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## T

#### Plan in a vacuum is topical

#### Second, counter-interpretation: a reduction is eliminating duplicative restrictions requiring environmental reviews

#### reduce is to bring down in extent or amount

American Heritage Dictionary 9

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reduce>.

To bring down, as in extent, amount, or degree; diminish.

#### B- The status quo has multiple sets of duplicative NEPA restrictions—one of many

Weber 7

[Lucas, no qualifications available, published on WindPower.net- the North American Offshore Wind Power Information Project, “Offshore Wind Energy Permitting”, May 10, p. online//wyo-tjc]

The Cape Wind Project provides the perfect illustration of this misuse of the NEPA environmental review process. This project has already undergone more than four years of rigorous environmental review, beginning with the Army Corps of Engineers in 2001. Nearly three years after submitting an application to the Corps, a Draft EIS was finally issued in 2004.130 Despite the fact that the Corps’ Draft EIS was 4,000 pages, the MMS did not find it to be comprehensive enough and, as the newly appointed lead agency, demanded another Draft EIS be completed under its supervision.131 The Final EIS is not expected to be issued until Fall of 2007 and the Record of Decision is not expected until Winter of 2007.132 In all, the Cape Wind Project will have undergone more than six years of environmental review.

This unreasonable delay runs contrary to the intended use of the NEPA environmental review process. According to the regulations, an EIS “shall normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages.”133 Accordingly, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), the agency charged with overseeing NEPA’s implementation, has “advised that under the new NEPA regulations even large complex energy projects would require only about 12 months for the completion of the entire EIS process.”134 The Cape Wind Project’s 4,000-page Draft EIS and its six years of environmental review would seem to be evidence that the process has gotten out of control.

Thus, the NEPA process has been converted into a tool for blocking the development of offshore wind energy. The MMS needs to rein in this environmental review process and honor the intention of NEPA. Based on the decision-making process that NEPA mandates, the choice of whether to permit the proposed projects should be easy for the agency to make.135

#### Third, we meet- we reduce the NEPA restriction on wind production

Russell 9

[Irma S., Dean and Professor, University of Montana School of Law, Streamlining NEPA to Combat Global Climate Change: Heresy or Necessity?, Lewis and Clark Law School’s Environmental Law Online, p. <http://www.elawreview.org/elaw/394/streamlining_nepa_to_combat_gl.html> //wyo-tjc]

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)[4] requires federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of major projects they undertake. It added to each agency's mission the additional requirement of considering the effects on the environment of federal projects.[5] To achieve its goal, NEPA mandates that "all agencies of the Federal Government . . . utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment."[6] NEPA's policy seeks to foster conditions "under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans."[7] NEPA has made significant changes in the way federal agencies go about achieving their missions.[8] Fulfilling the procedural requirements of NEPA takes time and money.[9]

NEPA results in delays in virtually all major energy projects. It applies to projects requiring federal permits because permitting requirements make energy projects federal agency actions under NEPA.[10] Thus, NEPA applies to traditional energy projects such as coal-fired utilities and, additionally, to energy projects aimed at supplying energy without the GHGs associated with combustion, such as concentrated solar installations, wind farms, and wave technology. The global climate crisis raises the question of whether the NEPA process is too slow. Should Congress streamline NEPA to bring clean power online faster? The argument for streamlining NEPA is that the intensity of global climate change makes rapid transition to clean energy a necessity. This argument suggests that a categorical approach to siting and licensing of clean energy resources may be a necessary step in the move toward greening the grid. Any reduction or shortening of the NEPA process is likely to be regarded as heresy by some. The benefits of shortening the timeframe or process for input in any major federal project must be scrutinized.

#### Fourth, prefer our interpretation:

#### Predictability- the NEPA process is the single largest restriction on production- it is common to every energy type and every agency.

#### Education- consolidating agency review processes exposes us to unique education that hasn’t been covered on other energy topics.

