### 2AC ASPEC

#### 2. We meet their definition – the USFG is a government with 3 branches and we fiat the action of the actor

**Black’s Law Dictionary, 1990 (p. 695)**

In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to

administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.

### 2AC T – Restriction

#### We meet – the moratorium is a restriction on the production of natural gas – this is contextual evidence

**Bernstein, ‘6** Dr. Bernstein is a Visiting Professor of Philosophy at Marist College; he also teaches at SUNY Purchase (which selected him Outstanding Teacher for 2004) and formerly at Pace University, and Marymount College (which selected him Outstanding Teacher for 1995). Dr. Bernstein lectures regularly at American universities and appears frequently on the radio talk shows. His op-eds have been published in such newspapers as The San Francisco Chronicle, The Chicago Tribune, The Baltimore Sun, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, The Washington Times, The Los Angeles Daily News, and The Houston Chronicle. (Andrew Bernstein, The Arlington Times, 2 June 2006, “Bush and Congress Should Life Environmental Restrictions on Energy Production,” Print)//CC

In addition to the moratorium on offshore drilling, the federal government repeatedly refuses to permit oil drilling in Alaska's National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Geologists claim that ANWR holds seven billion barrels of oil, enabling it to add significantly to American energy production. Further, in large measure due to environmental restrictions, America has not built a new oil refinery for more than 25 years, meaning a diminished ability to refine crude oil into gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, heating oil, and other petroleum products. Our refineries run at capacity constantly, making repairs difficult, leaving them more susceptible to breakdowns and fires, and--with most centered in the Gulf of Mexico--leaving the country's supply of refined oil vulnerable to such natural disasters as Katrina. Additionally, regulations have made building new nuclear power plants economically uninviting--despite the fact that nuclear plants, operated in free countries, where top minds are liberated to create advanced technology, have proven their reliability and safety. In France, for example, nuclear power provides roughly two-thirds of the nation's electricity. American nuclear plants have had, and continue to show, a superb safety record--and this includes Three Mile Island, whose 1979 partial meltdown led to no deaths or injuries. Finally, environmental restrictions also limit production of natural gas, which currently supplies 25 percent of the energy Americans consume, a figure that will rise in the future. Huge natural gas reserves in places such as the Rocky Mountain basins, Alaska, and the Outer Continental Shelf are either "off limits" or have their development severely restricted. These unnecessary restrictions endure despite the fact that the wholesale price of natural gas has quadrupled since the 1990s. As an example of the hurdles placed in front of natural gas companies, producers in Wyoming's Powder River Basin, which holds 39 trillion cubic feet of gas, several years ago saw the federal government suspend the issuing of drilling permits pending the outcome of a second "environmental impact" study. Is this kind of treatment going to encourage more companies to get into the energy business?

#### CI – A restriction is a limitation

**American Heritage Dictionary, ‘9** (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Houghton Mifflin, Updated 2009, Print)//CC

1. a. The act of restricting. b. The state of being restricted. 2. Something that restricts; a regulation or limitation.

#### We meet – Land access limits production of natural gas – contextual evidence

**NaturalGas.org, no date** (NaturalGas.org, no date given [website registered 2004], “Natural Gas Supply,” http://www.naturalgas.org/business/analysis.asp)//CC

In addition to the short term impediments to increasing natural gas supply, there exist other more general barriers to the increased supply of natural gas in the United States. These include: Land Access - The U.S. government owns more than 29 percent of all the land in the country, and an estimated 40 percent of undiscovered natural gas exists on this land. In several areas, the government has restricted access to federal lands. 59 percent of undiscovered gas resources are on federal lands and offshore waters. Outside of the western Gulf of Mexico, production companies are prohibited access to virtually all federal lands offshore the Lower 48 states. About 9 percent of resource-bearing land in the Rockies is also off limits, and access to another 32 percent is significantly restricted. The National Petroleum Council in 1999 estimated that 213 Tcf of natural gas exists in areas under federal access restrictions. This restriction is the result of presidential and congressional leasing moratoria, and affects the amount of natural gas resources that may be extracted to increase supply.

### Courts

#### 5: No Solvency - Court Action involves massive and costly delays

**Legomsky ‘2K** (Stephen H.; Charles F. Nagel Professor of International and Comparative Law and Director of the Institute for Global Legal Studies – Washington University, “Fear and Loathing in Congress and the Courts: Immigration and Judicial Review,” 78 Tex. L. Rev. 1615, June, l/n) ww

Still another concern with judicial review, at least in the immigration context, is delay. Delay is costly for several reasons. It impedes the very purpose of removal - to rid the country of those individuals whose presence Congress has found injurious to the public welfare. It also potentially creates an instrument that can be used by those with no legal basis for remaining to stall the inevitable. If the person is in detention, the delay increases the government's expenses.

