## Case

### Econ

Natty gas is about to fail- renewables are key

Doran and Reed 8/13

[Kevin Doran, institute fellow and assistant research professor at the Renewable and Sustainable Energy Institute(RASEI), and a joint institute of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the University of Colorado at Boulder. Adam Reed research associate at RASEI, 13 AUG 2012, “Natural Gas and Its Role In the U.S. Energy Endgame”, <http://e360.yale.edu/feature/natural_gas_role_in_us_energy_endgame/2561/>, \\wyo-bb]

A full-throttle shift to a gas-dominated electricity system, which now appears to be the ordained path forward in many parts of the country, will flash through our newfound abundance more quickly than we realize, and will not ultimately stave off catastrophic climate change, which by any reasonable measure of sanity is still the defining challenge of the 21st century — cheap gas or not. Within a decade or less, we could be facing high natural gas costs again, plus the added burden of a planet in an ever-deepening ecological crisis. Amid the din of enthusiasm surrounding the rush to natural gas, we run the risk of losing the real prize: a U.S. energy future consistent with our economic, environmental, and lifestyle aspirations. Wise use of natural gas, in conjunction with policies to support continued growth in renewable energy, can serve as a catalyst to quicken the transition to a sustainable energy system.

## Courts

**The CP would be send a massive signal of unpredictability to investors**

**Ford 5**

Matthew Ford, Law Student at St John's University School of Law in New York. 9/15, “John Roberts, Stare Decisis, and the Return of Lochner: An Impetus to Jump-Start the Labor Movement.” Mr. Zine Magazine, A Project of the Monthly Review.<http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/ford180905.html>, accessed 10/18/12,WYO/JF

**Our common law system is based largely on the idea of** [**"stare decisis,"**](http://www.law.cornell.edu/lexicon/stare_decisis.htm) **the idea that the rulings of judges are generally binding.** **Such a system** is designed to create continuity so as to **send a signal to society about what sort of behavior** society **will or will not tolerate**, **to avoid confusion certain to arise if laws are constantly changing,** and to diminish the likelihood of agitating society as a whole **or creating a backlash by overturning laws that are widely valued**. However, as Judge Roberts put it, "[S]tare decisis is not an inexorable command" (["Transcript: Day Two of the Roberts Confirmation Hearings,"](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/13/AR2005091300979.html) 13 September 2004). **The Supreme Court can overturn precedent** when it sees fit, or, in the words of Roberts, "**You have to consider whether** **[precedent has] created settled expectations that should not be disrupted in the interest of regularity in the legal system**" (["Transcript: Day Two of the Roberts Confirmation Hearings,"](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/13/AR2005091300979.html) 13 September 2004). If Roberts sticks to his word, large, well-organized, militant groups such as the Women's Rights Movement should find comfort in the fact that Roberts has implicitly acknowledged that the overturning of such a key precedent as [Roe v. Wade](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=410&invol=113) would likely lead to large-scale upheaval by the well-organized feminist movement that would shake society so forcefully that to even fathom overturning the ruling is to start trouble.

## Ptx

### Fights

#### Obama’s re-election is going to kill any chance of compromise

Zach Goldfarb, 11/7

['Fiscal cliff' clock starts as election fades to background](http://bdtonline.com/washingtonpost/x2082764871/Fiscal-cliff-clock-starts-as-election-fades-to-background), <http://bdtonline.com/washingtonpost/x2082764871/Fiscal-cliff-clock-starts-as-election-fades-to-background>, accessed 11/7/12,WYO/JF

After an election focused heavily on the economy and the soaring national debt, Washington will immediately turn to a year-end debate that has the potential to dramatically affect both: the looming "fiscal cliff." Unless Congress acts by New Year's Eve, taxes will rise for nearly 90 percent of Americans on Jan. 2, and the White House will be forced to carry out nearly $100 billion in automatic cuts to the Pentagon and other agency budgets. With neither party on track to take complete control of the White House, Senate and House, the fiscal cliff will require a compromise that has for the past two years eluded President Barack Obama and House Republican leaders. Failure to achieve consensus has the potential to throw the nation back into recession as households absorb a hit to their finances averaging $3,500. "When we wake up Wednesday morning, the fiscal-cliff clocks will start," said Maya MacGuineas, president of the bipartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. "Hopefully, the fiscal cliff will be the excuse for the parties to start working together. Hopefully, it will provide the excuse and cover for both sides to come to the table." During the campaign, Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney vowed to take very different approaches to the year-end convergence of expiring tax breaks and spending cuts. As the campaign wound down, it became clear that Obama's reelection would set the stage for an epic battle over taxes and spending with potentially far-reaching consequences. Democrats said a freshly reelected Obama would draw a line in the sand over his demand for increasing tax rates for the wealthy. He would invite Republicans to acquiesce to this demand or risk taking the blame for a dangerous political gridlock, as they did during the 2011 battle over the federal debt limit.