#### Fifth, their interpretation is bad: it’s broad and overlimiting—excludes important educational ground

#### Sixth, counter-interpretation: reduce is to make less complex

WordNet 8

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/reduce>.

make less complex; "reduce a problem to a single question"

#### Seventh, we meet- plan creates a one-stop agency for OSW permitting.

#### Eighth, 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

#### Ninth, 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.

## Grid

#### This shouldn’t be a voter we should be allowed to apologize for our rhetoric. Without the opportunity for apology, the lines are set to never break down abelism because of anger. We will reread the tag here: Grid failures inevitable- heat, storms, winds, hacking, solar flares and mistakes all make an economically threatening blackout inevitable

#### Ableism is inevitable- entrenched in history.

Wolbring, 08

[Wolbring, G. (2008). The politics of ableism. Development, 51(2), 252-258. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/dev.2008.17//uwyokb]

Ableism and preference of certain abilities has been rampant throughout history. Ableism shaped and continues to shape areas such as human security (Wolbring, 2006c), social cohesion (Wolbring, 2007f), social policies, relationships among social groups, individuals and countries, humans and non-humans, and humans and their environment (Wolbring, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Ableism is one of the most societally entrenched and accepted isms.

#### Turn- The politics of the K reify the abled/disabled dichotomy while unwittingly creating a purism test for membership in the disabled community allowing for the ghettoization of unacceptable forms of disability and excluding participation from non-disabled academics and citizens

Humphrey, 2k

(Jill C. Faculty of applied social science @ the Open University, Researching disability politics, or, some problems with the social model in practice, Disability & Society 15.1)

ABSTRACT This article arises from a research project involving the disabled members’ group in UNISON, and problematises the social model which explicitly undergirds the discourses and practices of this group. In abstract terms, **there are dangers that the social model can be interpreted in a way which privileges some impaired identities over others, sanctions a separatist ghetto which cannot reach out to other groups of disabled and disadvantaged people, and weaves a tangled web around researchers who adhere to the emancipatory paradigm.** In concrete terms, **these dangers are explored with reference to the stories of impaired people who believe that they are excluded from the disabled members’ group**, the **predicaments of ex-disabled and differently-disabled people in relation to the movement, and the culture of suspicion surrounding academics, particularly the `non-disabled’ researcher as would-be ally**. It is argued that, whilst such identities and issues might appear to be `marginal’ ones in the sense of occurring at the boundary of disabled communities, disability politics and disability studies, they should not be `marginalised’ by disabled activists and academics, and indeed that they pose challenges to our collective identities, social movements, theoretical models and research paradigms which need to be addressed. Introduction The social model arose as a reaction against the medical model of disability, which reduced disability to impairment so that disability was located within the body or mind of the individual, whilst the power to de® ne, control and treat disabled people was located within the medical and paramedical professions (Oliver, 1996). Under the bio-medical reÂ gime, material deprivation and political disenfranchisement continued unabated, whilst institutional discrimination and social stigmatisation were exacerbated by segregation (Barnes 1991). In this context, the social model harbours a number of virtues in rede® ning disability in terms of a disabling environment, repositioning disabled people as citizens with rights, and reconfiguring the responsibilities for creating, sustaining and overcoming disablism. Indeed, when the social model is confronted with the resurrection of the medical model in its bio-medical, psychological, psychiatric and sociological guises, then it needs to be vigorously defended (Shakespeare & Watson, 1997). However, this does not mean that the social model is flawless, in either its design or its implementation. More precisely, if it is interpreted in a way which undermines the very communities, politics and studies it was supposed to enhance, it is incumbent upon us to inquire `What’ s going on? What’ s going wrong?’ A fruitful starting point and indeed one which already contains an answer to the above questions, is to recognise that there are two main versions of the social model, which are necessarily interrelated, but which will lead into opposing directions if we are not careful. In academic texts, the social model begins with an appreciation of the individual and collective experiences of disabled people (e.g. Swain et al., 1993). It goes on to elaborate the nature of a disabling society in terms of the physical environment, the political economy, the welfare state and sedimented stereotypes (e.g. Barnes et al., 1999). Finally, it endorses a critical or emancipatory paradigm of research (e.g. Barnes & Mercer 1997a) . This analysis lends itself to a recognition of the array of diverse experiences of disabling barriers; a realistic appraisal of the need for broader political coalitions to combat entrenched structural inequalitie s and cultural oppressions; and an openness about the potential for non-disabled people to contribute to critical theory and research. **In activist discourses, the emphasis is upon the fact that it is non-disabled people who have engineered the physical environment, dominated the political economy, managed welfare services, controlled research agendas, recycled pejorative labels and images, and translated these into eugenics policies**. **This analysis lends itself to a dichotomy between non-disabled and disabled people which becomes coterminous with the dichotomy between oppressors and oppressed; § Marked 12:03 § and this tightens the boundaries around the disabled identity, the disabled people’ s movement and disability research**. **Whilst this hermeneutic closure is designed to ward off incursions and, therefore, oppressions from non-disabled people, it may also have some unfortunate consequences.** I would like to illustrate these consequences by drawing upon a research project involving the four self-organised groups (SOGs) for women, black people, disabled members, and lesbian and gay members in UNISON (see Humphrey, 1998, 1999). Material drawn directly from conversations and observations in the disabled members’ group is supplemented by interview transcripts with members of the lesbian and gay group, my own personal experiences of and re¯ ections upon disability and discrimination, and recent developments in various social movements and critical research texts. The rest of the article depicts three problematic consequences of the social model in practice and redirects them back to the social model as critical questions which need to be addressed by its proponents. First, **there are questions of disability identity where a kind of `purism’ has been cultivated from the inside of the disability community. Here,** it can be demonstrated that **some people with certain types of impairments have not been welcomed into the disabled members’ group** in UNISON, **which means that the disability community is not yet inclusive, and that its membership has been skewed in a particular direction.** Second, **there are questions of disability politics where a kind of `separatism’ has been instituted.** Whilst the UNISON constitution allows for separatism to be supplemented by both coalitions and transformations, these have been slow to materialise in practice, and the dearth of such checks and balances in the wider disabled peoples’ movement **implies that the danger of developing a specific kind of disability ghetto is more acute**. Third, there are questions of disability research where a kind of `provisionalism’ is suspended over the role of researchers. The most obvious dilemmas arise for the non-disabled researcher as would-be ally, but it is becoming clear that disabled academics can also be placed in a dilemmatic position, and it is doubtful whether any researcher can practise their craft to their own standards of excellence when operating under the provisos placed upon them by political campaigners.

