# Round 3 vs. UMKC BS (Neg)

## 1NC

### 1

#### A. Interpretation: Increase modifies financial incentives, so the aff has to make new financial incentives available for solar power

#### Increase means “to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment; add to: to increase taxes.”

Dictionary dot com 2013 [dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase]

#### B. Violation:

#### 1. The aff doesn’t increase the number, size, strength, or add to financial incentives: they change the definition of what is included in already existing financial incentives.

#### 2. EVEN IF expanding the PTC for solar power is an increase, they don’t increase the available pool of money, which means the plan results in a DECREASE in incentives for active solar power.

#### C. Interpretation:

#### 1. Ground: The only interpretation that provides stable link ground for the neg on this topic is one that demands the aff create new financial incentives for energy production. Without this interpretation, the aff can modify any number of existing laws in a myriad of ways that can’t be categorized under a small number of stable links. Allowing modification of existing financial incentives also eliminates any *unique* link ground because the financial incentives already exist.

#### 2. Bidirectionality: The aff justifies plans that alter existing financial incentives which allows reductions in incentives for existing energy production. These reductions nullify all negative link ground predicated on increased incentives or energy production.

#### D. Topicality is a voting issue because it is key to generate clash and balance aff and neg ground

### 2

#### A. Interpretation: Passive Solar is not energy production from solar power

#### 1. Production is distinct from consumption—passive solar is consumption because it doesn’t convert solar energy into a usable energy form, it actually uses the energy

Pacific Northwest Laboratory 1980 [An Analysis of Federal Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production, p. 22]

Energy production is defined as the transformation of natural resources into commonly used forms of energy such as heat, light, and electricity. By this definition, the shining of the sun or the running of a river are not examples of energy production, but the installation of solar panels or the construction of a hydroelectric dam are. Energy consumption is defined as the use of one of these common, "manufactured" forms of energy. Under this definition sunbathing is not energy consumption, but heating water by means of a solar panel is. In both definitions, the crucial ingredient is the application of technology and resources to change a natural resource into a useful energy-form.

#### 2. Their evidence concurs: passive solar is distinct from energy production

Garrett and Koontz, aff authors, 2008

[Vicki and Tomas M; School of Environment and Natural Resources, The Ohio State University; “Breaking the cycle: Producer and consumer perspectives on the non-adoption of passive solar housing in the US” Energy Policy 36; Elsevier; scholar]

Interviewees also pointed out that, at the national level, economic incentives related to energy tend to favor equipment, active technologies, or energy production rather than passive solar features.

#### 3. Passive solar is distinct from solar power because it doesn’t produce electricity and doesn’t use PV cells – the plan opens the door to CONSERVATION affs

Conserve Energy Future 2013

http://www.conserve-energy-future.com/SolarEnergy.php

Solar Energy is the energy that is produced by the sun in the form of heat and light. It is one of the most renewable and readily available source of energy. The fact that it is available in plenty and free and does not belong to anybody makes it one of the most important of the non-conventional sources of energy. Solar energy has been used by people since ancient times by using simple magnifying glasses to concentrate the light of the sun into beams so hot they would cause wood to catch fire. Mainly, Solar energy can be used to convert it into heat energy or it can be converted into electricity. Solar energy can be converted into electricity by means of solar thermal energy and photovoltaic. Through Solar Photovoltaic (SPV) cells, solar radiation gets converted into DC electricity directly. This form of energy can be used to power solar watches, calculators or traffic signals. They are often used in locations that are not connected to electricity grid. Solar heat energy can be used to heat water or space heating which means heating the space inside the building. Solar energy can be broadly categorized as active or passive solar energy depending on how they are captured and utilized. In active solar energy special solar heating equipment is used to convert solar energy to heat energy whereas in passive solar energy the mechanical equipment is not present. Active solar include the use of mechanical equipment like photovoltaic cells, solar thermal collectors or pumps and fans to trap the solar energy. Passive solar technologies convert solar energy to heat energy without use of active mechanical systems. It is mainly the practice of using windows, walls, trees, building placement and other simple techniques to capture or deflect the sun for use. Passive solar heating is a great way to conserve energy and maximizing it’s utilization. An example of passive solar heating is what happens to your car on a hot summer day. Environmental Impact Although Solar energy is considered to be one of the cleanest and renewable sources of energy among the available sources but is has some environmental impacts too. Solar energy uses photovoltaic cells to produce solar power. However, manufacturing the photovoltaic cells to produces that energy requires silicon and produce some waste products. Inappropriate handling of these materials may lead to hazardous exposure to humans and the environment. Installing solar power plants may require large piece of land, which may impact existing ecosystems. Solar energy does not pollute the air when converted to electricity by solar panels. It is found in abundance and does not help in global warming.

#### B. Violation

#### 1. Passive solar is consumption, not production

#### 2. Passive solar is not solar power

#### C. Interpretation

#### 1. Predictable negative links – Allowing consumption-based affs eliminates negative link arguments to energy production; no “useful energy form” is produced by passive solar, which means we have no link arguments based on new or more energy being created.

#### 2. Explodes the topic – Interpretations that include passive solar open the door to energy efficiency, energy conservation, and energy consumption affs. This allows radically different advantages like architecture, domestic energy efficiency, tree planting environment advantages, light pollution affs from changing light bulbs, windmill aesthetics.

#### 3. Bright line – New energy production is T, conservation of energy is not T. ALL of their 1AC evidence defines this as energy conservation rather than new production.

#### D. Topicality is a voting issue for clash, topic specific education, and equal division of ground

### 3

#### The United States federal government should ban all subsidies and tax credits for energy production and institute a carbon tax per ton of emissions. The tax should be revenue neutral and the revenue should be used for offsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit.

#### A carbon tax solves better and avoids picking winners

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.4-5

In this book I argue that the best energy policy for balancing the often-compet-¶ ing goals of cheap, clean, and secure energy would use the price system to fundamentally alter consumer behavior, business behavior, and the incentives to develop alternative-energy technologies. Currently, the price system fails to incorporate the true social cost of fossil fuels—the costs associated with climate¶ diange and oil security. Because these fossil fuels are artiﬁcially cheap, alternative clean and secure energy technologies are forced to compete on a very un-even playing ﬁeld. By taxing fossil fuels to reﬂect their true environmental and security costs, we can level the playing ﬁeld for these new technologies. Given a level playing ﬁeld, new technologies will ﬂourish, and energy conservation will regin in the overall growth of energy consumption. There will be no need for special subsidies, tax credits, and so forth for alternative technologies deemed winners of the congressional beauty pageant for alternative fuels. Instead, the marketplace will identify the winners and winnow out failed technologies.¶ There is currently no way for policymakers to identify the ultimate winners and¶ losers. We have no idea what technologies will dominate in thirty or ﬁfty years.¶ Instead of policymakers attempting to socially engineer the outcome, as in the¶ case ofcom-based ethanol, it is far better to create the market conditions under¶ which unknown and unknowable technologies will ﬂourish. Using the price system to modify human behavior is not a novel idea. “Sin¶ taxes” on alcohol and cigarettes, for example, have be shown to substantially¶ reduce consumption of both. in the Scandinavian counuies, high¶ taxes on alcohol have proved to be an eﬁecﬁve means of curtailing consurnp-¶ tion, after experimts with a variety of command-and-conu'ol policies, such as¶ prohibidon, generated much public discontent. But in the case of fossil fuels,¶ taxes would not only discourage the consumpﬁon of fossil fuels, but they¶ would also provide a level playing ﬁeld on which new energy technologies¶ could compete and ﬂourish. Speciﬁcally,¶ Congress should enact security a security tax per barrel of oil and a carbon tax per ton of carbon, thus raising the of all carbon-mntainingﬁnlr to ngﬂect tbeir true social cost.¶ Such a strategy has several advantages over the policy of awarding subsidies¶ and protective tariﬁ to industries represented by strong, entrenched lobbies¶ such as the Renewable Fuels Association (com-based ethanol producers) and¶ subjecting consumers to various command-and-conuols:¶ ° All new technologies would enjoy a more level playing ﬁeld.¶ ° The market, not the government, would determine which of the new tech-¶ nologies are the winners.¶ ° This approach is more uansparent. It is exuernely diﬂicult to assess the costs¶ (in terms of lost tax revenues) and the eﬁectiveness of the current patchwork¶ of subsidies and tax credits. In contrast, imposing carbon and security taxes would force us to ask how much we are willing to pay for clearner air and added oil security.¶ ° A focus on the prices right for fossil fuels would limit the opportunity¶ for Congress to pass legislation designed to enrich pardcular private-interest¶ groups.

#### Carbon Tax solves the aff – their authors say it’s the best way to spur the market for passive solar

Garrett and Koontz, aff authors, 2008

[Vicki and Tomas M; School of Environment and Natural Resources, The Ohio State University; “Breaking the cycle: Producer and consumer perspectives on the non-adoption of passive solar housing in the US” Energy Policy 36; Elsevier; scholar]

Addressing this fragmented innovation system could be beneficial for both passive solar and many alternative energy measures. As new energy sources and conservation measures are developed, the challenge of bringing them to market often calls for careful policy interventions. For example, in the US, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 required government agencies to purchase alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs). Alternative fuel (ethanol, natural gas, etc.) was not available in most locations, however, so the expenditure on AFVs did not result in reductions in petroleum use or the accompanying emissions (Helwig and Deason, 2007). New policies (Renewable Fuel Standard, restrictions on MTBE, Production Tax Credit, in addition to state policies addressing infrastructure for ethanol) have addressed both supply and demand issues, resulting in the highest production of ethanol in history (Solomon et al., 2007). On the other hand, tracking wind industry growth concurrent with government policies reveals a different pattern. During the years 2000, 2002, and 2004 the wind production tax credit was allowed to lapse, and US wind industry growth fell dramatically, to around 5% of worldwide growth and lower. Years when the credit was in effect, growth stayed above 20% (Wiser and Bolinger, 2007). These examples illustrate why support of energy innovations should continue beyond the research phase, into the diffusion stage. In its role as change agent, government policy can foster diffusion through professional networks and spur the private sector to take on innovation system functions. A new development with promise is the US Department of Energy's recently announced “Entrepreneur in Residence” program at three national laboratories (DOE, 2007). However, with total program funding capped at $300,000, the government is accepting a small role. It is worth noting that policies targeted at energy problems often have ancillary environmental benefits. In the case of passive solar or other conservation technologies, starting with carbon taxes and considering policies such as feed-in tariffs to promote alternative energies could be the beginning of a federal climate change policy. The links between energy conservation, renewable energy, and climate change are well established. In the case of passive solar or other conservation technologies, starting with carbon taxes and considering policies such as feed-in tariffs to promote alternative energies could be the beginning of a federal climate change policy. Public policies such as these are needed if we are to realize the potential of new energy-saving technologies such as passive solar housing features. Relying on markets alone to promote the use of passive solar in the US has yielded extremely slow adoption over the past three decades. Understanding the key factors, both supply- and demand-side, that prevent wider use of passive solar features enables us to make better policy choices to foster their use. Through a concerted effort to break the cycle of non-adoption, we can address energy issues that, over time, have detrimental impacts through climate change, pollution, and dependence on imported oil.