#### No compromise – House GOP hard line stance against tax raises

SFGate, “Fiscal Cliff impasse on tax rates is a big hurdle”, 11/8/2012. <http://www.sfgate.com/news/politics/article/Fiscal-cliff-Impasse-on-tax-rates-is-big-hurdle-4020913.php#ixzz2BgX4N7mY>

WASHINGTON (AP) — House Republicans' hard line against higher tax rates for upper-income earners leaves re-elected President [Barack Obama](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news%2Fpolitics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Barack+Obama%22) with a tough, core decision: Does he pick a fight and risk falling off a "fiscal cliff" or does he rush to compromise and risk alienating liberal [Democrats](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news%2Fpolitics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Democrats%22)?¶ Or is there another way that will allow both sides to claim victory?¶ Obama has been silent since his victory speech early Wednesday morning, but is set to weigh in Friday in remarks at the White House.¶ Capitol Hill Republicans, meanwhile, vow to stand resolutely against any effort by the president to fulfill a campaign promise to raise the top two income tax rates to Clinton-era levels. A battle would set the tone for the start of the president's second term.¶ "A 'balanced' approach isn't balanced if it means higher tax rates on the small businesses that are key to getting our economy moving again," House Speaker [John Boehner](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news%2Fpolitics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22John+Boehner%22), R-Ohio, said on Wednesday. "Raising tax rates is unacceptable," he declared Thursday on ABC. "Frankly, it couldn't even pass the House. I'm not sure it could pass the Senate."

#### No compomise

Margaret Collins and Inyoung Hwang, “Stocks Swings to Rise on Fiscal Cliff, Pimco’s Kashkari Says”, 11/8/2012

Stock-market volatility will increase by the end of the year as Congress delays reaching a resolution on extending spending and tax cuts until 2013, according to Pacific Investment Management Co.’s Neel Kashkari.

“There have been little signs of Republicans and Democrats really coming together to solve the fiscal cliff in a bipartisan matter,” Kashkari, 39, who heads global equities at [Newport Beach](http://topics.bloomberg.com/newport-beach/), California-based Pimco, said at the Bloomberg Portfolio Manager conference in New York. His firm manages about $8 billion in stocks and $1.92 trillion in total assets. “More likely, we’re going to see brinkmanship like we saw with the debt ceiling a year ago.”

Democrats maintained control of the [U.S. Senate](http://topics.bloomberg.com/u.s.-senate/) in the election results this week as Republicans kept their majority in the[House of Representatives](http://topics.bloomberg.com/house-of-representatives/). Lawmakers face the so-called fiscal cliff, or $607 billion of tax increases and federal spending cuts set to kick in automatically in January. The [Congressional Budget Office](http://topics.bloomberg.com/congressional-budget-office/) has said the economy would contract by as much as 0.5 percent next year if Congress doesn’t act.

### PC

#### No PC- Republicans will push against Obama initiatives for mid-term elections and block him from passing bills.

Spiering 11/7

(Charlie, Commentary Staff Writer at Washington Examiner, The Washington Examiner, “After Bush was re-elected in 2004, Democrats in Congress did not compromise,” November 7, 2012, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/after-bush-was-re-elected-in-2004-democrats-in-congress-did-not-compromise/article/2512871#.UJxNFMXA-xg//wyo-mm>)

Expect Republicans to dig in on their signature issues and block the president as Democrats did. By the time the 2014 mid-terms arrive, expect the party to emerge with a principled – but re-tooled – political narrative for Obama’s second mid-term elections, in which both the Senate map and history will favor them.

#### No PC until midterm elections- empiricism

Baker 10/22

(Ross K., Guampdn, “Radical change unlikely in Congress this year,” October 22, 2012, <http://www.guampdn.com/article/20121022/OPINION02/210220304/Radical-change-unlikely-Congress-year//wyo-mm>)

So you're a farmer upset about the unwillingness of the House to pass an agriculture bill. Or, you're an employee of the U.S. Postal Service who is disappointed with the lack of congressional action on reform. Or you're an IT person concerned about the failure to pass a cybersecurity bill. Well, don't get too hopeful that this November's election is going to produce a dramatically different crop of legislators. Chances are that the changes will be modest. If you're really looking for more radical change, just wait until 2014. If history is any guide, midterm elections -- not the years holding presidential races -- are when big turnovers in the makeup of Congress occur.