#### Rhetoric isn’t important – the k overfocuses on disability – the inevitability of linguistic slip ups makes this more confusing

Rose '04

Damon Rose "Don't call me handicapped!"Editor of BBC disability website Ouch! Monday, 4 October, 2004 http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\_news/magazine/3708576.stm

**Due to popular rubbishing of what is referred to as "political correctness', many disabled commentators now publicly say they don't care how people refer to them**. But privately they fume if someone calls them "handicapped" or "brave". Last year Ouch! ran a poll to try and determine what really are the most vilified words and expressions around disability. Unsurprisingly "retard" came top as the most offensive followed by "spastic".When breaking down the figures though, it was interesting to see that disabled people had voted "special" as fifth most offensive. "Special service", "special school" and "special needs" are phrases used in an attempt to be positive about disability. But in the same way women don't like being elevated to "lady", disabled people find it patronising to be lifted to the status of special. It differentiates them from normal, but in a saccharine manner. **Disabled people are different, but not better or more important. Besides, putting them on a pedestal does not appear to be shifting attitudes or solving the appalling disability unemployment situation. Clearly, language in this field is a hotch-potch of confusion.**

## Immigration

#### Offshore wind is gaining bipartisan momentum

NAW 28 Feb

[Del Franco, Mark: writer for North American Windpower. "Sen. Carper Renews Push For Offshore Wind Energy, Investment Tax Credit."*North American Windpower*. North American Windpower, 28 Feb 2013. Web. 12 Mar 2013. <http://www.nawindpower.com/e107\_plugins/content/content.php?content.11186 //Wyo-BF]

