# Wake – Round 7 vs. Rutgers AH (Neg)

## 1NC

### T – Energy Production

#### A. Interpretation – The aff has to affect both resource extraction and conversion into energy

Australian Government, Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency 2011 [“Energy Production and Consumption,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/national-greenhouse-energy-reporting/publications/supplementary-guidelines/energy-production-consumption.aspx]

Production of energy: in relation to a facility, means the:

1. extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility
2. manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility, or for use other than in the operation of the facility (regulation 2.23(3) NGER Regulations).

#### B. Violation – The plan only incentivizes R & D.

#### C. Reasons to Prefer

#### 1. Predictability –

Only our interpretation guarantees link arguments to both extraction and the burning of resources to produce energy. This is crucial link ground for pollution DAs and domestic/foreign energy tradeoff DAs.

#### 2. Limits –

Requiring the aff to both extract and convert the energy is necessary to eliminate affs that only extract, like capture carbon or methane or stockpile oil as a strategic military reserve with heg advantages. Also key to prevent affs that only burn fuels like Bataille-style affs that encourage rapid consumption or R&D affs that incentivize new ways to burn the same resources.

#### 3. Extra topicality

Any solvency based off of discourse or dialogue is not based off of the instrumental implementation of the affirmative. That’s unpredictable.

#### D. Topicality is a voting issue for both Fairness and Educational reasons.

### EIA CP

#### Text: Plan: The United States Federal Government should make the plan subject to completion of a binding integrated health and environmental impact assessment.

#### CP competes – Any permutation severs Resolved –

#### Firm in purpose or intent

Dictionary.com [http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved]

firm in purpose or intent; determined.

#### Severance permutations should be rejected - stable aff plan is the basis of neg predictability and competitive equity.

#### Policy level health impact assessment prevents health problems

IPIECA 5 (International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/26122126/Guide-to-HIA-in-the-Oil-and-Gas-Industry-IPIECA-2005>, Acc: 7/23/12, og)

This Guide defines and outlines the purpose and value of Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) within the oil and gas industry. It aims to describe the overall HIA process as it is currently understood and practised. HIA is a useful and beneficial tool for business, communities and government policy makers. Experience within the oil and gas industry suggests that health is a critical issue both to the project workforce and the surrounding communities. The oil and gas industry faces a complex agenda that increasingly requires an evaluation of health, social and environmental impacts throughout all of its operations. This concern is often expressed in all phases of exploration, production, refining and marketing activities. Initially, the impact assessment focused on environmental performance; however, over the past several years, the ‘license to operate’ has encompassed both environmental and social performance. These issues are sometimes considered part of the overall corporate social responsibility movement. While health and safety issues have always received the highest priority for any project, the traditional focus was on worker health and safety within the geographical boundaries of a proposed project. Community health outreach programmes and assessments have frequently been performed but not considered a mandatory performance requirement. Within the context of environmental and social issues, the oil and gas industry is increasingly asked to address problems that, traditionally, are ‘outside the fence line’ and considered responsibilities of the host government. A similar evolution and expansion of assumed responsibilities for the industry has been advocated by many stakeholders in the international public health community. Oil and gas companies need to understand and consider the potential public health impact of their overall activities and projects on host societies in order to understand and address their responsibilities appropriately. The practice of HIA is relatively new and rapidly developing, particularly in comparison to either the environmental or social impact assessment process for new or existing oil and gas projects. Therefore, health-specific HIA standards of practice and technical methodologies are less well defined and established. Within the HIA field, a significant difference between ‘policy HIA’ and ‘project HIA’ has developed. Policy level HIA could be developed for a specific industrial sector, e.g. extractive industries, by government and multilateral lending institutions like the World Bank. However, the purpose of this guidance document is to create a common understanding of the basic concerns, principles and practices of HIA for the oil and gas industry that would be relevant across a diversity of projects. In this publication, the term ‘project HIA’ includes both new proposed activities and existing operations.

### Fiscal Cliff DA

#### A. Compromise is coming now on the fiscal cliff, but Obama’s leadership is key

Hall and Lightman 11/8 (http://www.kansascity.com/2012/11/08/3907178/put-up-or-shut-up-time-for-congress.html#storylink=cpy)

Lawmakers sent mixed signals this week about serious negotiations vs. driving briefly off the cliff’s edge before settling.¶ Tuesday’s election results kept the same power players in place, the same group that went to that edge repeatedly during budget and debt ceiling negotiations over the last two years.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said Wednesday that he was ready to “find the common ground that has eluded us” and talk to Democrats, even about raising revenue.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., also talked conciliation, promising not to draw “any lines in the sand.”¶ The election’s status quo result – the same president, Republicans still controlling the House of Representatives and Democrats remaining in charge of the Senate – suggests the public “is obviously saying work together, meet halfway, come together,” said Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., usually a fierce partisan.¶ The rank and file may feel less sanguine. The election solidified conservatives’ hold on the House and liberals’ strength in the Senate, suggesting any deal could have a difficult time winning approval.¶ The key, said Republicans, is for President Barack Obama to take the lead and offer a detailed plan.¶ “The only thing that’s changed since the election is that the president is not campaigning,” said Don Stewart, spokesman for Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky.¶ Ultimately, say insiders, the doomsday alternative to inaction will force a deal. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said in a report Thursday that failing to act on the fiscal-cliff components could shave half a percentage point off of growth in the first half of 2013, raising the jobless rate to 9.1 percent and probably would trigger another recession. The CBO also said that addressing the components of the fiscal cliff results in a 3 or 4 percentage point swing between contraction and growth.¶

#### B. Warner opposes nuclear power – Japan

Lowkell 11 (http://www.bluevirginia.us/diary/3357/sen-warner-calls-for-temporary-halt-to-us-nuclear-projects)

I just received the following statement from Sen. Mark Warner's office about the nuclear accidents in Japan, and also about whether he agrees with Sen. Lieberman's call (as reported by CNN) for a "temporary halt in building new nuclear power plants in the United States."¶ Sen. Warner thinks it's appropriate to do all we can to assist the Japanese in stabilizing their ongoing nuclear emergency. He also thinks it makes sense to temporarily halt ongoing projects in this country until we have a firm grasp on lessons we might learn from the horrible events unfolding in Japan.