#### Government subsidies creates risky market structures – this turns case as pricing bubbles collapse

Gerdin 11 (Erik Gerding, Associate Professor at University of Colorado Law School. His research interests include securities, banking law, financial regulation generally, and corporate governance, “The Inherent, Ineluctable Instability of Financial Institution Regulation”, <http://www.theconglomerate.org/2011/09/the-inherent-ineluctable-instability-of-financial-institution-regulation.html>, September 12, 2011)

Here is my second contribution to the Faculty Lounge Online Forum on the legislative and regulatory process of financial reform. Check out the posts by the other contributors including, Kim Krawiec (Duke), Christie Ford (Univ. British Columbia), Brett McDonnell (Minnesota), Saule Omarova (North Carolina), and Dan Schwarz (Minnesota). In my last post, I concluded that the presence of government subsidies – particularly guarantees explicit (deposit insurance) and implicit (Too-Big-To-Fail) – makes the political economy of financial institution regulation different from other areas of the regulatory state. In this post, I argue that these government subsidies and moreover, the underlying reason for government subsidies, contributes to the inherent instability of financial institution regulation. The presence of government guarantees – explicit or implicit – creates strong incentives for financial firms to externalize the cost of their risk taking onto taxpayers. But there is more to government guarantees than moral hazard. Consider the following: Market distortion: When the government subsidizes some financial firms but not others, it distorts the market. A lower cost of capital allows the subsidized firms to undercut their competition. This can drive competitors either out of business or, if risk is being mispriced because of an asset boom, into riskier market segments (a phenomena I explored in a symposium piece). Cheaper debt and leverage: Government guarantees also. make debt cheaper than equity This supercharges the incentives of financial firms to increase leverage. Higher leverage of financial institutions, in turn, works to increase the effective supply of money. More money can fuel asset price bubbles and mask the mispricing of risk (phenomena explored by Margaret Blair in this paper, as well as by me in a forthcoming symposium piece in the Berkeley Business Law Journal.) Cheaper debt and regulatory capital arbitrage: Cheaper debt also supercharges financial firm incentives to game regulatory capital requirements (something I am writing about in the context of the shadow banking system. See also Jones; Acharya & Schnabl; Acharya & Richardson. Bailouts and correlated risk: Governments face pressure to bail out firms when their risk taking is highly correlated (because multiple firms will fail at the same time). On the flip side, this creates a strong incentive for financial firms to take on correlated risk. (See, e.g., Acharya et al.). Correlated risk taking reinforces the kind of herding that behavioral finance scholars have analyzed in the context of asset price bubbles. So feedback loops abound. What to do, then, about government subsidies? “Stop us before we bail out again” One approach is to erect barriers to the government providing subsidies and bailouts. Dodd-Frank is chock full o’ provisions that aim to do just this. But legal scholars need to give policymakers a dose of reality about the ability of law to hardwire “no bailouts, no subsidies.” I just came back from a conference last week in which a number of economists kept saying that this hardwiring was exactly what law needed to contribute to financial reform. Here is how some of the law professors in the room (including your friend and mine Anna Gelpern) responded: 1. Legal rules are by nature incomplete and, under pressure, firms and regulators will seek ways around rules. 2. It ain’t so easy for a sovereign to bind itself. In the end, what is the remedy and who will enforce it? 3. There is nothing to stop Congress from amending the law. Legislatures can’t entrench laws against amendments by future legislatures (although the government must honor contractual obligations – for a discussion of these issues, see U.S. v. Winstar) True, Dodd-Frank’s prohibitions on bailouts and governments are not just pieces of paper. Law does constrain government behavior to a degree and can promote political accountability. However, we should not expect “law” to work like a wind-up toy that is self-executing without worrying about issues of interpretation, compliance, incentives, and the norms of government actors. I restrained myself at the conference from delivering a little legal koan: “the law will bind government officials, if they believe it binds them.” As an aside: it strikes me that the legal academy has to do a much better job of educating economists, policy makers and the public about what is “law” and how it operates. We have to do this in an accessible manner and without undermining important norms of legal compliance. Financial reform proposals are replete with calls for more “automatic regulations” – whether to counter capture or political pressure to spike the economic punch when the party gets startin’. (For example, economists have proposed the very sensible policy of counter-cyclical capital buffers) But fetishizing automatic regulations can pervert financial regulation. Over-reliance on automatic regulation: Ignores the fact that regulators and lawmakers must interpret laws; and Discounts the likelihood or regulatory arbitrage or regulatory evasion. In short, we need to have a much richer discussion of what the “law in action” means. Letting it Burn: Confusing Bailouts with Other Externalities of Financial Institution Risk-Taking What if restrictions on bailouts and government guarantees work too well? There is a rationale for government interventions like deposit insurance, lender-of-last resort, and bailouts. They are not just about “capture.” Financial institution failure can impose significant negative externalities (which is a fairly antiseptic description of the social costs of financial crises). Counterparty and market discipline don’t force firms to internalize all of these externalities. I respect the intellectual consistency and fervor of those who believe that bailouts and government interventions are the root of all financial regulatory problems. But I wouldn’t trust them in any position of responsibility. Deposit insurance and bailouts aren’t the only ways governments distort markets when they act to avoid crises. Lender-of-last resort actions and even interest rates changes can create a type of moral hazard (see “Put, Greenspan”). It is a lot harder for central banks to calibrate liquidity responses to market seizures than armchair critics think. Countering Subsidies So if some government subsidization of the financial firms is inevitable, it is critical that the government counter these subsidies -- whether by limiting firm risk-taking or charging firms for the subsidy. Absent attempts to counter subsidies, we are right back where this post started – moral hazard, distortion, cheap debt --> leverage and capital arbitrage.

### 4

#### 1. CIR will pass now – vote count.

Martinez 1/24 (Gueillermo, columnist for the florida sun sentinel and on the editorial board, 2013, http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/opinion/fl-gmcol-oped0124-20130124,0,4256316.column)

Obama, White House officials, and even members of Congress say that this time it is different. And one can hope that is the case, for since Ronald Reagan last approved an amnesty program in 1986, immigration has been relegated to the all-talk-and-no-action category in American politics.¶ This year, after Hispanic voters helped put Obama in the White House with 70 percent of its vote, that is the least the administration can do for a group that desperately seeks security for its family members; who want their relatives to come out of the shadows, work, and pay taxes. In other words, live a normal life.¶ Even many of the better-known Republicans in Congress and conservative commentators in the media understand the party has to change its stand on this issue or lose the Hispanic vote for years to come.¶ Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., understands it so well he has been busy outlining his own plan to reform immigration law. It includes tougher enforcement on the border, a verification program, an increase in visa to scientists, and an agricultural workers program. And yes, it also addresses the issue of living in this country without papers.¶ So far Rubio's unwritten proposal has the approval of Congressman Paul Ryan, the Republican candidate for Vice President last November. It also has been praised by commentators like Sean Hannity and Bill O'Reilly. Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform, has called Rubio's plan a "step in the right direction."¶ However, some question his proposal on how to grant undocumented workers in this country a pass to legal residency and eventually citizenship. His plan does both, but has undocumented workers waiting in line for others who enter the country legally before they would be granted the much desired status.¶ Some liberals feel this would make undocumented workers spend years, if not decades, before they can apply for legalization. Rubio said he does not have an answer yet.¶ Still, this is the first time in decades when there is actually an opportunity to solve the problem of the millions who live in our midst without papers.¶ The 2012 presidential elections readied an awful lot of people. These conservative and Republicans now understand the demographics of the Hispanic vote is against the GOP and they must adapt or forever be a minority party.¶ This is the time for President Obama to prioritize the issue and not allow other equally important parts of his agenda distract from his promise to enact immigration reform in the first year of his second term, as he did four years ago.¶ At this point this is doable. The whipping Latinos gave Republicans in the last election is still fresh in everyone's mind. There should be enough Republican votes in the House and Senate to pass legislation.

#### 2. Obama’s political capital is key.

Hesson 1/2 (Ted, Immigration Editor at ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTq55JIAho)

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year.¶ To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with.¶ 1. Be a Leader¶ During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.¶ 2. Clear Space on the Agenda¶ Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said.

#### 3. Solar tax breaks are unpopular

NYT 12 (Cardwell, Diane, 2012, Jan. 26, “Energy Tax Breaks Proposed, Despite Waning Support for Subsidies,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/27/business/energy-environment/clean-energy-projects-face-waning-subsidies.html?pagewanted=all)

But the lobbying by the wind and solar industries comes at a time when there is little enthusiasm for alternative-energy subsidies in Washington. Overall concerns about the deficit are making lawmakers more skeptical about any new tax breaks for business in general. And taxpayer losses of more than half a billion dollars on [Solyndra](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/solyndra/index.html?inline=nyt-org), a bankrupt maker of solar modules that defaulted on a federal loan, has tarnished the image of renewable power in particular.

**4. The bill will open immigration and increase highly skilled immigrants.**

Amanda Peterson **Beadle 12/10**/12, Reporter/Blogger at ThinkProgress.org http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/10/1307561/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-needs-comprehensive-immigration-reform-that-includes-a-path-to-citizenship/

**The nation needs a comprehensive immigration plan,** and it is clear from a recent poll that most Americans support reforming the U.S.’s immigration system. In a new poll, nearly two-thirds of people surveyed are in favor of a measure that allows undocumented immigrants to earn citizenship over several years, while only 35 percent oppose such a plan. And President **Obama is expected to “begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform, including seeking a path to citizenship”** in January. Several top Republicans have softened their views on immigration reform following November’s election, but in the first push for reform, House Republicans advanced a bill last month that would add visas for highly skilled workers while reducing legal immigration overall. Providing a road map to citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. would have sweeping benefits for the nation, especially the economy. **Here are the** top 10 **reasons why the U.S. needs comprehensive immigration reform:** 1. **Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants** in the United States would boost the nation’s economy. It would add a cumulative $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole. 2. Tax revenues would increase. The federal government would accrue $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. And states would benefit. Texas, for example, would see a $4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. 3. Harmful state immigration laws are damaging state economies. States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law HB 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to $300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state. 4. A path to citizenship would help families access health care. About a quarter of families where at least one parent is an undocumented immigrant are uninsured, but undocumented immigrants do not qualify for coverage under the Affordable Care Act, leaving them dependent on so-called safety net hospitals that will see their funding reduced as health care reforms are implemented. Without being able to apply for legal status and gain health care coverage, the health care options for undocumented immigrants and their families will shrink. 5. **U.S. employers need a legalized workforce.** Nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status. But business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers, and a legalization program would ensure that they have them. 6. In 2011, immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses. Additionally, immigrant businesses employ one in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies, which collectively generated $4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States. 7. Letting undocumented immigrants gain legal status would keep families together. More than 5,100 children whose parents are undocumented immigrants are in the U.S. foster care system, according to a 2011 report, because their parents have either been detained by immigration officials or deported and unable to reunite with their children. If undocumented immigrants continue to be deported without a path to citizenship enabling them to remain in the U.S. with their families, up to 15,000 children could be in the foster care system by 2016 because their parents were deported, and most child welfare departments do not have the resources to handle this increase. 8. Young **undocumented immigrants would add billions to the economy if they gained legal status**. Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding $329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades. 9. And DREAMers would boost employment and wages. Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for young undocumented immigrants who would benefit from the DREAM Act by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create $181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and $10 billion in increased federal revenue. 10. **Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers**. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries, and immigrants more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created.

**5. Impact – Global Aging – Open immigration key to US aging transition – solves global aging.**

**Haas, '7** (Political Science Professor -- Duquesne, International Security, Summer)

**The more the** United States **maintains its enviable demographic position** (compared with the other great powers) **and relatively superior ability to pay for the costs of its elderly** population, **the more it will** be able both to **preserve its own position of international power dominance and** to **help other states address their aging** (and other) **problems** when it is in U.S. interests to do so. A critical implication of these facts is that such domestic policies as means-testing Social Security and Medicare payments, raising the retirement age to reflect increases in life expectancies, **maintaining largely open immigration policies to help keep the United States’ median age relatively low,** encouraging individual behaviors that result in better personal health, **and** perhaps above all **restraining the rising costs of its health-care system are critical international security concerns.** A defining political question of the twenty-first century for U.S. international interests is whether U.S. leaders have sufficient political will and wisdom to implement these and related policies. **The more proactive U.S. leaders are in minimizing** the scope of its **aging** population **and** the **costs associated** with it, **the more protected U.S. international interests will be. To ignore these costs, or even to delay** implementing various **reforms designed to limit their size, will jeopardize the level of global influence and security that the** UnitedStates enjoys today.