Sens. Tom Carper, D-Del., and Susan Collins, R-Maine, have reintroduced the Incentivizing Offshore Wind Power Act, which would provide financial incentives for investments in offshore wind energy. Co-sponsors of the bill include Sens. Chris Coons, D-Del.; Frank Lautenberg, D-N.J.; Sheldon Whitehouse, D-R.I; Sherrod Brown, D-Ohio; Jack Reed, D-R.I.; Angus King, R-Maine; Kirsten Gillibrand, D-N.Y.; Robert Menendez, D-N.J.; William Cowan, D-Mass.; and Ben Cardin, D-Md. The bill is also co-sponsored by Reps. Bill Pascrell, D-N.J., and Frank LoBiondo, R-N.J., in the House. The legislation provides a 30% investment tax credit (ITC) for the first 3 GW of U.S. offshore wind projects. Once awarded a tax credit, companies have five years to install the offshore wind facility. Companies cannot receive other tax credits in addition to the offshore wind ITC. In an interview with NAW, Carper said the legislation mirrors a bill he co-introduced with Sen. Olympia Snowe, R-Maine, in 2011 that provides "certainty and predictability" for offshore wind developers. Carper points out that offshore wind differs from onshore wind because of its infancy, long investment time and higher initial costs. "Investors need a quicker return on such a long-term investment, which is why the ITC is advantageous for offshore wind projects and the production tax credit is not," he notes. The proposed bill aims to provide the offshore wind industry with enhanced stability by amending Section 48 § Marked 12:07 § of the tax code to extend ITCs for the first 3 GW of offshore wind facilities placed in service. Tax-reform debate The timing of the legislation is noteworthy, given the debate over tax reform expected to occur this summer. In fact, some committees - such as the House Ways and Means Committee - are already looking at tax reform, Carper says, adding that the Senate is currently focused on Medicare reform. "[The two chambers] have somewhat different priorities," Carper says. Nevertheless, Carper expects that a healthy debate on all tax matters - including those pertaining to offshore wind - will come soon. However, Carper admits that the upcoming discussion on tax reform "doesn't auger well" for some tax incentives, such as those included in the offshore wind bill. "That's going to cost more than what's in the current code," he admits. Among other matters, Carper anticipates a healthy debate over the Bowles-Simpson budget plan, a 10-year deficit-reduction plan proposed by Erskine Bowles, a former White House chief of staff under President Bill Clinton, and Alan Simpson, a retired Republican senator. The goal of the plan is to reach a compromise on spending cuts and tax hikes. Nonetheless, Carper is taking a pragmatic approach. "Whether it's 3,000 MW or 2,000 or 2,500 - that's a dialable number,” he says. “The important thing is to preserve the concept and not let it die. I want to protect as much of it as I can." "I'm like a dog with a bone," he adds. "When I know something is right, it's right. And I will fight for it."

#### Wind power is popular in congress

Wald 13

[Wald, Matthew: energy & energy technology journalist for the New York Times. "The Wind Industry Gets to Draw Another Breath." *New York Times: Environment*. New York Times, 3 Jan 2013. Web. 8 Jan 2013. <http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/03/the-wind-industry-gets-to-draw-another-breath/>. //Wyo-BF]

In the last-minute tax maneuvering in Congress this week, wind power came out well. Wind not only got an extension of its tax credit in the federal budget compromise, but the rules were also restructured: while the extension runs for only one year, the nature of the deadline has changed. Projects do not need to be finished and feeding electricity to the grid by next New Year’s Eve; construction only needs to be started. That change could prove critical. The renewal comes so late – developers had lobbied all last year to avert a Dec. 31 expiration – that most wind developers had simply stopped work on projects that could not be finished by the end of 2012. The process of getting a wind farm going, including studying the wind resource, negotiating a land lease or purchase, obtaining environmental and construction permits, signing a contract to sell the electricity to a utility, getting financing, ordering the equipment and then installing it, can easily take more than two years. A Senate aide who was involved in the run-up to the yearlong extension by Congress said that approval on New Year’s Day could have been “like inviting somebody who is halfway around the world to lunch in an hour.’’ And hard deadlines on completions tend to create industrial rush hours. For example, the number of trucks fitted out to carry giant blades is limited, and developers were worried about lacking access to them in critical weeks in the middle of last year. Right now, those trucks are idle with the decline in activity. Meeting the deadline is crucial, because the aid is substantial. Wind developers can choose between a production tax credit, currently 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour for the first 10 years of production, or an investment tax credit, which is a prompt payment of 30 percent of the construction cost. Developers have projects in various early stages, and some of those will presumably now start up. On Wednesday, one opponent of wind power, John Droz Jr., said that when the expiration was pending last year, a number of projects were put on hold and “it will take them quite a while for them to get back up to speed, and some may not ever.’’ Still, state quotas for renewable energy will virtually guarantee some construction.

