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## 1NC

### 1

#### Text: The 50 states and all relevant U.S. territories should remove states' restrictions on local solar siting, including restrictions through Homeowners’ and Property Owners’ Associations.

#### States can remove restrictions on solar power – California proves.

States Advancing Solar 8 (April 8, A Clean Energy Group Initiative, “[Rules, Regulations and Policies](http://www.statesadvancingsolar.org/policies/policy-and-regulations),” <http://www.statesadvancingsolar.org/policies/policy-and-regulations/solar-access-laws>, d/a 8-4-12, ads)

California provides perhaps the most comprehensive set of state laws designed to encourage solar access and prevent restrictions on solar energy systems. These laws address municipal restrictions, residential landscaping, and homeowner association restrictions. California’s solar access laws appear in the state’s Civil, Government, Health and Safety, and Public Resources Codes. California’s Civil Code (714) ensures that solar easements may be created to ensure that proper sunlight is available to those who operate solar energy systems, including passive solar design. The Civil Code also states that no covenant or restriction contained in any document pertaining to the sale of property can contain language that explicitly prohibits or restricts the installation or use of a solar energy system.

#### Environmental policy is delegated now to the states now – the plan kills this federalist model

Sovacool 8 (Benjamin K., Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization, 27 Stan. Envtl. L. J. 397 2008, TGA)

Third, other countries continue to model American-style federalism. Germany, the Republic of Austria, Russian Federation, Spain, India, and Nigeria have all based parts of their government structure on American federalism, choosing to decentralize power by adopting constitutions that are more federalist than the ones that they have replaced.24 The "American experience with federalism," writes John Kincaid, "may have useful implications for an emerging federalist revolution worldwide."23 Mikhail Gorbachev even stated that "the phenomenon of federalism affects the interests of the entire global community.,16 Given such trends, it seems likely that other countries may model American environmental federalism. If this is the case, ensuring that the United States government addresses renewable energy and climate policy at the proper scale becomes even more important for the signal it sends to the world.

#### Federalism solves endless war.

Calabresi ’95 (Steven G., Assistant Prof – Northwestern U., Michigan Law Review, Lexis)

Small state federalism is a big part of what keeps the peace in countries like the United States and Switzerland. It is a big part of the reason why we do not have a Bosnia or a Northern Ireland or a Basque country or a Chechnya or a Corsica or a Quebec problem. [51](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=ee7ca1d6fbb003c7a6ecec5c625b6564&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAk&_md5=89cd79e3cd743db7d961de6128b607f0#n51) American federalism in the end is not a trivial matter or a quaint historical anachronism. American-style federalism is a thriving and vital institutional arrangement - partly planned by the Framers, partly the accident of history - and it prevents violence and war. It prevents religious warfare, it prevents secessionist warfare, and it prevents racial warfare. It is part of the reason why democratic majoritarianism in the United States has not produced violence or secession for 130 years, unlike the situation for example, in England, France, Germany, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Cyprus, or Spain. There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that is more important or that has done more to promote peace, prosperity, and freedom than the federal structure of that great document. There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that should absorb more completely the attention of the U.S. Supreme Court.

### 2

#### Immigration reform will pass – there’s a coalition of Democrats and moderate Republicans in the House.

Huffington Post 1/2 (Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month , 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html)

Good news for immigration advocates may have come Tuesday night, when Boehner broke the so-called "Hastert Rule" and allowed the fiscal cliff bill to come for a vote without support from a majority of his Republican conference. Given opposition to immigration reform by many Tea Party Republicans, the proof that Boehner is willing to bypass them on major legislation is a good sign, the Democratic aide said.¶ "If something is of such importance that the GOP establishment [is] telling Boehner, 'You must do this. You need to get this off the table soon,'" the Democratic aide said, the speaker could break the Hastert Rule again.¶ "He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide continued.¶ Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-immigration reform group America's Voice, also said he thinks the House could pass an immigration bill in the same way it did last night, relying on support from both parties. He's hopeful that the fiscal cliff fight could even make them happy to work out legislation in a more standard way.¶ "I never thought I'd say this, but after bruising battles over the future of the American and world economy, the chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya,'" Sharry said.

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

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

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

#### Pushing clean energy is unpopular and partisan.

LVS, ‘12

[Las Vegas Sun, 11-11-12, “Will Republicans play ball on Obama’s lofty second-term agenda?”, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/nov/11/will-republicans-play-ball-obamas-lofty-second-ter/]

But the phrase “cap-and-trade” makes conservatives see almost as much red as the name Nancy Pelosi. Plus, large swaths of the country — including some longtime Democrats — are beginning to doubt that there’s any real payoff to renewable energy investments. “It’s a lot of hocus-pocus,” said Nick Taylor, 42, a lifelong Las Vegas Democrat and single father of seven who voted for Romney. He used to have a job constructing solar panels with Bombard Electric. “We all made a lot of money doing it, but now the systems don’t work. ... Those are garbage now.” That’s left many lawmakers thinking the status quo may be better than the compromise. “Energy — that just divides the parties so much, and it’s something that the public isn’t really sold on,” Damore said, explaining that despite the arched rhetoric on both sides, the feeling of urgency is still too weak to push the parties to work something out. **“**Clean energy was sold as job creation, and now that doesn’t seem to have happened .. and it's not like the oil and gas industry is going anywhere.”

