## T

**First, we meet- the federal agencies that have restrictions that aren’t BOEM are the DOD, FAA, and Army Corps of Engineers- the restrictions the plan reduces are ALL in the United States**

**Second, counter-interp- ‘in the United States’ refers to the territory over which the US has exclusive sovereign control:**

1. **‘In’ indicates inclusion within a limit or boundary**

**Merriam Webster**, no date

[http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/in]

Definition of IN

1 a —**used as a function word to indicate inclusion, location, or position within limits** <in the lake> <wounded in the leg> <in the summer>

b : into 1 <went in the house>

**B- the United States refers to areas where the government has sovereignty**

**"United States" means the territory over which the sovereign nation of the "United States" exercises sovereign power**

**Ballentine's 95** (Legal Dictionary and Thesaurus, p. 689)

**the territory over which this sovereign nation called the “United States” exercises sovereign power**

**Third, we meet- US sovereignty and authority to enforce laws operates offshore in the seas out to 200 miles**

**Vann 12**

[Adam, Legislative Attorney, CRS Reports, “Wind Energy: Offshore Permitting”, 10.17, p. online//wyo-tjc]

As a primary matter, it is important to briefly review the source of federal and state claims of jurisdiction over the Outer Continental Shelf. **United States authority in the oceans begins at the coast**—called the baseline—**and extends 200 nautical miles out to sea.** The first 12 nautical miles comprise the U.S. territorial sea.5 **Under t**he 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea6 (**UNCLOS), a coastal nation may claim sovereignty over the air space, water, seabed, and subsoil within its territorial sea**.7 U.S. Supreme Court precedent and international practice indicate that this sovereignty authorizes coastal nations to permit offshore development within their territorial seas.8 **Although the United States has not ratified UNCLOS, it generally acts in alignment with its terms. The U.S. contiguous zone extends beyond the territorial sea to 24 nautical miles from the baseline. In this area, a coastal nation may regulate to protect its territorial sea and to enforce its** customs, fiscal, immigration, and sanitary **laws.**9

**Sixth, Err affirmative—the topic is massively neg-biased because of a lack of fed-key warrants and the states counterplan, and huge backfile generics because of past energy topics**

**Seventh, Competing interpretations is bad—comparisons are just as subjective as reasonability and their frame encourages a race to the bottom. We shouldn’t lose if our aff makes debate harder as long as it is still possible and educational.**

## K

**First, Our Interpretation: The resolution asks the question of desirability of USFG action. The Role of ballot is to say yes or no to the action and outcomes of the plan.**

**Second, is reasons to prefer:**

**(\_\_\_) A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac**

**(\_\_\_) C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another**

**Finally, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving.**

#### Predictions based on existential magnitude must be considered, there is no coming back from it, and there have been no previous examples to base predictions off of, and waiting to be reactive to situations is worse

Nick Bostrom, 02

Professor, Faculty of Philosophy, Oxford [University](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html) [www.nickbostrom.com](http://www.nickbostrom.com/) [Published in the Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2002). (First version: 2001)], accessed 1/16/13,WYO/JF

Existential risks are distinct from global endurable risks. Examples of the latter kind include: threats to the biodiversity of Earth’s ecosphere, moderate global warming, global economic recessions (even major ones), and possibly stifling cultural or religious eras such as the “dark ages”, even if they encompass the whole global community, provided they are transitory (though see the section on “Shrieks” below). To say that a particular global risk is endurable is evidently not to say that it is acceptable or not very serious. A world war fought with conventional weapons or a Nazi-style Reich lasting for a decade would be extremely horrible events even though they would fall under the rubric of endurable global risks since humanity could eventually recover. (On the other hand, they could be a local terminal risk for many individuals and for persecuted ethnic groups.) I shall use the following definition of existential risks: Existential risk – One where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential. An existential risk is one where humankind as a whole is imperiled. Existential disasters have major adverse consequences for the course of human civilization for all time to come. 2 The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn2%22%20%5Co%20%22) At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn3%22%20%5Co%20%22) A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn4%22%20%5Co%20%22) Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century. The special nature of the challenges posed by existential risks is illustrated by the following points: · Our approach to existential risks cannot be one of trial-and-error. There is no opportunity to learn from errors. The reactive approach – see what happens, limit damages, and learn from experience – is unworkable. Rather, we must take a proactive approach. This requires foresight to anticipate new types of threats and a willingness to take decisive preventive action and to bear the costs (moral and economic) of such actions. · We cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, social attitudes or national security policies that developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. We might find it hard to take them as seriously as we should simply because we have never yet witnessed such disasters.[[5]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn5%22%20%5Co%20%22) Our collective fear-response is likely ill calibrated to the magnitude of threat. · Reductions in existential risks are global public goods [13] and may therefore be undersupplied by the market [14]. Existential risks are a menace for everybody and may require acting on the international plane. Respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse for failing to take countermeasures against a major existential risk. · If we take into account the welfare of future generations, the harm done by existential risks is multiplied by another factor, the size of which depends on whether and how much we discount future benefits [15,16]. In view of its undeniable importance, it is surprising how little systematic work has been done in this area. Part of the explanation may be that many of the gravest risks stem (as we shall see) from anticipated future technologies that we have only recently begun to understand. Another part of the explanation may be the unavoidably interdisciplinary and speculative nature of the subject. And in part the neglect may also be attributable to an aversion against thinking seriously about a depressing topic. The point, however, is not to wallow in gloom and doom but simply to take a sober look at what could go wrong so we can create responsible strategies for improving our chances of survival. In order to do that, we need to know where to focus our efforts.

#### The prioritization of method, or other philosophical approaches over all else, trades off with real world change and creates a vicious cycle that prevents concrete solutions to problems

Owen 02, Reader in Political Theory at the University of Southampton (David, “Reorienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning”, Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 31, No. 3, <http://mil.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/3/653>)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

**Rhetoric describes and reflects reality, it does not shape it—objective reality exists outside of language**

**Fram-Cohen ‘85**

[Michelle, “Reality, Language, Translation: What Makes Translation Possible?” American Translators Association Conference, enlightenment.supersaturated.com/essays/text/michelleframcohen//possibilityoftranslation.html, 9-24-06//uwyo-ajl]