#### Won’t pass now- LGBT obligation

The Hill 3/19

GOP balks at LGBT protections in immigration reform  
<http://thehill.com/homenews/house/289019-gop-balks-at-lgbt-protections-in-immigration-reform#ixzz2O75yQ59Q> , accessed 3/20/13,WYO/JF

Republicans are refusing to cede ground in their opposition to benefits for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) immigrants as part of efforts to get comprehensive reforms passed this year, said Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.).¶ Behind President Obama, Democrats and human rights advocates have lobbied for LGBT couples to have the same rights as other couples under the nation's immigration laws, for the sake of keeping families united.¶ But Gutierrez, while he's pushing for those benefits to be included in the package, conceded Tuesday that he hasn't convinced anyone across the aisle to get on board.

#### PC no- expended all his re-election capital and low approval ratings

Geraghty 3/12

(Jim, National Review, “McClatchy Poll: Obama’s Post-Election Political Capital ‘Largely Gone’,” March 12, 2013, http://www.nationalreview.com/campaign-spot/342737/mcclatchy-poll-obamas-post-election-political-capital-largely-gone//wyo-mm)

If President Barack Obama had piled up political capital with his impressive re-election, it’s largely gone. His approval rating has dropped to the lowest level in more than a year, with more voters now turning thumbs down on his performance than thumbs up, according to a new McClatchy-Marist poll. The measure of how much people like him also has dropped. He’s still vastly more popular than Congress, particularly congressional Republicans. But in the biggest political clash of the year — over the federal budget and how to curb deficits — voters split 44 percent to 42 percent between preferring Congress or Obama.

#### The agenda is flooded now the plan does not trade off

Fox News, 3/4

Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities Read more: <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/#ixzz2O7ZO7uKQ>, accessed 3/20/13,WYO/JF

The automatic spending cuts that kicked in over the weekend effectively added another administrative headache for a White House and Congress that have struggled with even the most perfunctory tasks. ¶ At a certain point, something's got to give. ¶ The day-in, day-out debate and speechifying and crisis management are getting to a point where they could overshadow the other planks of President Obama's second-term agenda -- for now, anyway. ¶ "He has a very ambitious agenda with both the sequester and his separate policy priorities§ Marked 12:07 § , and there is a bandwidth issue at the end of the day," said John Ullyot, a longtime senior Senate aide and Republican strategist. ¶ For starters, agencies must now figure out how to trim their fiscal waistlines, while the president tries anew to negotiate a more "balanced" deal out of Congress -- all while trying to avert a government shutdown and secure another debt-ceiling increase. ¶ Still, all the items from the president's campaign and State of the Union address supposedly remain on the docket: immigration reform, gun control, policies to curb climate change, an increase in the minimum wage and expanded access to preschool.

## 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, reasons to prefer:

A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac

B. It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action

C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the K, 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

#### Perm: do the plan and rethink our relationship with the world.

#### Scenario planning is good. In a catastrophe-ridden world it’s vital to make predictions about the future.

Kurasawa, 2004

[Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology at York University, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention

and the Work of Foresight.” 2004, Constellations, Vol. 11, No. 4]

Independently of this room for maneuver and the chances of success. Humanitarian, environmental, and techno-scientific activists have convincingly shown that we cannot afford not to engage in preventive labor. contractualist justification, global civil society actors are putting forth a number of arguments countering temporal myopia on rational grounds. They make the case that no generation, and no part of the world, is immune from catastrophe. Complacency and parochialism are deeply flawed in that even if we earn a temporary reprieve, our children and grandchildren will likely not be so fortunate unless steps are taken today. Similarly, though it might be possible to minimize or contain the risks and harms of actions to faraway places over the short-term, parrying the eventual blowback or spillover effect is improbable. In fact, as I argued in the previous section, all but the smallest and most isolated of crises are rapidly becoming globalized due to the existence of transnational circuits of ideas, images, people, and commodities. Regardless of where they live, our descendants will increasingly be subjected to the impact of environmental degradation, the spread of epidemics, gross North-South socioeconomic inequalities, refugee flows, civil wars, and genocides. What may have previously appeared to be temporally and spatially remote risks are ‘coming home to roost’ in ever faster cycles. In a word, then, procrastination makes little sense for three principal reasons: it exponentially raises the costs of eventual future action; it reduces preventive options; and it erodes their effectiveness. With the foreclosing of long-range alternatives, later generations may be left with a single course of action, namely, that of merely reacting to large-scale emergencies as they arise. We need only think of how it gradually becomes more difficult to control climate change, let alone reverse it, or to halt mass atrocities once they are underway. Preventive foresight is grounded in the opposite logic, § Marked 12:08 § whereby the decision to work through perils today greatly enhances both the subsequent Moreover, I would contend that farsighted cosmopolitanism is not as remote or idealistic a prospect as it appears to some, for as Falk writes, “[g]lobal justice between temporal communities, however, actually seems to be increasing, as evidenced by various expressions of greater sensitivity to past injustices and future dangers.”36 Global civil society may well be helping a new generational self-conception take root, according to which we view ourselves as the provisional caretakers of our planetary commons. Out of our sense of responsibility for the well-being of those who will follow us, we come to be more concerned about the here and now.

