

“NO DRILLING IN ANWR!”

**“THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT PERMIT OIL
DRILLING IN THE COASTAL PLAINS OF THE ARCTIC NATIONAL
WILDLIFE REFUGE”**

**NEGATIVE TEAM
TOULMIN BRIEF**

**CATA 335: ARGUMENTATION
ELAINE R. DURR
RHIANNON A. CARLSON
APRIL 22, 2003**

Section 1

Proposition: The United States government should not permit oil drilling in the Coastal Plains of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Definitions:

“Government should permit”: Executive and Legislative branches must pass legislation allowing for oil to be extracted.

“Oil Drilling”: extraction of oil by deep oil drilling.

“Arctic National Wildlife Refuge”: a specific area called 1002 Area located in the northern part of ANWR.

Section 2

Claim: The United States government should not permit oil drilling in the Coastal Plains of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Grounds 1: The affirmative team's first harm that "the US is dependent on foreign oil" is not harmful.

Grounds 2: The affirmative team's second harm that "oil prices have increased" is not significant.

Grounds 3: The affirmative team's greater good that "oil drilling in ANWR will decrease unemployment" is not correct.

Grounds 4: The affirmative team's goal failure that "drilling in ANWR will increase state and federal revenue" is not topical.

Grounds 5: The affirmative team's first inherency statement that "there is a lack of oil available in the US where we are currently drilling" is not true.

Grounds 6: The affirmative team's inherency statement that "too much oil is being taken from areas around the world that are unstable" is not harmful.

Grounds 7: The affirmative team lacks effective inherency for SH#2, the increase cost of oil, GG#3, the potential for lowered unemployment rates, and GF#4, drilling in ANWR will increase state and federal revenue.

Grounds 8: The affirmative team's final inherency statement that "the US uses more oil than most other countries" and "more than it can produce" is an element of the status quo, but can be solved with a minor repair to the status quo.

Grounds 9: The affirmative team's plan will not function in a timely manner.

Grounds 10: The affirmative team's plan to establish and maintain environmental regulations will not work.

Grounds 11: The affirmative team's plan will not solve the US dependency on foreign oil, which is supposedly part of the status quo.

Grounds 12: The affirmative team's plan will not solve the problem of increased oil prices in the status quo.

Grounds 13: The affirmative team's plan will not solve the problem of high unemployment rates in the status quo.

Grounds 14: The affirmative team's plan will not solve the problem of the US federal debt present in the status quo.

Grounds 16: The affirmative team's plan will create the disadvantage of disrupting wildlife habitat in ANWR.

Grounds 17: The affirmative team's plan will create the disadvantage of destruction to the delicate ecosystem in ANWR.

Grounds 18: The affirmative team's plan will create the disadvantage of decreasing current jobs that rely on the wildlife in ANWR.

Grounds 19: The affirmative team's plan will create the disadvantage of damage to the environment as oil drilling has in the past.

Warrant: If you cannot provide a prima facie case for taking action, then action should not be taken.

Backing: Communication textbooks and Professor Lee McGaan say so.

Section 3

Refutation of Affirmative's Significant Claims:

Harm 1:

Claim: The affirmative team's first harm that "the US is dependent on foreign oil" is not harmful.

Grounds 1: Foreign oil is cheaper than producing more domestic oil.

Warrant 1: "Definition" According to basic economic principles, it is advantageous to buy products from countries that can produce them better and at a lower cost (Samuelson 299).

Grounds 2: According to the National Resource Defense Council (NRDC), between 1991 and 1995, the US did not import oil from Iraq, but oil prices and supplies remained relatively stable and the US economy boomed ("Murkowski Watch" 5).

Warrant 2: "Example" If one country stops selling oil to the US, supplies will not be reduced.

Backing: According to past experiences.

Qualifier: Most Likely.

Reservation: Unless the NRDC has false information.

Harm 2:

Claim: The affirmative team's second harm that "oil prices have increased" is not significant.

Grounds 1: According to Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Simmons and Company International, a specialized energy investment bank, \$35 oil in 2003 dollars when adjusted for inflation would be about \$15.25 in 1974 dollars (Simmons 6).

Warrant 1: "Authority" He is an expert in his field and can be believed.

Grounds 2: According to Lovins and Lovins, California doesn't have a shortage of oil; in fact, only 1% of California's electricity comes from oil (Lovins 4).

Warrant 2: "Authority" Lovins and Lovins are consultants to major oil companies and advisors to the Department of Defense on Energy Security; therefore, they are experts in their field.

Greater Good 3:

Claim: The affirmative team's greater good that "oil drilling in ANWR will decrease unemployment" is not correct or significant.

Grounds 1: According to a March 21, 2003 article from the Associated Press, Alaska's unemployment rate is 8.7% and the national is 7%; therefore, only a 1.7% difference is present

between the national and Alaskan unemployment rates not the 2.2% presented by the affirmative team (“Alaska Unemployment”).