Nida did not provide the philosophical basis of the view that the external world is the common source of all languages. Such a basis can be found in the philosophy of Objectivism, originated by Ayn Rand. Objectivism, as its name implies, upholds **the objectivity of reality**. This **means** that **reality is independent of consciousness,** **consciousness** **being the means of perceiving ?reality, not of creating it.** Rand defines language as "a code of visual-auditory **symbols that denote concepts**." (15) These symbols are the written or spoken words of any language. Concepts are defined as the "mental integration of two or more units possessing the same distinguishing characteristic(s), with their particular measurements omitted." (16) This means that **concepts are abstractions of** units **perceived** in **reality. Since words denote concepts, words are the symbols of such abstractions; words are the means of representing concepts in a language**. Since **reality provides the data from which we abstract and form concepts, reality is the source of all words**--and of all languages. **The very existence of translation demonstrates this fact. If there was no objective reality, there could be no similar concepts expressed in different verbal symbols**. There could be no similarity between the content of different languages, and so, no translation. **Translation** is the transfer of conceptual knowledge from one language into another. It is the transfer of one set of symbols denoting concepts into another set of symbols denoting the same concepts. This process **is possible because concepts have specific referents in reality**. Even if a certain word and the concept it designates exist in one language but not in another, **the referent** this **word and concept stand for** nevertheless **exists in reality, and can be referred to** in translation by a descriptive phrase or neologism. **Language is a means describing reality**, **and** as such **can** and should **expand** **to** **include** **newly discovered** or innovated **objects** in reality. The revival of the ancient Hebrew language in the late 19th Century demonstrated the dependence of language on outward reality. Those who wanted to use Hebrew had to innovate an enormous number of words in order to describe the new objects that did not confront the ancient Hebrew speakers. On the other hand, those objects that existed 2000 years ago could be referred to by the same words. Ancient Hebrew could not by itself provide a sufficient image of modern reality for modern users.

#### Aff is a better approach to protecting the environment – alt can’t overwhelm the psychological drive to consume

**Rachlinski 2k** -- Associate Professor of Law, Cornell Law School. (Jeffrey, THE PSYCHOLOGY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE, 2000 U. Ill. L. Rev. 299)

The best source of a remedy for global climate change is not the conventional remedies for commons dilemmas but a dramatic effort to eliminate the commons dilemma itself. **Government-led investment in alternative energy sources is more sensible** than pursuing a program of regulation or taxation or hoping consumers will shun fossil fuels. **Rather than try to fight psychological** (and economic) **pressures** to continue consuming fossil fuels, **the development of alternative means of generating electricity takes advantage of people's innate desire to develop** and advance **their condition** and that of their children. **Newer sources of electricity** would have to be significantly cheaper so as to compete with the readily available supply of inexpensive fossil fuels and at the same time increase rather than decrease the planet's wealth. This solution to the problem **harnesses rather than opposes economic and psychological forces in support of a solution.¶** There is precedent indicating that relatively inexpensive alternatives can successfully remedy global environmental problems. The international agreement to reduce ozone-depleting chemicals could not have been negotiated without the easy availability of alternative coolants. n91 To be sure, discontinuing the use of ozone-depleting chemicals was not cost-less. It has not, however, inflicted the kind of impoverishment that a sixty-percent reduction in fossil fuel consumption would. The availability of similarly priced alternatives gave countries a way to switch without incurring significant economic losses. Furthermore, political consensus on the issue was easily achieved because both environmentalists and one powerful industrial group, the manufacturers of alternatives to ozone-depleting chemicals, supported legislative action.¶ Developing alternatives to fossil fuels, however, requires governmental intervention. If an inexpensive means of producing electricity without consuming fossil fuels were about to become available, industry would be already rapidly pursuing it. To avoid the risk of global climate change, large-scale research regarding alternatives to fossil fuels is needed. In the past, when technological exigencies have arisen, the United States has been able to marshal its best scientists to make miraculous [\*319] scientific advances. The United States was able to construct an atomic bomb, develop the polio vaccine, and send humans to the moon, all under severe time constraints. Global climate change represents a similar exigency. Rather than spend public resources promoting green electricity or negotiating the next round of global climate change treaties, the United States should commit itself to developing a cheap alternative to fossil fuels. **Instead of trying to conquer the social and cognitive limitations of the human mind, such a program would take advantage of human motivation, determination, and imagination**. **The alternative is to convert every barrel of oil** and every ton of coal **into carbon dioxide and hope that the pessimistic climatologists are mistaken**.the so-called "managerial class."

**Renewable energy is a necessary stepping stone toward alt solvency**

**Scatena 11**--German Honors/Communication Studies Major Film Studies minor Memorial University of Newfoundland (Debora, Environment and Technology: Finding a Solution within the Modern Framework and Human Responsibilities, International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, 1;2; September 2011, http://www.ijbhtnet.com/journals/Vol\_1\_No\_2\_September\_2011/12.pdf)

It is possible to move past the challenge solely after a process of democratization has been put into place, specifically that example has come into being in Germany in October 2008 when the Renewable Energy Act (EEG, 28.10.2008) was approved. The act enables companies as well as private to invest in renewable energies and profit from it. However regulations are in place to preserve the quality and well being of nature as well. It is possible to see the German Renewable Energy Act, as a step that Heidegger foresaw, when discussing the impact of technology within nature. It is also possible to see the Act as an expansion of a philosophy and way of being within nature that a certain culture has developed. Moreover it is interesting to see how throughout the Act people have limitations on the use of nature they can have as well, nature is protected as it is the element can allow humanity to continue its development and sustain itself. If nature was not preserved in the Act it would be only a new energy policy but it wouldn't be able to take culture as well as people forward. Even so it is possible to see how technology as illustrated by Heidegger can move people ahead and through it the contemplative state can be achieved and captured, so that humanity actually improves thanks to technology. Nevertheless Germany is also the only country that put such regulations ahead for its citizen and its environment, so the road ahead is pretty steep unless people start realizing that those are not solely ideas, but they can be put into place. It is also possible to see a certain level of nature democratization is the Renewable Energy Act in question, since right after each way that people can use to support themselves with natural energy there are also as many rules to make sure nature is protected and not hurt in the balance. As a manmade Act it isn't perfect, but it is a possible way to create a unity front for both people and nature, also it is a beginning of the democratization of nature too. Latour states that “due process for the discovery of the common world” (Latour, 224) can be [hard] heard to get to**, but if a stepping stone is set**, certainly **people and nature can start a discourse which benefits both.** The realm of possibilities and solutions is achievable, but if the will of moving forward does not arise it is unlikely to reach a solution. Many things can be said and done, but it is important to always move towards the best ethics within a balance for humanity as well as nature. Technology is a tool that can enable men to get closer to the aim to be reached. It is also the tool that can move knowledge of the issue ahead, as it is seen in many reports released by institutions such as NASA and various Governments. In other words the road ahead is possible but not always straightforward. Heidegger as well as Latour present possible solutions, which as seen in Germany can be achieved, but they come with a series of challenges. Technology does reveal itself as a **starting point** to take humanity as well as knowledge and handling of the situation people are faced with more manageable, but it isn't the solution, it is the way to reach a two step solution. Nature does deserve the same level of democratization humanity is entailed to, for this reason it is possible to see the German approach through the Renewable Energy Act as a first step. How long until the rest of the world will catch up? Not an easy question to deal with, but a stepping stone to foresee how human future can co-exist with nature, through the use of technology and a new framework in approaching life. Not likely easy but possible, and by possible it is achievable with dignity by all parties. Solutions are out there, the contemplative status can lead people to reach the goal of overcoming the climate challenge as well as many more, **but steps need to be made to get started.**