#### Immigration reform is key to food security

Fitz 12 (Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center for American Progress, Time to Legalize Our 11 Million Undocumented Immigrants, November 14th, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/11/14/44885/time-to-legalize-our-11-million-undocumented-immigrants/)

Nowhere is the tension between immigrant labor and the economy more obvious than in agriculture. By most estimates, undocumented immigrants make up more than half of the workers in the agriculture industry. Likewise the U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that each farm job creates three “upstream” jobs in professions such as packaging, transporting, and selling the produce, meaning that what happens in the agricultural sector affects the economy as a whole.¶ Agriculture is particularly susceptible to the whims of the labor market, since crops become ripe at a fixed time and must be picked quickly before they rot. Migrant laborers often travel a set route, following the growing season as it begins in places such as Florida and works its way north. Disrupting this flow of pickers can be devastating to local economies and the nation’s food security.¶ After the passage of Georgia’s anti-immigrant law, H.B. 87, for example, the Georgia Agribusiness Council estimated that the state could lose up to $1 billion in produce from a lack of immigrant labor. A survey of farmers conducted by the Georgia Department of Agriculture found 56 percent of those surveyed were experiencing difficulty finding workers—a devastating blow to the state. Even a program by Gov. Nathan Deal (D-GA) to use prison parolees to fill the worker shortage quickly fell apart, with most walking off the job after just a few hours.¶ Creating a process for legalizing these undocumented workers would help stabilize the agricultural workforce and enhance our nation’s food security. It would also diminish the incentive of states to go down the economically self-destructive path that Georgia, Alabama, Arizona, and others have pursued.

#### Food shortages lead to extinction.

Brown, founder of the Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute, ‘9

[Lester, “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May]

The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such a collapse is possible. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever.As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk.States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy.Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six).Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.

### 3

#### The United States federal government should remove states' restrictions on local solar siting, including restrictions through Homeowners’ and Property Owners’ Association with the exception of solar farmland restrictions in New Jersey as per Bill A-2966 and the Energy Master Plan.

#### Bill A-2966 protects farmland from solar

Johnson 10/4/12 (10/4, http://www.njspotlight.com/stories/12/10/04/new-law-keeps-farmland-free-of-oversized-solar-projects/)

The issue is important because New Jersey is struggling to reinvigorate its solar sector, the second-biggest in the country behind only California. With the price of the solar credits dropping precipitously, lawmakers passed and Gov. Chris Christie signed a bill (A-2966) aimed at stabilizing the price of the credits, more formally known as Solar Renewable Energy Certificates (SRECs).¶ Unless some steps are taken to stabilize the sector, many industry executives and lawmakers fear investment in New Jersey could dry up.¶ The law has many provisions designed to bring more stability to the industry, including a requirement to more than double the amount of solar electricity that power suppliers must buy, a step advocates say will help balance the supply of solar credits and demand for them. By doing so, it could help prop up the prices of the credits, which have fallen from more than $600 in the summer of 2011 to less than $100 now.¶ Also, both the law and the Energy Master Plan discourage putting solar-energy systems on farmland or open space. The bill even requires the BPU to look at what financial incentives ought to be put in place, if any, to promote installation of solar arrays on brownfields and landfills, a proposal Christie first floated during his successful gubernatorial run.

#### The net benefit is a case turn: removing these restrictions reverses previous localized democratic activism.

#### These regulations were put in place after local engagment with solar power and the desire for ways to protect farmland from too much solar siting

New Jersey Times 6/3/12 (Florence and Burlington residents protest farmland solar site, http://www.nj.com/mercer/index.ssf/2012/06/florence\_and\_burlington\_reside.html)

LORENCE — A proposal to build a 137-acre solar field with 110,500 solar panels is drawing protest from Florence and Burlington Township residents who say the project is too large and will have unacceptable environmental impacts.¶ The solar field would be built by the Ridgefield company RenewTricity on a tract of farmland on the Florence-Burlington border that straddles Bustleton Road, just south of Route 130.¶ “It’s a wildly inappropriate place to try and put this,” said David Van Camp, a Burlington resident and member of Citizens Against Florence PhotoVoltaic, which is seeking to block the project.¶ The group argues a solar farm of the proposed magnitude will emit heat and glare, produce a constant audible hum of machinery, potentially spark electrical fires, affect endangered species found in the area and, by harming the property’s appearance, diminish the values of neighboring properties.¶ RenewTricity’s executive vice president and chief operating officer, Kenneth Bob, defended the proposal as environmentally sound.¶ “There are a lot of misconceptions about solar energy. The fact is that this is a well-known science,” said Bob, a New York resident. “We understand all evidence to show that there are no environmental damages. In fact, it is the contrary.”¶ The project is the latest in the region to come under criticism as residents and local officials increasingly complain that the rush to build clean energy installations threatens to eat up farmland and even residential backyards.¶ Officials from Mercer County and Mercer County Community College recently heard objections from residents opposed to a 67-acre solar farm planned for the West Windsor campus. Hamilton has passed a law limiting residential solar to rooftops and blocked a homeowner’s plan to install panels in his backyard.¶ Solar installations are deemed an inherently beneficial use of land under state law, which aids developers seeking zoning variances. Van Camp, like others fighting panel projects, said many Florence residents favor renewable energy but object that the RenewTricity’s proposal “is exploiting land for profit.”

### 4

#### 1. Energy production drives capitalism – it enables the capitalist cycle of growth and exploitation of the working class

ICC 11 (International Communist Current, “Nuclear energy, capitalism and communism” August 16th, World Revolution no.347, September 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear#\_ftnref30)

The increasing use of energy has been a feature of industrialisation around the world. It expresses not only the increase in scale of production and the impact of rising population, but also the development of productivity with the increase in the quantity of the means of production, including energy, that each worker is able to set in motion. This trend has continued today: between 1973 and 2008 total energy consumption increased by 80%.[18] The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. Energy is used to drive the development of productivity but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy. Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production. Increased productivity tends to require increased energy, so the capitalists (other than those in the oil industry) are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy. On the one hand this results in the profligate use of energy for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters of the Thames that characterised 19th century London to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 4. Class divisions are the root of all other oppressions

Kovel 2 (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124)

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

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

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

>edited for gendered language<

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

### Centralization

#### Market forces make solar uncompetitive

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow,, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, April 19, “Zycher testimony to joint House subcommittee hearing on subsidies for renewable energy,” <http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/zycher-testimony-to-joint-house-subcommittee-hearing-on-subsidies-for-renewable-energy/>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

