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#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production, this only contributes to environmental problems and neoliberal market based solutions

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As noted in the introduction, consumption presents itself as an area of ethical concern in at least three ways: first, because Western-­‐style consumption is putting an immense and unsustainable burden on the planet’s ecosystems, so much so that contemporary cultures of consumption are diminishing the capacity of the planet to support life as we know it in the future;50 second, because the high consumption, resource-­‐intensive lifestyles enjoyed by most people in the richest nations coexist in a world where great multitudes live lives oppressed by material deprivation;51 and thirdly, because there is a large and growing body of sociological and psychological literature indicating that once our basic material needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. are met, the limitless pursuit of more money and possessions neither produces any lasting happiness nor satisfies the human need for meaning.52 Far from representing the peak of civilization, cultures of mass consumption are showing distinct signs of widespread social, even spiritual, malaise.53 Any one of these issues, it could be argued, would be sufficient for consumption to become a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ When the three issues are considered together, the case for ethical engagement is compelling. At once, however, we are confronted with a strange incongruity, even a contradiction, of sorts, one that seems to tear the present analysis apart. In an age when the facts of ecological degradation, extreme poverty, and consumer malaise lie quite plainly before our eyes, one might have thought that First World consumption practices were already a subject of widespread ethical engagement. That is, one might have expected consumption practices to be a domain of constant and dedicated ethical attention, given that overconsumption seems to be driving several of the world’s most pressing problems (including the problem of consumer malaise). And yet, it can hardly be denied that any ethical engagement that takes place within consumer cultures does not, as a rule, seek to reduce or moderate consumption but rather encourage, glorify, and increase consumption – and increase it without apparent limit.54 And here is the contradiction: consumption is at once an extremely obvious realm for ethical engagement, for the three reasons stated above, and, at the same time, engaging the self by the self for the purpose of deliberately reducing or moderating consumption seems to be more or less unthinkable within modern consumer societies. Indeed, there seems to be an almost unquestioned assumption throughout consumer societies that consumption practices are somehow ‘beyond ethics,’ in the sense that how much we consume does not really need to inform the answer we give to the question of ‘how one ought to live.’ On the contrary, it is presumed that everyone is justified seeking as high a material standard of living as possible, a pursuit that is limited, it would seem, only by the laws of a free market economy.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion ourselves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western-­‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western-­‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption-­‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.
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#### The 50 states, Washington D.C. and relevant territories should offer the United States federal government to fund procurement of mobile solar power systems for its training exercises and operations in response to emergencies in the United States in compliance with the Solar Industry Environment & Social Responsibility Commitment. The 50 states, Washington D.C. and relevant territories should procure mobile solar power systems for state and local disaster response units.

#### Federal emergency response teams are the last resort for emergency response and are more specialized in monetary assistance. States and localities are in charge of preparedness and first response

Young 3, 1AC AUTHOR

[William, Jr. Research Engineer. University of Central Florida, “Problems and Solutions: Training Disaster Organizations on the Use of PV,” Florida Solar Energy Center, Presented at ASES 2003, <http://www.fsec.ucf.edu/en/publications/pdf/fsec-pf-371-03.pdf> //uwyo-baj]

Local government is the management authority over a disaster or hazard arid provides initial response. They manage all types of hazards and disasters and have responsibility for creating disaster plans and providing the primary resources for public protection. Police, fire, transportation, municipal facilities, sanitation, schools and other municipal services and resources are typically provided and controlled by local government. State government provides and maintains a comprehensive emergency management plan, various disaster programs and resources to assist local government with preparedness and recovery activities. The state is the pivotal point between policy guidance and resources available at the federal level and the implementation of comprehensive emergency management programs at the local level. The state also coordinates activities involving more than one community. In the present disaster response structure, federal government provides guidance and assistance to state and local governments when state and local resources are insufficient. The structure is defined in the Federal Response Plan (FRP) which defines the system for the overall delivery of federal assistance. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is the lead organization, under the authority of the President of the United States, that provides direction for mitigation. preparedness, response and recovery support from the various federal departments and agencies. Most federal assistance is in the form of financial loans and grants to individuals, businesses and communities, which become available after a disaster.

#### States better for individual engagement – national politics are beholden to fossil fuel lobbies and disregard INDIVIDUALS. We’re a better platform for ADVOCACY

Byrne, 8

Byrne, et al., 2008.

In Peter Droege eds. Urban Energy Transition: From Fossil Fuels to Renewable Power.

Oxford, UK: Elsevier Pps.27-53.

Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Established in 1980 at the University of Delaware, the Center is a leading institution for interdisciplinary graduate education, research, and advocacy in energy and environmental policy. CEEP is led by Dr. John Byrne, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University. For his contributions to Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) since 1992, he shares the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with the Panel's authors and review editors.

The political momentum built in US cities, states and regions to initiate climate mitigation and related efforts is to be contrasted with inaction by the US national government in addressing the climate challenge. Support for climate protection can be found in polling of Americans which points to 83% support among the country's citizens for greater national leadership in addressing climate change, and even deeper support for state and community action to address climate concerns (Opinion Research Corporation 2006). If the American people appear to support such initiatives, the question becomes why are states, cities and regions leading the way, rather than the national government? US national politics has for decades exhibited a troubling amenability to the interests of fossil fuel and automaker lobbies (Leggett 2001; Public Citizen 2005; NRDC 2001). A recent example of this influence can be found in the history of the National Energy Policy Development Group, which took input 'principally' from actors associated with such interests (US General Accounting Office (GAO) 2003). At the same time, the national administration has been noted for the presence of individuals with backgrounds in the auto, mining, natural gas, electric, and oil industries, in positions at the White House, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Departments, respectively, of Energy, Commerce, and the Interior (Bogardus, 2004; Drew and Oppel Jr 2004; NRDC, 2001). State-level politics may be able to obviate this influence through their efforts to allow a more direct citizen influence upon decision making. For example, 23 states permit citizens to petition for a direct vote (Initiative and Referendum Institute 2007), a strategy that has helped ensure the advancement of environmentally minded initiatives within states in recent years, such as the State of Washington's enactment by ballot of an RPS proposal in 2006 (Initiative and Referendum Institute 2007).
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#### Compromise on debt ceiling now- pc key

Posner Jan. 8th

[Eric Posner, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, Jan. 8th, 2013, President can raise debt ceiling on his own, http://www.stltoday.com/news/opinion/columns/president-can-raise-debt-ceiling-on-his-own/article\_1e07459c-348d-5dd0-a12a-96e3ebd354f6.html, uwyo//amp]

With the “fiscal cliff” behind us, we now must look forward to yet another budgetary battle — over the debt ceiling, in a repeat of summer 2011. Is there a way out of the endless stalemate between President Barack Obama and Republicans in Congress? Yes, but it requires the president to assert himself more aggressively than he has so far. The debt standoff is more ominous than the fiscal cliff because it doesn’t reflect a legitimate dispute over public policy. While reasonable people can disagree about the right level of taxation and spending, no one believes that the United States should default on its debt, not even the most ardent Tea Partiers. So holding the debt ceiling hostage is pure brinkmanship — akin to threatening to set off a nuclear bomb in Manhattan if the president fails to agree to spending cuts.