**The alt is a false choice – we need both tech and environmental consciousness**

**Anderson 96** -- political scientist, social psychologist, and author of numerous non-fiction books. President Emeritus of the World Academy of Art and Science; a founding Fellow of the Meridian Intl Institute; a Fellow of the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute; and a Distinguished Consulting Faculty member of Saybrook U. (Walter, There's no going back to nature, Sept/Oct 96 Issue, http://www.motherjones.com/politics/1996/09/theres-no-going-back-nature)

Projects such as this inspire enthusiasm from most people -- but are scornfully dismissed as "technological fixes" by back-to-nature true believers. The term technological fix deserves some attention here, since **it's one of the staples of ecotopian rhetoric**, along with the promiscuous overuse -- to the point of meaninglessness -- of the word "natural." The argument against simply fixing up something with a technological repair job may well apply in some specific cases -- if, for example, a person is presented with the choice between having a quadruple bypass and adopting a healthy lifestyle -- but it really **doesn't have** much **relevance to most current environmental concerns**. The world is not faced with a simple choice of either adopting more environmentally sensitive attitudes or applying new technologies. Rather, **we are seeing both a rapid evolution of technology away from heavy industrialism and value shifts about the environment.** Most of the other back-to-nature terms are similarly pumped-up and carelessly repeated concepts that have a certain amount of reasonableness if taken in moderation. That great favorite, "anthropocentrism," for example. This isn't just a challenge to the habit of valuing plants and animals only for their usefulness to humans -- which is something that needs challenging. The self-described "deep ecologists" are not interested in any such sensible objective. They escalate the rhetoric and prescribe that human beings learn how to live in equality with all other living things. However charming this might sound, it has utterly nothing to do with a world that is about to have 6 billion people in it, whether we like it or not. Bioregionalism, too, is a useful idea in some contexts -- such as governance of air basins. But it becomes pure nonsense when people begin to advocate it -- as Kirkpatrick Sale does in his book Dwellers in the Land -- as a solution to be imposed on the whole world, by relocating people from the cities to rural areas where they would then take up ecologically correct lifestyles. There are indeed people who remain in one place, don't get hooked into the global economy, and rarely travel -- all parts of the bioregional answer -- and that's a perfectly fine way to live. The trouble is in turning it into a universal mandate and a political agenda -- a crusade to get everybody living that way. Not everybody does, not everybody wants to, and not everybody can. Even the people who talk bioregionalism don't live that way -- and don't seem to notice the gap between what they say and how they live. Some years back, Sierra magazine ran an interview with poet Gary Snyder, in which he advised all of us: "Quit moving. Stay where you are...become a paysan, paisano, peón." He then proceeded directly, with no evident sense of irony, to telling of his recent trips to China and Alaska. A bit further on he added: "I've been traveling eight or 10 weeks a year, doing lectures and readings at universities and community centers around the United States. I'm able to keep a sense of what's going on in the country that way." I don't think this makes Snyder a hypocrite. I think he's a perfectly honest guy who would rather recycle green platitudes for admiring listeners than think hard about what it really means to live in a global civilization. Probably the most serious weakness of pop ecophilosophy is its Luddite tilt. Technology isn't just a thing -- it is human thought, action, information, and invention, and a living part of who and what we are. Some applications of technology are lousy and some are wonderful. **But simply taking sides for or against technology is the lowest common denominator of public discourse**. Some technologies are and will always be central to environmental protection. I doubt that most people realize how important information technologies are in environmental management today. We worry about the hole in the ozone layer -- and we should worry about it -- but don't appreciate the exquisite technology involved in detecting it, monitoring its ebbs and flows, projecting its future. Nobody sees a hole in the ozone. **Like many other major environmental issues, it is accessible to our understanding only through the use of monitoring technologies.** An enormous environmental information system has grown, spreading and connecting around the world. The living Earth is now inseparable from this ever-expanding complex of satellites, transmitters, relay towers, computers, and software. With these devices, people observe the condition of the ozone, speculate on the future of the world's climate, study tectonic movements deep below the surface, brood over the oceans, track the migrations of wild animals and the changes in forests and deserts. This is technology that doesn't fit into any simplistic pro vs. con debate. It is neither the malevolent cause of our problems nor their magical solution -- just an essential means of acquiring information. And it will play a larger part in bringing greater environmental awareness than the collected works of all the writers and philosophy professors who push deep ecology and bioregionalism.

#### Double bind: Heidegger simultaneously rejects technology while embracing the conveniences, this means either the perm would solve, or their alt should be rejected.

Waddington 05

(David I., Stanford University, Educational Philosophy and Theory, “A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding ‘The Question Concerning Technology’,” July 26, 2005, Wiley Online Library//wyo-mm)

Another significant failing of Heidegger's philosophy of technology is that the benefits of technology are not acknowledged. The hydroelectric dam across the Rhine does improve people's lives, and, as Rorty (1977, p. 302) points out, the spread of modern technology across the planet has prevented many people from dying of starvation. Yet, despite the fact that Heidegger never acknowledges the benefits of technology, he does not urge giving it up: We can say ‘yes’ to the unavoidable use of technological objects, and we can at the same time say ‘no,’ insofar as we do not permit them to claim us exclusively and thus to warp, confuse, and finally lay waste to our essence. (1966, p. 54) This smacks of having one's cake and eating it too. Under Heidegger's conception, we conveniently say ‘yes’ to the modern technologies that make our lives so comfortable, while somehow apparently saying ‘no’ to them as well.

#### Even if ontology is good in the abstract, those who advocate it fail to grapple with real-world problems.

Mulligan et al 06

(Kevin, Peter Simons, and Barry Smith, Springer Science, “What’s wrong with contemporary philosophy?” 2006, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/e6hl522358431760/fulltext.pdf//wyo-mm>)

Another example of the lack of interest in the real world in analytic ontology and metaphysics is provided by the sad story of current work in such ﬁelds as bioinformatics, artiﬁcial intelligence, and the so-called ‘‘Semantic Web’’. Ontology and metaphysics ought surely to be acknowledged as of great importance in ﬁelds such as these. 1 In fact, however, philosophical confusion is the order of the day, because AP-philosophers with some knowledge of ontology, manifesting their horror mundi, have shown little interest in grappling with the problems thrown up by these ﬁelds, leaving it instead to philosophically naı¨ve exponents of other disciplines to wreak ontological havoc. Philosophers, for their part, occupy themselves with in-house puzzles, ignorant of the damage their neglect is wreaking in the wider world.