### Bipart

**MLPs have bipartisan support**

Roberta **Rampton**, Reuters, “Tweaking U.S. Tax code could spur green energy: Senator”, Jun 7, **2012**.

(Reuters) - A freshman **U.S.** Democratic **senator** thinks he **may have found a way to encourage investment in wind, solar and biofuel projects without sapping** too many **taxpayer dollars or injecting new venom into a bitter partisan battle over energy incentives**. Chris Coons introduced legislation on Thursday that would allow a broad range of renewable power generation and transmission projects to qualify for a tax structure used widely by pipeline and other energy-related companies. The bill is unlikely to be considered until after the November presidential election, but may give lawmakers food for thought as they wrestle with whether to extend tax breaks for green energy set to expire this year. **The "master limited partnership,"** or MLP, structure **allows** certain types of **companies to raise money in the stock market, while having income taxed only at the unit holder level, avoiding corporate income taxes**. "**It's** something that's **been used for decades**," said Coons, who represents Delaware, a state where financing has fallen short for offshore wind power projects. "**This is one energy financing vehicle that we should all be able to agree on**," he said in an interview. Under the current law, MLPs must generate at least 90 percent of their income from real estate or natural resources like fossil fuels or timber - and must return most of its cash to its investors, who are taxed on those returns. There are about 100 MLPs in the United States with a total market capitalization of more than $350 billion, including the likes of pipeline giants Enterprise Products Partners and Kinder Morgan Energy Partners.

## K

### Method

**Overemphasis on method destroys effectiveness of the discipline**

**Wendt**, Handbook of IR, **2k2** p. 68

It should be stressed that **in advocating a pragmatic view we are not endorsing method-driven social science. Too much research in international relations chooses problems or things to be explained with a view to whether the analysis will provide support for one or another methodological ‘ism’.** But **the point of IR scholarship should be to answer questions about international politics that are of great normative concern, not to validate methods. Methods are means, not ends in themselves. As a matter of personal scholarly choice it may be reasonable to stick with one method and see how far it takes** us. But since we do not know how far that is, **if the goal of the discipline is insight into world politics then it makes little sense to rule out one or the other approach on a priori grounds. In that case a method indeed becomes a tacit ontology, which may lead to neglect of whatever problems it is poorly suited to address**. Being conscious about these choices is why it is important to distinguish between the ontological, empirical and pragmatic levels of the rationalist-constructivist debate. We favor the pragmatic approach on heuristic grounds, but we certainly believe a conversation should continue on all three levels.

### Calc

#### We should act to generate the greatest good for the greatest number of people, this comes from the evaluation of specific consequences of an action, rather than its mindset or other issues

S.E.P. 2009

[Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2009 Edition, “Consequentialism.” Online, http://www.illc.uva.nl/~seop/archives/spr2009/entries/consequentialism/] /Wyo-MB

The paradigm case of consequentialism is utilitarianism, whose classic proponents were Jeremy Bentham (1789), John Stuart Mill (1861), and Henry Sidgwick (1907). (For predecessors, see Schneewind 1990.) Classic utilitarians held hedonistic act consequentialism. Act consequentialism is the claim that an act is morally right if and only if that act maximizes the good, that is, if and only if the total amount of good for all minus the total amount of bad for all is greater than this net amount for any incompatible act available to the agent on that occasion. (Cf. Moore 1912, chs. 1-2.) Hedonism then claims that pleasure is the only intrinsic good and that pain is the only intrinsic bad. Together these claims imply that an act is morally right if and only if that act causes "the greatest happiness for the greatest number," as the common slogan says. Classic utilitarianism is consequentialist as opposed to deontological because of what it denies. It denies that moral rightness depends directly on anything other than consequences, such as whether the agent promised in the past to do the act now. Of course, the fact that the agent promised to do the act might indirectly affect the act's consequences if breaking the promise will make other people unhappy. Nonetheless, according to classic utilitarianism, what makes it morally wrong to break the promise is its effects on those other people rather than the fact that the agent promised in the past. Since classic utilitarianism reduces all morally relevant factors (Kagan 1998, 17-22) to consequences, it might appear simple. However, classic utilitarianism is actually a complex combination of many distinct claims, including the following claims about the moral rightness of acts: Consequentialism = whether an act is morally right depends only on consequences (as opposed to the circumstances or the intrinsic nature of the act or anything that happens before the act). Actual Consequentialism = whether an act is morally right depends only on the actual consequences (as opposed to foreseen, foreseeable, intended, or likely consequences). Direct Consequentialism = whether an act is morally right depends only on the consequences of that act itself (as opposed to the consequences of the agent's motive, of a rule or practice that covers other acts of the same kind, and so on). Evaluative Consequentialism = moral rightness depends only on the value of the consequences (as opposed to other features of the consequences). Hedonism = the value of the consequences depends only on the pleasures and pains in the consequences (as opposed to other goods, such as freedom, knowledge, life, and so on). Maximizing Consequentialism = moral rightness depends only on which consequences are best (as opposed to satisfactory or an improvement over the status quo).