Nonetheless: Renewable electricity generally, and wind and solar power in¶ particular, is very high cost and is likely to remain so for the foreseeable future because¶ of three central factors discussed below. As a result, they have achieved only small¶ market shares. Renewable electricity generation from all non-hydroelectric sources was¶ only 3.6 percent of total U.S. generation in 2010. The Energy Information¶ Administration estimated in 2007 that the proportion in 2030 would be that very same 3.6¶ percent. The EIA more recently has increased that projection to 11 percent. But it is not clear what changes in important parameters have yielded that increase¶ in the projected market share over the course of only a few years. No sound rationale,¶ whether economic or technological, can explain this change in the official wisdom. Quite¶ to the contrary: Both economic and technological factors suggest strongly that wind and¶ solar power will remain uncompetitive, heavily dependent upon subsidies both direct and¶ indirect, and small relative to the electricity market as a whole.¶ The implementation of energy policies in the U.S. for decades has pursued energy¶ sources defined in various ways as alternative, unconventional, independent, renewable,¶ and clean, in an effort to replace such conventional fuels as oil, coal, and natural gas.¶ These longstanding efforts without exception have yielded poor outcomes, in a nutshell¶ because they must swim against the tide of market forces. That is why the only reliable¶ outcome has been one disappointment after another, and there are powerful reasons to¶ predict that the same will prove true with respect to the current enthusiasm for renewable¶ electricity.

#### Aff doesn’t lead to solar decentralization—multiple alt causes

#### a) Federal incentives structure and net metering rules

THEIR AUTHOR Farell 10— (John, an ILSR senior researcher specializing in energy policy developments that best expand the benefits of local ownership and dispersed generation of renewable energy, "Community Solar Power")

We define community solar as a solar PV project with multiple individual owners living in geographic proximity to the solar project, and sharing the costs and benefits of ownership of the solar project. In this report, we explore whether community solar can: Overcome financial and institutional barriers to collectively-owned solar.  Increase the number of people who can invest in and own decentralized solar power.  Offer an affordable opportunity to “go solar.”  Disperse the economic benefits of solar power development. Tap unused space on existing structures and near existing grid connections rather than using open space requiring new transmission. Replicate. Existing community solar projects have overcome barriers to get electrons flowing, but most fail to meet the remaining goals. However, their failure comes as much from solar policy – the old rules – as from project design.

#### b. SEC regulations

THEIR AUTHOR Farell 10 (John, an ILSR senior researcher specializing in energy policy developments that best expand the benefits of local ownership and dispersed generation of renewable energy, "Community Solar Power")

A second serious issue for community solar is illustrated by the struggles of the University Park, MD, project. Because the project was a private enterprise, the investors had to comply with Securities and Exchange Commission's regulations. The most onerous is “registration” of an enterprise, a process that can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Although the University Park project avoided the costs of full registration by restricting themselves to in-state investors, it limited the project in other ways. They were allowed no more than 35 “unsophisticated” (non-wealthy) investors, were not allowed to advertise except by word of mouth. In addition, each member completed a 10-page financial disclosure form for the state of Maryland. Since the likely investors in community solar are not wealthy (the idea is to broaden participation beyond the wealthy or property owners), the Securities and Exchange Commission or state securities laws will be onerous. The limit on the number of investors means that projects will be limited in size or that individual contributions will have to be larger. A 22 kW system (like University Park) requires an average investment of $3,600 when split among 35 investors. This is less than buying solar independently, but is still a hefty sum for many households. The limits on solicitation are much more onerous. Using the state registration route (instead of full registration) means that the project cannot advertise. In fact, they are limited to discussing the investment opportunity by word of mouth with people they already have a relationship with. Disclosure requirements are also problematic, because it either means greater costs for the project or more in-kind time from each investor (or both) to correctly complete disclosure forms. Securities laws also required a lot of legal footwork for the Clean Energy Collective, and in part that’s due to downplaying the investment aspect of a community solar share and focusing instead on the opportunity to reduce electricity bills and receive cleaner energy. These laws are important protections against fraudulent investment opportunities, but they are needlessly complex for projects like community solar where most of the risks are well known. The creation of community solar gardens and other legal entities to support community solar will minimize the hurdles from securities regulations.

#### c.) Even with the option to use decentralized solar, incentives for centralized power generation trump.

THEIR AUTHOR - Farrell 11  (John, an ILSR senior researcher specializing in energy policy developments that best expand the benefits of local ownership and dispersed generation of renewable energy, "Community Solar Power"<http://www.ilsr.org/more-centralized-v-decentralized-solar/>)

A recent Colorado news story captures the spirit of my last post on the tension between centralized and decentralized generation, with a quote that describes the conventional (environmentalist) wisdom: “It’s not an either or choice, that we only put solar on rooftops or on people’s homes or do utility scale, large projects,” said Pete Maysmith**,** executive director of the Colorado Conservation Voters. “As we move forward toward energy independence, reducing our dependence on foreign oil, on dirty, polluting sources of energy like coal**,** we need to move forward on all fronts with renewable [energy], and that includes rooftop solar and community solar gardens, local power. It also includes utility-scale solar that is properly sited, and that’s really important.” As I illustrated with the example of FERC’s lavish incentives for new high-voltage transmission lines, the principled stand of “moving forward on all fronts” collapses in the face of incentives strongly skewed toward centralized power generation.  From rich federal incentives for centralizing infrastructure to the basic structure of federal tax incentives, distributed generation operates at a disadvantage.