#### 6: Perm – do both. Solves the link

Perine 8 (Katherine, Staff – CQ Politics, “Congress Unlikely to Try to Counter Supreme Court Detainee Ruling”, 6-12, http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000002896528&cpage=2)

Thursday’s decision, from a Supreme Court dominated by Republican appointees, gives Democrats further cover against GOP sniping. “This is something that the court has decided, and very often the court gives political cover to Congress,” said Ross K. Baker, a Rutgers Universitiy political science professor. “You can simply point to a Supreme Court decision and say, ‘The devil made me do it.’ ”

#### 7: Congress will roll it back

Mikva and Bleich 91 (Abner J., Chief Judge – US Court of Appeals for DC, and Law Clerk, “When Congress Overrules the Court”, California Law Review, May, 79 Calif. L. Rev. 729, Lexis)

Our intention, here, is to understand these recent struggles between Congress and the Court and place them in historical context, relying upon similar struggles that occurred at the dawn of the New Deal. There are, of course, many instances in which Congress has overruled decisions of the Court, most of which have innocent, constitutionally unexceptional, explanations. One of the authors served as a law clerk to Justice Minton, when his decision in a contracts case, Wunderlich v. United States, [1](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b0e4148c2461740fd8d4c29455d069f9&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAz&_md5=9c38151b077c95107c1da1da6dc96be3&focBudTerms=there%20are%2C%20of%20course%2C%20many%20instances%20in%20which&focBudSel=all#n1) was overturned by Congress with record-breaking speed. But, as the New Deal era has shown, not all the deeds of the Court and Congress can be innocently explained. There have, for example, been periods of political upheaval or turmoil in which the Court's erroneous interpretations appear to reflect deliberate attempts to frustrate the policy objectives of Congress. Under these circumstances, the dialectic between the  [\*730]  Court and Congress has represented not a healthy, respectful effort to clarify their respective obligations and objectives in a particular area, but rather an attempt by one branch to politicize the Constitution in order to accomplish its policy objectives.

#### 8: CP devastates Court legitimacy

Hubbart 5 (Phillip A., Adjunct Professor of Law, Former Judge – Third District Court of Appeal of Florida, Making Sense of Search and Seizure Law: A Fourth Amendment Handbook, p. 106)

Still, the framework of past Fourth Amendment decisions on a specific issue limits the choices that the Court can make in a given case, as the Court must necessarily make a reasoned case for accommodating the result it reaches in a way that logically appears within the scope of past case law. Stated differently, as a practical matter no Court, no matter what its judicial philosophy, can rewrite the law announced in its past cases without losing public confidence. Theoretically, of course, it has the de jure power to do so by overruling, artificially distinguishing or outright ignoring its prior relevant cases, willy-nilly. But if it did so, it would bring upon itself an avalanche of public and professional criticism that it could not possibly withstand. Indeed, impeachment proceedings might very well follow. The doctrine of stare decisis necessarily means that the Court’s basic reasoning process must be deductive from, and therefore generally consistent with, its past relevant decisions. Although this framework is somewhat flexible in nature, it clearly has its limits which, as a practical matter, restrict the Court’s decision-making process.

#### Causes terrorism

Shapiro 3 (Jeremy, Associate Director and Research Associate – Brookings Institute, March “French Lessons: The Importance of the Judicial System in Fighting Terrorism http://www.brookings.edu/fp/cusf/analysis/shapiro20030325.htm)

The unique nature of terrorism means that maintaining the appearance of justice and democratic legitimacy will be much more important than in past wars. The terrorist threat is in a perpetual state of mutation and adaptation in response to government efforts to oppose it. The war on terrorism more closely resembles the war on drugs than World War II; it is unlikely to have any discernable endpoint, only irregular periods of calm. The French experience shows that ad-hoc anti-terrorist measures that have little basis in societal values and shallow support in public opinion may wither away during the periods of calm. In the U.S., there is an enormous reservoir of legitimacy, established by over 200 years of history and tradition, in the judiciary. That reservoir represents an important asset that the U.S. government can profit from to maintain long-term vigilance in this type of war. Despite the unusual opportunity for innovation afforded by the crisis of September 11, the U.S. government has not tried to reform American judicial institutions to enable them to meet the threat of terrorism. To prevent the next wave of attacks, however far off they might be, and to avoid re-inventing a slightly different wheel each time will require giving life to institutions that can persist and evolve, even in times of low terrorist activity. Given the numerous differences between the two countries, the U.S. cannot and should not simply import the French system, but it can learn from their mistakes. Their experience suggests a few possible reforms: A specialized U.S. Attorney tasked solely with terrorism cases and entirely responsible for prosecuting such cases in the U.S. Direct and formal links between that U.S. Attorney’s office and the various intelligence agencies, allowing prosecutors to task the intelligences agencies during judicial investigations Special procedures for selecting and protecting juries in terrorism cases and special rules of evidence that allow for increased protection of classified information in terrorist cases Creating a normal, civilian judicial process that can prosecute terrorists and yet retain legitimacy is not merely morally satisfying. It may also help to prevent terrorist attacks in the long run. Not incidentally, it would demonstrate to the world a continuing faith in the ability of democratic societies to manage the threat of terrorism without sacrificing the very values they so desperately desire to protect.

