### 2NC Passive Solar Not T

#### And the plan simply says ‘passive solar’, which means the use of the sun for heat energy- this evidence also demonstrates our ground arguments- it is an energy efficiency technology with no moving parts and thus accesses independent literature

Passive Solar designs.com no date

[Sustainable Sources: 18 years of online Green Building information, p. http://passivesolar.sustainablesources.com/]

Passive solar design refers to the use of the sun’s energy for the heating and cooling of living spaces. In this approach, the building itself or some element of it takes advantage of natural energy characteristics in materials and air created by exposure to the sun. Passive systems are simple, have few moving parts, and require minimal maintenance and require no mechanical systems. Operable windows, thermal mass, and thermal chimneys are common elements found in passive design. Operable windows are simply windows that can be opened. Thermal mass refers to materials such as masonry and water that can store heat energy for extended time. Thermal mass will prevent rapid temperature fluctuations. Thermal chimneys create or reinforce the effect hot air rising to induce air movement for cooling purposes. Wing walls are vertical exterior wall partitions placed perpendicular to adjoining windows to enhance ventilation through windows.

### 2NC Solar Energy = No Limit

#### Hold the line on a narrow interp of solar power meaning electricity- otherwise EVERYTHING in the energy chain becomes topical, especially massive renewables like hydro, biofuels, evaporation and rainwater collection

Sklar 7

[Scott, 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. “What's the Difference Between Solar Energy and Solar Power?”, p. <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/u/scott-sklar-1495> //wyo-tjc]

Scott, I'm confused about the use of the terms solar energy and solar power. Is solar energy both a type of energy and a type of technology? Is solar power both a type of power and a type of technology? It seems like the terms get mixed up and used interchangeably, like kWh and kW do even though these units describe two different things. What are the general differences between solar energy and solar power? Thank you. -- Lee K. 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.

## Marx

### A2 ‘Method Doesn’t Come First’

#### FIRST, THIS IS ALL ANSWERED ABOVE—FAILURE TO JUSTIFY YOUR METHOD DESTROYS ANY ABILITY TO TRULY UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

#### SECOND, THIS ARGUMENT ONLY BELIES THEIR IGNORANCE TO THE WAYS CAPITAL STRUCTURES THEIR ENTIRE WORLD OF KNOWLEDGE—TO LEGITIMIZE AND MYSTIFY IT’S CONTRADICTIONS, IT MUST MASK IT’S TRUE NATURE, THUS THE BELIEF IN ‘OBJECTIVE POLITICAL INTEREST’ AND THE STATE AS THE SITE OF POLITICS—WHICH IS OUR MESZAROS AND HARNECKE EVIDENCE

#### THIRD, EXTEND OUR TUMINO EVIDENCE AS WELL AS THE SMITH EVIDENCE—BECAUSE EPISTEMOLOGY DETERMINES YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE WORLD, IT ALSO SHAPES YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF HOW TO INTERACT WITHIN IT- IN OTHER WORDS EPISTEMOLOGY IS NECESSARILY PRIOR TO PRAXIS BECAUSE IT DETERMINES YOUR SOLUTION.

#### ALSO, ONTOLOGY AND EPISTEMOLOGY ARE INSEPERABLE—IF YOUR METHOD IS WRONG, SO IS YOUR ENTIRE POLITICAL UNIVERSE:

HOLLIS & SMITH 96

[martin & Steve, Prof’s Int’l Relations, A Response: Why Epistemology Matters]

Now, there are two problems with this: first it seems a very odd way of distinguishing between ontology and epistemology. It implies, inter alia, that historians who write biographies are epistemologists, whilst historians who survey periods and movements are ontologists. That strikes us as nonsensical. The second problem is that they fail to see the extent to which Gidden’s claims are only possible precisely because he has already made an epistemological choice. Indeed, this choice is spelt out very clearly in the preface to the book Jabri and Chan cite. Giddens explicitly rejects structural sociology, seeing the focus of social theory as being on the actors and their interpretations of situations. In this critically important way he has already dealt with epistemology! Far from downplaying the role of epistemology in favour of ontology, his stress on ontology can only be made because he has already decided what kinds of criteria allow us to judge what kinds of things exist in the social world. For Giddens, the appropriate epistemological position is one of what we call ‘Understanding’. He defines social structures as the rules and resources that are grounded in the knowledgeable activities of human agents. Structures are not external to actors but are internal to them. Here, Giddens shows just how important epistemology is: it is only because he is working n the right-hand column of our two-by-two matrix that he can say that epistemology is secondary. After all, if you settle epistemological questions by fiat you are then likely to see them as settled! Thus, whilst Gidden’s work is seen by Jabri and Chan as promoting a conception of structuration that overcomes questions of epistemology by concentrating instead on questions of ontology, the paradox is that he has done no such thing.