#### No agent to the alt, that is bad: kills ground allows the negative to spike out of offense made against the alternative, kills education means the aff can’t test the kritik at multiple levels and see if it solves. Voter Fairness Education.

#### No link we are not the type of technology that Heidegger is critiquing

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).

## Disad

**No uniqueness and prices are regional- East Coast whole-sale prices are soaring right now which is 1ac Marcacci evidence**

**And spikes are inevitable- FERC regulations coming- they destroy wholesale prices**

**Zanesville Times Recorder 2012**

[Ohio newspaper, “Some say regulations to blame for high energy costs,” Oct. 19th 2012, http://www.zanesvilletimesrecorder.com/article/20121019/NEWS01/310190008//wyo-ng]

ZANESVILLE — Jeremiah Clegg said **energy costs at Casting Solutions Inc.**, the former Burnham Boiler foundry, have **risen by about $500,000 during the past couple of years.¶ “It’s a huge number we’re trying to absorb, and it has to come off our bottom lines,”** Clegg said. **“We’ve got 117 employees right now, but unfortunately we might have to make cuts, and pass on those costs to our customers.”**¶ **The same scenario is repeating itself across the country as energy companies such as American Electric Power cope with what they call unwieldy federal regulations and** small businesses such as GKM Auto Parts **are forced to make tough choices**.¶ American Electric Power Vice President of Strategic Policy Analysis Bruce Braine said the company already has invested $10 billion in the past decade to cut toxic emissions because of federal regulations.¶ But **a new “onslaught of command-and-control regulations” coming from the federal government could cause electricity rates to jump 10 to 30 percent in the coming years and lead to thousands of job losses for energy producers** who rely on coal, Braine said**.¶ That is, unless legislators can stem the tide by “reeling back” thousands of regulations**, said U.S. Congressman Bill Johnson, who represents the 6th District in Eastern and Southern Ohio, including northern Muskingum County.¶ **According to the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, 30 power plants in Ohio either are being retired or converted to run on biomass or natural gas in the coming years because of EPA emission restrictions, which** the coalition says **could cut energy supply and spike costs at a time when the country is trying to pull out of a recession**.¶ **“Anybody who doesn’t believe it, ask the coal miners who are out of work, people paying $300 more a year to fuel their homes, the businesses in jeopardy of closing down due to energy costs,”** Johnson said.¶ Johnson and fellow U.S. Rep. Pat Tiberi warn there are about 4,100 new federal regulations that are set to roll out after this year’s election, which could influence the national economy by $100 billion.¶ Many of those are targeted at the energy sector and could affect the coal industry, which plays a major role in Eastern Ohio’s economy.¶ Tiberi, who represents the 12th Congressional District, which includes southern Muskingum County, said **the federal government has “back-doored” many of the energy regulations after President Barack Obama was unable to gain support for cap-and-trade proposals.¶** “**They did administratively what they couldn’t legislatively**,” Tiberi said.¶ Johnson and Tiberi, both Republicans, said they would work to thwart new regulations from taking effect, if there is a change in the White House, and will continue to promote an “all of the above” energy strategy that includes clean coal, oil, gas, wind, solar and nuclear power.GKM Auto Parts store co-owner Kelly Moore just wants to know if and when some of those regulations “are going to be walked back.”¶ Moore’s concern about rising prices amid new federal regulations stretches across four stores in Zanesville, Dresden, Coshocton and West Lafayette.¶ “**Our electric prices have skyrocketed,** **our health care costs for employees are going up**,” Moore said. “**When we lose an employee, we can’t replace them. We’ve cut back hours, other things, but it has to stop. You hear about the middle class being crushed. Well, all of these regulations are also crushing small business.”**

basis of their wind resource, shallow bathymetry, hurricane risk and peak-power generation potential.

**No link: OSW doesn’t jack up electricity rates because of short distances of only a few miles and onshore makes it inevitable**

**Kimmell and Stalenhoef 11**

[Kenneth, general counsel to the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, was responsible for overseeing the state permitting of the Cape Wind project, and now serves as the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, and Dawn, environmental law attorney and Counsel for the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, “The Cape Wind Offshore Wind Energy Project: A Case Study of the Difficult Transition to Renewable Energy”, p**.** asp//wyo-tjc]

The project also highlights the issue of where to locate wind energy facilities. **There is an ongoing national debate concerning whether to build wind power facilities near “load centers**,” i.e., where high concentrations of people reside and demand energy. **One of the advantages of Cape Wind is that it is located only five miles from the eastern seaboard, which is densely populated and has high** electricity **demand.** **In contrast, there is sufficient land available to build wind farms** of Cape Wind’s size **in sparsely populated areas** such as the Great Plains. **However, these areas are typically far away from load centers, which inevitably leads to higher transmission costs and line leakage**.4

**Plan drops prices- it solves load issues unique to the Northeast and drops their wholesale price- that’s MArcacci**

**And two more warrants for the link turn: a) Alignment between demand and production potential and B) population density solves resources**

**Dvorak, 12**

Michael J. Dvorak, Bethany A. Corcoran, John E. Ten Hoeve, Nicolas G. McIntyre and Mark Z. Jacobson “US East Coast offshore wind energy resources and their relationship to peak-time electricity demand” <http://www.stanford.edu/group/efmh/jacobson/Articles/I/Offshore/12DvorakEastCoastWindEn.pdf>, accessed 10/26/12,WYO/JF