**6. Multiple nuclear wars.**

**Jackson & Howe, 11** (Senior Fellow – CSIS & Senior Associate – CSIS, http://csis.org/files/publication/110104\_gai\_jackson.pdf)

**A number of demographic storms are now brewing in different parts of the developing world**. The moment of maximum risk still lies ahead—just a decade away, in the 2020s. Ominously, this is the same decade when the developed world will itself be experiencing its moment of greatest demographic stress. Consider China, which may be the first country to grow old before it grows rich. For the past quarter-century, **China has been “peacefully rising,” thanks** in part **to a one-child**-per-couple **policy** that has lowered dependency burdens and allowed both parents to work and contribute to China’s boom. **By** the **2020**s, however, **the huge Red Guard generation**, which was born before the country’s fertility decline, **will move into retirement**, **heavily taxing the** resources of their children and **the state.** **China’s coming age wave**—by 2030 it will be an older country than the United States—**may weaken the t**wo pillars of the current **regime’s legitimacy**: rapidly rising GDP and social stability. Imagine workforce growth slowing to zero while tens of millions of elders sink into indigence without pensions, without health care, and without large extended families to support them. **China could careen toward social collapse**—**or**, in reaction, toward an **authoritarian clampdown**. The arrival of China’s age wave, and the turmoil it may bring, will coincide with its expected displacement of the United States as the world’s largest economy in the 2020s. According to “power transition” theories of global conflict, this moment could be quite perilous. By the 2020s, **Russia**, along with the rest of Eastern Europe, **will be in the midst of an extended population decline** as steep or steeper than any in the developed world. The Russian fertility rate has plunged far beneath the replacement level even as life expectancy has collapsed amid a widening health crisis. Russian men today can expect to live to 60—16 years less than American men and marginally less than their Red Army grandfathers at the end of World War II. By 2050, Russia is due to fall to 16th place in world population rankings, down from 4th place in 1950 (or third place, if we include all the territories of the former Soviet Union). Prime Minister Vladimir Putin flatly calls Russia’s demographic implosion “the most acute problem facing our country today.” **If the problem is not solved, Russia will weaken progressively, raising the nightmarish specter of a** failing or **failed state with nuclear weapons**. Or **this cornered bear may lash out** in revanchist fury rather than meekly accept its demographic fate. Of course, **some regions** of the developing world **will remain extremely young** in the 2020s. Sub-Saharan Africa, which is burdened by the world’s highest fertility rates and is also ravaged by AIDS, will still be racked by large youth bulges. So will a scattering of impoverished and chronically unstable Muslim-majority countries, including Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. **If the correlation between extreme youth and violence endures, chronic unrest and state failure could persist** in much of sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the Muslim world through the 2020s, or even longer if fertility rates fail to drop. Meanwhile, many fast-modernizing countries where fertility has fallen very recently and very steeply will experience a sudden resurgence of youth in the 2020s. It is a law of demography that, when a population boom is followed by a bust, it causes a ripple effect, with a gradually fading cycle of echo booms and busts. In the 2010s, a bust generation will be coming of age in much of Latin America, South Asia, and the Muslim world. But by the 2020s**, an echo boom will follow**—dashing economic expectations and perhaps **fueling political violence, religious extremism, and ethnic strife**. These echo booms will be especially large in Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan, the decade-overdecade percentage growth in the number of people in the volatile 15- to 24-year-old age bracket is projected to drop from 32 percent in the 2000s to just 10 percent in the 2010s, but then leap upward again to 19 percent in the 2020s. In Iran, the swing in the size of the youth bulge population is projected to be even larger: minus 33 percent in the 2010s and plus 23 percent in the 2020s. **These echo booms will be occurring in countries whose social fabric is already strained by rapid development**. **One country teeters on the brink of chaos, while the other aspires to regional hegemony. One already has nuclear weapons, while the other seems likely to obtain them**.

### 5

#### 1. Solar technology gets co-opted by capitalism – it’s adopted as temporary solution to the crisis of capitalism that enables the system to continue

Garza 90 (Margarita Perez, “The Antinuclear Power Movement and the Crisis of the U.S. Nuclear Power Industry, 1953 to 1989” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, May)

Although the antinuclear power movement adopted the soft energy perspective, it failed to analyze soft energy technologies from the point of view of the working class, thus exposing the innovations to capitalist integration. Solar technology like any technology can be used by capital to discipline workers. Hard solar can easily fit into capital’s centralized high technology model. For instance, tax dollars have been used to develop large central stations to produce solar electricity such as the power tower ($79 billion in fiscal 1977), which was the least cost effective of solar options at the time.(26) On the other hand, DOE spent only a small portion of its funds in the 1970s on community solar projects that were more cost- effective. How can capital benefit from solar? Solar technologies can help capital weather the proliferation of crises that have beset it since the 1960s by providing a whole selection of products that can be produced by American industry. For instance, once the domain of political activists, solar energy has been taken over by corporations. Business has justified its takeover by arguing that it alone can quicken the pace of the diffusion of solar technologies.(27) Furthermore, capital has also come to see the solar vision as a means of imposing austerity measures on the working class and other groups to maintain existing living standards.

#### 2. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear

Foster 5 [John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol. 57, Issue 4, “Naked Imperialism”, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>]

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China,that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

#### 3 Vote negative to adopt the historical material criticism of the 1NC - historical analysis of the material conditions of capital is the only way to break free from is contradictions and social inequalities it causes

Tumino 1 (Steven, teaches at the City University of New York, Spring, What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before)

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### 4. Historical materialism must come first - it predetermines consciousness and the very possibilities of reflective thinking

**Marx 1859** (Karl, a pretty important dude. “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface” http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm) JM

>edited for gendered language<

In the social production of their existence, [people] inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which [people] become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

### Case

#### Focus on ontology is bad - preventing widespread death takes precedence.

Davidson, Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago, ‘89

[Arnold, coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Critical Inquiry, Winter 1989. p.426]

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: “The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face… Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted- in our relations with men… The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men… that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of.” Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associated himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussion of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgement of others: “As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?… I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God [CR, p.470].” The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always directed toward the human; every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one understands the source of her intuition. The mass extermination of human beings, however, does not produce foam, but dust and ashes; and it is here that questioning must stop.

#### Their infatuation with ontology is politically debilitating – focusing on ontology divests politics of its emancipatory potential and devolves into a self-justifying cycle of never-ending critique.

Yar, Ph.D in the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University, 2k

[Majid, “Arendt's Heideggerianism: Contours of a `Postmetaphysical' Political Theory?,” Cultural Values, Volume 4, Issue 1, January, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Complete]

Similarly, we must consider the consequences that this 'ontological substitution' for the essence of the political has for politics, in terms of what is practically excluded by this rethinking. If the presently available menu of political engagements and projects (be they market or social liberalism, social democracy, communitarianism, Marxism, etc.) are only so many moments of the techno-social completion of an underlying metaphysics, then the fear of 'metaphysical contamination' inhibits any return to recognisable political practices and sincere engagement with the political exigencies of the day. This is what Nancy Fraser has called the problem of 'dirty hands', the suspension of engagement with the existing content of political agendas because of their identification as being in thrall to the violence of metaphysics. Unable to engage in politics as it is, one either [a] sublimates the desire for politics by retreating to an interrogation of the political with respect to its essence (Fraser, 1984, p. 144), or [b] on this basis, seeks 'to breach the inscription of a wholly other politics'. The former suspends politics indefinitely, while the latter implies a new politics, which, on the basis of its reconceived understanding of the political, apparently excludes much of what recognizably belongs to politics today. This latter difficulty is well known from Arendt's case, whose barring of issues of social and economic justice and welfare from the political domain are well known. To offer two examples: [1] in her commentary on the U.S. civil rights movement in the 1950s, she argued that the politically salient factor which needed challenging was only racial legislation and the formal exclusion of African-Americans from the political sphere, not discrimination, social deprivation and disadvantage, etc.(Arendt, 1959, pp. 45-56); [2] Arendt's pronounceraent at a conference in 1972 (put under question by Albrecht Wellmer regarding her distinction of the 'political' and the 'social'), that housing and homelessness were not political issues, that they were external to the political as the sphere of the actualisation of freedom as disclosure; the political is about human self-disclosure in speech and deed, not about the distribution of goods, which belongs to the social realm as an extension of the oikos.[20] The point here is not that Arendt and others are in any sense unconcerned or indifferent about such sufferings, deprivations and inequalities. Rather, it is that such disputes and agendas are identified as belonging to the socio-technical sphere of administration, calculation, instrumentality, the logic of means and ends, subject-object manipulation by a will which turns the world to its purposes, the conceptual rendering of beings in terms of abstract and levelling categories and classes, and so on; they are thereby part and parcel of the metaphysical-technological understanding of Being, which effaces the unique and singular appearance and disclosure of beings, and thereby illegitimate candidates for consideration under the renewed, ontological-existential formulation of the political. To reconceive the political in terms of a departure from its former incarnation as metaphysical politics, means that the revised terms of a properly political discourse cannot accommodate the prosaic yet urgent questions we might typically identify under the rubric of 'policy'. Questions of social and economic justice are made homeless, exiled from the political sphere of disputation and demand in which they were formerly voiced. Indeed, it might be observed that the postmetaphysical formulation of the political is devoid of any content other than the freedom which defines it; it is freedom to appear, to disclose, but not the freedom to do something in particular, in that utilising freedom for achieving some end or other implies a collapse back into will, instrumentality, teleocracy, poeisis, etc. By defining freedom qua disclosedness as the essence of freedom and the sole end of the political, this position skirts dangerously close to advocating politique pour la politique, divesting politics of any other practical and normative ends in the process.[21]

#### Rhetoric of apocalypse is key to producing substantive change and generating agency – studies prove

Veldman 12 (Robin Globus, phd candidate B.A and M.A, “Narrating the Environmental Apocalypse: How Imagining the End Facilitates Moral Reasoning Among Environmental Activists” in Ethics & the Environment 17.1.)

As we saw in the introduction, critics often argue that apocalyptic rhetoric induces feelings of hopelessness or fatalism. While it certainly does for some people, in this section I will present evidence that apocalypticism also often goes hand in hand with activism. Some of the strongest evidence of a connection between environmental apocalypticism and activism comes from a national survey that examined whether Americans perceived climate change to be dangerous. As part of his analysis, Anthony Leiserowitz identified several “interpretive communities,” which had consistent demographic characteristics but varied in their levels of risk perception. The group who perceived the risk to be the greatest, which he labeled “alarmists,” described climate change ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT, 17(1) 2012 using apocalyptic language, such as “Bad…bad…bad…like after nuclear war…no vegetation,” “Heat waves, it’s gonna kill the world,” and “Death of the planet” (2005, 1440). Given such language, this would seem to be a reasonable way to operationalize environmental apocalypticism. If such apocalypticism encouraged fatalism, we would expect alarmists to be less likely to have engaged in environmental behavior compared to groups with moderate or low levels of concern. To the contrary, however, Leiserowitz found that alarmists “were significantly more likely to have taken personal action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” (ibid.) than respondents who perceived climate change to pose less of a threat. Interestingly, while one might expect such radical views to appeal only to a tiny minority, Leiserowitz found that a respectable eleven percent of Americans fell into this group (ibid). Further supporting Leiserowitz’s findings, in a separate national survey conducted in 2008, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, and Leiserowitz found that a group they labeled “the Alarmed” (again, due to their high levels of concern about climate change) “are the segment most engaged in the issue of global warming. They are very convinced it is happening, humancaused, and a serious and urgent threat. The Alarmed are already making changes in their own lives and support an aggressive national response” (2009, 3, emphasis added). This group was far more likely than people with lower levels of concern over climate change to have engaged in consumer activism (by rewarding companies that support action to reduce global warming with their business, for example) or to have contacted elected officials to express their concern. Additionally, the authors found that “[w]hen asked which reason for action was most important to them personally, the Alarmed were most likely to select preventing the destruction of most life on the planet (31%)” (2009, 31)—a finding suggesting that for many in this group it is specifically the desire to avert catastrophe, rather than some other motivation, that encourages pro-environmental behavior. Taken together, these and other studies (cf. Semenza et al. 2008 and DerKarabetia, Stephenson, and Poggi 1996) provide important evidence that many of those who think environmental problems pose a severe threat practice some form of activism, rather than giving way to fatalistic resignation.

#### The plan is only a REFUND, Up-front costs deter individuals according to their own evidence

Garrett and Koontz, aff authors, 2008

[Vicki and Tomas M; School of Environment and Natural Resources, The Ohio State University; “Breaking the cycle: Producer and consumer perspectives on the non-adoption of passive solar housing in the US” Energy Policy 36; Elsevier; scholar]

Two policy administrators also mentioned up-front costs. In Pennsylvania, where loans and grants for passive solar are available, the public has some interest, but will not make a conversion until prices for design, installation, and the product itself come down.

#### Passive solar will be discarded—can’t meet energy demands

Brook and Hong 12 (Barry, Senior Fellow at the Breakthrough Institute and a Research Professor at the University of Adelaide in Australia, Sanghyun, PhD candidate at the University of Adelaide, No Nukes? Then Say Yes to Global Warming: How the Anti-Nuclear Movement Undermines Climate Efforts, <http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/programs/energy-and-climate/no-nukes-then-say-yes-to-global-warming/>)

Our recent research (currently submitted to the journal [*Energy*](http://www.journals.elsevier.com/energy/)) uses MCDMA to show that even when the negative consequences of using nuclear power are properly factored in (and costs assigned to waste management, accident consequences, and so on), those **scenarios with reduced nuclear power result in a less sustainable future** in Japan.