### 2NC A2 ‘We’re Not Bad Knowledge’

#### FIRST, EXTEND THE TUMINO EVIDENCE THAT IS READ ON THE ALTERNATIVE—THEIR NON-MATERIALIST THEORY LACKS ANY COHERENCE IN EXPLAINING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THEIR HARMS—THIS IS NOT JUST BECAUSE OF SLOPPY RESEARCH BUT IS SYMPTOMATIC OF THE WAYS CAPITAL HAS DIFFUSED THEIR ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO SYSTEMS OF EXPLOITATION, REPLICATING THAT VERY SYSTEM

#### SECOND, THE 1AC IS A RIGGED GAME—IF WE WIN A LINK, THEIR ARGUMENTS ARE SUSPECT BECAUSE CAPITALISM INFORMS BOTH THEIR GOAL AND THEIR METHOD, CHANNELING INTO WAY THAT REINFORCE CAPITAL

MESZAROS (Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex) 1995

[Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, p. 71// wyo]

The capital system is an irrepressibly expansion oriented mode of social metabolic control. Given the innermost determination of its nature, the material reproductive and the political functions must be radically separated in it —producing thereby the modern state as the structure of alienation par excellence — just as production and control must be radically divorced in it. But ‘expansion’ in this system can only mean capital-expansion to which everything else must be subordinated, and not the development of positive human aspirations and the coordinated provision of the means for their satisfaction. This is why in the capital system the wholly fetishistic criteria of expansion must impose themselves on society also in the form of the radical separation and alienation of the power of decision making from everyone — including the ‘personifications of capital’ whose freedom’ consists in imposing on others capital’s imperatives — at all levels of societal reproduction, from the domain of material production to the highest levels of politics. For once the objectives of social existence are defined by capital in its own way, ruthlessly subordinating all human values and aspirations to the pursuit of capital-expansion, there can be no room for decision making, other than one strictly concerned with finding the instruments best suited for reaching the predetermined goal.

#### ABSENCE OF STRUCTURAL HISTORICISM ARTIFICIALLY DIVIDES THE SOCIAL AND MATERIAL WORLD IN WAYS THAT FUNDAMENTALLY MISTAKE THE SOCIAL WHILE STIFLING POLITICAL STRUGGLE, SINCE ACADEMIC DISCUSSION AFFECTS THE REAL WORLD

Giminez, 99 (Martha, prof. of sociology @ U.C. Boulder. Alethia 2, October, 19-25 http://www.colorado.edu/Sociology/gimenez/work/alethia.html uw/mjs)

Does it make a difference whether social theories accept ontological dualism or ontological individualism, as long as they introduce structures as background variables or social contexts? My answer is that it does make a profound difference. To deny the ontological reality of structures produces an impoverished social science, one which artificially divides the social from its material conditions of possibility and is therefore unable to theorize the logic of social systems and modes of production, and their contradictions, processes, and tendencies. Such perspectives might yield good descriptions and partial explanations of circumscribed social phenomena, but little else. Politically, ontological individualism cannot, therefore, be the basis of an emancipatory social science though its research findings might contribute to emancipatory projects. Archer's theory, on the other hand, offers a useful model which, with modifications, is compatible with a dialectical and materialist reading of Marx; one which does not reduce his work to an idealist dialectic. Archer's ontological dualism and depiction of the different social times linked to stages in the interplay between structure and agency seems awkward and undialectical, but is an important advance over conflationary social theories. In the end, no defense of structure will be convincing to ontological individualists and collectivists who deny its ontological reality, for the debate about structure and agency is not just about "science"; it is a political debate reflecting, at the level of ideological struggles in academia, class divisions and muted class struggles in the real world.