**Offshore wind energy** (OWE), **located near large and dense coastal electricity demand centers, has the potential to provide large amounts of carbon-free power**. **Because OWE transmission cables are underwater, the burden of building new terrestrial transmission**, which has been shown to be a limiting factor for land-based turbines,1 **is greatly reduced**. In the USA, the majority of the population lives near oceans or the Great Lakes. As of 2003, 53% (153M people) lived in counties adjacent to oceans or the Great Lakes, with 23 of the 25 most densely populated US counties being coastal.2 **The 28 states that have coastal boundaries use 78% of the nation’s electricity.**3 **Of these 28 states, only six states have enough land-based wind resource potential to generate up to 20% of their electricity demand** (see Department of Energy,4 p. 48). **The 16 states and the District of Columbia from Florida to Maine near the coast (Figure 1) embody 34% of the total US electricity sales** (2009),5 35% of the total US CO2 emissions3 and 37% of the US population.6 The population density of the US East Coast (USEC) is both a benefit and a burden for the abatement of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. **Dense populations allow a new electrical generation to serve a large number of people in a limited spatial area with limited investment in transmission**. At the same time, states with high population densities and high demand for new transmission have the highest siting difficulties (specifically Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania; see Vajjhala and Fischbeck,7 pp. 660–661). Congestion has become an expensive problem in the Mid-Atlantic where transmission expansion has lagged demand. For example, congestion costs charged by the regional transmission operator (RTO) PJM were 3–9% of total energy market revenues between 2003 and 2010 (see PJM,8 p. 472). **OWE farms could ease transmission congestion in this region by putting large amounts of power generation online adjacent to the USEC**.9 **The USEC OWE resource has been roughly estimated to harbor hundreds of gigawatts of potential capacity**,10 although this resource has not yet been studied in significant temporal or climatological detail. Hart et al.11 clarified the importance of obtaining more temporal and spatial detail in a wind energy resource analysis, particularly for determining the extent to which hourly demand for electricity can be met by renewable supply. It is known that aggregating wind power generation with transmission lines from multiple, geographically dispersed wind farms reduces the number of hours with no output and makes the total wind energy output probability density function more Gaussian than Weibull.12 Kempton et al.13 explored the utility of connecting offshore wind farms along the USEC by using buoy and reanalysis data, finding that wind farms connected \_1000 km apart and aligned with the prevailing frontal movements reduced ramp rates and lowered the number of no or full-power events. **A high-voltage, direct current (HVDC) offshore transmission line called the Atlantic Wind Connection has been proposed from offshore New York to Virginia, and an alternative offshore grid location has been proposed, which takes advantage of sea breezes, spanning from Long Island, New York to the Georges Bank.**14 In this study, we characterized the annual mean OWE resource and calculated the resource during periods of peak USEC electric demand on the basis of an analysis of electric demand data. The wind resource was modeled at potential locations with the use of a mesoscale weather model for 5 years at high resolution and validated with the use of a total of 32 buoys and offshore towers. This validation of a publicly available weather model provides insight into what the relative errors of forecasting USEC OWE might be if wind farms are built. The most suitable locations for large-scale development of OWE are prescribed on the

## CP

**Micro-grid fails---unreliable and quality problems**

**BIESI 11** Brookings Institution Energy Security Initiative, The Hoover Institution Shultz-Stevenson Task Force on Energy Policy, "Assessing the Role of Distributed Power Systems in the U.S. Power Sector", October, media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/Distributed-Energy.pdf

Microgrid¶ Generation technologies are central to discussions around distributed energy systems. However, controls, infrastructure and demand side management are also an integral part of the broader discussion. The term ‘microgrid,’ is used to refer to a smaller version of a main or central electrical grid that much like its larger counterpart, consists of interconnected electrical loads and distributed energy generation resources that are typically controlled by a central control system. A microgrid may operate independently as its own self-contained entity, or may be interconnected with an adjoining central utility grid or neighboring microgrid. ¶ The concept of the microgrid is often associated with a power system in developing countries where the centrally managed grid is weak or inadequate. However, microgrid architectures are deployed in the United States including in various communities such as university campuses, hospitals, industry and military. Fully 74 percent of the global microgrid market dollars were spent in North America in 2010. 40¶ Although not a specific technology in itself, the notion of the microgrid is a system comprised of software, controls and hardware infrastructure including sensors, inverters, switches and converters. The microgrid and its primary components form the platform that is necessary for the integration of distributed generation resources with the local loads consuming the energy. The benefits of such architectures lie in the fact that they can be locally operated and controlled independent of a centrally managed utility. Such architecture enables distributed power systems, whether they operate on a stand-alone basis, or as an integrated component of a larger central grid.¶ 1.4 Functional **Risks of DPS Technology** Despite the policy support and cost declines in technology, **DPS applications are constrained by several fundamental technical and functional factors**. These factors give rise to risks associated with power quality, “dipatchability” and **reliability**. Some of the most important technical risks of widespread DPS deployment and integration are listed below. ¶ Power Quality¶ Some DPS technologies rely on power electronic devices, such as AC-to-DC or DC-to-AC converters. If such devices are not correctly set up, the integration of DPS power can result in a harmonic distortion and in operational difficulties to loads connected to the same distribution systems. 41¶ Reactive Power Coordination¶ With the proper system configuration and network interface, DPS can bring relief to the power system by providing close proximity power support at the distribution level. However, some **renewable generation sources such as wind can worsen the reactive coordination problem**. Wind generators have asynchronous induction generators designed for variable speed characteristics and, therefore, must rely on the network to which they are connected for reactive power support.42¶ **Reliability** and Reserve Margin¶ Intermittent power generation such as solar and wind is non-dispatchable. It is thus necessary to maintain sufficient generation reserve margins in order to provide reliable power generation. If there is a high level of distributed generation deployment, reserve margin maintenance can be a problem.

**Links to politics**

**Sater** **11** Daniel, Research Fellow at Global Green USA's Security and Sustainability Office, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions”, Global Green, globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf

Widespread development of microgrids will require large capital expenditures by the DOD and Congress. In the current climate of budget cuts, especially with regard to the DOD, any new spending is **likely to attract heavy scrutiny**. One of the benefits of allowing present trends to continue is that it does not require any new action by the DOD or Congress.¶ Microgrids remain a relatively new development and some **base commanders** might **resist their implementation**. Despite their advantages in cybersecurity over the large-scale smart grid, the DOD must make advances in cybersecurity to ensure that microgrids do not make the energy supply for military installations less secure instead of more so.

**U.S. Sea Power is key to deter Chinese hegemony and war in the south china sea**

**Cropsey, 12**

Dr. Seth Cropsey Hudson Institute “The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security” <http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf>, accessed 12/20/12,WYO/JF

A nation burdened with massive debt whose ability to shape world events has been limited in tandem with its capacity to invest in research and technology will have more and more trouble finding markets. **China’s potential hegemony would not only force its neighbors’ to reconsider whether the U.S. is a reliable ally. It would also become an increasingly powerful magnet for trade** in the region—**at the expense of U.S. commerce. Unlike the U.S. whose seapower has protected global sea lanes that other states have used to their benefit China** has a different set of values. It views with suspicion a liberal trading system notwithstanding the benefits received from it. **China’s friends include Iran and North Korea. Beijing is a poor candidate to support the international order that has been the keel of U.S. foreign and security policy** for a century. **Waning U.S. seapower is an invitation that China will regard as a complement to its rising military and navy in particular. It foreshadows a coercive resolution of territorial disputes in the South China Sea**, the likelihood of an increased regional arms race, and the troubling international perception that the U.S. is—or has—abandoned its role as a great power. American seapower is the strategic keel of our foreign and security policy. **Reducing it would be an exercise of history-making shortsightedness. Restoring it would be an act of statesmanship from which Americans and all who cherish political liberty would benefit for the remainder of this century. Thank you.**

**CONFLICT IN THE SCS ESCALATES TO FULL-SCALE NUCLEAR WAR**

STRAITS TIMES 1995

[staff, “Choose Your Own Style of Democracy”, May 21, p. ln// wyo-tjc]

In his speech, Dr Mahathir also painted three scenarios for Asia.