In particular, the greenhouse-gas emissions of the nuclear-free scenario can reach up to about 430 kg per megawatt hour. By comparison, in the 35% nuclear-power scenario, it is only 267 kg per megawatt hour, in spite of the higher renewable energy share of the former. Except for the differing nuclear capacity, in all scenarios the ratio of coal to gas power had the largest influence on greenhouse-gas emissions.¶ Unfortunately, **a high dependency on renewables** without ongoing support for nuclear in Japan **cannot cut the electricity generation sector’s greenhouse gas emissions unless some currently undeveloped alternative forms of cheap, large-scale energy storage are deployed in the future.**

#### Energy spending crowds out investment on more effective technologies and causes complacency – turns the case.

Carl 4-6 (Jeremy Carl. Hoover Institution. “When Subsidies Fizzle” April 6, 2012. <http://www.hoover.org/publications/hoover-digest/article/113426>)

While pricing carbon can help boost renewable technologies in general, the idea of picking particular winning renewable technologies is a fool’s errand. Many environmentalists have been calling for heavy subsidization and massive build-out of renewables almost since the first significant wind turbines and solar panels were introduced in the 1970s. If we had been foolish enough to listen to them and subsidize these early-stage technologies on a mass scale, we would have an energy system even more expensive, unreliable, and dysfunctional than what we have now—with probably little impact on the climate to boot. Instead, through three decades of R&D improvements we have at least brought these technologies to the level where they can compete with fossil fuels in certain situations. And nobody knows where the next breakthrough will come from. Until the natural-gas fracking revolution was unleashed a few short years ago, almost every expert in academia and industry thought we were running out of natural gas. Now we are figuring out what to do with our abundance. This highlights another problem with subsidies. Heavy subsidization of sort-of-OK renewable-energy technologies tends to crowd out funding of R&D on the true breakthrough technologies we would need to transform our energy system. Subsidies also cause complacency and weaken the relentless focus that companies need to get renewables to be competitive at the “Chindia price”—a price they will need to hit if they are to be widely deployed globally rather than simply in politically favorable regimes in California or Europe.

## 2NC

### CP

#### We have empirical proof that the CP captures all of the aff -- Australia demonstrates the CP (a) creates a market for passive solar and (b) architects perceive the plan as a change to the nature of energy/architecture relationship, just like the plan

Archicentre 2011

[Archicentre is quality endorsed and wholly owned by the Australian Institute of Architects, <http://prwire.com.au/print/carbon-debate-puts-immediate-focus-on-housing-design-1>, August 14th]

The current carbon tax debate is placing an immediate focus on housing design and energy saving products as prudent people considering purchasing a home or carrying out a renovation will increasingly begin to factor in the cost of running a home and using building products that are less energy intensive to produce.¶ Archicentre State Manager Victoria, David Hallett said considering the carbon tax is planned to be introduced in July 2012 it is prudent for people to consider its impact when planning a building project which can take up to twelve months to commence.¶ Mr Hallett said, “As carbon pricing will impact both on materials used and on the running costs of the home, the major area for home buyers and renovators to create a winner is at the design stage.¶ “Ultimately the cost saving starts with the design and siting of the home including making provision for natural light in the main living areas and the orientation of the home to gain the maximum benefit for passive solar heating and provision for water harvesting.¶ “This is the stage where all of the ideas are assembled and thought through to ensure the best design for the budget is worked out.¶ “This stage can also the most expensive time for new home builders or renovators, if they make a mistake on the original design and have to undertake costly variations, the greatest reason for cost blow outs on projects.”¶ Mr Hallett said the proposed carbon tax is a catalyst for people to look differently at housing and encourage smaller and better designed homes, and being more careful in material selection as a major strategy to cope with Australia’s housing affordability.¶ Archicentre undertakes over 20,000 reports each year and its Design Concepts consider climatic conditions, prevailing local conditions, site orientation, the zoning or location of the rooms in the home, materials, construction techniques and the building cost.¶ Mr Hallett said the first step in orientation is maximising the northern aspect, where exposure to the sun is best controlled. Eaves and pergolas can be precisely designed to block the summer sun, and still allow the desirable winter sunshine to penetrate.¶ “It is important to prioritise rooms based on access to views and solar orientation. An open-plan kitchen and living area, for example, should have top position, while bedrooms or bathrooms require less daylight, as they are largely used for short periods of time, or at night.¶ By zoning the home, unused areas can be closed off, and cooling and heating appliances can be designed for maximum efficiency and minimum use.¶ Mr Hallett said the carbon tax introduction will have a major impact on reinforcing sustainable housing design across the market in new homes and renovations.

#### 1NC Carbon Tax solves the aff – their authors say it’s the best way to spur the market for passive solar

Garrett and Koontz, aff authors, 2008

[Vicki and Tomas M; School of Environment and Natural Resources, The Ohio State University; “Breaking the cycle: Producer and consumer perspectives on the non-adoption of passive solar housing in the US” Energy Policy 36; Elsevier; scholar]

Addressing this fragmented innovation system could be beneficial for both passive solar and many alternative energy measures. As new energy sources and conservation measures are developed, the challenge of bringing them to market often calls for careful policy interventions. For example, in the US, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 required government agencies to purchase alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs). Alternative fuel (ethanol, natural gas, etc.) was not available in most locations, however, so the expenditure on AFVs did not result in reductions in petroleum use or the accompanying emissions (Helwig and Deason, 2007). New policies (Renewable Fuel Standard, restrictions on MTBE, Production Tax Credit, in addition to state policies addressing infrastructure for ethanol) have addressed both supply and demand issues, resulting in the highest production of ethanol in history (Solomon et al., 2007). On the other hand, tracking wind industry growth concurrent with government policies reveals a different pattern. During the years 2000, 2002, and 2004 the wind production tax credit was allowed to lapse, and US wind industry growth fell dramatically, to around 5% of worldwide growth and lower. Years when the credit was in effect, growth stayed above 20% (Wiser and Bolinger, 2007). These examples illustrate why support of energy innovations should continue beyond the research phase, into the diffusion stage. In its role as change agent, government policy can foster diffusion through professional networks and spur the private sector to take on innovation system functions. A new development with promise is the US Department of Energy's recently announced “Entrepreneur in Residence” program at three national laboratories (DOE, 2007). However, with total program funding capped at $300,000, the government is accepting a small role. It is worth noting that policies targeted at energy problems often have ancillary environmental benefits. In the case of passive solar or other conservation technologies, starting with carbon taxes and considering policies such as feed-in tariffs to promote alternative energies could be the beginning of a federal climate change policy. The links between energy conservation, renewable energy, and climate change are well established. In the case of passive solar or other conservation technologies, starting with carbon taxes and considering policies such as feed-in tariffs to promote alternative energies could be the beginning of a federal climate change policy. Public policies such as these are needed if we are to realize the potential of new energy-saving technologies such as passive solar housing features. Relying on markets alone to promote the use of passive solar in the US has yielded extremely slow adoption over the past three decades. Understanding the key factors, both supply- and demand-side, that prevent wider use of passive solar features enables us to make better policy choices to foster their use. Through a concerted effort to break the cycle of non-adoption, we can address energy issues that, over time, have detrimental impacts through climate change, pollution, and dependence on imported oil.

#### Carbon tax would spur passive solar use

Green Party 2010

[GPUS Platform, http://www.gp.org/committees/platform/comments/?p=620]

We propose:¶ a. More progressive taxation. Sales, corporate and income taxes should be adjusted to relieve the burden on those less able to pay and increase the burden on large and multinational corporations and the super wealthy, who do not pay their fair share. Raise the state income tax for higher income people. Also, reduce income taxes for low-wage workers to encourage people to seek employment rather than relying on public assistance.¶ b. Raising corporate taxes. The corporate share of taxes has fallen from 33% in the 1940s to 7% today, while the individual share has risen from 44% to 85%.¶ c. Implementing tax policies that promote sustainability and social responsibility. Subsidies, export incentives, tax loopholes and tax shelters that benefit large corporations now amount to hundreds of billions of dollars each year. These promote growth and the consumption of resources.¶ d. Shifting investments away from such things as automating the production of disposable products, which reduces the number of jobs. Also, discourage leveraged buyouts and mergers, which extract working capital. Instead, we must promote community development and job creation.¶ e. Imposing Carbon taxes on all fossil fuels, because of detrimental effects of carbon emissions on the environment. Those with the highest carbon content would be taxed the most, ranging from coal (highest) to oil to natural gas. Revenues would go into a fund initially earmarked for carbon-reducing activities. [See section E. Clean Air / Greenhouse Effect / Ozone Depletion on page 47 in chapter III]¶ f. Offsetting Regressive Taxes. The carbon tax would favor those of lower income by being directed to fund public transportation improvement and subsidies, weatherization and other efficiency measures, and passive solar installations. As revenues increase, the funds would be used to provide relief to low income people in such programs as housing and education and could eventually replace regressive taxes such as sales taxes.

#### Carbon tax creates the market for passive solar use

Milsted 2010

[Carl, http://www.holisticpolitics.org/GlobalWarming/Future.php]

At the beginning of this chapter I said that the U.S. needs to cut its carbon dioxide emissions by 75% just to keep world emissions constant—if we allow the rest of the world to catch up. Yet in my carbon tax calculations I assumed that the reduction in carbon burning would be less. We have a contradiction. This is intentional. I don't want to immediately cut carbon burning by 75%. It would be a huge burden on the economy and likely unnecessary. The world hasn't caught up yet, so we have time. And the world can likely withstand a few years of carbon dioxide emission growth as long as it is followed up by shrinkage. Actually, a near-immediate 25% reduction in carbon burning would be considered ambitious by many environmentalists. It is more than the Kyoto Treaty calls for. The bigger environmental benefit of a carbon tax is not the immediate conservation, but the market created for real long term solutions. At a doubling of retail energy costs, many existing alternative energy technologies become economically viable: passive solar, flat plate collectors, hybrid cars, and maybe even more exotic technologies such as photovoltaics, electric cars and Stirling engine hot water heaters.

#### The CP creates a strong incentive for individuals to buy passive solar designs

Green 2011

[Michael, Carbon tax and households, first appeared in Greener Homes, http://www.michaelbgreen.com.au/carbon-tax-households]

Simple steps at home will offset the cost of the carbon tax¶ AS a householder, there’s one key feature of the federal government’s carbon tax that you mustn’t overlook: you can avoid paying it.¶ And that’s what you’re meant to do. Ian Porter, CEO of the Alternative Technology Association, observes that the tax is intended to encourage households and businesses to use less energy, and therefore, produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions.¶ “Anyone who is energy-wise is likely to experience very little impact at all,” he says.¶ The government predicts a price rise of about $10 per week for an average household (offset by the average compensation, which is just over $10 per week). Of that amount, the electricity portion comprises $3.30 per week.¶ But these numbers are based on average usage. They don’t take into account the way we can change our habits. You can offset the rising prices by becoming more energy efficient around the home.¶ “The normal rule of thumb is that around 10 per cent – if not more – of your energy bill can be reduced by simple, cheap or free measures, such as avoiding standby power, switching lights off and installing draught excluders under your doors to keep your rooms warmer,” Mr Porter says.¶ So for a savvy householder, the deal is good news: you can reduce your energy consumption and carbon emissions, avoid the tax and pocket the compensation.¶ Damian Sullivan, from the Brotherhood of St Laurence, agrees that we shouldn’t worry that the tax will cause a big jump in our cost of living. The charity operates a social enterprise, Brotherhood Green, which conducts energy audits and retrofits of existing homes for low-income earners.¶ “Electricity prices are already rising dramatically, with or without a carbon price,” he says. “The compensation will cover the added impact, but the scheme also provides an incentive for people to implement energy efficiency around their homes.”¶ As part of the plan, the government has promised to set up a national energy savings initiative, which would oblige energy retailers to help customers to reduce their electricity demand.¶ “There are a whole lot of measures you can take, from everyday actions and home maintenance, to purchasing efficient appliances when you need new ones,” he says.¶ Mr Sullivan says it pays to regularly re-assess your habits. The dollars quickly add up, with even the most innocuous changes in household behaviour. By washing your clothes in cold water, avoiding using a dryer, sealing draughts and installing an efficient showerhead, the savings for a family of four could total over $300 per year, he says.¶ For his part, Mr Porter looks coolly upon the custom of running a second fridge. “So often when we replace a refrigerator, we keep the old one. People like to leave it in their garage and store beer in it, but it’s an energy guzzler if you do that,” he says. “Consider the type and the number of appliances you choose to have.”¶ If the opportunity arises, you can hardwire cheaper bills and fewer greenhouse gas emissions by designing and building as efficiently as you can.¶ “If you’re lucky enough to be at the point where you’re designing, buying or renovating a house, that’s when passive solar design comes to the fore – initiatives such as orientation, glazing and thermal mass,” Mr Porter says. “That’s where you’ll make some of your biggest savings.”