#### New energy structures don’t alter social practices—aff is simply a rhetorical appeal.

THEIR AUTHOR Hoffman and Pippert 5 (Steven M. Hoffman, PhD, Professor of Political Science at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Angela High-Pippert, PhD, Director of Women’s Studies at the University of St. Thomas, and serves on the ACTC Women’s Studies Coordinating Committee, "Community Energy: A Social Architecture for an Alternative Energy Future", Bulletin of Science Technology %26 Society 2005 25: 387)

The maturation of these technologies has sparked a good deal of conversation about a radically decentralized energy system that would embody an equally distinct sort of democratic social apparatus. There are, however, important caveats that need to be explored as to whether the development of distributed technologies *necessarily* presages a fundamental and parallel shift in the social organization of the electricity system. That is, although distributed technologies are undoubtedly much more environmentally benign than coal, nuclear, and large-scale hydro facilities**,** there is little proof that a distributed system even implies a more benign or fundamentally distinct type of social order. In this respect, the idea of community energy, a term of choice for those seeking to further the development of distributed technologies, oftentimes represents more of a rhetorical appeal than a call for a substantive change in the ongoing operation of the grid.

#### Plan doesn’t spillover to other facets of civil society

THEIR AUTHOR - Hoffman and Pippert 5 (Steven M. Hoffman, PhD, Professor of Political Science at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Angela High-Pippert, PhD, Director of Women’s Studies at the University of St. Thomas, and serves on the ACTC Women’s Studies Coordinating Committee, "Community Energy: A Social Architecture for an Alternative Energy Future", Bulletin of Science Technology %26 Society 2005 25: 387)

The nature of community energy and the role that such initiatives might play in the general fabric of civic life is not well understood. This article makes it clear that several conceptual models are available. Community energy initiatives might, for instance, perform the intermediate role envisioned by so-called stealth theorists, allowing the mass of citizens to avoid the sort of engagement preferred by a select group of citizens actively and continuously involved in intense, democratic debate (Hibbing & Theiss-Morse, 2002). For those participating in an initiative, the time and effort would be more significant and ongoing than participation in other forms of engagement such as a deliberative polling process or a citizen’s jury. But in all instances, intense engagement would be confined to a fairly narrow set of citizens, namely, those citizens with the requisite knowledge and interest. Interaction with the larger community would be confined to message development, that is, “wind is good/nuclear is bad,” and the mass of citizens would have only limited personal involvement, say, a willingness to participate in a community-sponsored energy conservation program. Only very rarely would the majority of citizens be expected to aggressively participate in public policy making or in any sort of sustained political process.

#### “Participatory democracy” devolves into relativism—leads to unquestionable oppression and passive nihilism

Kiely 95 (Ray, Professor of International Politics Ray, professor of International Politics at Queen Mary University, "Third Worldist Relativism: A New Form Of Imperialism", Journal of Contemporary Asia v25 no2 p159-78)

First, as many critics have pointed out (see Habermas 1987; Dews 1987; Norris 1990), extreme versions of relativism are self-contradictory. To argue that there are no criteria by which different discourses can be assessed “looks itself suspiciously like an *absolute* claim to validity, and this is something which relativists hold to be impossible (McLennan 1992; 339). Moreover, any understand of another culture automatically leads to the acceptance that “some things can be asserted as meaningful across very different cultures” (ibid). If this is the case then it is at least possible that there are at least some universal criteria for the assessment of all societies. Furthermore, without any universal criteria for the assessment of different societies, we are left with a situation where social science simply “rubs up against” the existing state of affairs. This is ironic given that relativism professes to be a “theory” which preaches tolerance and pluralism. In fact, at its worse it simply ignores, or even becomes an apology for all kinds of oppressive practices, or for a retreat from politics.

### Resiliency

#### Complexity theory has zero validity as a means of interpreting real world events. Lack of empirical observations means complexity cannot interpret our social reality or improve policy making.

Rosenhead, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Management at the London School of Economics, ‘98

[Jonathan, “Complexity theory and management practice”, Science as Culture

<http://human-nature.com/science-as-culture/rosenhead.html>, RSR]