**Water wars are real and their K doesn’t apply**

**Dinar 2** Shlomi, Ph.D. candidate at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, SAIS Review 22.2 (2002) 229-253, Water, Security, Conflict, and Cooperation, "Negotiation and International Relations: A Framework for Hydropolitics”, International Negotiation 5, no. 2

The dichotomy of conflict and cooperation over water and its relationship to national and regional security reflects the reality of hydropolitics. While military clashes have been associated with water, the concept of security does not end with nor does it only imply armed conflict. Because the pursuit of peace, and thus conflict and cooperation, constitutes the flip side of security, water is indeed relevant to the concept of security. It is this phenomenon that traditionalists have cast off as irrelevant and other rejectionists of the environment-security link have ignored.¶ Linking security with the environment does not increase the possibility that nations will engage in more armed action against other states for the sake of natural resources such as water. Albeit minimal, evidence already exists as to the military skirmishes and military threats that have taken place over water. Nations will engage in armed conflict and political disputes over water whether or not scholars acknowledge the link between the environment and security. Similarly, the existence of more than 3,600 water treaties, the oldest dating to 805 AD, demonstrates a rich history of cooperation [End Page 239] over water regardless of scholarly debate on cooperation and the environment. The debateregarding the link between water, conflict, and cooperation is thus futile and has become a scholarly debate marred by polemics and semantics.¶Given its geographical attributes, freshwater truly straddles the notion of sovereignty that traditionalists cherish so deeply and the international or regional conception that environmental globalists hold true. The problems that arise from shared water resources are both national and regional in nature. Similarly, the solutions that are needed to solve such problems are both national and regional. Most importantly for the debate on the environment and security, however, the impediments to cooperation and the instigation of conflict over water are both national and international in their sources. States in particular regions will continue to see water as a national security concern. Even though a regional agreement may be the best solution to states' water problems, they will continue to couch their need to access sufficient and clean freshwater in security and nationalist terms.

### No link

#### Extend the no link argument- their cards talk about the big oil companies.

#### Second the K doesn’t link- the basis for our drought adv is pondering if the way that the current electricity is produced is correct because of the large amount of water consumption

**Our Aff is not the type of consumption they criticize- Wind panels don’t consume anything rather are just a transfer energy into a different form**

**Cohen, 10**

Dustin Cohen 2010 March 10 Some Notes on Heidegger’s Question Concerning Technology (Enframing, Standing Reserve and Virtual Technologies) http://cybject.wordpress.com/2010/03/11/some-notes-on-heidegger%E2%80%99s-question-concerning-technology-enframing-standing-reserve-and-virtual-technologies/

Martin Heidegger was concerned about the status of the human amidst modern technology. Tied to the changing status of the human is his assertion (and a major theme of Cybject) that modern technology displaces the “wordliness” of the world and puts a human-world in its place.¶ Heidegger uses the term “enframing” to explain the way humans, as users of modern technology, have come to relate to (and literally “frame”) the world. **To demonstrate the characteristics of this modern technological “enframing”** of the world **he contrasts a windmill with a modern hydroelectric power plant**. **In describing how the windmill differs** **from the** **type of** “revealing” that **characterizes modern technology**, **he explains** that the “**old windmill’s…sails do indeed turn in the wind**; [but are] … left entirely to the wind’s blowing. …**the windmill does not unlock energy from the air currents in order to store it”**.¶ In describing how **the windmill differs from the type of revealing that characterizes modern technology**, Heidegger explains: “But [do the the properties of contemporary technologies] not hold true for the old windmill as well? No. **Its sails do indeed turn in the wind; they are left entirely to the wind’s blowing. But the windmill does not unlock energy from the air currents in order to store it.”** With **the windmill**, the wind **turns the turbines, the wind-energy instantaneously powers the turbines. At no point is the wind’s energy manipulated or stored up as a different kind of energy. The windmill only transfers motion, it “reveals” wind energy**, but does not commandeer nature’s energy or store it for future use (Mitcham).

§ Marked 11:59 §