#### Doesn’t link to politics – conservatives like it

Trabish 12 (Herman K., Contributor to Wired and Greentechmedia Trabish: December 7, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Why-is-DC-Talking-about-a-Carbon-Tax-Again)

Washington insiders at both ends of the political spectrum have begun talking about a carbon tax.¶ The document "A Progressive Carbon Tax Will Fight Climate Change and Stimulate the Economy" by Richard Caperton of the Democrat-aligned Center for American Progress (CAP) is a little surprising because the assumption since 2009 has been that some version of a market-based cap-and-trade program was the only politically viable way to put a price on carbon emissions.¶ Advocacy for a carbon tax by academics at the Republican-aligned American Enterprise Institute (AEI) is astonishing because the word "tax," thanks to Grover Norquist, seemed to have been synonymous with the word "unpatriotic" on that side of the aisle.¶ But with both parties struggling with how the federal government can put its fiscal house in order, things may have changed.¶ At an AEI-hosted conference in July, AEI researchers Kevin Hassett and Aparna Mathur and Brookings Institution researcher Adele Morris jointly proposed the idea as part of a broad fiscal reform program because it could be a “significant source of revenue.” ¶ A tax “starting at about $20 per ton of CO2 in 2015 and rising at 4 percent over inflation would raise over $100 billion in the first year, rising to over $400 billion per year by 2040,” they estimated. And, they added, a tax “that funds deficit reduction or offsets other distortionary taxes would be a lot less costly to the economy than one that doesn’t.”¶ They recommended a progressive structure so that a rebate program would not be needed to protect vulnerable businesses and those with low incomes.¶ “A greenhouse gas tax can reduce the need for both more burdensome regulation and other federal outlays and tax expenditures,” they said, putting them in agreement with other AEI presenters who noted that a carbon tax has advantages over the traditional regulation conservatives disdain at least as much, adding that it provides an incentive to reduce consumption, drives emissions reductions via the lowest-cost options, and is more transparent.

#### CP doesn’t link - Republicans want to repeal all energy subsidies and stop picking winners

CNS News 12 (http://cnsnews.com/news/article/gop-congressmen-gov-t-should-stop-picking-winners-and-losers-energy-sector)

(CNSNews.com) – Several Republican leaders in the Senate and House spoke about their legislation to repeal all tax subsidies to the energy industry on Thursday, stating that government should not be in the business of “picking winners and losers” but should instead seek to ensure a level playing field for all competitors.¶ At a Capitol Hill press conference with Sen. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.), Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah), and Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wisc.), House Rep. Mike Pompeo (R-Kan.) introduced his legislation, which mirrors that currently in the Senate, to repeal all energy tax credits.¶ The federal government must “stop picking winners and losers, stop supporting multi-million dollar, billion -dollar boondoggles, things like Solyndra, companies that simply can’t survive in the marketplace on their own,” said Sen. Johnson.¶ Rep. Pompeo said, “We have been uniform and broad and favor no one. We are literally trying to get the federal government’s tax code out of the business of picking winners and losers.”¶ “It’s time for these industries to compete, to enter their products into the marketplace, and convince customers that the energy that they provide is something that they can afford and they want,” he said.

#### Market uncertainty destroys solvency

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

While libertarians are often caricatured as those who have near religious certainty about the correctness of their ideologically-charged view of the world, the reality is quite the opposite. In short, we libertarians argue that, in energy markets, much is uncertain. We don’t know whether renewable energy is the “best” way to reduce greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. We don’t know for certain when (or even if) oil will meaningfully grow more scarce. We don’t know what the transportation market will look like tomorrow. And we don’t know better than greedy, profit-hungry investors whether money spent in this sector or that – or on this technology or that – is a better deal than money spent in some other way. Hence, we propose to leave it to producers and consumers to sort such things out. Nor are we libertarians the only ones who see wisdom in this policy path. Even “soft energy” guru Amory Lovins has no complaint with leaving energy decisions to the market and letting the chips fall where they may.

#### This ensures error replication and market failure

Taylor 8 Jerry, CATO, Powering the Future, 8/22, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=9609>

Before you confidently hold forth about the future of energy markets, you really ought to pick up a copy of Vaclav Smil's 2005 book, "Energy at the Crossroads," and direct your attention to Chapter 4. There you will find a thorough review of the most prominent energy forecasts that have been offered over the last several decades by various blue-ribbon commissions, government forecasting agencies, top-flight academics, energy trade associations, think tanks, policy advocates and energy corporations. **One can't help but conclude that drunk monkeys would be just as reliable** as "the best and the brightest" when it comes to soothsaying about the future of technology, market share or price. The point here is that we don't know what the energy future may hold and we should accordingly treat the periodic energy crazes that sweep the political landscape more skeptically than we have in the past. Markets will provide the lowest-cost energy possible because energy producers compete mightily with one another for profit. If you need any proof that unleashing government to plan our energy future is like giving car keys to drunken teenagers (to paraphrase P.J. O'Rourke), you need look no further than President Bush's 2002 "Freedom CAR" initiative. First, it was charged with delivering us into the hydrogen age. But then the president discovered switch grass; fuel cells were henceforth "out" and cellulosic ethanol was "in." Now it turns out that 200-proof grain alcohol is not the fuel of the future; electricity delivered via plug-in electric-gasoline hybrids is. And Freedom CAR is but one example of many that one could marshal; whole books have been written about the myriad economic disasters and quiet taxpayer waste associated with our ongoing practice of energy planning in post-World War II America. The problem isn't that ignorant or venal people are charged with making our collective energy decisions. The problem is that we can no more sensibly plan the energy economy than we can centrally plan any other sector of the economy, particularly given the fact that political decisions are inevitably made primarily on their political merits, not on their economic or environmental merits. Markets will provide the lowest-cost energy possible because energy producers compete mightily with one another for profit. The argument we frequently hear that "we need every source of energy in the future to meet our staggering energy needs" is ridiculous. Some energy — such as nuclear fusion and grid-connected solar energy — is simply too expensive to produce now, which is to say, it costs more to generate than it is worth. Subsidies and mandates to get "every energy source to market" simply force us to generate and consume energy that costs more than it is worth. In an ideal world, we would strip the energy market of all subsidies; liberate the energy industry to exploit resources on federal lands; leave prices alone so that they deliver accurate information to investors about wealth-creating opportunities and to consumers about relative scarcity; allow energy companies to structure themselves in any manner they like; and fully embrace free trade in energy markets, which keeps prices down. I don't disagree that we have a responsibility to police the public environmental commons. But the best way to do that is to set emission rules or regulations that apply fairly to all emitters in all sectors of the economy and that have some relationship to the harms being addressed. Once that's done, market actors will order their affairs efficiently to produce the lowest-cost energy possible and do a better job picking "winners" than would-be central planners.

### DA

#### Preserving existence is the primary obligation of a human and precedes value to life questions.

Wapner 03 [Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University. “Leftist Criticism of "Nature" Environmental Protection in a Postmodern Age,” Dissent Winter 2003 <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm>]

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems.

#### Imagining unintended catastrophes is both accurate and necessary – scenario planning is effective.

Tetlock, Mitchell Endowed Professor at the University of California, Berkeley, ‘9

[Philip, the author of Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?, The National Interest, 8-25-9, “Reading Tarot on K Street”,

<http://nationalinterest.org/bookreview/reading-tarot-on-k-street-3220>, RSR]

The authors point out too that just because something—like geopolitical risk—is hard to quantify does not give you license to ignore it. Rough approximations are better than tacitly treating the risk as zero. Ask the energy companies that rushed into Yeltsin’s Russia in the 1990s to make large fixed-capital investments and were then compelled by Putin in the next decade to “renegotiate.” This means we need to value contrarian thinkers, even though they can be a royal pain and slow down the adoption of policies preferred by insiders. And so the authors suggest we might consider one much-hyped, but still useful, method of prying open otherwise closed minds: scenario planning. This requires policy advocates to envision worlds in which things don’t work out as planned—a world in which we are not greeted as liberators in Iraq; or a world in which deregulation leads not to greater market efficiencies but rather to excessive borrowing that severely destabilizes financial markets. History rarely overtly repeats itself but it often rhymes—and there is an advantage to those who can pick up the more subtle similarities. Saddam Hussein bore some resemblance to Hitler, but he also bore some to Ceauçescu, Mussolini, Kim Il Sung and Stalin, all of whom played a far more risk-averse geopolitical game. The case for the 2003 invasion of Iraq loses much of its rhetorical force when we use historical analogies in a more nuanced fashion. The authors are even nimble enough to see that although there are many settings in which foxes like themselves have an advantage—they are slower to jump to premature conclusions and are quicker to change their minds in response to new evidence—hedgehogs are still sometimes remarkably prescient. As far back as 1933, Churchill classified Hitler as a grave threat to Great Britain—a category into which, incidentally, he also tossed Gandhi. Similarly, the most bearish and bullish financial pundits occasionally have their days in the sun.

#### Renewables will collapse in the US – financial incentives are rolling back

Jacobs 12 (Justin, Petroluem Economist, 5/25 ; Is the boom-time over for US renewables, Lexis)

Justin Jacobs, LONDON: The clean energy sector has been a rare bright spot for the ailing US economy since the financial crisis took hold. Strong political support from the Obama administration and generous stimulus spending has fuelled a golden age for wind and solar technologies and led to a resurgence in the moribund nuclear industry. Non-hydro renewable electricity generation in the US, including nuclear power, doubled from 2006 to 2011, even if it still accounts for less than a tenth of electricity produced. But the good times could soon come to an end, though, as stimulus funds run dry and a host of subsidy programmes expire over coming years, potentially creating a ruinous "funding cliff", a report from three think tanks has warned. The report, Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence, was written by authors from the Breakthrough Institute, the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and the World Resources Institute. It points to 2012 as a make-or-break year for the sector. Federal funding for clean energy - wind, solar and nuclear primarily - is expected to fall by nearly half this year, from $30.7 billion in 2011 to around $16 billion. That is down from a peak of $44.3 billion dollars in 2009. And spending is projected to continue its precipitous decline. By 2014 federal spending on clean energy technologies is projected to fall to $11 billion, a decline of 75% from 2009, the report's author's claim. Last year, for example, a crucial grant programme known as Section 1603, which BP took advantage of to approve an $800 million wind farm in Kansas, was allowed to expire. That led to an increase of some 50%-130% in the cost of financing new wind projects, according to the report. Dozens of similar subsidy programmes, representing 70% of all clean energy support measures, are scheduled to expire by 2014. "In the first quarter of 2012, global clean energy investment dropped to its lowest level since 2008. Good news stories are being replaced with headlines about closing factories, bankruptcies, and cancelled projects. Clean tech appears to be at a crucial inflection point," says Letha Tawney, a co-author of the report and senior associate at the World Resources Institute.

#### Immigration reform will pass, Obama is key, and it’s the top priority

Maestas 1/25 (http://politic365.com/2013/01/25/chc-meets-with-president-on-immigration-signaling-top-legislative-priority/)

Congressman Gutierrez said the following in a statement after the meeting, “Immigrants need action now and immigration reform cannot wait. We have a unique opportunity to finally put our government on the side of hard-working immigrants. We all need to work together — the President and Congress, Republicans and Democrats — to get something done right away.”¶ “The President is the quarterback and he will direct the team, call the play, and be pivotal if we succeed. I am very optimistic based on conversations with Republicans in the House and Senate that we will do more than just talk about the immigration issue this year. The President putting his full weight and attention behind getting a bill signed into law is tremendously helpful. We need the President and the American people all putting pressure on the Congress to act because nothing happens in the Capitol without people pushing from the outside.”¶ Gutierrez also mentioned what the immigration legislation will likely include, “We need a secure border and an electronic employment verification system that is combined with a generous and rigorous legalization program to get immigrants already living here on-the-books and in the system. We also need visas and visa reform for the people waiting decades to come here and a system for the future that people and employers will actually use and not try to go around. All of this is achievable if Republicans work with Democrats and that work has already begun.”¶ The White House released the following in a statement after the meeting, “The President was pleased to hear from CHC members and noted that they share the same vision, including that any legislation must include a path to earned citizenship. The President further noted that there is no excuse for stalling or delay. The President made it clear he will continue to lead on this issue, and that he looks forward to working with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and other key Members of Congress in a bipartisan process to move this debate forward at the earliest possible opportunity.”¶ On Tuesday, President Obama is expected to travel to Nevada to deliver an immigration speech to signal his commitment to achieving legislation on this topic.¶ Also of note today, The Washington Post has reported that a bipartisan working group of senators has come close to an agreement on a broad set of principles that will guide the immigration reform legislation.