**In the first -the worst possible scenario -Asian countries would go to war against each other, he said. It might start with clashes** between Asian countries **over the Spratly Islands** because of China's insistence that the South China Sea belonged to it along with all the islands, reefs and seabed minerals. **In this scenario, the United States would offer to help** and would be welcomed by Asean, he said. The Pacific Fleet begins to patrol the South China Sea. **Clashes occur between the Chinese navy and the US Navy. China declares war on the US and a full-scale war breaks out with both sides resorting to nuclear weapons.**

Conditionality bad:

Kills 2ac: 2as is key to debate

**Sea Power is key to keep Indo-Pak cooperation intact**

**Cropsey, 12**

Dr. Seth Cropsey Hudson Institute “The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security” <http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf>, accessed 12/20/12,WYO/JF

Finally **there are the consequences if U.S. seapower continues to decrease and proves unable to meet even the reduced goals it has set for itself. History is a good guide**. Nations in the middle like to side with the winner. **During our Civil War British political leadership considered recognizing the Confederacy** **but was** eventually **dissuaded by Union** military success. In World War II Sweden declared neutrality but grew increasingly amenable to Allied requests as Germany’s military position worsened. **Romania initially sided with Germany in the same war but changed sides following U.S. attacks on their oil fields** and a coup that deposed the pro German dictator, Antonescu. Bulgarians followed a similar path from siding with the Nazis to switching their allegiance to the Allies in 1944. Saudi Prince Bandar, acknowledging China’s increasing international prominence and power visited Beijing last year and met with President Hu. **American weakness at sea, especially in the Indo-Pacific will change the current military, diplomatic, and commercial character of the region.** **Whether the U.S. fleet shrinks because of too little funding or because unreformed procurement practices have raised the price of ships or because ships have been called home to save on operational expense, the result is the same. While we were once present in strength, we would be no more**.

**Indo-Pak war causes extinction**

**Washington Times 1**

July 8, LN.

**The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir**, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. **It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary**. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries. Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

## Debt

**No possibility at compromise, gop is ok with cuts, and democrats won’t let other programs take the hit**

**Stacy Kaper, 1/24**

“Once Unthinkable, Severe Spending Cuts Now Seem Plausible” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/once-unthinkable-severe-spending-cuts-now-seem-plausible-20130123>, accessed 1/24/.13,WYO/JF

And **Democrats argue that they never wanted the sequester** [**to begin**](http://www.nationaljournal.com/once-unthinkable-severe-spending-cuts-now-seem-plausible-20130123) **with**, but were forced to pass it in 2011 as part of the package to raise the debt limit. The cuts are split in half between military and discretionary domestic spending. The all-cuts, no-revenue package is the best deal Democrats expect to get, and they aren't reopening negotiations unless they include new revenue. "**Sequester is kind of a one-sided, cuts-only approach. Every time we talk about** ... balanced budgets, reducing deficits, **there have to be revenues and cuts in equal proportion or some in a reasonable proportion**," said Democratic Sen. Mary Landrieu of Louisiana. "You just can’t get from where we are to where we need to go with cuts only.” Meanwhile, **Republicans showed no signs of moving off their call to replace the sequester cuts with entitlement reforms.** Republican Sen. Mike Crapo of Idaho said he thinks there's a growing sense among his colleagues that the mandatory spending cuts will go into effect. Sen. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., put it this way: "**The only thing worse than the sequester is no sequester. We have got to hit those budget targets.... If we can do it another way, fine, but if not, we’ve got to have that hammer.” Indeed, a buzzword gaining traction among Republicans is "flexibility," as in departments will need it to minimize fallout from the budget ax.**

**Extension just passed- GOP caved**

**Reuters, 1/23**

“Debt limit extension bill passes House” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/23/us-usa-fiscal-idUSBRE90M11F20130123>, accessed 01/24/13

(Reuters) - **The House of Representatives on Wednesday passed a Republican plan to allow the federal government to keep** [**borrowing money**](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/23/us-usa-fiscal-idUSBRE90M11F20130123) **through mid-May, clearing it for fast enactment** after the top Senate Democrat and White House endorsed it. **The vote in the Republican-controlled House was 285-144**, with no votes coming from 33 Republicans and 111 Democrats. The measure avoids for the time being a repeat of the 2011 debt ceiling standoff that rattled markets and resulted in a downgrade of the government's triple-A [credit rating](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/23/us-usa-fiscal-idUSBRE90M11F20130123). The Treasury is expected to exhaust remaining capacity under the $16.4 trillion debt limit between mid-February and early March. **The House vote marked a sharp departure from Republican vows to use the debt ceiling issue as a way to extract spending cuts from President Barack Obama.**

**Senate is going to pass immediately**

**AP, 1/23**

“US House passes debt limit extension, Senate approval imminent” <http://www.clarionledger.com/viewart/20130123/NEWS03/130123015/US-House-passes-debt-limit-extension-Senate-approval-imminent->, accessed 1/23/13,WYO/JF

**The House overwhelmingly passed a bill** Wednesday **to permit the government to borrow enough money to avoid a first avoid default for at least four months**, defusing a crisis looming next month and setting the stage for a springtime debate over taxes, spending and the deficit. **The House passed the measure on a bipartisan 285-144 vote as majority Republicans back away from their previous demand that any increase in the government's borrowing cap be paired with an equivalent level of spending cuts.** **Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said the chamber would immediately move to advance the legislation to the White House, which has announced Obama would sign it.** The measure would suspend the $16.4 trillion cap on federal borrowing and reset it on May 19 to reflect the additional borrowing required between the date the bill becomes law and then. The amount of borrowing required depends on the tax receipts received during filing season, but over a comparable period last year the government ran deficits in the range of $150 billion. The measure also contains a provision that slaps at the Senate, which hasn't debated a budget since 2009, by withholding the pay for either House or Senate members if the chamber in which they serve fails to pass a budget plan. Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., announced Wednesday that the chamber would indeed debate a budget this year but maintained the GOP's "no budget, no pay" move had nothing to do with the decision.