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

-Political capital high: economy on cusp of revival

-AT: Compromise Bill Disproves: Compromised and merely delayed the big battles

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

#### Solar incentives sap capital – republican opposition, fossil fuel interests, and Solyndra scandal

NYT, New York Times, “End of Clean Energy Subsidies?” May 5, 2012

The federal government has given generously to the clean energy industry over the last few years, funneling billions of dollars in grants, loans and tax breaks to renewable power sources like wind and solar, biofuels and electric vehicles. “Clean tech” has been good in return. ¶ During the recession, it was one of the few sectors to add jobs. Costs of wind turbines and solar cells have fallen over the last five years, electricity from renewables has more than doubled, construction is under way on the country’s first new nuclear power plant in decades. And the United States remains an important player in the global clean energy market. ¶ Yet this productive relationship is in peril, mainly because federal funding is about to drop off a cliff and the Republican wrecking crew in the House remains generally hostile to programs that threaten the hegemony of the oil and gas interests. The clean energy incentives provided by President Obama’s 2009 stimulus bill are coming to an end, while other longer-standing subsidies are expiring. ¶ If nothing changes, clean energy funding will drop from a peak of $44.3 billion in 2009 to $16 billion this year and $11 billion in 2014 — a 75 percent decline. ¶ This alarming news is contained in a new report from experts at the Brookings Institution, the World Resources Institute and the Breakthrough Institute. It is a timely effort to attach real numbers to an increasingly politicized debate over energy subsidies. While Mr. Obama is busily defending subsidies, the Republicans have used the costly market failure of one solar panel company, Solyndra, to indict the entire federal effort to encourage nascent technologies.

#### Lack of debt ceiling raise triggers default and collapses the world economy- bonds are a juggernaut in the world economy

Goldfarb Jan. 1st

[Zachary Goldfarb, January 1st, The Washington Post, ‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/fiscal-cliff-deal-does-little-to-tame-threats-from-debt-ceiling-high-unemployment-rates/2013/01/01/8e4c14aa-5393-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f_story_1.html>, uwyo//amp]

The deal fell somewhere in between. But by gaining the support of both sides, it did not achieve what many economists believe is necessary for the short- and long-term success of the U.S. economy. Leaving the fate of the debt ceiling up in the air will cause anxiety among businesses and individuals, potentially crimping hiring, investing and consumer spending. In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation’s bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy. And while a default would be all but certain to push the economy into recession, growth is likely to be slow — and job-market improvement slight — even without such a cataclysmic event. The unemployment rate, which stands at 7.7 percent, is not expected to fall below 7.4 percent by the end of this year, and not below 6 percent until at least 2016 or later. In the midst of the recession, the government stepped in with spending programs and deep tax cuts to lift growth and reduce unemployment. A majority of economists say those efforts worked. But federal stimulus has been winding down. And the spending cuts and tax hikes set for 2013 are expected to be a drag on the economy — with government policy offsetting much of the robust recovery being experienced in the private sector. Nor does the agreement do what many analysts say is necessary to achieve long-term budget savings and tame the federal debt, which is projected to grow rapidly as a percentage of the economy in the coming decades.

#### Economic decline causes protectionism and war – their defense doesn’t assume accompanying shifts in global power.

Royal 10 – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crisis could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavious of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations, However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crisis could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. P. 89) Economic decline has been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘**D**iversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increase incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlated economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crisis and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

# Solvency

#### Plan fails: PV industry not suited to emergency response, and the voluntary response teams prefer generators

Young 3, 1AC AUTHOR

[William, Jr. Research Engineer. University of Central Florida, “Problems and Solutions: Training Disaster Organizations on the Use of PV,” Florida Solar Energy Center, Presented at ASES 2003, <http://www.fsec.ucf.edu/en/publications/pdf/fsec-pf-371-03.pdf> //uwyo-baj]

Experience has shown that photovotaics can be used effectively to supply electrical power during emergencies. Training is needed to provide the education for potential users to determine which applications and under what conditions is it the preferred alternative. The key obstacles to using PV in disasters arc: - The PV industry lacks sufficient understanding of the specific needs of emergency response teams and the conditions under which they operate. - Emergency management and disaster relief organizations lack an understanding of photovoltaic technology and the conditions under which it offers advantages over conventional equipment. While photovoltaics have been commercially available over 30 years, disaster-related organizations have not embraced the technology as some markets have. Many of the same handicaps PV faces in the energy and electricity marketplace exist in the disaster marketplace. If the PV industry and disaster-related organizations lack proper understanding then education and experience are essential. Many organizations have become aware of PV technology, but do not have the hands-on experience with PV that they possess with generators. The volunteer nature of these organizations and diversity of their administrations add to the difficulty of introducing a new technology. This change lacks governmcnt support in favor of what has always been done before. Emergency plans need to be updated to address renewables. Conventional education and information dissemination approaches are probably not sufficient to spur widespread application of PV for disaster relief. FSEC and SNL completed a small joint design and demonstration project with several disaster organizations and the PV industry. The organizations found the equipment valuable, but lacked funding to purchase more. Funding flows in times of emergencies but PV equipment is not available in mass numbers at that time. In times of emergencies, these organizations go with what they know and have. How do these organizations gain the knowledge and experience they need to accept PV in their operations under these circumstances?