It hardly needs saying that there is no formally validated evidence demonstrating that the complexity theory-based prescriptions for management style, structure and process do produce the results claimed for them. These results are generally to do with long-term survival, a phenomenon not susceptible to study using short-term experimental methods. Such evidence as is adduced is almost exclusively anecdotal in character. The stories range from improving tales of successful corporate improvisation, to longer accounts of organisational death wishes or of innovation which bypasses the obstruction of the formal hierarchy; there are also approving quotations from business leaders. The problem with anecdotal evidence is that it is most persuasive to those who experienced the events in question, and to those who are already persuaded. For others it can be hard to judge the representativeness of the sample of exhibits. This is especially so if, even unintentionally, different standards of proof or disproof are used for different sides of an argument. Such distortions do occur in Stacey (1992). Thus the advantage of opportunistic policies is supported by presenting examples of success, while the perils of formal planning methods are driven home by examples of failure. Yet obviously opportunism has its failures, and analytic techniques even have their modest achievements – which are not cited. In the absence of a conclusive case based on evidence of organisational success, it is not surprising that great weight is placed on the authority of science. Wheatley (1992) has it in her title – "Leadership and the New Science". Merry (1995) relegates it to his sub-title, but in the plural: "Insights from the New Sciences of Chaos, Self-Organization and Complexity". Indeed ‘New Sciences’, always capitalised, runs through his book like the message in Blackpool rock. However all management complexity authors lean heavily on ‘science’ in their texts. These are liberally peppered with phrases like "Scientific discoveries have shown that…" or "The science of complexity shows that…". The illustrative examples provided are commonly of natural rather than social or managerial phenomena – the behaviour of molecules when the temperature of liquid rises, a laser beam, the weather… This invocation of (natural) science comes out clearly in a passage on page 11 of Stacey (1996). A list of Nobel and other eminent scientists who have developed "the science of complexity" is presented. So far this science has "focused primarily on the evolution of life and the behavior of chemical and physical systems". However "it is not only to natural systems that this science applies; as I will show in Chapter One, we too constitute such systems". These systems which "we" also constitute are complex adaptive systems – precisely those to which the findings of the "new science" apply. Or do they? If we are to accept the argument from scientific authority there are a number of links in the argument. First we have to accept that the "findings" do actually apply to the natural systems which natural scientists have investigated. Then we have to accept that these findings can be generalised to all such systems. Then we have to accept that organisations (let us leave individual humans out of it) do constitute systems of the same kind. And then we have to accept that findings can be transferred across from one domain to a quite different one. This could be a long haul! We should start with the least problematic element – the solidity of those natural science results in their own domains. There are indeed a considerable number of findings which have passed stringent tests of scientific validity. (We should ignore any ultra-Popperian objections that all scientific results can only be provisional, a spur to refutation – or we will have no solid ground to stand on.) Stewart (1989) provides a good source of such examples – the weather (of course), ecological cycles, fluid dynamics, chemical clocks… Experiments are only possible in some cases, but in all observations of real world events fit patterns consistent with aspects of complexity theory. What follows from this is that complexity theory is a field within which some surprising and diverse results have been found, leading on to some further intriguing conjectures. What does not follow is that any such result necessarily applies to all situations which share some of its structural features (for example, mathematical structure). Many of the ‘results’ cited in the complexity literature are not, however, firmly grounded in this way on empirical observations. They are the outputs of computer simulations. Typically some simple laws of behaviour and interaction are postulated, and the computer is used to see how the operations of these laws would translate into long-term development or macro-behaviour. For example Kauffman (1993, 1995) models how an organism might evolve through an ‘adaptive walk’ of mutations across available alternatives, depending on the degree of cross-coupling of the organism’s component parts. Krugman (1996) shows how aggregate patterns of land use (eg the formation of multiple business districts, racial segregation) could result from individual responses to purely local conditions. Stacey (1996) reports a wide variety of simulations, mostly produced under the auspices of the Santa Fe Institute, in which simple rules of individual behaviour generate replications of the flocking of birds, the trail-laying of ants, the dynamics of organism-parasite systems…In each case the computer tracks the way in which such simple laws, if they were to hold, could produce patterned order. Evidently such demonstrations, absorbing though they may be, cannot constitute proofs that these laws are indeed the cause of the observed behaviour. Indeed Kauffman (1993) in the introduction to his 700 page volume, stresses that "this is not a finished book …Premises and conclusions stand open to criticism." Krugman (1996) adopts an informal approach, and allows himself to include "a few wild speculations". That is well and good – but it would be as well if the ‘not proven’ dimension of complexity theory was prominently acknowledged in this way by all those involved in extrapolating its results into new territory. Mittleton-Kelly (1997) recognises a further need for circumspection which arises in essaying to transfer complexity theory formulations from the natural to the social domain. Behaviour in the former may be assumed to be governed by laws; in the latter, awareness of a claimed law may itself generate changed behaviour. In this crucial respect, social systems (including organisations and their managements) are fundamentally different from all other complex systems. It can be seen from this that scientific authority is an unsafe ground for asserting that specific results from complexity theory necessarily apply to organisations, or that complexity-based lessons constitute imperatives for management practice. Krugman (1996), on the concluding page of his exploration of the relevance of complexity theory for economics, states "at this point I have no recommendations to offer." By contrast in the management complexity literature there is a tendency to make just such unwarranted statements – both generalisations and prescriptions. Both tendencies can be amply illustrated from a single work – Stacey (1992).

#### It’s possible to predict risks – things like black swans and perfect storms don’t matter.

Pate-Cornell, Burt and Deedee McMurtry Professor of Engineering at Stanford, ‘12

[Elisabeth, specialty is engineering risk analysis with application to complex systems (space, medical etc.). Her research has focused on explicit inclusion of human and organizational factors in the analysis of systems’ failure risks. Her recent work is on the use of game theory in risk analysis with applications that have included counter-terrorism and nuclear counter-proliferation problems, “On “Black Swans” and “Perfect Storms”: Risk Analysis and Management When Statistics Are Not Enough”, Journal of Risk Analysis, Vol. 32, No. 11, 2012, RSR]

Whether a rare event is a “black swan” or a “perfect storm” is often in the eyes of the beholder and may not matter that much in practice. Problems arise when these terms are used as an excuse for failure to act proactively. As stated by Augustine (“Law” XLV(81) ): “One should expect that the expected can be prevented, but the unexpected should have been expected.” Clearly, one cannot assess the risks of events that have really never been seen before and are truly unimaginable. In reality, there are often precursors to such events. The best approach in that case is thus a mix of alertness, quick detection, and early response. By contrast, rare combinations of known events that can place heavy loads on human or technical systems can be anticipated and their probabilities assessed based on a systematic risk analysis anchored in history and fundamental knowledge. Risk management procedures can then be designed to face these events, within limits of risk tolerance and resource constraints. In any case, “it was a ‘black swan’ or “a ‘perfect storm’” is not an excuse to wait until a disaster happens to take safety measures and issue regulations against a predictable situation.

#### We should make predictions---complexity results in either political paralysis or pure reaction.

Ulfelder, Research Director for the Political Instability Task Force at Science Applications International Cooperation, ‘11

[Jay, “Why Political Instability Forecasts Are Less Precise Than We’d Like (and Why It’s Still Worth Doing)" May 5 dartthrowingchimp.wordpress.com/2011/05/05/why-political-instability-forecasts-are-less-precise-than-wed-like-and-why-its-still-worth-doing/]

If this is the best we can do, then what’s the point? Well, consider the alternatives. For starters, we might decide to skip statistical forecasting altogether and just target our interventions at cases identified by expert judgment as likely onsets. Unfortunately, those expert judgments are probably going to be an even less reliable guide than our statistical forecasts, so this “solution” only exacerbates our problem. Alternatively, we could take no preventive action and just respond to events as they occur. If the net costs of responding to crises as they happen are roughly equivalent to the net costs of prevention, then this is a reasonable choice. Maybe responding to crises isn’t really all that costly; maybe preventive action isn’t effective; or maybe preventive action is potentially effective but also extremely expensive. Under these circumstances, early warning is not going to be as useful as we forecasters would like. If, however, any of those last statements are false–if responding to crises already underway is very costly, or if preventive action is (relatively) cheap and sometimes effective–then we have an incentive to use forecasts to help guide that action, in spite of the lingering uncertainty about exactly where and when those crises will occur. Even in situations where preventive action isn’t feasible or desirable, reasonably accurate forecasts can still be useful if they spur interested observers to plan for contingencies they otherwise might not have considered. For example, policy-makers in one country might be rooting for a dictatorship in another country to fall but still fail to plan for that event because they don’t expect it to happen any time soon. A forecasting model which identifies that dictatorship as being at high or increasing risk of collapse might encourage those policy-makers to reconsider their expectations and, in so doing, lead them to prepare better for that event. Where does that leave us? For me, the bottom line is this: even though forecasts of political instability are never going to be as precise as we’d like, they can still be accurate enough to be helpful, as long as the events they predict are ones for which prevention or preparation stand a decent chance of making a (positive) difference.