#### **Top priority**

Cramer 1/25 (Ruby, Buzzfield staff, http://www.buzzfeed.com/rubycramer/obama-tells-hispanic-caucus-immigration-is-my-top)

President Barack Obama met Friday morning with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to assure them that comprensive immigration reform would be his "top legislative priority," Representative Linda Sánchez told BuzzFeed. Sánchez, along with six members of Congress, convened in the Roosevelt Room with Obama and members of his senior staff, including advisors Cecilia Muñoz, Valerie Jarrett, and Rob Nabors.¶ "In his opening remarks he said, 'This is my top legislative priority,' and that resonated with us. We know he's serious about this. It was a very positive meeting," said Sánchez.¶ Sánchez — a key member of immigration talks who has been working toward reform legislation for more than 10 years — said specifics were not discussed at the meeting.
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#### There are over 365 affs that they let in.

Carroll Energy Solutions ‘12

[365 Ways to Save Energy in 2012, http://www.savewithces.com/365in2008.html]

Welcome to the largest source of energy saving tips on the world wide web!

1) Install a programmable thermostat. It's suprisingly easy to install one yourself. 2) Don't set the thermostat higher than you actually want it. 3) Don't let furniture and draperies block the air flow from air registers. 4) If your home has a boiler system, avoid covering radiators with screens or blocking them with furniture. 5) Use rags or hand towels instead of paper towels or napkins. 6) When using the fireplace, turn down the furnace to 55 degrees. If you don't, all the warm air from the furnace will go right up the chimney, wasting energy and money. 7) Save on energy costs by comparing electricity rates from different power providers in your state. 8) Keep plantings at least one foot away from your central air conditioning unit for adequate airflow. 9) During late afternoon and early evening, turn off unnecessary lights and wait to use heat-producing appliances. 10) Shade south- and west- facing windows during the hottest part of the day in the summer. 11) Plant a tree. One well-placed shade tree can reduce your cooling costs by 25 percent. 12) When planting trees, place leafy shade trees to the south and west, and evergreens to the north. 13) As if it wasn't already obvious, use CFL lighbulbs in your home. Get them for under a buck if you buy in bulk. 14) A ceiling fan should blow air down in the winter and up in the summer. 15) Set the fan on your central air conditioner to "on" rather than "auto." This will circulate air continuously, keeping the temperature more even throughout the house and aiding in dehumidification. 16) Make sure your window air conditioner is the proper size. 17) Vacuum registers and vents regularly. 18) Raise the thermostat to about 78 to 80 degrees whenever you go to bed or leave the house. 19) If your home can't accommodate central air conditioning, try a whole-house attic fan. 20) During the winter, remove window air conditioners and seal the windows with caulk and weatherstripping. 21) Use safety plugs in all unused outlets. These are prime places for outside air to leak into your home. 22) Hire an environmental consultant to assess your residence for hazards. 23) If your home has a large, single-pane picture window, use heavy draperies during the winter to help hold back cold air. 24) Reflective window film can help reduce heat gain during the summer, and it will keep furniture and carpets from fading. 25) Check window panes to see if they need new glazing. If the glass is loose, replace the putty holding the pane in place. 26) If drafts sneak in under exterior doors, replace the threshold. 27) If you cannot install a weatherstripping threshold in a door, block the drafts with a rolled-up towel or blanket. 28) Add fireproof caulk where the chimney meets the wall, inside and outside. 29) When the fireplace is not in use, make sure fireplace dampers are sealed tight, and keep the glass doors closed. 30) If you never use your fireplace, plug the chimney with fiberglass insulation and seal the doors with silicone caulk. 31) Maintain your central air conditioner by cleaning the outside compressor with a garden hose (be sure to shut off power at the fuse or breaker first). 32) Seal the edges of unused doors and windows with rope caulk. 33) Don't forget to weatherize the attic access. Secure batt insulation to the back of the hatch or door, and use weatherstripping to seal the opening. 34) Set the water heater temperature at 120 degrees - about halfway between low and medium. 35) Cover the central air compressor with a tarp to keep it clean during the winter. 36) Seal doors and windows with caulk and weatherstripping in the summer and the winter. A $15 weatherstripping kit can deliver similar effects to buying brand new windows.. 37) Add foam gaskets behind all outlet covers and switch plates. 38) Unplug all electrical devices when not in use to reduce phantom load. 39) Fix leaky faucets, especially if it's a hot water faucet. One drop per second can add up to 165 gallons a month - that's more than one person uses in two weeks. 40) Use aerators on kitchen and bathroom sink faucets. 41) Take showers, not baths. 41) Purchase a residential wind power generator. You can find local providers here: wind power companies 42) If your water heater is more than 15 years old, install an insulating wrap to reduce "standby" heat loss. 43) If accessible, insulate hot water pipes passing through unconditioned space. 44) Use smaller kitchen appliances whenever possible. 45) Vacuum the refrigerator coils about twice a year to keep the compressor running efficiently. 46) Don't leave the refrigerator door open. 47) Don’t leave the oven door open either. 48) Keep the refrigerator temperature about 36-38 degrees, and the freezer at 0-5 degrees. 49) Don't overload the refrigerator or freezer. 50) Make sure the refrigerator is level, so the door automatically swings shut instead of open. 51) Check the seal on your refrigerator door by closing it on a dollar bill. If you can pull the bill out easily, it's time to replace the gaskets 52) Use your oven's self-cleaning feature immediately after cooking, while the oven is still hot. 53) Use lids on pots and pans to reduce cooking times. 54) Don’t put a small pan on a large burner. 55) Use energy saving power strips on your heaviest energy draining devices. 56) Run the dishwasher only with full loads, and use the air-dry cycle. 57) Wash only full loads of clothes, and be sure to set the water level appropriately. 58) Use hot water only for very dirty loads, and always use cold water for the rinse cycle. 59) Clean the lint screen on the dryer every time you use the machine. 60) Remove clothes from the dryer while they're still damp and hang them up. 61) Dry one load of clothes immediately after another. 62) Switch to compact fluorescent light bulbs. 63) Use light dimmers. Be careful with CFC bulbs because they may not be compatible with dimmer switches. 64) Use motion sensors in your switches to have lights turn off when no one is in the room. 65) Install timers on lights that tend to be left on for longer than they are needed. 66) Keep lamps away from thermostats. 67) Dust light fixtures regularly. 68) Use only a single bulb in a multi-socket fixture. 69) Replace an incandescent outdoor light or high-intensity floodlight with a high-pressure sodium fixture. 70) Get a thermal link detectorto identifyhidden sources of cold or hot air entering your home. A side benefit is that they're really cool and you can use them telling how hot your pans are when you cook! 71) Decorate with pale colors on walls, ceilings and floors. You will use less light. 72) Get rid of spare refrigerators or freezers. 73) Keep outdoor hot tubs covered when not in use. 74) Keep waterbeds covered with quilts or blankets to help retain their heat. 75) Install timers on appliances that tend to be left on longer than they are needed. 76) Keep the garage door closed, especially during the winter. 77) If you need a new lawn mower, consider an electric model. 78) Instead of air-polluting and expensive charcoal or propane, try an electric or natural gas grill 79) Install a low flow showerhead; don't worry they're well engineered today to still deliver high water pressure. 80) Place humidifiers and dehumidifiers away from walls and bulky furniture 81) If your home has no sidewall insulation, place heavy furniture like bookshelves, armoires and sofas along exterior walls, and use decorative quilts as wall hangings. 82) When you take a vacation, turn off and unplug everything you can. 83) When you’re away from the house for an extended time, set your water heating to the lowest setting. 84) Remember that it pays to invest in energy efficiency. 85) Add a reflecting panel behind radiators 86) If your home has electric baseboard heating, be sure to keep furniture and draperies away from the heaters, and leave at least a three-inch clearance under the heating unit. 87) Keep curtains and blinds closed at night to keep cold air out, but open them during the day to let the sun warm the room. 88) Avoid using space heaters, including electric, kerosene or propane models. Not only are they expensive to operate, they're also very dangerous. 89) If you have hardwood or tile floors, add area rugs to keep your feet warm. 90) If you'll be going on vacation, lower the thermostat to 55 degrees. This will save energy while preventing water pipes from freezing. 91) If you have a wood-burning fireplace, have the chimney cleaned and inspected regularly, and burn only fully dried hardwoods to produce the most heat output. 92) Always read the Energy Guide label carefully, and make sure you're comparing "apples to apples”. 93) When purchasing a refrigerator, choose the capacity that's right for your family. 94) When replacing your furnace, make sure you choose the capacity that’s right for your home. 95) When replacing your central air conditioning, choose the appropriate capacity for your home. 96) In almost every case, a natural gas appliance is more economical to use than an electric model. 97) Replace your inefficient furnace with a geothermal heat pump. You can find geothermal heating companies online. 98) Shop during the off-season. Many heating and cooling manufacturers offer significant rebates during seasonal sales promotions, and dealers may charge less for installation. 99) Investigate new technology carefully. Some innovations, like convection ovens or argon-filled windows, may save energy and make life more convenient. 100) Look for the "Energy Star" logo when you make a purchase. 101) Don't over-dry your laundry. 102) Don't bother pre-rinsing dishes with the idea that your dishwasher will work less hard. 103) Start websites about saving energy to convince other people to do the same. That way your efforts can be multiplied. 104) You can operate a couple of fans with a fraction of the electricity needed for air conditioning, and their cooling effect may make it possible to cut back on AC use. 105) Heating food in the microwave uses only 20 percent of the energy required by a full-sized oven. 106) Drive steadily--and a bit slower. Hard acceleration and abrupt braking will use more fuel than if you start and slow more moderately. 107) If you travel at 65 mph instead of 55, you are penalized by lowering your mileage 12.5 percent. If you get your vehicle up to 75 mph, you're losing 25 percent compared with mileage at 55 mph. 108) A loaded roof rack can decrease an SUV's fuel efficiency by 5 percent, and that of a more aerodynamic car by 15 percent or more. 109) Stick with regular. If your car's manufacturer specifies regular gas, don't buy premium with the thought of going faster or operating more efficiently. 110) After starting the car in the morning, begin driving right away; don't let it sit and "warm up" for several minutes. 111) Try do-it-yourself low-E windows. If your windows don't have a low-E coating, consider applying a self-adhesive film on the glass. 112) Stop Junk Mail write to: Mail Preference Service, Direct Marketing Association, 11 West 42nd St., PO Box 3861, New York, NY 10163-3861. 113) Use reusable containers for food storage instead of wrapping food in foil or plastic wrap. 114) Be aware of your paint you use - Use latex paint instead of oil-based paint. Oil-based paint is highly toxic. 115) Inflate your tires well. This preserves the life of the tires and saves gas, which ultimately saves money. 116) Recharge Your Batteries 117) Bring your own shopping bags to the grocery store. 118) If your purchase is small don't take any bag 119) Use small plastic bottles, filled with water or stones to displace the amount of water in toilets 120) Use cloth diapers when you put a diaper on your child 121) Recycle your printer's toner cartridges. Find recycling companies near you. 122) Buy products that are recycled. By purchasing these products, you are helping to conserve natural resources, and to protect the environment. 123) Carpool or walk to reduce carbon dioxide pollution in the air. 124) Buy in bulk--this saves not only on packaging that you would eventually have to dispose of, but reduces tremendously the amount of industrial waste generated to make the packaging. 125) Shop for durable, long-lasting products. For example, use a metal razor instead of disposables, or a metal roasting pan instead of a disposable one. 126) Reuse whatever you can, including aluminum pie tins, glassware, plastic cutlery and aluminum foil. 127) Buy products with recycled contents. 128) Precycle-make an effort to buy products with recyclable packaging. 129) Leave the grass clippings on the lawn. 130) Start a backyard composting bin for yard clippings. 131) Make recycling easy by putting recycle bins in the rooms where you use the products. 132) Replace paper cups, plates and napkins with washable, reusable cups and plates and cloth napkins. 133) Keep used paper in a stack and use the flip side for scrap work. - - Perfect all of your documents before you print them. Run grammar and spell check to eliminate careless mistakes, and then preview your document in print preview. 134) Don’t let the water run while your shampooing or conditioning your hair or washing your body 135) Turn off the water while you are brushing your teeth 136) Use rechargeable batteries, instead of disposable ones 137) Turn off your lights and any electronics when not in use 138) Use rags or hand towels instead of paper towels or napkins. 139) Buy fruits and veggies loose, and not in plastic bags. 140) Decrease TV watching. 141) Recycle paper products (newspaper, office paper, cardboard, etc), aluminum, glass, tin, steel, plastic, batteries and everything else possible. 142) Mend and repair, rather than discard and replace. 143) Dispose of leftover food, yard trimmings, and weeds by starting a compost pit in your backyard. When contents decompose into soil use the soil for plants and gardening. 144) If your family celebrates Christmas, buy a living Christmas trees, and plant it somewhere after the Christmas season. 145) Plant trees in your community. 146) Buy a water bottle for yourself. Refill, use it, and carry it with you at all times. 147) Don't use electrical appliances for things you can easily do by hand, such as opening cans. 148) Save wire coat hangers and return them to the dry cleaners. 149) Turn off the lights, TV, or other electrical appliances when you are out of a room. 150) Flush the toilet less often. 151) Start a compost pile. 152) Plant short, dense shrubs close to your home's foundation to help insulate your home against cold. 153) Use mulch to conserve water in your garden. 154) Keep your car tuned up. 155) Use public transit whenever possible. 156) On weekends, ride your bike or walk instead. 157) Buy a more fuel-efficient model (such as a hybrid or electric) when you're ready for a new car. 158) Have your heating system inspected regularly. 159) Recycle your engine oil. 160) Keep your tires properly inflated to save gas. 161) Keep your wheels properly aligned to save your tires. (It's safer too.) 162) Print or copy on both sides of the paper. 163) Use smaller paper for smaller memos. 164) Re-use manila envelopes and file folders. 165) Think twice about buying "disposable" products. 166) Buy paper products instead of plastic if you must buy "disposables." 167) Buy locally grown food and locally made products when possible. 168) Join a conservation organization. 169) Volunteer your time to energy conservation projects. 170) Give money to energy conservation projects. 171) Convert by example. Encourage your family, friends, and neighbors to save resources too. 172) Learn about energy conservation issues in your community or state. Teach children to respect nature and the environment. 173) Collect the water used to wash vegetables and salad to water your houseplants. 174) Call your local government to see if they have a disposal location for used car batteries and other hazardous household wastes. 175) Send e-greetings instead of paper cards 176) Don't buy bottled water if you know your tap water is safe - transporting water from its source to the supermarket shelves is an expensive waste of energy. Find water companies that can deliver potable water near you 177) Collect rainwater to water your flowers. 178) Plant local species of trees. 179) Don't use electrical equipment like leaf-blowers as they consume so much energy for so little gain. Use a rake instead - it's better for your health too! - Take time out to sit out in your backyard with friends and family, and appreciate the beauty of nature! 180) Pay your bills online. Instead of using paper to pay your bills pay them over the internet instead. 181) Shop online. Instead of taking the car to, for instance, buy a couple of books buy them online. 182) Read your morning paper online. 183) Find the quickest route. To avoid getting lost and to not use more gas than necessary look up where you are going before you leave. 