#### No solvency, portable solar takes a long time to charge and doesn’t last long

Woody, 7

[Todd, Environment Editor at Forbes, “8: SOLAR POWER GOES PORTABLE,” Business 2.0, May 2007, ebscohost, //uwyo-baj]

Consumers could be mixing margaritas at the beach this summer by plugging their blenders into boom-box-size solar-powered battery packs. Hitting the shelves this spring is the XPower Powerpack Solar, a 10-amp battery with a 5-watt solar panel. Unlike smaller solar chargers meant to top off mobile phones and other gadgets, the $169 XPower packs enough juice to run larger consumer electronics: It can run a laptop for three hours and a TV for 45 minutes. The XPower is made by Xantrex, a Canadian company that sells inverters for solar power systems and wind turbines. Xantrex thinks personal renewable energy is a $100 million business. (Analysts say the market is top new to put a dollar figure on.) "People who have a recreational lifestyle want cleaner, greener products," says product manager Grant Dunbar. It takes 40 hours of sunshine to fully charge the XPower, so Dunbar expects that most people will charge it up from a wall outlet at home and then use the solar panel to top it off while outdoors. Meanwhile, Xantrex has rolled out the PowerHub 1800 — an $899 backup battery that taps rooftop solar arrays. Which means guilt-free refrigeration for those margaritas too.

# Disaster

**Racism not the root cause of all violence**

**Mertus 99**

 (Professor Julie Mertus is the co-director of Ethics, Peace and Global Affairs. She has written widely on human rights and gender, conflict, the Balkans, U.S. foreign policy and U.N. institutions. She is the author or editor of ten books, including Bait and Switch: Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy, named "human rights book of the year" by the American Political Science Association) and, most recently Human Rights Matters: Local Politics and National Human Rights Institutions and The United Nations and Human Rights. Before entering academia, she worked as a researcher, writer and lawyer for several human rights and humanitarian organizations., J.D., Yale Law School; B.S. Cornell University, International Council on Human Rights Policy, “THE ROLE OF RACISM AS A CAUSE OF OR FACTOR IN WARS AND CIVIL CONFLICT”, http://www.ichrp.org/files/papers/167/112\_-\_The\_Role\_of\_Racism\_as\_a\_Cause\_of\_or\_Factor\_in\_Wars\_and\_Civil\_Conflict\_Mertus\_\_Julie\_\_1999.pdf)

This paper examines the role of racism as a cause of or factor in wars and civil conflicts. “Racism” as understood here is defined broadly to encompass acts and processes of dehumanisation. The conflicts in Rwanda and Kosovo serve as case studies; the former illustrates a case where the racist nature of the conflict has been clear to most observers, and the latter represents a case where racism plays an important yet overlooked role. Racism did not cause either conflict. Rather, the conflicts were the outcome of political manipulation and enlargement of already existing group classification schemes and social polarisation, a history of real and imagined oppression and deprivation, the absence of the rule of law and democratic structures, and state monopoly over the provision of information. Under such conditions, political élites could use racist ideology as a method of gaining power and, when necessary, waging war**.**

#### Preventing death is the first ethical priority – it’s the only impact you can’t recover from.

Zygmunt Bauman, University of Leeds Professor Emeritus of Sociology, 1995, Life In Fragments: Essays In Postmodern Morality, p. 66-71

The being‑for is like living towards‑the‑future: a being filled with anticipation, a being aware of the abyss between future foretold and future that will eventually be; it is this gap which, like a magnet, draws the self towards the Other,as it draws life towards the future, making life into an activity of overcoming, transcending, leaving behind. The self stretches towards the Other, as life stretches towards the future; neither can grasp what it stretches toward, but it is in this hopeful and desperate, never conclusive and never abandoned stretching‑toward that the self is ever anew created and life ever anew lived. In the words of M. M. Bakhtin, it is only in this not‑yet accomplished world of anticipation and trial, leaning toward stubbornly an‑other Other, that life can be lived ‑ not in the world of the `events that occurred'; in the latter world, `it is impossible to live, to act responsibly; in it, I am not needed, in principle I am not there at all." Art, the Other, the future: what unites them, what makes them into three words vainly trying to grasp the same mystery, is the modality of possibility. A curious modality, at home neither in ontology nor epistemology; itself, like that which it tries to catch in its net, `always outside', forever `otherwise than being'. The possibility we are talking about here is not the all‑too‑familiar unsure‑of‑itself, and through that uncertainty flawed, inferior and incomplete being, disdainfully dismissed by triumphant existence as `mere possibility', `just a possibility'; possibility is instead `plus que la reahte' ‑ both the origin and the foundation of being. The hope, says Blanchot, proclaims the possibility of that which evades the possible; `in its limit, this is the hope of the bond recaptured where it is now lost."' The hope is always the hope of *being fu filled,* but what keeps the hope alive and so keeps the being open and on the move is precisely its *unfu filment.* One may say that the paradox *of hope* (and the paradox of possibility founded in hope) is that it may pursue its destination solely through betraying its nature; the most exuberant of energies expends itself in the urge towards rest. Possibility uses up its openness in search of closure. Its image of the better being is its own impoverishment . . . The togetherness of the being‑for is cut out of the same block; it shares in the paradoxical lot of all possibility. It lasts as long as it is unfulfilled, yet it uses itself up in never ending effort of fulfilment, of recapturing the bond, making it tight and immune to all future temptations. In an important, perhaps decisive sense, it is selfdestructive and self‑defeating: its triumph is its death. The Other, like restless and unpredictable art, like the future itself, is a *mystery.* And being‑for‑the‑Other, going towards the Other through the twisted and rocky gorge of affection, brings that mystery into view ‑ makes it into a challenge. That mystery is what has triggered the sentiment in the first place ‑ but cracking that mystery is what the resulting movement is about. The mystery must be unpacked so that the being‑for may focus on the Other: one needs to know what to focus on. (The `demand' is *unspoken,* the responsibility undertaken is *unconditional;* it is up to him or her who follows the demand and takes up the responsibility to decide what the following of that demand and carrying out of that responsibility means in practical terms.) Mystery ‑ noted Max Frisch ‑ (and the Other is a mystery), is an exciting puzzle, but one tends to get tired of that excitement. `And so one creates for oneself an image. This is a loveless act, the betrayal." Creating an image of the Other leads to the substitution of the image for the Other; the Other is now fixed ‑ soothingly and comfortingly. There is nothing to be excited about anymore. I know what the Other needs, I know where my responsibility starts and ends. Whatever the Other may now do will be taken down and used against him. What used to be received as an exciting surprise now looks more like perversion; what used to be adored as exhilarating creativity now feels like wicked levity. Thanatos has taken over from Eros, and the excitement of the ungraspable turned into the dullness and tedium of the grasped. But, as Gyorgy Lukacs observed, `everything one person may know about another is only expectation, only potentiality, only wish or fear, acquiring reality only as a result of what happens later, and this reality, too, dissolves straightaway into potentialities'. Only death, with its finality and irreversibility, puts an end to the musical‑chairs game of the real and the potential ‑ it once and for all closes the embrace of togetherness which was before invitingly open and tempted the lonely self." `Creating an image' is the dress rehearsal of that death. But creating an image is the inner urge, the constant temptation, the *must* of all affection . . . It is the loneliness of being abandoned to an unresolvable ambivalence and an unanchored and formless sentiment which sets in motion the togetherness of being‑for. But what loneliness seeks in togetherness is an end to its present condition ‑ an end to itself. Without knowing ‑ without being capable of knowing ‑ that the hope to replace the vexing loneliness with togetherness is founded solely on its own unfulfilment, and that once loneliness is no more, the togetherness ( the being‑for togetherness) must also collapse, as it cannot survive its own completion. What the loneliness seeks in togetherness (suicidally for its own cravings) is the foreclosing and pre‑empting of the future, cancelling the future before it comes, robbing it of mystery but also of the possibility with which it is pregnant. Unknowingly yet necessarily, it seeks it all to its own detriment, since the success (if there is a success) may only bring it back to where it started and to the condition which prompted it to start on the journey in the first place. The togetherness of being‑for is always in the future, and nowhere else. It is no more once the self proclaims: `I have arrived', `I have done it', `I fulfilled my duty.' The being‑for starts from the realization of the bottomlessness of the task, and ends with the declaration that the infinity has been exhausted. This is the tragedy of being‑for ‑ the reason why it cannot but be death‑bound while simultaneously remaining an undying attraction. In this tragedy, there are many happy moments, but no happy end. Death is always the foreclosure of possibilities, and it comes eventually in its own time, even if not brought forward by the impatience of love. The catch is to direct the affection to staving off the end, and to do this against the affection's nature. What follows is that, if moral relationship is grounded in the being-for togetherness (as it is), then it can exist as a project, and guide the self's conduct only as long as its nature of a project (a not yet-completed project) is not denied. Morality, like the future itself, is forever not‑yet. (And this is why the ethical code, any ethical code, the more so the more perfect it is by its own standards, supports morality the way the rope supports the hanged man.) It is because of our loneliness that we crave togetherness. It is because of our loneliness that we open up to the Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being‑with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through allowing the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in the present.