#### Extinction

Gordon 2 (Harvey, Visiting Lecturer in Forensic Psychiatry – Tel Aviv University, “The ‘Suicide’ Bomber: Is It a Psychiatric Phenomenon?” , Psychiatric Bulletin, 26, http://pb.rcpsych.org/cgi/content/full/26/8/285)

Although terrorism throughout human history has been tragic, until relatively recently it has been more of an irritant than any major hazard. However, the existence of weapons of mass destruction now renders terrorism a potential threat to the very existence of human life (Hoge & Rose, 2001). Such potential global destruction, or globicide as one might call it, supersedes even that of genocide in its lethality. Although religious factors are not the only determinant of ‘suicide’ bombers, the revival of religious fundamentalism towards the end of the 20th century renders the phenomenon a major global threat. Even though religion can be a force for good, it can equally be abused as a force for evil. Ultimately, the parallel traits in human nature of good and evil may perhaps be the most durable of all the characteristics of the human species. There is no need to apply a psychiatric analysis to the ‘suicide’ bomber because the phenomenon can be explained in political terms. Most participants in terrorism are not usually mentally disordered and their behaviour can be construed more in terms of group dynamics (Colvard, 2002). On the other hand, perhaps psychiatric terminology is as yet deficient in not having the depth to encompass the emotions and behaviour of groups of people whose levels of hate, low self-esteem, humiliation and alienation are such that it is felt that they can be remedied by the mass destruction of life, including their own.

#### 9: CP kills business confidence

Woellert 5 (Lorraine, Legal Correspondent – Business Week, “Forget Roe and the Framers. Let’s Talk Business”, Washington Post, 10-16, Lexis)

Friends and peers trying to describe Miers and Roberts like to use the P-word -- pragmatic. That's sweet music to business ears: Corporations worship pragmatism and don't give a whit about judicial philosophy. But it's rank heresy to many on the right, who have had it up to here with jurists who weigh social and cultural mores when crafting opinions. Religious and other social conservatives want justices who will apply a very narrow "strict constructionist" interpretation to the Constitution and not read new rights -- such as the right to privacy found in Roe v. Wade -- into the framers' text. Roberts already has disappointed them. "Judges take a more practical and pragmatic approach when deciding the rule of law," rather than sticking to a strict philosophy, he told the Senate Judiciary Committee. "The Framers were aware they were drafting for the future." Roberts also tipped his hat to the importance of legal precedent and the need to avoid enacting rapid and radical changes in law: "It is a jolt to the legal system to override precedent." Translation: Roe might be here to stay, but business can take comfort. What corporate America wants from the judicial branch more than anything else is consistency and predictability -- tools for planning in the short term. That's one reason CEOs mourned the resignation of Sandra Day O'Connor. Legal scholars have scoffed at her philosophical inconsistency, but business execs lauded her practicality and her frequent acknowledgments of real-world situations in opinions that often made their 9-to-5 workday a little easier.

#### Recession results

Braithwaite 4 (John, Australian Research Council Federation fellow, Australian National University, and chair of the Regulatory Institutions Network, The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 592 Annals 79, March, Lexis)

The challenge of designing institutions that simultaneously engender emancipation and hope is addressed within the assumption of economic institutions that are fundamentally capitalist. This contemporary global context gives more force to the hope nexus because we know capitalism thrives on hope. **When business confidence collapses**, capitalist **economies head for recession**. This dependence on hope is of quite general import; business leaders must have hope for the future before they will build new factories; consumers need confidence before they will buy what the factories make; investors need confidence before they will buy shares in the company that builds the factory; bankers need confidence to lend money to build the factory; scientists need confidence to innovate with new technologies in the hope that a capitalist will come along and market their invention. Keynes's ([1936]1981) General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money lamented the theoretical neglect of "animal spirits" of hope ("spontaneous optimism rather than . . . mathematical expectation" (p. 161) in the discipline of economics, a neglect that continues to this day (see also Barbalet 1993).

#### Global nuclear war

Mead 92 (Walter Russell, Senior Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, New Perspectives Quarterly, Summer, p. 30)

The failure to develop an international system to hedge against the possibility of worldwide depression- will open their eyes to their folly. Hundreds of millions-billions-of people around the world have pinned their hopes on the international market economy. They and their leaders have embraced market principles-and drawn closer to the West-because they believe that our system can work for them. But what if it can't? What if the global economy stagnates, or even shrinks? In that case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor. Russia. China. India-these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the 1930's.