## REMs

#### Impacts inevitable—global offshore wind market is expected to grow tenfold by 2020

PRWEB Newswire 13

[Press Release Web Newswire. "Offshore Wind Power to Grow Tenfold by 2020, with UK Leading the Way." *Digital Journal*. Digital Journal, 29 Jan 2013. Web. 29 Jan 2013. <http://www.digitaljournal.com/pr/1041016>. //Wyo-BF]

The global offshore wind power market, fuelled by the depletion of fossil fuel reserves, the declining cost of wind power generation and impressive investment from the UK, is expected to explode over the next decade, states research and consulting firm GlobalData. The company’s new report\* forecasts the global offshore wind power market to rocket from a 2012 cumulative installed capacity of 5.1 Gigawatts (GW) in 2012 to a far greater 54.9 GW by the end of the decade, growing at a Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of 34.5%. The UK is a major player in the offshore wind power market thanks to its substantial financial commitment and ideal location, contributing more than half of the global installed capacity last year, with 2.7 GW. Jonathan Lane, GlobalData's Head of Consulting for Power and Utilities, says: “While risks for offshore developers remain, in particular the potential rationing of Contracts for Difference (CFD) under the levy control framework, the still nascent transmission regime and the competition from nuclear power, the UK government is firmly supporting offshore wind via the Energy Bill.”

**New mines are coming online and will stabilize the market**

**Justin Keupper, 2/8**

Understanding China's Rare Earth Metals Market: What Changing Regulations Could Mean Read more: <http://www.minyanville.com/trading-and-investing/commodities/articles/Understanding-China2527s-Rare-Earth-Metals-Market/2/8/2013/id/48000#ixzz2KzcyzDEz>, accessed 2/15/13,WYO/JF

**Many countries opted to develop their own rare earth metal reserves, following China’s market moving decisions to cut exports**. **Countries like Australia, Brazil, Canada, Japan, South Africa**, Tanzania, Greenland **and the United States are all undergoing efforts to restart rare earth metal production** after China undercut prices in the 1990s. Some public companies operating in the space include: General Moly Inc. ([NYSEAMEX:GMO](http://finance.minyanville.com/minyanville?Page=QUOTE&Ticker=GMO)) – A development stage company focused on molybdenum properties located in Eureka County, Nevada, USA. Lynas Corporation Limited (ASX:LYC) – A rare earth metal company focused on developing its properties in Australia and Malaysia. **Molycorp** Inc. ([NYSEhttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.minyanville.com/trading-and-investing/commodities/articles/Understanding-China2527s-Rare-Earth-Metals-Market/2/8/2013/id/48000?refresh=1):MCP) – **A rare earth metal and molybdenum development company with a presence in 11 different countries around the world**. Of these companies, **the only two established projects outside of China include Molycorp’s efforts in the U.S. and Lynas’ efforts in Australia**. Many other junior miners looking to develop resources to commercial viability may also face troubles, with only a handful of them projected to reach such a commercial stage, according to some [analystshttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.minyanville.com/trading-and-investing/commodities/articles/Understanding-China2527s-Rare-Earth-Metals-Market/2/8/2013/id/48000?refresh=1). The Bottom Line Rare earth metals are a vital component of many critical [technologieshttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.minyanville.com/trading-and-investing/commodities/articles/Understanding-China2527s-Rare-Earth-Metals-Market/2/8/2013/id/48000?refresh=1), ranging from renewable energy to defense applications. **While China has been a quintessential provider since the 1990s, REE reserves are starting to pop up in many other major world markets, after the communist country imposed export restrictions that wreaked havoc on the market in 2010**. Moving forward, China appears ready to continue its crackdown on the rare earth metals industry, putting pressure on global supply and helping boost prices. But, **the opposing supply coming online from other markets around the world could help offset these trends and ultimately stabilize the market with a more robust supply to meet growing demand.**