#### **Applying complexity theory leads to policy paralysis and numerous other failures.**

THEIR AUTHOR Hendrick, Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford, ‘9

[Diane, “Complexity Theory and Conflict Transformation: An Exploration of Potential and Implications,” June, <http://143.53.238.22/acad/confres/papers/pdfs/CCR17.pdf>]

It is still relatively early days in the application of complexity theory to social sciences and there are doubts and criticisms, either about the applicability of the ideas or about the expectations generated for them. It is true that the translation of terms from natural science to social science is sometimes contested due to the significant differences in these domains, and that there are concerns that the meanings of terms may be distorted, thus making their use arbitrary or even misleading. Developing new, relevant definitions for the new domain applications, where the terms indicate a new idea or a new synthesis that takes our understanding forward, are required. In some cases, particular aspects of complexity theory are seen as of only limited applicability, for example, self-organisation (see Rosenau‘s argument above that it is only relevant in systems in which authority does not play a role). There are those who argue that much that is being touted as new is actually already known, whether from systems theory or from experience, and so complexity theory cannot be seen as adding value in that way. There are also concerns that the theory has not been worked out in sufficient detail, or with sufficient rigour, to make itself useful yet. Even that it encourages woolly thinking and imprecision. In terms of application in the field, it could be argued that it may lead to paralysis, in fear of all the unexpected things that could happen, and all the unintended consequences that could result, from a particular intervention. The proposed adaptability and sensitivity to emerging new situations may lead to difficulties in planning or, better expressed, must lead to a different conception of what constitutes planning, which is, in itself, challenging (or even threatening) for many fields. The criteria for funding projects or research may not fit comfortably with a complexity approach, and evaluation, already difficult especially in the field of conflict transformation, would require a re-conceptualisation. Pressure for results could act as a disincentive to change project design in the light of emergent processes. There may be the desire to maintain the illusion of control in order to retain the confidence of funders. On the other hand, there are fears that complexity may be used as an excuse for poor planning, and implementation, which is a valid concern for funders. In addition, there may be scepticism that the co-operation and co-ordination between different researchers or interveners, (let alone transdisciplinary undertakings) appropriate to working on complex problem domains, will not work due to differing mental models, competing interests and aims, competition for funding, prestige, etc. Such attempts appear, therefore, unrealistic or unfeasible.

## 2NC

### Cap

#### You cannot permute a method – it strips out all of the conceptual theory that allows us both understand the world and to create a praxis to end oppression

Tumino 1 [Stephen, Prof English at Pitt, ““What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online]

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups. The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

#### Ethics DA – We have ethical obligation to repudiate capitalism – this means any risk a link is a reason to reject the permutation

Marsh 95 (James, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, “Critique, Action, Liberation” p. 334-335)

An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed it may seem unlikely, given this particular person’s past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over **our** capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations**.** I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but i remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. Ideologies of scientific elitism, therefore, as they function in capitalist society are correct if there is no such thing as ethical, constitutive reason operating in community**.** If such constitutive reason is possible and actual in human beings as human in community, then scientific elitism is false. Men and women acting democratically and participatively do have a capacity to understand themselves and their lives in a way that is cogent and in touch with reality. Indeed, many of the popular movements in Europe, England, and the United States in the last twenty years such as feminism, environmentalism, civil rights, and antiwar movements, often acting against the advice or opinion of experts have shown themselves to be right and effective. In the Vietnam War, for example, millions of people in the united states taking to the streets in protest proved the “best and the brightest” in the white house, pentagon, and state department wrong. The “best and the brightest” according to the standards of scientific elitism proved to be deluded. The presence of an ethical, political rationality in all of us as human invalidates scientific elitism at its core. As I am arguing it here, a fundamental link exists among dialectical phenomenology, ethical, constitutive rationality, and democracy. Philosophy and ethics, properly understood, are antielitist. To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental, indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial**.** What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet’s “to be or not to be” speech? What does an empirical of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx’s capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso’s Guernica? To the extend, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason by the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factural, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

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

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

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

#### Deregulation increases the control of corporations at the expense of the people

Bretton Woods Project 2k (14 June 20 The World Bank And The State: A Recipe For Change? <http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/art.shtml?x=16242> pg 7-8)