### 2AC Obama Good DA

#### Link turn and non-unique – recent vote counts prove

Natural Resources Committee (Congressional Committee – Headed by Chairman Doc Hastings) June 21, 2012 “House Passes Bipartisan Bill to Boost American Energy Production and Job Creation” http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=300321

Today, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, with a bipartisan vote of 248-163. This bipartisan package of bills will expand American energy production on federal lands and create new American jobs by streamlining government red-tape and regulations. It will also set long term production goals to establish a real all-of-the-above American energy plan.

#### Link turn – oil lobbies control Congress, the White House, and agencies – they support the OCS

**Broder and Krauss, 5/23** political and business correspondents covering energy (John M. Broder and Clifford Krauss, The New York Times, 23 May 2012, “New and Frozen Frontier Awaits Offshore Drilling,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/science/earth/shell-arctic-ocean-drilling-stands-to-open-new-oil-frontier.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1&hp)//CC

Mr. Obama took office under the watchful gaze of environmentalists who had supported him and an oil industry that feared he would rescind its subsidies and push climate change legislation. ExxonMobil and other major oil companies spent millions of dollars to ensure that such legislation never passed. Shell took a different tack. Even before Mr. Obama’s election, the company joined the United States Climate Action Partnership, a coalition of businesses and environmental groups advocating a response to global warming. It was a canny move, calculated to gain access to top policy makers, including the president. “It helped people look at us differently and helped open doors,” Mr. Odum said. “I do not think there is any doubt about that.” Shell employs three dozen lobbyists, according to government disclosure records. It spent $4.5 million on lobbying in 2008, the last year of the Bush administration. Lobbying costs leapt to $10.2 million in 2009, $10.4 million in 2010 and $14.8 million last year. In the Obama administration’s first two and a half years, Mr. Odum visited the White House at least six times, according to federal records. In 2010 and 2011, Sara B. Glenn, a top Shell lobbyist, was cleared into the executive complex 13 times, to meet with Ms. Zichal and others. The intensity of Shell’s campaign was matched by the fervor of Mark Begich, the new senator from Alaska. He had won his seat in something of a fluke, defeating the longtime Republican incumbent, Ted Stevens, who was ensnared in what later turned out to be a deeply flawed Justice Department corruption investigation. No politician in Alaska can survive as an opponent of any oil development, including those in the waters of the Arctic, the National Petroleum Reserve and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Mr. Begich enthusiastically supported all three. When he first met Mr. Obama at a mayors’ conference in June 2008, Mr. Begich said, he told him, “If I’m elected, this is what I’m going to focus on.” Being a crucial Democratic vote in a narrowly divided Senate representing a decidedly Republican state gave Mr. Begich leverage. Whenever the president called to court his support — on health care, climate change, the debt ceiling or budget matters — Mr. Begich always turned the discussion to oil and gas in Alaska, particularly Arctic exploration. “Any time he initiated a call, I felt that was carte blanche to make my case,” Mr. Begich said. A chronology of his contact with the Obama administration on Arctic oil issues fills six pages. He came to believe that his re-election hinged on delivering a reluctant president on oil issues, particularly drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf in the Arctic. A Begich aide said that the unstated premise of every conversation with the president was, “You need me, and I need the O.C.S.” The senator said he remained unsure of Mr. Obama’s intentions until the spring of 2011, when the president called to discuss budget negotiations with Republicans, and Mr. Begich again pressed him on oil. “He said, ‘I’m with you 60 or 70 percent,’ ” Mr. Begich said. “What that meant to me was he was going to approve everything except A.N.W.R.,” the Arctic wildlife refuge. He was right. Shell also kept up a steady flow of visits, letters and calls to the agencies that could grant or deny the myriad permits it needed in the Arctic. Over time, Shell’s proposal had expanded to include a total of as many as 10 test wells in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas over two years. A company lobbyist said that the most resistance came from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which had the singular mission of protecting whales and other sea mammals.

**The disad doesn’t provide an opportunity cost to the plan – it’s reciprocal with advantage CPs, we’ll only make one, and it’s limited to logic.**

**Politics are compartmentalized – political capital is irrelevant**

**Dickinson 9** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### Immigration reform is at the top of the agenda

Manu Raji (writer for Politico) November 7, 2012 “Harry Reid agenda: Filibuster crackdown, tax increases” http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1112/83514.html

Once the procedural snafus are resolved, Reid said “very high” on his priority list will be an attempt to pass an immigration overhaul, an issue important to the Latino community that powered Tuesday night’s Democratic wins. But it would certainly start a divisive and emotional debate certain to alienate conservative members of both parties. Reid said he could get 90 percent of his caucus to support such a measure. Republicans, he said, would block immigration reform “at their peril.” “Not for political reasons; because it’s the wrong thing to do to not have comprehensive immigration reform,” Reid said. “The system’s broken and needs to be fixed.”