#### THEY DON’T ENGAGE THE MATERIAL CAUSES OF CASE HARMS—THEIR PINPOINTING OF LOCALIZED, SPECIFIC CAUSES IS CIRCULAR AND STRENTHENS CAPITAL’S INVULNERABILITY TO CRITICISM

Mezaros 95, (Istvan, Prof. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Sussex, Beyond Capital, London: Merlin Press, pg. 105-6, uw/mjs)

The reason why capital is structurally incapable of addressing causes as causes—in contrast to treating all newly arising challenges and complications as more or less successfully manipulatable effects—is because it happens to be its own causal foundation: a varitable, unholy ‘causa sui’. Anything that might aspire at socioeconomic legitimacy and viability must be accompanied within its predetermined structural framework. For as a mode of social metabolic control capital cannot tolerate the intrusion of any principle of socioeconomic regulation that might constrain its expansion-oriented dynamics. Indeed, expansion as such is not simply a relative—to a greater or lesser extent commendable, and in that light under certain circumstances freely adopted whereas under other consciously rejected—economic function but an absolutely necessary way of displacing the capital system's emerging problems and contradictions, in accord with the imperative of avoiding like plague their underlying causes. The self propelling causal foundations of the system cannot be questioned under any circumstance. If troubles appear in it, they must be treated as temporary ‘disfunctions’, to be remedied by reasserting with ever greater rigour the imperative of expanded reproduction. It is for this reason that there can be no alternative to the pursuit of expansion—at all cost—in all varieties of the capital system. So long ad the scope for unobstructed expansion is objectively present, the process of displacing the system’s contradictions can go on unhindered. When things do not go well, i.e., when there is a failure in economic growth and corresponding advancement, the difficulties are diagnosed in terms of the circular proposition which runs away from the underlying causes and highlights only their consequences by saying that ‘there is not enough growth.’ Dealing with problems in this perverse circular way, constantly repeating even at times of major recessions that ‘everything is in place’ for healthy expansion, creates the illusion that capital’s mode of social metabolic control is in no need of fundamental change. Legitimate change must be always envisaged as limited alteration and improvement of what is already given. Change must be brought about by innovation undertaken strictly at the instrumental level, which is supposed to make it self evidently beneficial. Since, however, the necessary historical qualifying conditions and implications of continued expansion are systematically disregarded or brushed aside as irrelevant, the assumption of the permanence and unquestionable viability of capital's causa sui is utterly fallacious.

### FW

## Link

#### WE CANNOT ATTEMPT SUSTAINABLE ENERGY METHODS UNTIL WE MOVE PAST THE QUESTION OF CAPITALISM

#### Lawrence, 96

(P. British Socialist Party delegate, “Slower than the Speed of Light,” World Socialist Movement, http://www.worldsocialism.org/articles/slower\_than\_the\_speed.php)

But the problem is not simply one of supplying energy, using any means available in an indiscriminate manner. The production of energy has considerable impact upon the environment, so it is important that the methods used should take this factor into account. Why, for example, has capitalism been so slow to take up the opportunity to develop renewable energy sources, as opposed to the burning of fossil fuels and nuclear power? Capitalism has not provided us with an integrated world strategy of productive development , which is aimed directly at the satisfaction of human needs and can be socially controlled so as to avoid any destructive effects on the environment. The result of this was highlighted in a recent London Guardian editorial: We live in a solar-powered world, yet nearly two and a half billion people—most of them living in very hot climates—are desperately short of energy with which to improve their existence. There are two energy crises; the one we know about, in which 21 per cent of the world's population guzzles 70 per cent of the world's commercial energy output, mostly in the form of pollutant causing stored sunlight—fossil fuels. The other energy crisis is barely perceived and the proceedings of the UN World Solar Summit which has been grappling with it for the last two days have been barely reported. It is the crisis in which 40 per cent of the world's population still lives at a basic subsistence level without any form of electricity.(1) From a practical point of view, society has available a wide range of technical options and there are large reserves of skill, labour and materials, yet at the same time we suffer from a chronic inability to take these up in a free and consciously regulated manner. It is not only that under world capitalism there are economic barriers to producing enough energy for needs. What does become available on the energy markets is produced by methods which in themselves generate further social problems. The present structure of world energy supply involves an unnecessary waste of useful resources; it is destructive of the environment; it produces severe secondary problems and it is fraught with dangers. For more information, see [(Global Warming)](http://www.worldsocialism.org/articles/profit_depleting_agreements.php). This is the position that we are in now and world capitalism provides no foreseeable means for getting out of it. What has been the background to the problems associated with energy supply, which at the present time are worsening? The existing structure of energy supply and the particular production framework of economic forces and a military development which has resulted from them. It is simply impossible to freely deploy the technical options which now exist in response to human needs within this existing economic and military framework.