Warrant 1: “Authority” The Associated Press is a knowledgeable source and can be trusted.

Warrant 1-b: “Definition” 1.7%, by definition, is not a significant amount.

Grounds 2: Labor Department officials say that a rate of 8.7% is normal for Alaska’s traditional peak jobless time of January and February, before seasonal employment begins to pick up again (“Alaska Unemployment”).

Warrant 2: “Authority” Labor Department officials are experts in their field.

Goal Failure 4:

Claim: The affirmative team’s goal failure that “drilling in ANWR will increase state and federal revenue” is not topical.

Grounds 1: The US federal debt comes from federal expenditures and transfer payments exceeding the incoming revenue (Samuelson 731).

Warrant 1: “Cause” The presence or absence of oil drilling is not the cause of the US federal debt.

Backing: According to economics principles.

Qualifier: Always.

Refutation of Inherency claims:

Claim: The affirmative team’s first inherency statement that “there is a lack of oil available in the US where we are currently drilling” is not true.

Grounds 1: Conservative projections predict another 40 years of production at the Prudhoe Bay production fields alone without even considering ANWR (“The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge”).

Warrant 1: “Definition” Forty more years of oil production at Prudhoe Bay is by definition enough to say that there is not a lack of oil in current drilling locations.

Claim: The affirmative team’s inherency statement of “too much oil being taken from areas around the world that are unstable” is not harmful.

Grounds 1: It is advantageous to buy products from countries that produce them more efficiently, regardless of the amount of product and the countries’ stability (Samuelson 299).

Warrant 1: “Definition” If something is advantageous it should be done and not considered harmful.

Backing: According to policy qualifications and experts.

Qualifier: Most Likely.

Reservation: Unless the disadvantages vastly outweigh the advantages.

Claim: The affirmative team lacks effective inherency for SH#2, the increase cost of oil; GG#3, the potential for lowered unemployment rates; and GF#4, drilling in ANWR will increase state and federal revenue.

Grounds 1: The price of almost all goods has increased due to inflation.

Warrant 1: “Deduction” If the cost of all goods has increased with inflation, then oil prices have increased due to inflation, as well.

Grounds 2: Unemployment rates are caused by economy fluctuations and seasonal jobs and are therefore not inherent in the status quo (Samuelson 675).

Warrant 2: “Deduction” If unemployment rates fluctuate, the Alaska rates do as well and will go down in time.

Warrant 2-b “Definition” By the definition of inherency, fluctuating unemployment rates and seasonal problems are not inherent in the status quo.

Backing: According to economic principles.

Qualifier: Always.

Grounds 3: The affirmative team gave no evidence of the state and federal debt being topical to the debate or inherent in the status quo.

Warrant 3: “Definition” By definition, if an argument has not been supported with evidence then it cannot be considered an inherent problem that is topical to the debate.

Claim: The affirmative team’s final inherency statement that “the US uses more oil than most other countries” and “more than it can produce” is an element of the status quo, but can be solved with a minor repair to the status quo.

Grounds 1: Increasing vehicle fuel economy standards to 40 mpg over the next decade could save more than 50 billion barrels of oil over the next 50 years, which is almost ten times more oil than the refuge would yield in the same amount of time and would also save consumers money (“Fuelish Claims” 3).

Warrant 1: “Policy” If a plan’s advantages are greater than another’s and it produces less harm, it should be adopted.

Backing: According to policy qualifications.

Qualifier: Most Likely.

Reservation: Unless the provided information is incorrect.

Grounds 2: Fuel economy for new passenger cars and light trucks nearly doubled between 1975, when standards were first adopted, and their peak in 1988 (“National Security” 3).

Warrant 2: “Example” It is probable that if standards were increased today with all the new technologies available that similar benefits would result.

Workability Claims:

Workability 1:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will not function in a timely manner.

Grounds 1: Oil from ANWR would take about 10 years to begin reaching the market (“Oil and the Arctic”).

Warrant 1: “Definition” By definition, ten years is too long to have any effect on the current problems.

Workability 2:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan to establish and maintain environmental regulations will not work.

Grounds 1: Regulations are easily circumvented by large corporations.

Warrant 1: “Sign” Circumvention is a sign that something is not effective and will not last.

Grounds 2: The oil industry currently has lower standards and exemptions from basic environmental regulations to ensure a profit can be made (Lance 7).

Warrant 2: “Example” If current regulations are below normal, it is probable that future regulations will be, as well.

Grounds 3: Regulation in the Prudhoe Bay oil fields significantly decreased after its initial opening for oil exploration (“Energy, Economics, and the Environment” 2).

Warrant 3: “Analogy” The regulation system in Prudhoe is similar to that being set up by the affirmative team’s plan.