#### No farm bill

Charles Abbott (writer for the Insurance Journal) November 8, 2012 “Post-Election Congress Expected to Target Crop Insurance” http://www.insurancejournal.com/news/national/2012/11/08/269899.htm

Federally subsidized crop insurance will be a big target for lawmakers looking to cut the budget deficit in the lame-duck session of Congress opening next week, agricultural policy experts agreed the morning after a status-quo general election. But lawmakers will probably be unable to break their deadlock over enacting a five-year, $500 billion farm bill covering a wide range of agricultural policy from food stamps to crop subsidies and soil conservation. The worst drought to hit the Midwest farm belt in half a century should double the cost of crop insurance this year, and the nagging drought threatens 2013 crops as well. Another key question for farm policy watchers after the re-election of President Barack Obama is whether Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack will serve a second term. Since the 1960s, only one USDA secretary has served two terms. Ethanol likely benefited from Obama’s victory, said analyst Mark McMinimy of Guggenheim Securities, noting that Obama and Vilsack are biofuels backers. The Environmental Protection Agency may decide this month whether to relax the requirement to use ethanol in gasoline. Livestock producers say they are being ruined by high grain prices as more U.S. crops are diverted to fuel. With Democrats still in narrow control of the Senate and Republicans keeping their majority in the House, analysts said a short-term extension of the 2008 farm law, probably into spring, was the likely outcome. ODDS AGAINST FIVE-YEAR FARM BILL “Odds are against a five-year farm bill in the lame duck (session) unless it’s part of a budget agreement,” and a budget deal is also unlikely, said Pat Westhoff of the think tank Food and Agricultural Policy Research, based at the University of Missouri. Crop insurance already is the biggest part of the farm safety net, costing the government around $7 billion a year. The cost was expected to jump to $15 billion or more this year because the government will shoulder most of the underwriting losses for the 16 insurance companies in the field.

#### fiscal cliff’ thumps Farm Bill

Angela Bowman (writer for The Cattle Network) November 8, 2012 “Fiscal cliff, not farm bill, priority during lame duck session” http://www.cattlenetwork.com/cattle-news/Fiscal-cliff-not-farm-bill-priority-during-lame-duck-session-177729721.html?ref=721

The fight for congressional attention is quickly turning into a fight between the looming fiscal cliff and the farm bill as Congress heads into its post-election, year-ending session. However, with no major changes made to the presidency, Senate or the House, there’s little chance that this lame duck session will be anything but lame. That’s what Mary Kay Thatcher, senior director of congressional relations for the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), told AgriTalk’s Mike Adams in an interview on Wednesday. "There's a lot of high-priority items (other than the farm bill) that have to be done," she said. "It's going to be a very uphill push to get this farm bill done in the lame duck session."

### US Leadership

**US leadership allows us to implement better epistemologies, the permutation incorporates the critique and creates policy change by using that knowledge on a global scale**

**Safety 2k2** (Adel, “Leadership and Global Governance” The International Leadership Series (Book Two) Universal Publishers)

At the same time experiential learning in a multicultural context with a diversity not only of cultural and political views, but also of learning styles, cannot easily lend itself to a compartmentalized and neatly divided set of learning outcomes, as a modern curriculum syllabus would traditionally seek to achieve. This is because in a world increasingly awash with information and sources of knowledge, interdisciplinary knowledge is no longer an exclusive domain available only to the cultured elite, it is becoming a necessary tool for thoughtful and interactive decision-making. In short, interdisciplinary knowledge is an important leadership skill. This is all the more so in the face of the paradox of complexity and simplicity, which the information and communication revolution is bringing to bear upon the field of epistemology. Veteran America diplomat Harlan Cleveland captures this paradox in a wonderful way when he discusses the relationship between leadership and chaos. One of the first important challenges a leader must face has to do with what the literature on management as leadership calls prioritising. This is the ability to make sufficient sense of the prevailing chaos in order to untangle from it what is most immediately relevant to one’s own situation and decision-making responsibility. For the emerging leader, the necessary understanding of which information is more relevant and more urgent than the rest is only the first step. He or she must then strive to transform this information into knowledge. He then must be able to make use of this knowledge to advance the cause of his or her community or organization. And it is at this stage that leadership skills and attitudes can help transform knowledge into applied knowledge, into wise decisions, into effective actions, and finally into good results for the common good of one’s community or organization. And it is in this manner that leadership can be a transformation activity, not only transforming information into knowledge, into judicious decision and effective action, but also transforming, through empowerment and ownership, followers into leaders and leaders into followers. In this way, emerging leaders, using ever-growing networks of connections and bonds of friendships, and acquiring the skills and attitudes to engage in leadership activities by transformation and service, can work together to tackle global challenges for the common good of humanity.