#### Their ethical framework is a cop-out – weighing consequences is key to political responsibility.

Saul D. Alinsky, Activist, Professor, and Social Organizer with International Fame, Founder of the Industrial Areas Foundation, Rules for Radicals, 1971, p. 24-27, gender paraphrased

We cannot think first and act afterwards. From the moment of birth we are immersed in action and can only fitfully guide it by taking thought. Alfred North Whitehead That perennial question, “Does the end justify the means?” is meaningless as it stands; the real and only question regarding the ethics of means and ends is, and always has been, “Does this particular end justify this particular means?” Life and how you live it is the story of means and ends. The end is what you want, and the means is how you get it. Whenever we think about social change, the question of means and ends arises. The man of action views the issue of means and ends arises. The man of action views the issue of means and ends in pragmatic and strategic terms. He has no other problem; he thinks only of his actual resources and the possibilities of various choices of action. He asks of ends only whether they are achievable and worth the cost; of means, only whether they will work. To say that corrupt means corrupt the ends is to believe in the immaculate conception of ends and principles. The real arena is corrupt and bloody. Life is a corrupting process from the time a child learns to play his mother off against his father in the politics of when to go to bed; he who fears corruption fears life. The practical revolutionary will understand Geothe’s “conscience is the virtue of observers and not of agents of action”; in action, one does not always enjoy the luxury of a decision that is consistent both with one’s individual conscience and the good of [hu]mankind. The choice must always be for the latter. Action is for mass salvation and not for the individual’s personal salvation. He who sacrifices the mass good for his personal conscience has peculiar conception of “personal salvation”; he doesn’t care enough for people to be “corrupted” for them. The men [and women] who pile up the heaps of discussion and literature on the ethics of means and ends—which with rare exception is conspicuous for its sterility—rarely write about their won experiences in the perpetual struggle of life and change. They are strangers, moreover, to the burdens and problems of operational responsibility and the unceasing pressure for immediate decisions. They are passionately committed to a mystical objectivity where passions are suspect. They assume a nonexistent situation where man suspect. They assume a nonexistent situation where men dispassionately and with reason draw and devise means and ends as if studying a navigational chart on land. They can be recognized by one of two verbal brands; “We agree with the ends but not the means,” or “This is not the time.” The means-and-end moralists or non-doers always wind up on their ends without any means. The means-and-ends moralists, constantly obsessed with the ethics of the means used by the Have-Nots against the Haves, should search themselves as to their real political position. In fact, they are passive—but real—allies of the Haves. They are the ones Jacques Maritain referred to in his statement, “The fear of soiling ourselves by entering the context of history is not virtue, but a way of escaping virtue.” These non-doers were the ones who chose not to fight the Nazis in the only way they could have been fought; they were the ones who drew their window blinds to shut out the shameful spectacle of Jews and political prisoners being dragged through the streets; they were the ones who privately deplored the horror of it all—and did nothing. This is the nadir of immorality. The most unethical of all means is the nonuse of any means. It is this species of man how so vehemently and militantly participated in that classically idealistic debate at the old League of Nations on the ethical differences between defensive and offensive weapons. Their fears of action drive them to refuge in an ethics so divorced from the politics of life that it can apply only to angels, not to men. The standards of judgment must be rooted in the whys and wherefores of life as it is lived, the world as it is, not our wished-for fantasy of the world as it should be. I present here a series of rules pertaining to the ethics of means and ends: first, that one’s concern with the ethics of means and ends varies inversely with one’s personal interest in the issue. When we are not directly concerned our morality overflows; as La Rochefoucauld put it, “We all have strength enough to endure the misfortunes of others.” Accompanying this rule is the parallel one that one’s concern with the ethics of means and ends varies inversely with one’s distance from the scene of conflict. The second rule of the ethics of means and ends is that the judgment of the ethics of means is dependent upon the political position of those sitting in judgment. If you actively opposed the Nazi occupation and joined the underground Resistance, then you adopted the means of assassination, terror, properly destruction, the bombing of tunnels and trains, kidnapping, and the willingness to sacrifice innocent hostages to the end of defeating the Nazis. Those who opposed the Nazi conquerors regarded the Resistance as a secret army of selfless, patriotic idealists, courageous beyond expectation and willing to sacrifice their lives to their moral convictions. To the occupation authorities, however, these people were lawless terrorists, murders, saboteurs, assassins, who believed that the end justified the means, and were utterly unethical according to the mystical rules of war. Any foreign occupation would so ethically judge its opposition. However, in such conflict, neither protagonist is concerned with any value except victory. It is life or death.