Refutation of Solvency Claims:

Solvency for SH#1:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will not solve the US dependency on foreign oil, which is supposedly part of the status quo.

Grounds 1: According to a 1998 USGS study, assuming a price of \$24 dollars per barrel, there is a 95% chance of finding 1.9 billion barrels, a 5% chance of finding 9.4 billion barrels, and a 50% chance of finding 5.3 billion barrels (“Arctic National Wildlife Refuge” 5).

Warrant 1: “Authority” The USGS is an authoritative source on the subject of recoverable oil.

Grounds 2: There is a 50% chance of finding less than a year’s worth of oil considering the US uses 7 billion barrels per year (“Arctic National Wildlife Refuge” 5).

Warrant 2: “Definition” By definition, less than a year’s worth of oil will not solve foreign oil dependency.

Grounds 3: Drilling for oil in ANWR will decrease imports by a mere 2% in the year 2020 according to Joe Lieberman, a senator from Connecticut, rather than the 8% stated by the affirmative team (“Press Conference” 2).

Warrant 3: “Definition” By definition, two percent is not enough to decrease foreign dependency.

Warrant 3-b: “Authority” Joe Lieberman is very knowledgeable on this subject.

Solvency for SH#2:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will not solve the problem of increased oil prices in the status quo.

Grounds 1: The amount of economically recoverable oil in the refuge would increase world reserves by only 0.3% (“Fuelish Claims” 2).

Warrant 1: “Definition” By definition, 0.3% is not enough to influence world prices.

Backing: According to basic economics.

Qualifier: Always.

Grounds 2: Oil prices are set on a world market and other nations have vastly larger reserves and lower production costs (“The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: Drilling”).

Warrant 2: “Sign” These are all signs that oil prices will not decrease.

Grounds 3: From 1991 to 1995, the US did not import oil from Iraq, but oil prices and supplies remained relatively stable and the US economy boomed (“Murkowski Watch” 5).

Warrant 3: “Comparison” The situation that occurred between 1991 and 1995 is similar to one that would result from the US not importing oil from a single country today or in the near future.

Backing: According to past experiences.

Qualifier: Most Likely.

Reservation: Unless the presented information is incorrect.

Solvency for GG#3:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will not solve the problem of high unemployment rates in the status quo.

Grounds 1: The Congressional Research Service, an unbiased source on the subject of oil drilling, predicted in October 2002 that oil drilling in the refuge would generate 60,000 to 130,000 jobs not the 450,000 to 735,000 jobs that the affirmative team stated (“Fuelish Claims” 2).

Warrant 1: “Sign” Fewer jobs is a sign that unemployment rates will not decrease.

Grounds 2: According to the NRDC the majority of jobs created by drilling in ANWR would be short-term and only last for five years (“Fuelish Claims” 2).

Warrant 2: “Cause” Short term jobs will not affect the unemployment rate.

Grounds 3: There is not enough economically recoverable oil in ANWR to support the large number of jobs.

Warrant 3: “Definition” By definition, less oil will result in fewer jobs.

Solvency for GF#4:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will not solve the problem of the US federal debt present in the status quo.

Grounds 1: According to Clusen of the NRDC in his testimony in front of the Senate Committee on energy and natural resources, a portion of revenue currently generated from oil and gas production on federal lands is mostly returned to the states (Clusen 4).

Warrant 1: “Cause” If revenue is returned to the states, it cannot affect the US federal debt.

Grounds 2: The fact that the state revenue utilizing petroleum rose after drilling in Prudhoe Bay does not prove that state revenue will increase if drilling occurs in ANWR.

Warrant 2: “Comparision” The amount of oil in Prudhoe Bay is not similar to the amount of oil in ANWR.

Grounds 3: Revenue from drilling in ANWR is based on the amount of oil present, which is not certain.

Warrant 3: “Definition” By definition, something that is uncertain cannot be counted on to generate a profit.

Disadvantages Claims:

Disadvantage 1:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will create the disadvantage of disrupting wildlife habitat in ANWR.

Grounds 1: As reported by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the caribou population did increase after oil field development began in the Prudhoe Bay area, but the population has declined since. The article states that there are fundamental differences between the calving areas of the caribou in the Prudhoe Bay region and the porcupine caribou herd in ANWR. In Prudhoe, there is a greater amount of alternative calving areas available, while ANWR is smaller and lacks alternative areas. Because ANWR is smaller than the Prudhoe Bay area and is utilized by 6 times as many caribou, it is expected that caribou populations will decrease in ANWR if drilling commences (“Arctic National Wildlife Refuge” 11).

Warrant 1: “Authority” The US Fish and Wildlife Service is an expert in this area.

Disadvantage 2:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will create the disadvantage of destruction to the delicate ecosystem in ANWR.