**PC irrelevant, Republicans won’t let Boehner compromise on fiscal deals**

**Hadar, 1/22**

[Leon, “Much tougher job for Obama in second term; Mid-term Congressional elections in 18 months among his major hurdles,” The Business Times Singapore, January 22, 2013, LexisNexis, //uwyo-baj]

 Mr **Obama may have acquired more political capital in the aftermath of his 2012 presidential win and may be in a better position to negotiate a new fiscal deal with the Congressional Republicans. But Republican lawmakers, including many who subscribe to the anti-government agenda of the Tea Party, continue to rule over the House and are not likely to give the green light to** Speaker **Boehner to reach a long-term and comprehensive fiscal deal with the White House.**

**Massive support for wind**

**Smart Grid News, 12**

[“Heavyweight support grows for wind production tax credit” http://www.smartgridnews.com/artman/publish/Technologies\_DG\_Renewables/Heavyweight-support-grows-for-wind-production-tax-credit-5224.html#.UJMMEcW\_GSp, accessed 11-1-12, TAP]

But more **supporters are lining up to fight for an extension to the wind energy production tax credit**, and the latest group to sign on is **an impressive list of¶ heavyweights: state treasurers, comptrollers, investment advisors, asset managers and others managing a total of more than $800 billion in assets are calling for an immediate extension of the wind tax credit.** Many of them are members of the Investor Network on Climate Risk, a project of Ceres, a sustainability leadership advocacy organization.¶ .¶ In a letter addressed to congressional leaders Wednesday, the signers said "**The wind power industry has been a bright spot for employment and has, despite the recession, created one of America's fastest-growing manufacturing sectors.** However, even the threat of the PTC's expiration is already causing thousands of layoffs." The letter mentions Vestas and Gamesa as examples of companies who have or will lay off employees, and many more wind companies have announced layoffs as a result of the uncertainty over the tax credit.

**No spillover –compartmentalized**

**Edwards 00** [Distinguished Professor of Political Science, director of the Center for Presidential Studies, Texas A&M University (George C. III, March. “Building Coalitions.” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 30, Iss. 1.)]

Besides not considering the full range of available views, members of Congress are not generally in a position to make trade-offs between policies. Because of its decentralization, Congress usually considers policies serially, that is, without reference to other policies. Without an integrating mechanism, members have few means by which to set and enforce priorities and to emphasize the policies with which the president is most concerned. This latter point is especially true when the opposition party controls Congress.

**Secretary of Interior would take the blame**

**EVAN LEHMANN, 09**

“Can Offshore Winds Spin a Market for U.s.-Made Turbines?” <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/11/09/09climatewire-can-offshore-winds-spin-a-market-for-us-made-71345.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed 01/19/13,WYO/JF

Coastal states in the East are hoping to change that. About **10 states**, from Maine to Maryland, **have agreed to join forces to find ways to share expensive elements of offshore wind**, **like ports used for installation and maintenance**, scientific studies on the impacts of marine life, and perhaps a shared underwater transmission system that would link a chain of wind farms to big cities. **They're also having discussions with the U.S. Interior Department, which approves seabed leases, about shortening the long line of regulatory hurdles that developers need to clear before they can begin construction. They believe Interior Secretary Ken Salazar might help them convince all the federal agencies involved in offshore to work in cooperation to reduce overlapping requirements for environmental impact statements and other requirements.**

**That shields politics**

**Dobkin 8**—past Chairperson of the Immigration Law Section of the Oakland County (Michigan) Bar Association and has lectured and presented seminars on immigration in the U.S., Canada and the U.K. (Donald, THE RISE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE: APRESCRIPTION FOR LAWLESSNESS, [www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf](http://www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf))

Because **an agency’s actions often receive far less** media **attention than the actions of the President**, the general public is often unaware of political decisions being made at the agency level. This lack of accountability in general **makes it easier to pursue a political agenda at the agency level.** 25 President George W. Bush has also used the inattention to agency action to pursue some of the more **unpopular aspects of his political agenda** **to avoid direct accountability.** For example, rather than openly challenging environmental protections, President Bush has used agencies to help him pursue his anti-environmental agenda to ensure the “systematic dismantling of various environmental regulations.” 26 ¶ The White House’s tightening of control via executive orders had its origins in the alteration of the context of presidential leadership during the 1960’s and 1970’s: [table omitted]¶ In an era of growing budget deficits, divided government, a more open political process, and a general loss of public faith in “big government,” presidents beginning with Richard Nixon no longer saw unalloyed benefits in relying on “neutral” staff agencies. Instead, they sought greater political responsiveness. This meant relying more heavily on aides within the White House Office, and appointing political loyalists to exercise topdown control of the other Executive Office of the President (EOP) agencies. 27 ¶ The attached Table 1 illustrates the magnitude of the EOP, which by 2004 had reached 1,731 staffers ranging from everything to Homeland Security Staff, OMB, CEA, and other agencies:¶ During this same time period, “presidents have increased the number of political appointees at the upper levels of the non-White House EOP agencies, and brought the agencies more tightly under White House staff control.” 29 The appointment process has allowed presidents to use agencies as a means for major—and often unpopular—policy changes. For instance, President Reagan made “a series of fox-in-the-chicken-coop appointments to undermine public interest regulation,” notably of his infamous anti-environment interior secretary, James Watt. 30 Many commentators have noted that the current Bush Administration has made similar appointments. 31 These types of appointments make it difficult for agencies to exhibit expertise and to execute the law in an impartial manner. As a result, we are left with “a more thoroughly politicized, White House-dominated EOP, but one that is short on institutional memory, administrative expertise, and organizational continuity.” 32 ¶ **The rise in the presidentially-led Administrative States merely reflects the growing use—and creation—of unilateral powers by the President:¶** To pursue a unilateral strategy, of course, presidents must be able to justify their actions on some blend of statutory, treaty or constitutional powers; and when they cannot, their only recourse is legislation. But given the ambiguity of Article II powers and the massive corpus of law that presidents can draw upon . . . the appeal of unilateral powers is readily apparent. 33 ¶ Although some would argue that a unilateral executive branch is justified based on the majoritarian “mandate” produced by a presidential election, it is difficult to take this notion very seriously when “a President can be elected without obtaining a majority of the popular vote—as in the cases of President Clinton in 1992 and 1996 and President George W. Bush in 2000.” 34 Indeed, in the 2000 election, the winning candidate did not even garner a plurality of the popular vote. 35 Furthermore, presidential elections often center on issues like national security, which are far removed from the everyday decisions of administrative agencies. 36 ¶ The situation is only likely to worsen. In the early days of President George W. Bush’s administration, Professor Kagan predicted that President Bush would continue Clinton’s “expansion of presidential administration.” 37 Professor Sargentich has noted that this prediction **has** **undoubtedly “come to pass,”** **as exemplified by recent executive branch acts such as the OMB’s farreaching and controversial Peer Review Bulletin, which guides agency decisions**. 38