### Climate Change

#### Our aff is the process of informing people about the details of climate change – that allows us to take the debate away from the elites and put it in the hands of ordinary people – closing the gap about climate change between citizens and policy makers is essential to solving extinction

Chhreti and Grossman 2010 (Netra and Gary, “POLICY MAKERS VERSUS PEOPLE” <http://www.aucegypt.edu/gapp/cairoreview/pages/articleDetails.aspx?aid=171>)

Climate change has become a major environmental issue of the twenty-first century, a threat in which humans are implicated both as perpetrators and as victims. It is a complex issue requiring thorough study. The political decisions being taken in response to climate change will affect everything from global economic development to the lifestyles and livelihoods of ordinary citizens everywhere—in short, the future of the planet and its inhabitants. Yet, much of the climate change policy debate is limited to an elite set of people—politicians, scientists, and special interest groups. For the general public, questions and debates regarding climate change are framed as just too complex and technical. Ordinary citizens supposedly find it difficult to understand the aspects of climate change and the politics surrounding the issue. These citizens, though, will have to live with the consequences of climate change policy. The distance between citizens and policy makers on the issue of climate change is ever widening. There must be a goal to close this gap and enable ordinary people to feel they have some stake in climate change policy. Failure to do so will make it less likely that citizens will eventually buy into behavior changes that policy to address climate change may entail. In the case of climate change, democracy is not merely the preferred approach on principle; it is a pragmatic necessity if policy is to achieve results. World Wide Views on Global Warming, or WWViews, was a project aimed at giving a broad sample of citizens from across the world the opportunity to engage in global climate policy debates. Initiated by the Danish Board of Technology, a group overseen by Denmark’s Ministry of Science, Technology, and Development, WWViews organized discussion groups on a single day in September 2009 in thirty-eight countries across six continents. In the first global citizen consultation of its kind, the participants debated and voted on recommendations for policy makers on issues already on the agenda at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) summit in Copenhagen, also known as COP15, which took place in December 2009. Citizen forums became a part of the formal policy process in the United States in the 1970s as one of the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. Citizen forums have been conducted in many countries throughout the world on such topics as genetically modified food, nanotechnology, electronic surveillance, and, of course, climate change. WWViews proved to be a project with ambitions not only to promote greater citizen awareness of climate change but also to channel citizen views toward policy makers with the intention of influencing policy decisions. WWViews demonstrated that ordinary citizens can indeed comprehend the complexity of the climate change issue and make intelligent contributions to the debate. The project brought together a diverse set of forty-four regional and national partners ranging from some with significant experience in organizing deliberative processes to others with none. Some four thousand citizens participated at forty-four individual sites, and spent the day together deliberating and voting on twelve questions in four thematic areas—climate change consequences, long-term climate goals, greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), and technology—then formulating concrete recommendations for COP15 delegates. Overall, the WWViews participants concluded that climate change is a serious issue that affects everyone, that the negative effects of climate change are being exacerbated by a lack of action, and that immediate steps are now required to address climate change. According to the organizers, the WWViews on Global Warming produced nine clear policy recommendations to address climate change: –Make a deal at COP15. –Keep any temperature increase below 2 degrees. –Annex 1 countries [thirty-seven industrialized nations including the U.S.] should reduce emissions by 25−40 percent or more by 2020. –Fast-growing economies should also reduce emissions by 2020. –Low-income developing countries should limit emissions. –Give high priority to an international financial mechanism. –Punish non-complying countries. –Make technology available to all. –Strengthen or supplement international institutions.

### 2AC Framework

#### Framework – the k needs to prove the whole plan is bad– any other interp moots aff offense and decreases policy education – key to take the plan out of the hands of technocratic elites

**Kuzemko 12** [Caroline Kuzemko, CSGR University of Warwick, Security, the State and Political Agency: Putting ‘Politics’ back into UK Energy, <http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2012/381_61.pdf>]