#### Deontology is moral evasion – consequentialist decision-making is imperative.

Kai Nielsen, Professor of Philosophy, University of Calgary, Absolutism and Its Consequentialist Critics, ed. Joram Graf Haber, 1993, p. 170-172 gender paraphrased

Forget the levity of the example and consider the case of the innocent fat man. If there really is no other way of unsticking our fat man and if plainly, without blasting him out, everyone in the cave will drown, then, innocent or not, he should be blasted out. This indeed overrides the principle that the innocent should never be deliberately killed, but it does not reveal a callousness toward life, for the people involved are caught in a desperate situation in which, if such extreme action is not taken, many lives will be lost and far greater misery will obtain. Moreover, the people who do such a horrible thing or acquiesce in the doing of it are not likely to be rendered more callous about human life and human suffering as a result. Its occurrence will haunt them for the rest of their lives and is as likely as not to make them more rather than less morally sensitive. It is not even correct to say that such a desperate act shows a lack of respect for persons. We are not treating the fat man merely as a means. The fat man's person‑his interests and rights are not ignored. Killing him is something which is undertaken with the greatest reluctance. It is only when it is quite certain that there is no other way to save the lives of the others that such a violent course of action is justifiably undertaken. Alan Donagan, arguing rather as Anscombe argues, maintains that "to use any innocent man ill for the sake of some public good is directly to degrade him to being a mere means" and to do this is of course to violate a principle essential to morality, that is, that human beings should never merely be treated as means but should be treated as ends in themselves (as persons worthy of respect)." But, as my above remarks show, it need not be the case, and in the above situation it is not the case, that in killing such an innocent man we are treating him merely as a means. The action is universalizable, all alternative actions which would save his life are duly considered, the blasting out is done only as a last and desperate resort with the minimum of harshness and indifference to his suffering and the like. It indeed sounds ironical to talk this way, given what is done to him. But if such a terrible situation were to arise, there would always be more or less humane ways of going about one's grim task. And in acting in the more humane ways toward the fat man, as we do what we must do and would have done to ourselves were the roles reversed, we show a respect for his person. In so treating the fat man‑not just to further the public good but to prevent the certain death of a whole group of people (that is to prevent an even greater evil than his being killed in this way)‑the claims of justice are not overriden either, for each individual involved, if he is reasonably correct, should realize that if he were so stuck rather than the fat man, he should in such situations be blasted out. Thus, there is no question of being unfair. Surely we must choose between evils here, but is there anything more reasonable, more morally appropriate, than choosing the lesser evil when doing or allowing some evil cannot be avoided? That is, where there is no avoiding both and where our actions can determine whether a greater or lesser evil obtains, should we not plainly always opt for the lesser evil? And is it not obviously a greater evil that all those other innocent people should suffer and die than that the fat man should suffer and die? Blowing up the fat man is indeed monstrous. But letting him remain stuck while the whole group drowns is still more monstrous. The consequentialist is on strong moral ground here, and, if his reflective moral convictions do not square either with certain unrehearsed or with certain reflective particular moral convictions of human beings, so much the worse for such commonsense moral convictions. One could even usefully and relevantly adapt herethough for a quite different purpose‑an argument of Donagan's. Consequentialism of the kind I have been arguing for provides so persuasive "a theoretical basis for common morality that when it contradicts some moral intuition, it is natural to suspect that intuition, not theory, is corrupt."" Given the comprehensiveness, plausibility, and overall rationality of consequentialism, it is not unreasonable to override even a deeply felt moral conviction if it does not square with such a theory, though, if it made no sense or overrode the bulk of or even a great many of our considered moral convictions, that would be another matter indeed. Anticonsequentialists often point to the inhumanity of people who will sanction such killing of the innocent, but cannot the compliment be returned by speaking of the even greater inhumanity, conjoined with evasiveness, of those who will allow even more death and far greater misery and then excuse themselves on the ground that they did not intend the death and misery but merely forbore to prevent it? In such a context, such reasoning and such forbearing to prevent seems to me to constitute a moral evasion. I say it is evasive because rather than steeling himself to do what in normal circumstances would be a horrible and vile act but in this circumstance is a harsh moral necessity, he [it] allows, when he has the power to prevent it, a situation which is still many times worse. He tries to keep his `moral purity' and [to] avoid `dirty hands' at the price of utter moral failure and what Kierkegaard called `double‑mindedness.' It is understandable that people should act in this morally evasive way but this does not make it right.
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#### Deal is key to prevent credit downgrade

Jim Puzzanghera, “Moody's says 'fiscal cliff' deal doesn't end credit downgrade risk”, LA Times, 1/2/2012

WASHINGTON -- Moody's Investors Service warned Wednesday that the "fiscal cliff" tax deal was not enough to remove the risk of a downgrade of the U.S. credit rating.¶ The company, one of three major credit rating firms, said the deal approved Tuesday night to raise about $620 billion in tax revenue over the next 10 years was "a further step in clarifying the medium-term deficit and debt trajectory of the federal government."¶ But the package, which averted income tax increases on most Americans, did not produce "meaningful improvement" in the ratio of the federal government's debt to its economic output.¶ Although Moody's said it expected additional deficit-reduction measures in the coming months, the company did not remove its negative outlook on the U.S.' AAA rating. President Obama and Congress delayed automatic federal spending cuts for two months to provide time for negotiations on more deficit-reduction measures.¶ "Moody's will need to consider these measures in assessing the rating outlook," the company said Wednesday. The nation's debt outlook after those negotiations will determine whether Moody's downgrades the U.S. rating a notch to Aa1.¶ Moody's initially warned in September that it probably would downgrade the rating if U.S. officials did not address the nation's rising debt. Fitch Ratings issued a similar warning in November and reiterated it last week.¶ Fitch, which also has a negative outlook on the U.S. rating, had no update Wednesday.¶ [Updated 1:48 p.m. Jan. 2] Standard & Poor’s said Wednesday the tax deal would not change its AA+ credit rating for the U.S. or change the negative outlook it has for the rating.]¶ Moody's said it was particularly concerned that the tax deal did not include an increase in the nation's debt limit. The U.S. technically hit its $16.4-trillion debt limit Tuesday, but the Treasury Department said it could juggle the nation's finances to allow for continued borrowing for about two more months.¶ The long, divisive fight over raising the debt limit in 2011 led Standard & Poor's to downgrade its U.S. credit rating.¶ "Although Moody's believes that the debt limit will eventually be raised and that the risk of default on Treasury bonds is extremely low, this confluence of events adds uncertainty to the outcome of negotiations" over spending cuts, Moody's said.¶ The tax deal was positive for the U.S. economy because it averted the recession that probably would have hit in the first half of this year if all the George W. Bush-era tax cuts expired. But the expiration of temporary payroll tax break as of Tuesday "will likely be a constraint on growth in coming quarters," Moody's said.¶ The tax deal will help bring the ratio of debt to economic output down from an anticipated high of about 80% in 2014 to the upper 70% range for the rest of the decade, Moody's said.¶ Although that's an improvement, additional steps to bring the ratio down further are needed to save the nation's AAA rating, Moody's said.