184) If you journal, use your computer instead of a notepad. 185) Email what you can. 186) Work from your home. If you can. 187) Once each month clean or change the filter in your furnace. 188) You should have your heating system inspected once a year to ensure maximum efficiency. The cost of inspection will pay for itself. 189) If you don’t have a programmable thermostat, you need to invest in one. 190) If you want to heat your home quickly, don’t set the thermostat higher than your target temperature, it will get warmer at the same rate, regardless of set temperature. 191) Vacuuming the registers and vents of your duct system will dramatically improve their efficiency. 192) Prevent obstructions from allowing your heating and cooling vents to work properly. 193) A reflecting panel behind your radiators can prevent up to 25% of heat loss into the wall. 194) During the winter, close curtains and blinds at night to prevent heat loss; keep them open during the day to absorb energy from the sun. 195) Keep your feet warm with area rugs on hardwood and tile floors. 196) When you’re on vacation set your thermostat to 55 degrees to save energy and prevent your pipes from freezing. 197) Plug your chimney with insulation if you never use your fireplace. You can also seal the doors with caulk. 198) Clean off your central air conditioning unit outdoors with a garden hose. 199) Keep the area surrounding your outside air conditioning unit clear for adequate airflow. 200) Try to hold off turning on lights during the late afternoon until it is necessary. 201) Don’t forget to shade south and west facing windows during the middle of the day in the summer. 202) Fill your yard with trees, not only are they good for the environment, a well-placed shade tree can reduce cooling costs significantly. 203) Ceiling fans can significantly reduce the amount of cooling required in your home. 204) If your air conditioner is oversized, it will work inefficiently because it will not have the appropriate amount of time to dehumidify the air. Make sure it is appropriate. 205) Rather than central air conditioning, your home may be cooled with a whole-house fan. If feasible, this will save you money. 206) Take your air conditioners out of the windows during the winter and seal the window with weatherstripping and caulk. 207) If you cannot remove the air conditioner during the winter purchase and install an insulated cover. 208) Keep your central air equipment clean with a tarp in the winter when it is not in use. 209) Attend a weatherization seminar to learn more about weatherstripping your windows. 210) Go around your home with a candle to find air leaks. Use caulk or expanding foam to fill those leaks. 211) Look under your exterior doors to see if air is escaping. If it is, install a threshold. 212) In the winter, use rope caulk to seal the moving parts of the window. You can remove this once the cold season is over. 213) Make sure the access to your attic is sealed. You can also put insulation on the back of your access door. 214) Set your hot water heater to the lowest temperature that will still allow you to have warm water. 215) Water saving showerheads and faucets save hot water. Well designed units will not reduce your water pressure. 216) One drop a second of hot water coming from a leaky faucet can use more hot water than one person uses in two weeks. Fix the leak. 217) Baths use much more water than a 10 minute shower. 218) Install insulation around your hot water if the label does instruct you not to do so. Many older units are not adequately insulated. 219) Drain the sediment from you water heater. 220) To conserve energy and reduce internal heat gain turn off computers, monitors, printers and copiers during non-business hours. 221) Ensure that the built-in power management system for your office equipment is active. 222) Ensure your screen saver is compatible with the computer's power management features, and that the setup allows the system to go into power saver mode. 223) Using a laptop computer instead of a desk-top system can save 80-90% in electrical cost. 223) Educate and encourage coworkers to be energy-conscious and to offer ideas about how energy can be saved. 224) Designate a "responsible party" in your home to be responsible for and to promote good energy practices for the organization and/or facility. 225) Reduce or replace inefficient, outdated or excessive lighting within your building. 226) When replacing old lighting equipment evaluate new technologies that may need fewer fixtures and/or fewer lamps within existing fixtures. 227) Ensure that light levels will remain at adequate levels before changing out technologies and/or reducing number of lamps. 228) Where practical, replace incandescent lamps with compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs). Ensure you install compatible dimming technology if CFLs are used along with a dimming system. 229) Replace incandescent "EXIT" signs with LED signs. LEDs use about one-tenth the wattage and last 50 times longer than incandescent-lamp signs. 230) Install lighting occupancy sensors that automatically turn lights on or off, depending on occupancy. You can learn a lot about saving power on the websites of many local power companies. 231) Take advantage of natural daylight: turn off or dim electric lighting when adequate sunlight is available to illuminate interior space. 232) Ensure outdoor lighting is off during daytime. 233) In winter, set office thermostat offices between 65 and 68 during the day/business hours, and 60 to 65 degrees during unoccupied times. 234) In summer, set thermostats between 78 and 80 degrees during the day/business hours, and above 80 degrees during unoccupied hours. 235) Adjust thermostats higher when cooling and lower when heating an occupied building or unoccupied areas within a building, e.g., during weekends and non-working hours. 236) During summer months, adjusting your thermostat setting up one degree typically can save 2-3% on cooling costs. 237) Consider installing locking devices on thermostats to maintain desired temperature settings. 238) Install programmable thermostats that automatically adjust temperature settings based on the time of day and day of the week. - If you have multiple HVAC units, set thermostats to return to the occupied temperature a half an hour apart. 239) Drive sensibly. Aggressive driving (speeding, rapid acceleration and braking) wastes gasoline. 240) Consider buying a highly fuel-efficient vehicle. A fuel-efficient vehicle, a hybrid vehicle, or an alternative fuel vehicle could save you a lot at the gas pump and help the environment. 241) Combine errands into one trip. Several short trips, each one taken from a cold start, can use twice as much fuel as one trip covering the same distance when the engine is warm. 242) Replace clogged air filters to improve gas mileage by as much as 10% and protect your engine. 243) Get regular engine tune-ups and car maintenance checks to avoid fuel economy problems due to worn spark plugs, dragging brakes, low transmission fluid, or transmission problems. 244) Keep tires properly inflated and aligned to improve your gasoline mileage by around 3.3%. 245) Use the grade of motor oil recommended by your car's manufacturer. Using a different motor oil can lower your gasoline mileage by 1%-2%. 246) Check into telecommuting, carpooling and public transit to cut mileage and car maintenance costs. 247) Reduce drag by placing items inside the car or trunk rather than on roof racks. 248) Clear out your car; extra weight decreases gas mileage. 249) Use air conditioning only when necessary. 250) Using cruise control on the highway helps you maintain a constant speed and, in most cases, will save gas. 251) When you use overdrive gearing, your car's engine speed goes down. This saves gas and reduces wear. 252) Avoid high speeds. Above 60 mph, gas mileage drops rapidly 253) Idling gets you 0 miles per gallon. The best way to warm up a vehicle is to drive it. No more than 30 seconds of idling on winter days is needed. 254) Leaving the refrigerator door open really does waste energy. 255) Your refrigerator should be set around 38 degrees. 256) Make sure there is a firm seal on your refrigerator. If it releases even just a small amount of cold air, the energy costs will be significant. 257) If you are going to use your oven’s self cleaning feature, use it after cooking while the oven still has heat. 258) Always use lids on your pots while cooking. 259) Match your cooking pan to the size of the burner; don’t cook on a large burner with a small pan. 260) Purchase new grease plates under range burners because they will reflect heat more efficiently. 261) Don’t run your dishwasher until there is a full load. When you do, make sure to use the air dry cycle. 262) Don’t wash loads of laundry until you have a full load to put together. 263) Use cold water for all but your most dirty loads of laundry. Always use cold water for the rinse cycle. 264) Make sure to clean the lint screen every time you use the dryer. 265) Dry one load of clothes immediately after another to take advantage of the heat built up in the machine. 266) Switch to compact fluorescent light bulbs today! 267) Use motion sensors in your switches to have lights turn off when no one is in the room. 268) Install timers on lights that tend to be left on for longer than they are needed. 269) Install timers on appliances that tend to be left on longer than they are needed. 270) Keep lamps away from thermostats. 271) Dust light fixtures regularly. 272) Use only a single bulb in a multi-socket fixture. 273) Replace an incandescent outdoor light or high-intensity floodlight with a high-pressure sodium fixture. 274) Use low-voltage lighting kits to light walkways, patios and decks. 275) Decorate with pale colors on walls, ceilings and floors. You will use less light. 276) Get rid of spare refrigerators or freezers. 277) Keep outdoor hot tubs covered when not in use. 278) Keep waterbeds covered with quilts or blankets to help retain their heat. 279) Keep the garage door closed, especially during the winter. 280) If you need a new lawn mower consider an electric model. 281) Instead of air-polluting and expensive charcoal or propane, try an electric or natural gas grill 282) Unplug any electrical device that's not being used. 283) Place humidifiers and dehumidifiers away from walls and bulky furniture 284) If your home has no sidewall insulation, place heavy furniture like bookshelves, armoires and sofas along exterior walls, and use decorative quilts as wall hangings. 285) When you take a vacation turn off and unplug everything you can. 286) When you’re away from the house for an extended time set your water heating to the lowest setting. 287) Remember that it pays to invest in energy efficiency. One way to do so would be by contacting local solar companies to have photovoltaic panels installed on your residence. 288) Always read the Energy Guide label carefully, and make sure you're comparing "apples to apples”. 289) When purchasing a refrigerator choose the capacity that's right for your family. 290) When replacing your furnace make sure you choose the capacity that’s right for your home. 291) When replacing your central air conditioning choose the appropriate capacity for your home. 292) In almost every case, a natural gas appliance is more economical to use than an electric model. 293) Replace inefficient appliances - even if they're still working 294) Shop during the off-season. Many heating and cooling manufacturers offer significant rebates during seasonal sales promotions, and dealers may charge less for installation. 295) Investigate new technology carefully. Some innovations, like convection ovens or argon-filled windows, may save energy and make life more convenient. 296) Look for the "Energy Star" logo when you make a purchase. Attempt to purchase products only from green companies that do not harm the environment during their manufacturing process. 297) Don't over dry your laundry. 298) Don't bother prerinsing dishes with the idea that your dishwasher will work less hard. 299) Put your PC to sleep or turn it off. 300) You can operate a couple of fans with a fraction of the electricity needed for air conditioning, and their cooling effect may make it possible to cut back on AC use. 301) Heating food in the microwave uses only 20 percent of the energy required by a full-sized oven. 302) Drive steadily--and a bit slower. Hard acceleration and abrupt braking will use more fuel than if you start and slow more moderately. 303) If you travel at 65 mph instead of 55, you are penalized by lowering your mileage 12.5 percent. If you get your vehicle up to 75 mph, you're losing 25 percent compared with mileage at 55 mph. 304) A loaded roof rack can decrease an SUV's fuel efficiency by 5 percent, and that of a more aerodynamic car by 15 percent or more. 305) Stick with regular. If your car's manufacturer specifies regular gas, don't buy premium with the thought of going faster or operating more efficiently. 306) After starting the car in the morning begin driving right away; don't let it sit and "warm up" for several minutes. 307) Try do-it-yourself low-E windows. If your windows don't have a low-E coating, consider applying a self-adhesive film on the glass. 308) inflate your tires well. This preserves the life of the tires and saves gas, which ultimately saves money. 309) Recharge Your Batteries 310) Bring your own shopping bags to the grocery store. 311) If your purchase is small don't take any bag 312) Use small plastic bottles, filled with water or stones to displace the amount of water in toilets 313) Use cloth diapers when you put a diaper on your child 314) Recycle your printer toner cartridges. 315) Buy products that are recycled. By purchasing these products, you are helping to conserve natural resources, and to protect the environment. 315) Carpool or walk to reduce carbon dioxide pollution in the air. 316) Buy in bulk--this saves not only on packaging that you would eventually have to dispose of, but reduces tremendously the amount of industrial waste generated to make the packaging. 317) Shop for durable, long-lasting products. For example, use a metal razor instead of disposables, or a metal roasting pan instead of a disposable one. 318) Reuse whatever you can, including aluminum pie tins, glassware, plastic cutlery and aluminum foil. 319) Buy products with recycled contents. 320) Precycle--make an effort to buy products with recyclable packaging. 321) Leave the grass clippings on the lawn. 322) Start a backyard composting bin for yard clippings. 323) Make recycling easy by putting recycle bins in the rooms where you use the products. 324) Replace paper cups, plates and napkins with washable, reusable cups and plates and cloth napkins. 325) Keep used paper in a stack and use the flip side for scrap work. - - Perfect all of your documents before you print them. Run grammar and spell check to eliminate careless mistakes, and then preview your document in print preview. 326) Don’t let the water run while your shampooing or conditioning your hair or washing your body 327) Turn off the water while you are brushing your teeth 328) Use rechargeable batteries, instead of disposable ones 329) Turn off your lights and any electronics when not in use 330) Use rags or hand towels instead of paper towels or napkins. 331) Buy fruits and veggies loose, and not in plastic bags. 332) Decrease TV watching. 333) Recycle paper products (newspaper, office paper, cardboard, etc), aluminum, glass, tin, steel, plastic, batteries and everything else possible. 334) Mend and repair, rather than discard and replace. 335) Dispose of leftover food, yard trimmings, and weeds by starting a compost pit in your backyard. When contents decompose into soil use the soil for plants and gardening. 336) If your family celebrates Christmas, buy a living Christmas trees, and plant it somewhere after the Christmas season. 337) Plant trees in your community. 338) Buy a water bottle for yourself. Refill, use it, and carry it with you at all times. 339) Don't use electrical appliances for things you can easily do by hand, such as opening cans. 340) Save wire coat hangers and return them to the dry cleaners. 341) Turn off the lights, TV, or other electrical appliances when you are out of a room. 342) Flush the toilet less often. 343) Start a compost pile. 344) Plant short, dense shrubs close to your home's foundation to help insulate your home against cold. 345) Use mulch to conserve water in your garden. 346) Keep your car tuned up. 347) Use public transit whenever possible. 348) On weekends, ride your bike or walk instead. 349) Buy a more fuel-efficient model (such as a hybrid or electric) when you're ready for a new car. 350) Recycle your engine oil. 351) Keep your tires properly inflated to save gas. 352) Keep your wheels properly aligned to save your tires. (It's safer too.) 353) Print or copy on both sides of the paper. 354) Use smaller paper for smaller memos. 355) Re-use manila envelopes and file folders. 356) Think twice about buying "disposable" products. 357) Buy paper products instead of plastic if you must buy "disposables." 358) Buy locally grown food and locally made products when possible. 359) Join a conservation organization. 360) Volunteer your time to energy conservation projects. 361) Give money to energy conservation projects. 362) Convert by example. Encourage your family, friends, and neighbors to save resources too. 363) Learn about energy conservation issues in your community or state by reaching out to environmental companies within your community. While doing so, make sure to teach your children to respect nature and the environment. 364) Collect the water used to wash vegetables and salad to water your houseplants. 365) Contact Carroll Energy Solutions to have an energy audit performed. We will show you the energy saving techniques that will be most appropriate for your life.