Both Hay (2007) and Flinders and Buller (2006) suggest that there are other forms that depoliticisation can take, or in the terminology of Flinders and Buller ‘tactics’ which politicians can pursue in order to move a policy field to a more indirect governing relationship (Flinders and Buller 2006: 296). For the purposes of understanding the depoliticisation of UK energy policy, however, two of Colin Hay’s forms of depoliticisation are most useful: the ‘… offloading of areas of formal political responsibility to the market…’ and the passing of policymaking responsibility to quasipublic, or independent, authorities (Hay 2007: 82-3). 1 What each of these forms of depoliticisation has in common is the degree to which they can serve, over time, to reduce political capacity by removing processes of deliberation and contestation, thereby reducing the ability for informed agency and choice. In that politics can be understood as being inclusive of processes of deliberation, contestation, informed agency and collective choice the lack of deliberation and capacity for informed agency would result in sub-optimal politics (Hay 2007: 67; cf. Gamble 2000; Wood 2011; Jenkins 2011). There seems little doubt that, with regard to energy as a policy area, the principal of establishing a more indirect governing system had become accepted by UK political elites. One of the very few close observers of UK energy policy from the 1980s to early 2000s claims that both Conservative and New Labour politicians had actively sought to remove energy from politics, making it an ‘economic’ subject: From the early 1980s, British energy policy, and its associated regulatory regime, was designed to transform a state-owned and directed sector into a normal commodity market. Competition and 1 "These"forms"are"referred"to"elsewhere"by"the"author"as"‘marketised’"and"‘technocratic’"depoliticisation"(Kuzemko" 2012b:").liberalization would, its architects hoped, take energy out of the political arena… Labour shared this vision and hoped that energy would drop off the political agenda…. (Helm 2003: 386) 2 As already suggested this paper considers the intention to depoliticise energy to have been reasonably successful. By the early 2000s the Energy Ministry had been disbanded, there was little or no formal Parliamentary debate, energy was not represented at Cabinet level, responsibility for the supply of energy had been passed to the markets, it was regulated by an independent body, and the (cf. Kuzemko 2012b). Furthermore, the newly formed Energy Directorate within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), which now had responsibility for energy policy, had no specific energy mandates but instead mandates regarding encouraging the right conditions for business with an emphasis on competition (Helm et al 1989: 55; cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 107). As feared by various analysts who write about depoliticisation as a sub-optimal form of politics, these processes of depoliticisation had arguably resulted in a lack of deliberation about energy and its governance outside of narrow technocratic elite circles. Within these circles energy systems were modelled, language was specific and often unintelligible to others, including generalist politicians or wider publics, and this did, indeed, further encourage a high degree of disengagement with the subject (cf. Kern 2010; Kuzemko 2012b; Stern 1987). Technical language and hiring practices that emphasised certain forms of economic education further isolated elite technocratic circles from political contestation and other forms of knowledge about energy. Arguably, by placing those actors who have been elected to represent the national collective interest at one remove from processes of energy governance the result was a lack of formal political capacity in this policy field. It is worth, briefly, at this point reiterating the paradoxical nature of depoliticisation. Whilst decisions to depoliticise are deeply political, political capacity to deliberate, contest and act in an issue area can be reduced through these processes. Depoliticisation has been an ongoing form of governing throughout the 20 th century it may (Burnham 2001: 464), however, be particularly powerful and more difficult to reverse when underpinned by increasingly dominant ideas about how best to govern. For example Hay, in looking for the domestic sources of depoliticisation in the 1980s and 1990s, suggests that these processes were firmly underpinned by neoliberal and public choice ideas not only about the role of the state but also about the ability for political actors to make sound decisions relating, in particular, to economic governance (Hay 2007: 95-99). Given the degree to which such ideas were held increasingly to be legitimate over this time period depoliticisation was, arguably, genuinely understood by many as a process that would result in better governance (Interviews 1, 2, 3, 15 cf. Hay 2007: 94; Kern 2010). This to a certain extent makes decisions to depoliticise appear both less instrumental but also harder to reverse given the degree to which such ideas become further entrenched via processes of depoliticisation (cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 61-66; Wood 2011: 7).

### 2ac Enviro

**Perm do the plan and address the root cause—either the perm solves or the alt does nothing**

**Turn—plan is key to effective data which solves the risk of unjustified environmental rhetoric—either the plan is an internal link turn or the environment is an extinction disad to the alt**

**Space resources solve the impact—space resources eliminate the motivation for environmental conflict**

**Turn—hegemonic securitization is key to effective deterrence—collapse causes great power wars—heg statistically solves—that’s Barnett and Zhang and Shi**

**No link—apocalyptic enviro rhetoric now—the plan just makes action effective**

**Environmental reps good**

**Kurasawa 4** – Prof Sociology, York (Fuyuki, Cautionary Tales, Constellations 11.4, AG)

And yet dystopianism need not imply despondency, paralysis, or fear. Quite the opposite, in fact, since the pervasiveness of a dystopian imaginary can help notions of historical contingency and fallibilism gain traction against their determinist and absolutist counterparts. Once we recognize that the future is uncertain and that any course of action produces both unintended and unexpected consequences, the responsibility to face up to potential disasters and intervene before they strike becomes compelling. From another angle, dystopianism lies at the core of politics in a global civil society where groups mobilize their own nightmare scenarios (‘Frankenfoods’ and a lifeless planet for environmentalists, totalitarian patriarchy of the sort depicted in Atwood’s Handmaid’s Tale for Western feminism, McWorld and a global neoliberal oligarchy for the alternative globalization movement, etc.). Such scenarios can act as catalysts for public debate and socio-political action, spurring citizens’ involvement in the work of preventive foresight.