#### Downgrade is biggest risk to economy – cuts economy by 10 ½ points

Reuters Dec. 30th

[Ryan Vlastelica, Edward Krudy and Doris Frankel , Reuters, Dec. 30th, 2012, Forget the 'fiscal cliff': Debt ceiling is much scarier, <http://www.nbcnews.com/business/forget-fiscal-cliff-debt-ceiling-much-scarier-1C7753061>, uwyo//amp]

Investors fearing a stock market plunge if the U.S. tumbles off the "fiscal cliff" next week may want to relax. But they should be scared if a few weeks later Washington fails to reach a deal to raise the nation's debt ceiling as that threatens a default, another credit downgrade and a financial markets panic. Market strategists say that falling off the cliff for any lengthy period -- which would lead to automatic tax hikes and stiff cuts in government spending -- would badly dent both consumer and business confidence, but it would take some time for the U.S. economy to slide into recession. In the meantime, there would be plenty of chances for lawmakers to make amends by reversing some of the effects. Advertise | AdChoices That has been reflected in a U.S. stock market that has still not shown signs of melting down. Instead, it has drifted lower and gotten more volatile. In some ways, that has let Washington off the hook. In the past, a plunge in stock prices forced the hand of Congress, such as in the middle of the financial crisis in 2008. "If this thing continues for a bit longer and the result is you get a U.S. debt downgrade ... the risk is not that you lose two and half percent, the risk is that you lose ten and a half," said Jonathan Golub, chief U.S. equity strategist at UBS Equity Research in New York. U.S. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner said earlier this week that the United States will technically reach its debt limit at the end of the year. 'Tremendous fight' The White House has said it will not negotiate the debt ceiling as in 2011, when the fight over what was once a procedural matter preceded the first-ever downgrade of the U.S. credit rating, but it may be forced into such a battle again. A repeat of that war is most worrisome for markets. Markets posted several days of sharp losses in the period surrounding the debt ceiling fight in 2011. Even after a bill to increase the ceiling passed, stocks plunged in what was seen as a vote of no confidence in Washington's ability to function, given how close lawmakers came to a default. Credit ratings agency Standard & Poor's lowered the U.S. sovereign rating to double-A-plus, citing Washington's legislative problems as one reason for the downgrade. The benchmark S&P 500 dropped 16 percent in a four-week period ending Aug. 21, 2011. "I think there will be a tremendous fight between Democrats and Republicans about the debt ceiling," said Jon Najarian, a co-founder of online brokerage TradeMonster.com in Chicago. "I think that is the biggest risk to the downside in January for the market and the U.S. economy." There are some signs in the options market that investors are starting to eye the January period with more wariness. The CBOE Volatility Index, or the VIX, the market's favored anxiety indicator, has remained at relatively low levels throughout this process, though on Thursday it edged above 20 for the first time since July.

#### Debt Ceiling will be first- 11th hour deal is being pushed and congress doesn’t want to roll over the polarization

Ye 1/8

[Robin Ye, “Dianne Feinstein and Obama Should Pressure Democrats to Pass An Assault Weapons Ban ASAP”, http://www.policymic.com/articles/22268/dianne-feinstein-and-obama-should-pressure-democrats-to-pass-an-assault-weapons-ban-asap, \\wyo-bb]

The 11th hour “end” to America’s least favorite cliff has bought Washington an essential two months to negotiate the impending, and potentially more harmful, debt ceiling problem. This leaves an incredibly small window to pass meaningful legislation that pertains to anything other than $16.4 trillion national debt and spending cuts. Democrats are already dealing with staunch conservative values when it comes to budgetary talks. Wait again until March and another round of frustration might just push back any chance of bi-partisanship goodwill and cooperation. Negotiating before the inevitable debt-ceiling impasse could reduce the (still strong) chances of non-cooperation, for the 113th Congress does not want to follow its predecessors as polarized and incapable of action.

#### **Next disaster relief bill will face more Republican opposition; they will link it to spending cuts. Prefer our predictive and comparative evidence**

Staten Island Advance, 1/8

[“Getting House approval of an additional $51 billion in aid for Sandy victims won't be easy,” January 8, 2013, <http://www.silive.com/opinion/editorials/index.ssf/2013/01/getting_house_approval_of_addi.html> //uwyo-baj]

Having finally prevailed on Speaker John Boehner to allow a House vote to allocate $9.7 billion to replenish the Federal Emergency Management Agency's flood insurance program fund, Republicans made it sound as if it was just the first installment of a much larger, $60-billion aid package in the works for victims of Hurricane Sandy. "Today's vote was a down payment on a much larger aid bill," a relieved Rep. Michael Grimm asserted after the vote Friday. "I thank my colleagues for voting in favor of this important flood insurance bill and hope to see the same level of support on Jan. 15 to pass the remainder of the $60 billion in emergency aid bill." Well . . . maybe. True, Speaker Boehner ultimately allowed the vote to replenish the flood insurance fund and promised to take a vote on the remaining $51 billion in the aid package on Jan. 15, But don't forget, it was Mr. Boehner who canceled the expected vote on the entire Sandy relief package last week in the first place. That came in the wake of all the weeping and gnashing of teeth over the "fiscal cliff" budget vote. And a big part of the reason he canceled it was that he was feeling pushback from conservative, Tea Party-backed members of his Republican caucus. He may have relented in the face of pleas from Mr. Grimm, Rep Peter King and other Northeast Republicans and scheduled a new vote on the $51-billion portion of the package for Jan. 15. However, there's no guarantee there are enough votes in the House to pass it. In fact, that expected "part two" of the Sandy aid package may be more difficult to bring about than GOP lawmakers are admitting. Some arch-conservative groups have made the vote on this bill a make-or-break litmus test for Republican lawmakers. And they've warned that they'll be watching it closely on Jan. 15. That pressure is why 67 members of the House — all Republicans — voted against the flood insurance replenishment on Friday. That kind of opposition on a disaster relief bill is unheard of. Congressional votes on aid packages in the wake of such catastrophes are usually slam-dunks, with quick, overwhelming approval and little, if any opposition. But this time, the hard-line conservative groups are insisting that any money allocated for victims of Sandy next Tuesday be offset by spending cuts elsewhere in the budget. Funny, we don't recall a similar criterion being applied to the votes for aid for victims of Hurricane Katrina, the Joplin, Mo., or Alabama tornado outbreaks or countless other natural disasters. Only the aid for Sandy victims is held to the conservatives' sudden matching-dollars standard. The influential Club for Growth, which is holding fast to this rule, has declared, "This vote will be included in the Club for Growth's 2013 congressional scorecard" and cautioned that "Our congressional scorecard for the 113th Congress provides a comprehensive rating of how well or how poorly each member of Congress supports pro-growth, free-market policies and will be distributed to our members and to the public." In other words, Republicans who don't want to have their conservative reputations questioned should not buck the Club for Growth. Other conservative groups have been even more blunt, warning that they'll finance primary opponents for Republicans who don't toe the line. And all these hard-liners are pointing to the vote a week from today as a showdown — a demonstration of their power over Republicans in Congress.