**New wind turbine designs don’t require REM’s**

Jonathan **Benson** September 22, **2011**

staff writer “Advanced wind turbine design eliminates need for environmentally-harmful rare earth metals, generates electricity at $0.04 per kWh”  
<http://www.naturalnews.com/033647_wind_turbines_rare_earth_metals.html#ixzz2Bp0AH8aH>  
**According to a recent report by Green Tech Media**, **the budding technology does not require the use of expensive**, **environmentally-damaging rare earth metals** typically imported from China, **and it also generates electricity at a lower cost than traditional coal-burning plant**s are able to do. **Most** [**wind turbines**](http://www.naturalnews.com/033647_wind_turbines_rare_earth_metals.html) **in use today rely on complicated gearboxes** that run at high temperatures, **that wear out easily,** and that are difficult and expensive to maintain. **They also require the use of dysprosium**, an expensive, **rare-earth metal obtained from China**, a country whose track record of environmental friendliness leaves much to be desired In other words, the lofty price of dysprosium, which can run as high as $2,000 per kilo (2.2 pounds), combined with the frequent need to maintain and replace a slew of intricate turbine parts, has made current wind energy production technologies inadequate and unable to compete in the energy market apart from government subsidization. **The PMG design, however, eliminates the gear-driven system, which BWP describes as "a bunch of very high precision, high quality steel parts in a gear box," with a direct drive system that is "basically one big moving part." And since this single part relies on neodymium, which is one-twentieth the price of dysprosium, and mined in California using an environmentally-friendly extraction process, its potential to replace current wind** [**energy**](http://www.naturalnews.com/energy.html) **technologies is essentially a given.**

# 1AR

## ptx

#### Obama sold 39 million acres of the OCS for drilling—should have triggered the link

DOI 21 Mar

["Obama Administration Holds 39-Million-Acre Oil and Gas Lease Sale in Central Gulf of Mexico." *eNews Park Forest*. DOI, 21 Mar 2013. Web. 22 Mar 2013. <http://www.enewspf.com/latest-news/science/science-a-environmental/41445-obama-administration-holds-39-million-acre-oil-and-gas-lease-sale-in-central-gulf-of-mexico.html>. //Wyo-BF]

Taking the latest step in President Obama’s efforts to continue to expand safe and responsible domestic energy production, the Department of the Interior yesterday held a nearly 39 million-acre oil and gas lease sale for the Central Gulf of Mexico that drew $1,214,675,536 in high bids for tracts on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf offshore Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama. A total of 52 offshore energy companies submitted 407 bids on 320 tracts, covering more than 1,722,191.42 acres. The sum of all bids received totaled $1,595,397,446. “Today’s sale reflects strong, continuing industry interest in the Gulf of Mexico,” said Secretary Salazar, who opened this morning’s sale. “Developing public energy resources in the Gulf of Mexico is good for the Gulf’s economy, and reflects President Obama’s commitment to expand oil and natural gas production safely and responsibly, reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and supporting American energy jobs.” As part of the Obama Administration’s all-of-the-above energy strategy, domestic oil and gas production has grown each year the President has been in office, with domestic oil production currently higher than any time in two decades and natural gas production at its highest level ever. Renewable electricity generation from wind, solar, and geothermal sources has doubled and foreign oil imports now account for less than 40 percent of the oil consumed in America – the lowest level since 1988.

## K

#### Perm solves

Jeff Huysmans, Lecturer in politics at the department of government at Open University, Alternatives “Defining Social Constructivism in Security Studies: The Normative Dilemma of Writing Security” Feb 2002 p. 59-60.

There is no solution for the normative dilemma in the social-con­structivist security analyses defined above. The particular under­standing of language makes any security utterance potentially se­curitizing. Consequently, enunciating security is never innocent or neutral. Of course, this does not have to result in a normative dilemma; it does so only if one wants to or has to utter security in a political context while wanting to avoid a securitization of a par­ticular area. Someone may also employ security language with the intention of securitizing an area. This does not necessarily require a conservative interest in keeping the status quo or in establishing law and order. Securitization can also be performed with an emancipatory interest. Given the capacity of security language to priori­tize questions and to mobilize people, one may employ it as a tac­tical device to give human-rights questions a higher visibility, for example. It is also possible to mobilize security questions in nonse­curity areas with the intention to change the conservative bias of the security language. This would require a positive concept of se­curity that defines liberation from oppression as a good that should be secured.