Deregulation the dismantling of legal and administrative controls deemed to interfere with the operation of the market has also greatly increased the powers and influence of the corporate sector in general and of transnationals in particular. Limitations on the free movement of capital between countries have been stripped away through international agreements and governments have sought to attract inward investment by creating as attractive a "policy environment" for business as possible. To do so they have dismantled many social and environmental controls that might add to business costs. Britain’s national economic policy, as outlined by the 1992-1997 Conservative administration, for example, was to promote the country to foreign investors as a low wage, deregulated "enterprise zone" with relatively pliant workforces. In a 1995 brochure the government’s Invest in Britain Bureau (IBB) highlighted the country’s "pro-business environment" specifying "labour costs significantly below other European countries" and assuring potential investors that "no new laws or regulations may be introduced without ascertaining and minimising the costs to business." It continues: "The UK has the least onerous labour regulations in Europe, with few restrictions on working hours, overtime and holidays... There is no legal requirement to recognise a trade union. Many industries operate shift work, and 24-hour, seven days-a-week production for both men and women." 31 The Conservative government removed important regulations which companies claimed made them less internationally competitive. By 1993, 605 regulations had been identified for the axe; these included measures for which environmental, consumer and other citizen’s groups had long campaigned for example on health and safety, biotechnology, advertising in sensitive areas, hedgerow preservation, food standards and energy efficiency. 32 A similar process of active deregulation has been undertaken in the economies of the former Soviet Union which have undergone crash marketisation under World Bank and IMF guidance. In the Russian Far East, for example, land use and tax laws have been reformed to attract foreign investment in mining and forestry. 33 Foreign companies, eager to exploit the mineral and timber resources of the Russian Far East, are pressing the Russian government to relax environmental standards. Meanwhile, in the countries of the South, where governments (under the tutelage of the IMF) have been setting up "free trade zones" since the early 1970s to provide "a favourable climate" for private sector investment, deregulation is now being extended throughout the wider national economy. 35 Workers rights to organise and strike have been restricted; environmental regulations weakened; foreign ownership restrictions watered down or abolished; and TNCs granted freedom from planning and environmental controls and given permission to repatriate profits without restriction. 36,37 Since the ratification of the latest General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) agreement in 1994, these deregulated regimes, North and South, have the protection of international law. Moreover, as Alexander Goldsmith, editor of the business and environment magazine Green Futures, notes: "Under the rules by which countries can initiate challenges to other countries’ trading practices or their environmental or consumer laws, an alarming process of mutual deregulation is underway." 38 US corporations lobby the US government to target EU regulations under GATT, whilst their subsidiaries and partners in Europe lobby the EU to target US regulations. North American interests, for instance, are seeking to overturn European bans on the use of Bovine Somatotropin (BST), a genetically-engineered growth hormone for cattle, and on the sale of furs from animals caught with steel leg-hold traps. The EU, meanwhile, is challenging US fuel consumption standards for cars; food safety laws, limitations on lead in consumer products; state recycling laws; and restrictions on driftnet fishing and whaling. Several hard-won pieces of European environmental or public health legislation have already been overturned. In May 1997, the WTO ruled against the European Union’s ban on imports of beef produced with artificial growth hormones. 39 Indeed, in many instances, companies themselves have been actively involved in writing new investment and environmental rules. In the Philippines, for example, the government in 1995 introduced a new mining code overturning previous laws which limited foreign control of mining companies to 40 per cent. Under the new code which companies such as Western Mining Corporation helped to draft 100 per cent foreign ownership is now allowed. Companies also have the right to displace and resettle people within their "concessionary areas" and have far fewer environmental regulations to deal with.

#### The development of new energy sources and environmental crisis rhetoric are used to expand institutions of capitalism

Cock 10 (Jacklyn Cock is a Professor Emeritus in the Department

of Sociology at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa, “‘Green Capitalism’ or

Environmental Justice? A Critique of the Sustainability Discourse”, July 14th, Session: Sustainability of What? http://isa2010.aimit.se/142278/Paper)

The ecological crisis is not some future and indeterminate event. It is now generally acknowledged that we are in the first stages of ecological collapse. Capital’s response to the ecological crisis is that the system can continue to expand by creating a new ‘sustainable’ or ‘green capitalism’, bringing the efficiency of the market to bear on nature and its reproduction. These visions amount to little more than “a renewed strategy for profiting from planetary destruction”1. The business of ‘sustainability’, in this view, is simply “a new frontier for accumulation in which carbon trading is the model scheme” 2. The two pillars on which ‘green capitalism’ rests are technological innovation and expanding markets while keeping the existing institutions of capitalism intact. This is Thomas Friedman’s ‘green revolution’ which relies on linking the two. As he insists, green technology represents “the mother of all markets”3. More specifically, ‘green capitalism’ involves: • appeals to nature (and even the crisis) as a marketing tool; • developing largely untested clean coal technology through Carbon Capture and Storage, which involves installing equipment that captures carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases and then pumping the gas underground; • the development of new sources of energy such as solar, nuclear and wind, thereby creating new markets; • the massive development of biofuels, which involves diverting land from food production; • the carbon trading regime enshrined in the Kyoto Protocols.

#### Embracing “experience” as the basis for epistemology ignores the mediated nature of experience. Experience is just another site for articulating the dominant ideology because it ignores the historical continuity of class domination in favor of a “local” understanding of oppression.

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, “Putting Materialism back into Race Theory”, <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm>)

Bourgeois philosophical assumptions haunt the Afrocentric project and, in the domain of black feminist theory, Patricia Hill Collins provides an instructive example of this intersection. In Black Feminist Thought, Collins posits the "special angle of vision" that black women bring to knowledge production process (21), and this "unique angle" (22) provides the "standpoint" for Afrocentric feminism, a feminism that she equates with humanism (37). Similar to the experiential metaphysics of Black women's standpoint theory, Collins also situates Afrocentric feminist epistemology "in the everyday experiences of African-American women" (207). Consequently, Collins suggests that "concrete experience" constitutes a criterion of meaning (208). However, the experiential, the "real", does not adequate the "truth", as Collins implies. Collins rejects the "Eurocentric Masculinist Knowlege Validation Process" for its positivism but, in turn, she offers empiricism as the grounds for validating experience. Hence, the validity of experiential claims is adjudicated by reference to the experience. Not only is her argument circular, but it also undermines one of her key claims. If race, class, gender, and the accompanying ideological apparatuses are interlocking systems of oppression, as Collins suggest, then the experiential is not the site for the "true" but rather the site for the articulation of dominant ideology. On what basis then, could the experiential provide grounds for an historical understanding of the structures that make experience itself possible as experience? Asante and Collins assume that experience is self-intelligible and in their discourse it functions as the limit text of the real. However, I believe experience is a highly mediated frame of understanding. Though it is true that a person of color experiences oppression, this experience is not self-explanatory and, therefore, it needs to be situated in relation to other social practices. Experience seems local but it is, like all cultural and political practices, interrelated to other practices and experiences. Thus its explanation come from its "outside". Theory, specifically Marxist theory, provides an explanation of this outside by reading the meaning of all experiences as determined by the economic realities of class. While Asante's and Collins' humanism reads the experience of race as a site of "self-presence", the history of race in the United States—from slavery to Jim Crow to Katrina—is written in the fundamental difference of class. In other words, experience does not speak the real, but rather it is the site of contradictions and, hence, in need of conceptual elaboration to break from cultural common sense, a conduit for dominant ideology. It is this outside that has come under attack by black (humanist) scholars through the invocation of the black (transcendental) subject.