#### Passive solar isn’t topical—solar power is distinct from solar energy, which is much broader and explodes limits

Sklar, ‘7 founder and president of The Stella Group, Ltd., in Washington, DC, is the Chair of the Steering Committee of the Sustainable Energy Coalition and serves on the Boards of Directors of the Sustainable Buildings Industry Council, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, and the Renewable Energy Policy Project. The Stella Group, Ltd., a strategic marketing and policy firm for clean distributed energy users and companies using renewable energy (Scott Sklar, 23 October 2007, “What’s the Difference Between Solar Energy and Solar Power?” http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2007/10/whats-the-difference-between-solar-energy-and-solar-power-50358)//CC

Lee, this is a question I get often, and believe it is worth addressing. Solar "power" usually means converting the sun's rays (photons) to electricity. The solar technologies could be photovoltaics, or the various concentrating thermal technologies: solar troughs, solar dish/engines, and solar power towers. Solar "energy" is a more generic term, meaning any technology that converts the sun's energy into a form of energy—so that includes the aforementioned solar power technologies, but also solar thermal for water heating, space heating and cooling, and industrial process heat. Solar energy includes solar daylighting and even passive solar that uses building orientation, design and materials to heat and cool buildings. Now in the early 1980's, I was Political Director of the Solar Lobby, formed by the big nine national environmental groups, that embraced all solar technologies—which we viewed as wind, hydropower, and biomass, along with the long list of traditional solar conversion technologies. The thesis, which is correct, is that the sun contributes to growing plants, wind regimes, and evaporation and rain (hydropower), so that all the renewables are part of the solar family. Now, of course, most would argue that geothermal, and tidal and wave (effected by the gravitational force of the moon) are not solar, but we included these technologies as well.

#### Our precision is vital—turns solvency and research quality

Resnick 1

[Evan Resnick, Journal of International Affairs, 0022197X, Spring 2001, Vol. 54, Issue 2, “Defining Engagement”]

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for **effective policymaking**. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

#### Also a pre-requisite to any effective communication – if we win a link we have an epistemology DA to your interp.

Pregerson, US Judge for the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, ‘6

[Harry, “ARMANDO NAVARRO-LOPEZ, Petitioner, v. ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General, Respondent. No. 04-70345 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT 503 F.3d 1063; 2007 U.S. App., RSR]

Expanding these categories beyond recognition at the expense of depriving common words like “felony” and “violence” of their ordinary meaning does a disservice to the law. In order for judges to apply laws and for citizens to obey them, words must have meanings that are consistent and predictable. Precision in language is necessary not only for effective communication, but also for a well-functioning legal system. As guardians of the rule of law, we should be careful not to contribute to the deterioration of the English language, with the loss of respect for the law that inevitably results.

#### Also, err negative on any questions of limits. Better to overlimit than underlimit because depth is more educational than depth.

TPC, ‘10

[Texas Panhandle P-16 Council, Texas based group of teachers and educators from across the state, 2010, “Breadth vs. Depth of High School Curriculum Content”,

<http://www.panhandlep-16.net/users/0001/docs/Position%20Paper2.pdf>, RSR]

#### Less breadth and more depth in curriculum better prepares students for future careers and education. This is the position of over one hundred faculty assembled in the Texas Panhandle, and it is also the conclusion of many scholarly studies reviewed for this paper. In fact, there are far too many studies to cite in this paper, so only a few representative studies are used. In a 2008 study entitled “Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Science Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework” 1 the researchers noted: “In a comparison of 46 countries, Schmidt et al. (2005) noted that in top-achieving countries, the science frameworks cover far fewer topics than in the United States, and that students from these countries perform significantly better than students in the United States. They conclude that U.S. standards are not likely to create a framework that develops a deeper understanding of the structure of the discipline. By international standards, the U.S. science framework is „unfocused, repetitive, and undemanding‟”. The study went on to say that “the baseline model reveals a direct and compelling outcome: teaching for depth is associated with improvements in later performance.

#### **Without critical thinking skills developed through clash and competition we can’t effectively act on content-specific knowledge** **English et al 7**

[Eric English, Stephen Llano, Gordon R. Mitchell, Catherine E. Morrison, John Rief & Carly Woods, all former debate coaches, “Debate as a Weapon of Mass Destruction” http://www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/EnglishDAWG.pdf]

It is our position, however, that rather than acting as a cultural technology expanding American exceptionalism, switch-side debating originates from a civic attitude that serves as a bulwark against fundamentalism of all stripes. Several prominent voices reshaping the national dialogue on homeland security have come from the academic debate community and draw on its animating spirit of critical inquiry. For example, Georgetown University law professor Neal Katyal served as lead plaintiff’s counsel in Hamdan, which challenged post-9/11 enemy combat definitions.12 The foundation for Katyal’s winning argument in Hamdan was laid some four years before, when he collaborated with former intercollegiate debate champion Laurence Tribe on an influential Yale Law Journal addressing a similar topic.13 Tribe won the National Debate Tournament in 1961 while competing as an undergraduate debater for Harvard University. Thirty years later, Katyal represented Dartmouth College at the same tournament and finished third. The imprint of this debate training is evident in Tribe and Katyal’s contemporary public interventions, which are characterized by meticulous research, sound argumentation, and a staunch commitment to democratic principles. Katyal’s reflection on his early days of debating at Loyola High School in Chicago’s North Shore provides a vivid illustration. “I came in as a shy freshman with dreams of going to medical school. Then Loyola’s debate team opened my eyes to a different world: one of argumentation and policy.” As Katyal recounts, “the most important preparation for my career came from my experiences as a member of Loyola’s debate team.”14 The success of former debaters like Katyal, Tribe, and others in challenging the dominant dialogue on homeland security points to the efficacy of academic debate as a training ground for future advocates of progressive change. Moreover, a robust understanding of the switch-side technique and the classical liberalism which underpins it would help prevent misappropriation of the technique to bolster suspect homeland security policies. For buried within an inner-city debater’s files is a secret threat to absolutism: the refusal to be classified as “with us or against us,” the embracing of intellectual experimentation in an age of orthodoxy, and reflexivity in the face of fundamentalism. But by now, the irony of our story should be [end page 224] apparent—the more effectively academic debating practice can be focused toward these ends, the greater the proclivity of McCarthy’s ideological heirs to brand the activity as a “weapon of mass destruction.”