#### Using the state doesn’t mean we think it is perfect. We work with it because there’s no other option

Eric **Mazur**, doctoral candidate in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of California Santa Barbara, 19**97**, American Indian Studies, p. 251

We might add also that notions of authority, sovereignty, and political participation are not necessarily constructed on a single intellectual foundation. In the case of Nathan Jim, our introduction to this wide- ranging conflict over authority, as well as in the broader historical development of the relationship of Native American religious traditions and the American constitutional order, there are clear differences over how authority is determined, and by whom and under what circumstances. Native traditions, centered (at least in part) on the cultural orientation toward land, cannot but conflict with the American constitutional order's orientation toward the same land. Not as easily integrated into American culture as Christianity's symbolic emphasis on "The Word" (and its parallel relationship to the Constitution as symbolic of the federal government's authority dependent on territoriality), Native American religious traditions expose the very real and tangible conflict that lies at the heart of the American constitutional order. The strengths behind the Constitution are grounded in the control of the land, and any challenge to that control can be met with subtle, but immeasurable resistance. Nathan Jim may not see the legal system of the American constitutional order as his law, but he has understood the power it holds over him, and has agreed to abide by it. So, too, in many ways, have Native American religious traditions agreed to abide by the American constitutional order. They may not accept the source of its authority, but in the face of overwhelming power, they may have had no other choice but to accept it.

#### IT’S A DOUBLE-BIND: EITHER THE ALTERNATIVE LINKS OR DOESN’T SOLVE. IN ISOLATION, ALTERNATIVES CAN’T INDIVIDUALLY DECONSTRUCT DOMINANT SECURITY DISCOURSE. THEY MUST ENGAGE WITH SECURITY, BUT IN DOING SO LEGITIMIZE THE PRACTICES BEING CRITIQUED.

Jeff Huysmans, Lecturer in politics at the department of government at Open University, Alternatives “Defining Social Constructivism in Security Studies: The Normative Dilemma of Writing Security” Feb 2002 p. 50-51.

Although the critical edge of this literature cannot be ignored, denaturalizing security fields is not necessarily successful in moderating the normative dilemma. The research continues to map the security discourses, therefore repeating, in an often highly systematic way, a security approach to, for example, migration or drugs. Demonstrating the contingent character of the politicization does question the foundational character of this contingent construction, but it does not necessarily undermine the real effects. It does this only when these discourses rely heavily for their effects on keeping the natural character of its foundations unquestioned. This points to a more general issue concerning this kind of analysis. Although it stresses that language makes a difference and that social relations are constructed, it leaves underdeveloped the concept of security formation that heavily prestructures the possibilities to “speak” differently through rarifying who can speak security, what security can be spoken about, how one should speak about security, and so on.27 Another related problem is that the approach assumes that in dictating the mere existence of alternative practices challenges the dominance of the dominant discourse. This is problematic since the alternative constructions do not exist in a vacuum or in a sheltered space. To be part of the game, they must, for example, Coy test political constructions of migration. Alternative practices are thus not isolated but engage with other, possibly dominant, constructions. This raises the question of how the “engagement” actually works. It involves relations of power, structuring and restructuring the social exchanges. Staging alternative practices does not necessarily challenge a dominant construction. The political game is more complex, as Foucault’s interpretation of the “sexual revolution”— the liberation from sexual repression—of the second half of the twentieth century showed.28 In a comment on human-rights ap­proaches of migration, Didier Bigo raises a similar point—that op­posing strategies do not necessarily radically challenge established politicizations: “It is often misleading to counterpose the ideology of security to human rights because they sometimes have more in com­mon than their authors would like to admit. They often share the same concept of insecurity and diverge only in their solutions.”29 The main point is that alternative discourses should not be left in a vacuum. The way they function in the political struggle should be looked at. How are the alternative discourses entrenched in a specific political game? Are they possibly a constitutive part of the mastery of the dominant construction?