prove that CO2 is causing global warming through the greenhouse effect? No, the current warming period began about 1800 at the end of the little ice age, long before there was an appreciable increase of CO2. There have been similar and even larger warmings several times in the 10,000 years since the end of the last ice age. These earlier warmings clearly had nothing to do with the combustion of fossil fuels. The current warming also seems to be due mostly to natural causes, not to increasing levels of carbon dioxide. Over the past ten years there has been no global warming, and in fact a slight cooling. This is not at all what was predicted by the IPCC models," Happer testified.

## **Wide levels of historic climate variability, and lots of tampering with the evidence to create a false crisis today**

*Marc Morano 2009 (Former communications director for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee), "Scientist Tells Congress: Earth in 'CO2 Famine' - Increases 'Will Be Good For Mankind'", February 25, 2009, U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, [http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord\\_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=AF8F5B20-802A-23AD-49FB-8A2D53F00437)*

"The existence of climate variability in the past has long been an embarrassment to those who claim that all climate change is due to man and that man can control it. When I was a schoolboy, my textbooks on earth science showed a prominent 'medieval warm period' at the time the Vikings settled Greenland, followed by a vicious 'little ice age' that drove them out. So I was very surprised when I first saw the celebrated 'hockey stick curve,' in the Third Assessment Report of the IPCC. I could hardly believe my eyes. Both the little ice age and the Medieval Warm Period were gone, and the newly revised temperature of the world since the year 1000 had suddenly become absolutely flat until the last hundred years when it shot up like the blade on a hockey stick. This was far from an obscure detail, and the hockey stick was trumpeted around the world as evidence that the end was near. We now know that the hockey stick has nothing to do with reality but was the result of incorrect handling of proxy temperature records and incorrect statistical analysis. There really was a little ice age and there really was a medieval warm period that was as warm or warmer than today," Happer continued.

## SOLVENCY

### 1. Biofuels don't work.

#### **Not effective at absorbing carbon and may even cause more greenhouse gas than the fuels they replace**

*Bryan Walsh 2008 (Reporter for TIME Magazine), "The Trouble With Biofuels", February 14, 2008, TIME Magazine, <http://content.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1713431,00.html>*

But according to a pair of studies published in the journal *Science* recently, biofuels may not fulfill that promise — and in fact, may be worse for the climate than the fossil fuels they're meant to supplement. According to researchers at Princeton University and the Nature Conservancy, almost all the biofuels used today cause more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional fuels, if the full environmental cost of producing them is factored in. As virgin land is converted for growing biofuels, carbon dioxide is released into the atmosphere; at the same time, biofuel crops themselves are much less effective at absorbing carbon than the natural forests or grasslands they may be replacing. "When land is converted from natural ecosystems it releases carbon," says Joseph Fargione, a lead author of one of the papers and a scientist at the Nature Conservancy. "Any climate change policy that doesn't take this fact into account doesn't work."

#### **Despite billions in taxpayer money spent, biofuels have produced no benefit**

*Robert Bryce 2014 (a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute), "Biofuels Are a Bad Idea", May 8, 2014, Bloomberg View, <http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2014-05-08/biofuels-are-a-bad-idea>*

Biofuels, we have been repeatedly told, are the magic bullet, the energy-independence-punish-the-Arabs-anti-terror-better-than-standard-diesel-fuel miracle elixir. It isn't true. It's never been true. Despite tens of billions in taxpayer money that have been thrown at corn ethanol, soy diesel, algae and the rest, the U.S. economy, and more particularly the U.S. military, has gained nothing.

### 2. Biofuels can't provide even a small fraction of our energy needs

*Robert Bryce 2014 (a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute), "Biofuels Are a Bad Idea", May 8, 2014, Bloomberg View, <http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2014-05-08/biofuels-are-a-bad-idea>*

The objective facts about biofuels -- their low power density, their effect on food prices, their inability to provide even a small fraction of our energy needs -- have been known for years. When it comes to energy production, we need density, and biofuel production is not dense. It diverts arable land from food production and from nature. Biofuel production is the antithesis of green.

### 3. Too expensive to be marketable. Algae biofuel costs over \$32/gallon

*Michael Kanellos 2009 (Reporter for Green Tech Media), "Algae Biodiesel: It's \$33 a Gallon", February 3, 2009, Green Tech Media, <http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/algae-biodiesel-its-33-a-gallon-5652>*

Algae biofuel startup Solix, for instance, can produce biofuel from algae right now, but it costs about \$32.81 a gallon, said Bryan Wilson, a co-founder of the company and a professor at Colorado State University. The production cost is high because of the energy required to circulate gases and other materials inside the photo bioreactors where the algae grow. It also takes energy to dry out the biomass, and Solix uses far less water than other companies (see Cutting the Cost of Making Algae by 90%).