#### AGENCY DECISIONS ARE NO LONGER SECRET OR HIDDEN - THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT GUARANTEES PERCEPTION

SKRZYCKI (staffwriter) 2/13/98

[Cindy, “Will Congress Wake Up to Its Rule-Blocking Weapon?,” Washington Post, LN]

While the act may not be working as some intended, some regulatory analysts see great value in having the agencies report on every rule to the GAO and Congress -- especially since GAO has established an Internet database for the review act. "This breaks the monopoly on information that has traditionally been held by the agencies," said Angela Antonelli, deputy director for economic policy at the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank. She believes Congress now will be able to finally grasp what agencies do every day.

#### [ ] Solar power support costs political capital

- Extend 1NC NYT ’12 evidence – renewables support is increasingly politicized as the debate gets pushed as a threat to fossil fuel interests and gets caught up in the Solyndra scandal by Republicans.

# Cp

#### Uniform 50 state action is legit

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publius, 2011

State Positioning In anticipation of an expanded federal role, states began to position themselves to influence federal policy, both through associations representing all fifty states as well as individual state attempts to shape the outcome of any future policy. Consequently, one could begin to consider states, both collectively and individually, as strategic actors engaged in intergovernmental lobbying in search of most favored status as the federal government moved onto terrain that they had long dominated. In some instances, this entailed state alliance with other entities, including industries and environmental advocacy groups. Organizations that represent the views of all states must of course contend with differences among their membership but generally find consensus positions that allow them to take fairly uniform stands in attempting to influence federal policy. Virtually all of these state-based entities took a fairly similar stance on possible expansion of the federal role in climate change, reflected in position papers, policy briefs, public workshops, and formal testimony aimed at the 111th Congress and the Obama Administration. They generally tended to endorse intergovernmental strategies that would protect existing state policies and allow for continued state innovation. They also sought to extract as much rent as possible, in the form of grants and other financial support, from the federal government to cover implementation costs, further promote their most promising renewable energy sources, and underwrite efforts to “adapt” to changing climates. Among those associations that represent elected state officials, for example, the National Governors Association and National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) took generally similar positions. This reflects some differences on issues such as vehicle emission standards, reflecting the regional divides noted above. But most other areas of climate change reflect a fairly uniform position, represented in a 2009 NCSL resolution that received overwhelming support: “Federal legislation should not preempt state or local governments from enacting policy options that differ from federal choices or from enacting stricter or stronger measures.” Those organizations that represent state agencies with a common function, such as the Environmental Council of the States (environmental protection agencies), the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (electricity regulatory boards), the National Association of State Energy Officials (energy departments), and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (state and local air quality units), took similar stances, though tailored to their particular area. In short, these groups sought to protect state interests under contested federalism, whether giving states latitude to sustain existing policies or take additional steps in the future.

#### 50 State action is better for environmental justice

#### -- Local Solutions

#### A. States lead to greater community spirit and informed decision making

Steven G. Calabresi, Professor of Constitutional Law, Formerly Law Clerk, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, Court of Appeals Judge Robert H. Bork, and Ralph K. Winter, and Served in the Reagan and Bush Administrations, December 1995 (“A Government of Limited and Enumerated Powers: In Defense of United States v. Lopez” – Michigan Law Review) p. lexis

The greater congruence of mores between citizens and representatives in state governments in turn may produce greater civic mindedness and community spirit at the state level. This might ameliorate the highly corrosive decline of public spiritedness at the national level that has occurredxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

 as a result of the current perception that there exists a discongruence of mores between members of Congress and the public. Finally, decentralization improves the quality of governmental decisionmaking by improving the information flow from the populace to the relevant government decisionmakers. Centralized command and control decisionmaking is often economically inefficient beyond a certain point in all social organizations. This point holds true for the military, for corporations that contract out for many goods and services, and for government as well. Large, multilayered bureaucracies cannot process information successfully. Decentralization alleviates this crucial problem by leading to better informed decisionmaking. As our society and economy grow in complexity, the amount of information that government must process increases as well. This is why overly centralized, top-down command and control mechanisms are even less desirable in today's complex modern economy than they were during the Model-T era of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal. Ironically, the decentralized federalism of the horse-and-buggy era is better suited to the needs of our information economy than is the overly centralized, outmoded nationalism of the New Deal.

#### B. That forms the crux of the environmental justice - the movement is decisively in favor of community activism and against federal action

Richard L. Revesz, Professor of Law, New York University, December 2001 (“Federalism and Environmental Regulation: A Public Choice Analysis” – Harvard Law Review) p. lexis

In particular, the environmental justice movement is made up of a large number of advocacy groups concerned with issues such as the location and cleanup of hazardous waste sites. A study by Robert Lowry found that these local groups have different outlooks than their national counterparts. For example, they are not comfortable with technocratic solutions xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

and tend to view environmental problems in moral terms. More importantly, these groups strongly favor community-level action. As Luke Cole, a prominent environmental justice advocate puts it: "The question of where - at what level of government - environmental decisions should be made is one which has been answered clearly and decisively by the Environmental Justice Movement: at the community level." That such groups, which first emerged in the early 1980s, now have considerable impact on public policy is strong evidence against Ratliff's thesis.