**They’re wrong—its key to effective movements**

**Dabelko 97** – director, Environmental Change and Security Project (Geoffrey, Environment and Security, SAIS Review 17.1, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais\_review/v017/17.1dabelko.html)

Undoubtedly, environment and security research, rhetoric, and activities--and the sobering statistics and trenchant analyses of environment and population dynamics that accompany them--have significantly raised the profile of many environmental concerns. They have also generated many useful discussions and new ways of thinking among a diverse set of experts, including those who previously considered the environment peripheral or unimportant to their interests. At the same time, there are serious limitations to the environment and security conceptual and linguistic framework. As convincing as certain security-related arguments may be, they are not the only reasons why the American public, decisionmakers, and other nations should care about the environment. Value-oriented considerations about the aesthetics of nature, human responsibility for global stewardship, and humanitarian concerns are also important. These considerations [End Page 141] can greatly enhance the process of **formulating effective solutions and winning sustained public attention** **and support for** international **environmental action**. Policymakers might therefore be best served by framing international environmental priorities in terms of a broad set of interests, including, but not limited to, security concerns. They should resist the temptation, common in security analyses, to examine environmental problems solely in terms of crises and "threats." Though helpful in setting priorities, threat-based analyses can have the unintentional effect of encouraging decisionmakers to pay attention to issues only when crises are imminent, by which time it is often too late for effective interventions and corrective measures. Examining how environmental preservation will enhance security and other interests over time might lead decisionmakers to adopt more appropriate long-term strategies to address the underlying causes of problems. International environmental issues will be most effectively addressed in the decades to come through a combination of conceptual clarity, a pragmatic and multidisciplinary approach to problem solving, an emphasis on long-term strategies, and an improved willingness and ability among leaders to explain the complexity of environmental change. As the debates on environment and security continue, environmentalists' arguments will be strengthened if they resist the temptation to place all their priorities under the attention-grabbing security rubric. Meanwhile, skeptical foreign policy experts will benefit from recognizing the real and potential effects of environmental change and their relevance to many critical interests. As the United States considers security expenditures and priorities for the twenty-first century, the vibrant debates concerning environment and security matters will continue to be instructive.

**Representations of ecological crisis are good – rejecting apocalyptic rhetoric would destroy the environmental movement. True, Earth won’t cease to exist, but all of humanity actually could die.**

**Foster 98** (1998, John Bellamy Foster, a member of the Board of the Monthly Review Foundation, teaches sociology at the University of Oregon and is coeditor of Organization & Environment, Monthly Review, April, findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1132/is\_/ai\_20931195, da 2/10, mat)

[T]he postulation of a planetary ecological crisis, the very idea that the planet is somehow `vulnerable' to human action or that we can actually destroy the earth, repeats in negative form the hubristic claims of those who aspire to planetary domination. The subtext is that the earth is somehow fragile and that we need to become caring managers or caring physicians to nurse it back from sickness into health.... Against this it is crucial to understand that it is materially impossible for us to destroy the planet earth, that the worst we can do is to engage in material transformations of our environment so as to make life less rather than more comfortable for our own species being, while recognizing that what we do also does have ramifications (both positive and negative) for other living species....Politically, the millenarian and apocalyptic proclamation that ecocide is imminent has had a dubious history. It is not a good basis for left politics and it is very vulnerable to the arguments long advanced by [Julian] Simon and now by [Greg] Easterbrook, that conditions of life (as measured, for example, by life expectancy) are better now than they have ever been and that the doomsday scenario of the environmentalists is far-fetched and improbable.1 Aside from the purely rhetorical flourishes—the use of such terms as "millenarian" and "apocalyptic" which because of the sense of religious fatalism associated with them imply something irrational in character (the wrath of God, the second coming) which has little to do with the arguments of most environmentalists—this can be taken as a serious criticism not only of The Vulnerable Planet but of ideas that have common currency in environmental circles. It is noteworthy that this same criticism, of being "apocalyptic," has frequently been leveled at such figures as Henry David Thoreau, George Perkins Marsh, Rachel Carson, Paul Ehrlich and Barry Commoner—indeed at almost all figures who have contributed anything of importance to understanding the modern ecological crisis.2 Naturally, some phrases utilized in the environmental discussion—such as Silent Spring, The Closing Circle, Earth in the Balance, The End of Nature, and The Vulnerable Planet—are metaphorical, and while pointing to real concerns are not to be taken too literally. When it comes to actual argument, though, most analysts attempt to present an accurate portrayal of the real dimensions of the problem. Thus the opening sentences of Chapter One of The Vulnerable Planet convey the exact sense in which the title of that work is to be understood: "Human society has reached a critical threshold in its relation to the environment. The destruction of the planet, in the sense of making it unusable for human purposes, has grown to such an extent that it now threatens the continuation of much of nature, as well as the survival and development of society itself." It might have been added that the survival of the human species was also in doubt as a result of these very same processes.