Grounds 1: According to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, oil development-no matter how carefully it is done-will harm large portions of the refuge. The exploration and production would not be confined to a limited area and would range across as many as 35 separate fields, which would affect wildlife habitats on hundreds of thousands of acres inter-spread between sprawling oil fields and pipelines. In addition, habitats would also be disrupted by industrial activity associated with airports, permanent production, and gravel roads to connect the facilities (“Arctic National Wildlife Refuge” 8, 9).

Warrant 1: “Authority” The US Fish and Wildlife Service is a knowledgeable source and can be trusted.

Disadvantage 3:

Claim: The affirmative team’s plan will create the disadvantage of decreasing current jobs that rely on the wildlife in ANWR.

Grounds 1: 1/4th of the permanent jobs in Alaska rely on the wildlife that will be harmed and/or destroyed by the drilling (“Wildlands” 5).

Warrant 1: “Cause” Destroying the wildlife in Alaska will jeopardize its jobs.

Disadvantage 4:

Claim: The affirmative team's plan will create the disadvantage of damage to the environment as oil drilling has in the past.

Grounds 1: Every year, oil operations on Alaska's Northern slope emit more than 56,000 tons of nitrogen oxides, which contribute to smog and acid rain. The Prudhoe Bay complex, spanning over 1000 square miles, averages over 400 spills per year and pumps out more air pollution than the total emissions of Washington, D.C. ("The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: The Impact"). As reported by the Sierra Club, in April 2002 it took only 12 minutes for a corroded pipeline to dump approximately 100,000 gallons of crude oil and salt water onto an area of the tundra in Prudhoe Bay the size of 2 football fields ("Wildlands" 6).

Warrant 1: "Comparison" The oil operations in these areas are similar to the ones that are being planned for ANWR.

Backing: According to experts who have studied the current oil operations and those planned for ANWR.

Qualifier: Always.

WORKS CITED

- “Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.” US Fish and Wildlife Service. 18 October 2000. http://arcticcircle.uconn.edu/ANWR/anwr_fws.htm (12 February 2003).
- “Alaska Unemployment Rate Rises in February.” The Associated Press State and Local Wire. 21 March 2003. LexisNexis Academic. Available online. (22 March 2003).
- Clusen, Charles M. “Prepared Testimony of Charles M. Clusen Natural Resources Defense Council Before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.” Federal News Service. 12 July 2001. Lexis Nexis Congressional. Available online. (10 February 2003).
- “Energy, Economics, and the Environment.” University of Cincinnati. 16 May 2001. <http://www.uc.edu/news/ebriefs/energy01/html> (24 March 2003).
- “Fuelish Claims: Drilling the Arctic Won’t Create a Significant Number of Jobs.” National Resources Defense Council. 02 November 2001. <http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/artech/farcjobs/asp> (14 February 2003).
- Lance, Linda. “Testimony of Linda Lance Vice President of the Wilderness Society Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Resources.” eMediaMillWorks. 11 July 2001. Lexis Nexis Congressional. Available online. (10 February 2003).
- Lovins, Amory B and Hunter L. Lovins. “Fool’s Gold in Alaska.” Foreign Affairs 80:4 (2001): 72-86.
- “Murkowski Watch: Separating the Senator’s Arctic Refuge Myths from Reality.” National Resources Defense Council. 08 March 2002. <http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/artech/farcmurk.asp> (14 February 2003).
- “National Security and Oil: ‘Dangerous Addiction’ Report Outlines Risks of Import Dependence, Offers Roadmaps to Save 5 Million Barrels per Day.” National Resources Defense Council. 16 January 2002. <http://www.nrdc.org/media/pressRelease/020116.asp> (07 March 2003).
- “Oil and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.” National Resources Defense Council. 18 April 9, 2003 <http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/arctic.asp> (07 March 2003).
- “Press Conference with Senators Joseph Lieberman (D-CT); John Kerry (D-MA); and Paul Wellstone (D-MN).” Federal News Service. 17 April 2003. Lexis Nexis Congressional. Available online. (10 February 2003).
- Samuelson, Paul A. and William D. Nordhaus. Economics. 17th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 2001.

Simmons, Matthew R. "Prepared Testimony of Matthew R. Simmons Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources." Federal News Service. 13 February 2003. Lexis NexisCongressional. Available online. (07 March 2003).

"The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: Drilling in the Refuge vs. Energy Efficiency." National Resources Defense Council. 02 April 2001.
<http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/anwr/anwr3.asp> (14 February 2003).

"The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: The Impact of Oil Development on the North Slope." National Resources Defense Council. 02 April 2001.
<http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/anwr/anwr2.asp> (14 February 2003).

"Wildlands: Oil Development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge." Sierra Club.
http://www.sierraclub.org/wildlands.arctic/oil_development.asp (14 February 2003).