#### A materialist method is key - illumination of social and political relations through dialetical materialism is key to achieving class consciousness and thus stopping capitalism

Lukacs 1919 (George, Hungarian philosopher, He was the founder of Western Marxism, “What is Orthodox Marxism” http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm)

If the question were really to be formulated in terms of such a crude antithesis it would deserve at best a pitying smile. But in fact it is not (and never has been) quite so straightforward. Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research had disproved once and for all every one of Marx’s individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious ‘orthodox’ Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and hence dismiss all of Marx’s theses in toto – without having to renounce his orthodoxy for a single moment. Orthodox Marxism, therefore, does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx’s investigations. It is not the ‘belief’ in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a ‘sacred’ book. On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened only along the lines laid down by its founders. It is the conviction, moreover, that all attempts to surpass or ‘improve’ it have led and must lead to over-simplification, triviality and eclecticism. 1 Materialist dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic. This definition is so important and altogether so crucial for an understanding of its nature that if the problem is to be approached in the right way this must be fully grasped before we venture upon a discussion of the dialectical method itself. The issue turns on the question of theory and practice. And this not merely in the sense given it by Marx when he says in his first critique of Hegel that “theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses.” [[1]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#1) Even more to the point is the need to discover those features and definitions both of the theory and the ways of gripping the masses which convert the theory, the dialectical method, into a vehicle of revolution. We must extract the practical essence of the theory from the method and its relation to its object. If this is not done that ‘gripping the masses’ could well turn out to be a will o’ the wisp. It might turn out that the masses were in the grip of quite different forces, that they were in pursuit of quite different ends. In that event, there would be no necessary connection between the theory and their activity, it would be a form that enables the masses to become conscious of their socially necessary or fortuitous actions, without ensuring a genuine and necessary bond between consciousness and action. In the same essay [[2]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#2) Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible. “It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought.” Or, as he expresses it in an earlier work: [[3]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#3) “It will then be realised that the world has long since possessed something in the form of a dream which it need only take possession of consciously, in order to possess it in reality.” Only when consciousness stands in such a relation to reality can theory and practice be united. But for this to happen the emergence of consciousness must become the decisive step which the historical process must take towards its proper end (an end constituted by the wills of men, but neither dependent on human whim, nor the product of human invention). The historical function of theory is to make this step a practical possibility. Only when a historical situation has arisen in which a class must understand society if it is to assert itself; only when the fact that a class understands itself means that it understands society as a whole and when, in consequence, the class becomes both the subject and the object of knowledge; in short, only when these conditions are all satisfied will the unity of theory and practice, the precondition of the revolutionary function of the theory, become possible. Such a situation has in fact arisen with the entry of the proletariat into history. “When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing social order,” Marx declares, “it does no more than disclose the secret of its own existence, for it is the effective dissolution of that order.” [[4]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#4) The links between the theory that affirms this and the revolution are not just arbitrary, nor are they particularly tortuous or open to misunderstanding. On the contrary, the theory is essentially the intellectual expression of the revolutionary process itself. In it every stage of the process becomes fixed so that it may be generalised, communicated, utilised and developed. Because the theory does nothing but arrest and make conscious each necessary step, it becomes at the same time the necessary premise of the following one.
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#### Protestors opposed solar power siting in New Jersey

Merced Sun-Star 5/30/12 (http://www.mercedsunstar.com/2012/05/30/2364377/solar-project-draws-protest.html#storylink=cpy)

The first large-scale solar energy project proposed for Merced County is drawing criticism from farmland advocates and environmental groups.¶ The Quinto Solar Project, planned for more than 1,000 acres outside of Santa Nella, would create a 110-megawatt photovoltaic facility -- enough power for about 40,000 homes.¶ The project's owner, SunPower Corp., is expected to sell the renewable energy to Southern California Edison under a 20-year contract.¶ While the solar installation is being touted as a boon for the local economy, concerns have been voiced that the project's plan doesn't go far enough to address negative effects to wildlife and agriculture.¶ "I hope they dramatically alter their mitigation plan," said Amanda Carvajal, executive director for Merced County Farm Bureau. "This is very precedent-setting. That's our biggest concern."¶ Worries around the project include cutting off travel pathways for kit foxes and other animals, as well as the future viability of farming on the land in question.

#### Solar restrictions have been implemented to protect farmland

AFP 12 (http://americanfarm.com/publications/the-new-jersey-farmer/archives/649-farmers-meet-to-hear-about-solar-energy)

The public comment period for the State Agricultural Development Board’s proposed rules on solar energy development on farmland was closed on April 8. The regulations which result will cover commercial farms and be applicable to those seeking protections under the Right to Farm Act.¶ The SADC’s proposal clarifies the Agricultural Management Practices which must be adhered to in relation to solar installations on farmland. The law in existence already places limits on solar generation — 10 percent of land or 10 acres of solar panels —whichever is less, in order to maintain farmland assessment for tax purposes, as well as to receive Right to Farm protection. Additionally, the use of solar panels to agriculture use must not exceed a one-to-five ratio, and the maximum amount of power generated can not exceed ten megawatts. Soil Conservation plans and setback requirements are other components of the existing law, and other details are under development, Frank said. On Preserved Farms, solar can only be uses to generate on-farm electric, can not cover more than one percent of the land area or generate more than 110 percent of the farm’s historical use.