**Specifically, DOI shields Obama**

**Foy 9** Paul, Huffington Post, "Ken Salazar Blamed By Oil And Gas Companies For Scant Interest In New Drilling Projects", 11/19, www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/11/19/ken-salazar-blamed-by-oil\_n\_364027.html

Ken Salazar **Blamed** By Oil And Gas Companies For Scant Interest In New Drilling Projects¶ SALT LAKE CITY — Drillers say it's getting so hard to obtain an oil-and-gas lease in the Rocky Mountains under the new administration of President Barack Obama that many aren't bothering to show up for auctions.¶ The criticism came after the government held an auction of public lands in Utah that was remarkable for how few parcels were offered or sold. Only five drilling leases sold Tuesday.¶ The Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States says the new administration is scaring away drillers, who say it's holding up leases after taking their auction money.¶ "Why would any company want to go through the time and expense of participating in lease sales when there's zero certainty that the leases will be issued and that there will be any return on their investment?" asked Kathleen Sgamma, the association's government-affairs director, in an interview.¶ In part, **that's a reaction to a series of decisions by the Department of the Interior** that suspended the award of 60 of 77 leases sold at a contested December 2008 auction. Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar faulted the outgoing Bush administration for rushing to award leases on the doorstep of many of Utah's national parks.¶ The Bureau of Land Management has turned exceedingly cautious about awarding leases in Utah, where many of the battles over vast swaths of public land have been playing out.

#### Winners win—unlocks the agenda

Green 10

 (David, professor of political science at Hofstra University, June 11, “The Do-Nothing 44th President”,  <http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html>, accessed 10-31-2011,WYO/JF

**Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement.** In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. **This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush**. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. **By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.**

#### Hagel nomination killed pc

Jim Rutenberg, 1/27

“Conservative group runs ads against Chuck Hagel” <http://bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2013/01/27/new-conservative-group-financed-anonymously-run-ads-against-confirmation-hagel-for-defense/WVcccenmblzojGWWu3hZBO/story.html>, accessed 1/27/13,WYO/JF

A new conservative group calling itself Americans for a Strong Defense and [financed](http://bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2013/01/27/new-conservative-group-financed-anonymously-run-ads-against-confirmation-hagel-for-defense/WVcccenmblzojGWWu3hZBO/story.html) by anonymous donors is running advertisements urging Democratic senators in five states to vote against Chuck Hagel, President Obama’s nominee to be secretary of defense, saying he would make the United States ‘‘a weaker country.’’ Another freshly minted and anonymously backed organization, Use Your Mandate, which presents itself as a liberal gay rights group but purchases its television time through a prominent Republican firm, is attacking Hagel as ‘‘anti-gay,’’ “anti-woman,’’ and ‘‘anti-Israel’’ in ads and mailings. Those groups are joining at least five others that are organizing to stop Hagel’s confirmation, a goal even they acknowledge appears to be increasingly challenging. But the effort comes with a built-in consolation [prize](http://bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2013/01/27/new-conservative-group-financed-anonymously-run-ads-against-confirmation-hagel-for-defense/WVcccenmblzojGWWu3hZBO/story.html) should it fail: depleting some of Obama’s political capital as he embarks on a new term with fresh momentum. The media campaign to scuttle Hagel’s appointment, unmatched in the annals of modern presidential Cabinet appointments, reflects the continuing effects of the Supreme Court’s 2010 Citizens United decision, which loosened campaign finance restrictions and was a major reason for the record spending by outside groups in the 2012 election.

**Impacts are inevitable**

**Politico 12/30**

“Graham: Panetta says deal won't avert sequestration” <http://www.politico.com/blogs/politico-live/2012/12/graham-panetta-says-deal-wont-include-sequestration-152982.html>, accessed 1/2/13,WYO/JF

**Sen.** Lindsey **Graham** (R-S.C.) **says Defense Secretary** Leon **Panetta has told him there "will be nothing" in the fiscal cliff deal to avoid sequestration**. "I was called by Leon Panetta last night...during dinner," Graham said on "Fox News Sunday", "and he said, **'Lindsey, I have been told there's not going to be anything in the bill to avoid sequestration going into effect**.'" Panetta says "**if we do this, it will be shooting the Defense Department in the head, and we'll have to send out 800,000 layoff notices at the beginning of the year**. He's worried to death that if we don't fix sequestration, we are going to destroy the finest military in the world at a time we need it the most and this bill doesn't cover defense cuts, on top of the ones we already have," Graham said. **Sequestration, which would kick in on Jan 2 if there is no deal to avert it, would cut nearly $500 billion in defense spending over the next decade.**

**No econ impact---deal will be reached and markets will rebound**

**O'Kane ½**

 Josh, "'Cliff' deal is no panacea for market", 2013, www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/investment-ideas/cliff-deal-is-no-panacea-for-market/article6875372/

**While the countdown is on to yet another show-stopping U.S. fiscal deadline,** Mr. Sollbach said, “**the U.S. isn’t going to default.” He expects another high-stakes drama to go down to the wire i**n February and March, **but says that “crisis fatigue” is setting in among investors. “Ultimately, people realize they’re going to solve this thing,”** Mr. Sollbach said.¶ **This means investors should see clearer buying opportunities as details shape up ahead** of the next bargaining deadlines.¶ Mr. **Vasic calls himself “moderately constructive” despite his warnings. “There will be plenty of counterpunching opportunities in markets**,” he said. **While volatility will creep back into markets as the next deadline approaches, he said, “inevitably, they will rise again**.”

**Economic collapse does not cause war—their historical arguments are wrong**

**Ferguson 6**

(Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

**Nor can economic crises explain** the **bloodshed**. What may be **the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to** the rise of **fascism and** the outbreak of **World War II. But** that simple story leaves too much out. **Nazi Germany started the war** in Europe **only after its economy** had **recovered. Not all** the **countries affected by the** Great **Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars** of aggression. In fact, **no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible** for the century as a whole. **Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.**

**This isn’t a repeat of the 30’s**

**Zakaria 9** (Faree, PhD in Political Science from Harvard, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, December 12, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>)

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks** (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). **Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran**. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. **But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.