# case

**PV isn’t effective in generating electricity or fiscally, says environmental activists—German experiments prove**

**Monbiot 10**

[Monbiot, George: environmental and activist in Britain, author of a number of environmental books including Heat: How to Stop the Planet from Burning. "Solar PV has failed in Germany and it will fail in the UK." *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 11 Mar 2010. Web. 12 Sep 2012. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/georgemonbiot/2010/mar/11/solar-power-germany-feed-in-tariff>. //Wyo-BF]

My own instincts press me to support solar power. Like most environmentalists I believe that small is beautiful. I hate pylon lines and I don't care for the sight of big power plants of any description, wind farms included. I detest the big energy firms which provide our electricity. I am deeply attracted to the idea of being able to produce my own power, just as I love producing my own fruit and vegetables. But my attempts to find the best means of tackling climate change, which I explain at greater length in my book, Heat, have forced me to put my gut feelings to one side. **Our choices must be based on the best possible information. Otherwise we waste our lives chasing chimeras**. Against my instincts **I have come to oppose solar photovoltaic power** (PV) in the UK, **and the** feed-in **tariffs designed to encourage it, because the facts show unequivocally that this is a terrible investment. There are much better ways of spending the rare and precious revenue**

**xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx**

 **that the tariffs will extract from our pockets.** If we are to prevent runaway climate change, we have to ensure that we get the biggest available bang for our buck: in other words the greatest cut in greenhouse gas production from the money we spend. **Money spent on ineffective solutions is not just a waste: it's also a lost opportunity**. Environmentalists have no trouble understanding this argument when lobbying against nuclear power. Those who maintain that it's more expensive than renewable electricity argue that we shouldn't waste our money investing in it. But now I hear the same people telling us that we should support every form of renewable generation, regardless of the cost. I'm delighted that Jeremy has accepted my bet that solar PV won't reach grid parity in 2013. I am also happy for the winnings to go to SolarAid. I agree with Jeremy that **solar PV is an appropriate technology in Africa**, where most people are off-grid and there's much more sunlight. **It's in this country that it makes no sense.** And I accept Jeremy's challenge to write a column admitting I'm wrong if he wins the bet (but I won't accept his subtle slippage, substituting "near" for "at"). If I am wrong, it won't be the first time. In 2005, before I had crunched the numbers, I called on green NGOs to switch from supporting windfarms to promoting "decentralised microgeneration projects", which I considered a more attractive option. After I discovered just how badly this would set back efforts to decarbonise our power supplies, I changed my views. What would it take to change his? Jeremy and I can speculate about how useful solar electricity will be in the UK until we've worn our keyboards out. Until our bet closes in 2013, by which time billions of pounds will have been committed, no one will know which of us is right. But you don't have to rely on speculation to see how this is likely to pan out. As the old cookery programes used to say: "Here's one we prepared earlier." **The German experiment**, almost identical to the UK's, **has now been running for ten years.** An analysis published in November by the Ruhr University (pdf) shows just what it has achieved. **When the German programme began in 2000, it offered** index-linked **payments** of **51** euro **cents for every KWh of electricity produced by solar PV. These were guaranteed for 20 years.** This is similar to the UK's initial subsidy, of 41p. As in the UK, the solar subsidy was, and remains, massively greater than the payments for other forms of renewable technology. **The real net cost of the solar PV installed in Germany between 2000 and 2008 was €35bn.** The paper estimates **a further real cost of €18bn in 2009 and 2010: a total of €53bn in ten years.** These investments make wonderful sense for the lucky householders who could afford to install the panels, as lucrative returns are guaranteed by taxing the rest of Germany's electricity users. But what has this astonishing spending achieved? **By 2008 solar PV was producing a grand total of 0.6% of Germany's electricity. 0.6% for €35bn.** Hands up all those who think this is a good investment. **After years of these incredible payments, and the innovation and cost reductions they were supposed to stimulate, the paper estimates that saving one tonne of carbon dioxide through solar PV in Germany still costs €716.** The International Energy Agency has produced an even higher estimate: €1000 per tonne. There are dozens of ways in which you can save carbon for 100th of the cost of solar PV at high latitudes
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# Disasters

#### rob

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: 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. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

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

Kurasawa, 2004

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

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

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

# K

## Perms

#### Must have a complete rejection of production focus to study energy production from a consumption angle, any permutation will fail because it contributes to the hegemony of production based solutions to problems

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

This chapter is an attempt to point in an alternative direction, what I term the consumption angle. The task is straightforward in the initial stages of conceptualizing: reject the production angle, adopt its polar opposite, the consumption angle, and play out its implications. The result is to show how the consumption angle raises questions outside the production angle. The first step, however, is to play out the nature of the production angle and its associated ‘‘environmental improvement’’ approach and show how they neglect throughput and irreversibility issues. Before proceeding, however, it is worth noting that, although such initial conceptualization is, in many ways, straightforward, the more operational it becomes the trickier it gets, as will be evident in the hypothetical example at the end of this chapter. This trickiness, I suspect, is not due so much to the difficulties of constructing an alternative logic, one grounded in the biophysical, as it is to the hegemony of the production angle. When the idea of production as the core of economic activity is pervasive, problems in the economy (like ecosystem decline and community deterioration) are logically construed as indeed, production problems, problems to be solved with more or better production. If more, even better, production makes only marginal improvements, if it increases risk or material throughput, 3 it only postpones the day of reckoning. Contradictions mount and risks proliferate. The challenge is to push beyond the production angle, to chart an analytic perspective that at once eschews the production orientation and raises difficult questions about excess resource use.

#### Perm fails—focus on production renders consumption invisible

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

The difficulty in conducting such a transformative research agenda, I submit, lies in two facts. One is the reluctance or inability of social scientists to ground their theorizing in the biophysical, a problem I only touch on here. 1 A second is the fact that the economic strands of the various disciplines focus on production. Economic sociology concerns itself with issues of labor and management, economic history with the rise of industrialism, economic anthropology with subsistence provisioning, and political economy with the political effects of increasing trade, finance, and development. Consumption is nearly invisible. These strands of research adopt the position of the dominant social discipline— economics— and accept consumption as a black box, as simply what people do at the end point of material provisioning, as the reason for all the ‘‘real stuff’’ of economic activity, that is, production. The economy produces goods and goods are good so more goods must be better. There is little reason to investigate consumption, except to estimate demand functions. Consumers, after all, will only purchase what is good for them and producers, as a result, will only produce what consumers are willing to pay for.