## DISADVANTAGES

### 1. Federal deficits

**Link: Aff Increases Use Of Algae Biofuels**

**Link: Higher government cost. Government Paid \$150 A Gallon for algae fuel**

*Lachlan Markay 2014 (Reporter for The Washington Free Beacon), "Report: Pentagon Paid \$150 Per Gallon for Green Jet Fuel", May 7, 2014, The Washington Free Beacon, <http://freebeacon.com/national-security/report-pentagon-paid-150-per-gallon-for-green-jet-fuel/>*

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted in its report that a Pentagon official reported paying "about \$150 per gallon for 1,500 gallons of alternative jet fuel derived from algal oil." GAO's report examined the financial challenges facing increased purchases and use of alternative jet fuels by federal agencies. "Currently, the price for alternative jet fuels exceeds that of conventional jet fuel," the report noted. The price for conventional jet fuel is currently \$2.88 per gallon. GAO's report reveals that federal agencies have paid significantly higher prices in an effort to promote biofuels in commercial and military aviation.

**Link: Algae fuel costs are Higher Than Normal**

*HealthResearchFunding.org 2014 (A health website run by the National Health Council "Algae Biofuel Pros and Cons", February 22, 2014, <http://healthresearchfunding.org/algae-biofuel-pros-cons/>*

Needs maintenance and control on temperature conditions when cultivating commercially.

Since it is used to grow in natural conditions, the cultivation should be done according to what the environment that algae are used to. It is needed that people in charge for the cultivation are able to maintain the right temperature to make algae healthy and produce as much oil as possible. Costs are higher than the usual costs of diesel. Since the cultivation will need more maintenance and support over the entire process of growing and generating oil. Due to this reason, there are many interested people who would think about trying the fuel for their vehicles or their electrical equipment since it is still not available in a low price.

**Link: Algae-fuel Production Expensive**

*Elizabeth Svoboda 2010 (Writer for Popular Mechanics), July 7, 2010, "Debunking 10 Energy Myths: Fuel from Algae Is Cheap", Popular Mechanics, <http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/energy/debunking-myths-about-nuclear-fuel-coal-wind-solar-4>*

But in-depth experimentation suggests that algae-fuel supremacy isn't going to come easy. The strains of algae that work best for biodiesel are specialized lipid-producers that won't thrive in just any circumstances. Algae-fuel researchers have tried growing the organisms in open ponds for decades, but the water often becomes contaminated with native algae, which quickly outcompete lipid-rich strains. Closed bioreactors come with their own set of issues. "Even relatively inexpensive ones are going to add dramatically to capital costs," says biochemical engineer John Sheehan, who worked on a stalled National Renewable Energy Laboratory algae-fuel project. Plus, as bioreactors scale up, decreased surface-area-to-volume ratios often make it difficult for all the algae to get the solar energy they need, making them subpar for fuel production. Algae fuel may eventually take off, but it's going to require a lot of testing, technical tweaking and expensive infrastructure to get there.

**Link: \$150 Per Gallon For Jet Fuel**

*Bret Baier 2014 (News anchor for Fox News), May 8 2014, "Grapevine: Chicago mayor's motorcade busted on traffic cams" (Transcript of Bret Baier on Special Report With Bret Baier), Fox News, <http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/special-report-bret-baier/2014/05/08/grapevine-chicago-mayors-motorcade-busted-traffic-cams>*

Think filling up your gas tank is painful on your wallet? Imagine \$150 a gallon. That is how much the U.S. government -- funded by you the taxpayer -- shelled out for jet fuel made from algae. The going rate for regular jet fuel? Around \$2.85 per gallon

**Brink : U.S. Already Deep In Debt**

*Salim Furth 2013 (Ph.D. in economics from the University of Rochester), "High Debt Is a Real Drag", February 22, 2013, The Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/02/how-a-high-national-debt-impacts-the-economy>*

Three teams of economists have separately shown that high government debt has a negative effect on long-term economic growth. When government debt grows, private investment shrinks, lowering future growth and future wages. Estimates across advanced economies show that debt drag reaches large and statistically significant levels as debt grows, with the worst effects occurring after debt reaches 90 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). With U.S. federal, state, and local government debt at 84 percent of GDP and rising, policymakers should begin taking debt drag into account when considering new deficit spending.

**Impact: Higher deficits hurt the economy**

*Dr William Gale and Benjamin Harris 2011. (Gale - PhD in economics, Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-director of the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center; former assistant professor in the Department of Economics at UCLA, and a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers under President George H.W. Bush; Harris - master's degree in economics from Cornell University and a master's degree in quantitative methods from Columbia University; senior research associate with the Economics Studies Program at the Brookings Institution) "A VAT for the United States: Part of the Solution" [http://www.taxanalysts.com/www/freefiles.nsf/Files/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf/\\$file/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf](http://www.taxanalysts.com/www/freefiles.nsf/Files/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf/$file/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf)*

But even in the absence of a crisis, sustained deficits have deleterious effects, as they translate into lower national savings, higher interest rates, and increased indebtedness to foreign investors, all of which serve to reduce future national income. Gale and Orszag (2004a) estimate that a 1 percent of GDP increase in the deficit will raise interest rates by 25 to 35 basis points and reduce national saving by 0.5 to 0.8 percentage points of GDP.

# 525 pages

Remember, this download is just a SAMPLING

Take a good look at that table of contents. You truly want to be a part of this community of debaters.

See you at NITC!

**[REGISTER TODAY](#)**

[MonumentPublishing.com/NITC](http://MonumentPublishing.com/NITC)