#### c. Mark Warner is key to negotiations

Tucker 11/9 (Sean Tucker is assistant managing editor for GovWin from Deltek, the network that helps government contractors win new business every day., http://govwin.com/seantucker\_blog/fiscal-cliff-deal-whats-planned/742506)

¶ In a press conference yesterday, Senator Mark Warner (D-VA) told reporters, "In the lame duck, my hope is that we’ll be able to make enough of a down payment to avoid the sequester cuts, to avoid the fiscal cliff." ¶ Warner is emerging as a key figure in negotiations. The [National Journal](http://govwin.com/news/gang-eight-regroups-postelection/742420) reports that the "gang of eight," a "bipartisan group of senators" who have ironed out compromises on difficult issues in the past, "is meeting in an unofficial capacity to try and reach agreements on how to head off the fiscal cliff." ¶ Members include Democratic Senators Kent Conrad of North Dakota, Dick Durbin of Illinois, and Mark Warner of Virginia; and Republican Senators Saxby Chambliss of Georgia, Tom Coburn of Oklahoma, and Mike Crapo of Idaho, and a pair of newly elected members, Democrat Michael Bennet of Colorado and Republican Mike Johanns of Nebraska.

#### d. The fiscal cliff would harm the elderly poor, working class and disabled and results in hundreds of thousands of people being thrown out onto the streets

Carson 11/8 (Linda, http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2012/11/08/18725336.php)

Berkeley, CA. -- The Berkeley Housing Authority administers approximately 1,939 subsidized rental-housing units through the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program and the Moderate Rehabilitation SRO program for low-income families in Berkeley, and unless the Obama Administration and Congress come up with a new plan to avoid what is being called the "fiscal cliff," which includes disastrous budget cuts that are scheduled to go into effect on January 2, 2013, resulting in an 8.2 percent across-the-board spending cut to the nation's discretionary nondefense programs, many federal programs affecting the working class, elderly, disabled and the poor will lose hundreds of billions of dollars in funding, during 2013. This includes 8.2% in spending cuts to the nation's poverty programs and subsidized housing programs such as Public Housing and the Housing Choice Voucher Program (Formerly called the Section 8 Voucher Program), including the nation's homeless programs. Subsidized voucher holders in the Housing Choice Voucher Program pay 30% to 40% of their income for rent, and the rest of the monthly rent is covered by the subsidized housing voucher from the federal Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program. The 8.2% in spending cuts threaten 200,000 voucher holders or more with eviction from their housing, if the automatic spending cuts go into effect on January 2, 2013, as is scheduled. The so-called "Fiscal Cliff" is the combination of Bush-era tax cuts about to expire, and the catastrophic across-the-board spending cuts scheduled to kick in on January 2, 2013, to the nation's domestic programs and the Pentagon through a federal budget process that is called sequestration. Sequestration is a term that is used to describe the implementation of mandatory spending cuts in the federal budget, such as automatic across-the-board spending cuts that take place when annual budget deficits occur. The results of sequestration is that it may result in $800 billion in spending cuts during 2013 according to estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, unless Congress and the White House take action to stop the automatic spending cuts scheduled to occur on January 2, 2013. According to a Congressional Budget Office forecast predicting that if a new budget agreement is not reached, the automatic spending cuts would cause a new recession with 9.1 percent national unemployment, and a Congressional Research Service prediction of a loss of 1.4 million jobs occurring next year. Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program Tenants Placed At Risk In The Bay Area, If Sequestration Budget Cuts Go Into Effect On January 2, 2013 Locally, as the Berkeley Housing Authority presently continues it's negotiations to privatize it's 75 public housing units in a deal to sell the public housing units to some out of state billionaires "Jorge M. Perez and Stephen M. Ross" of the Related Companies of California, LLC, and some of Berkeley's public housing tenants face pressure to trade in their public housing town-homes for federally subsidized Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, according to an October 9, 2012, Dear Colleague letter signed by Rep. Dick Norman, the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, he writes that if sequestration takes effect, it is estimated that 200,000 tenants would be evicted from their subsidized housing units across the nation. Furthermore, he writes that in some markets the income provided by Section 8 tenants (Housing Choice Voucher Program) wouldn't be replaced by new tenants, and that the landlords would lose their income as a result. Click on link for Dear Colleague letter: <http://tinyurl.com/9q8m7cy> According to the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities (CLPHA), around 303,499 seniors rely on Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers for affordable housing, representing 16% of all Section 8 households and that Section 8 housing is home to 458,124 households with one or more family members that are disabled, representing 25% of all voucher households. Additionally, 59% of Section 8 households are families with children (more than 2,357,977 children in total), with the average family income of $11,049 for the Section 8 households. Children living in Section 8 households represent 50% of all Section 8 residents according to CLPHA. According to the nonprofit organization called the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, $17.37 billion would be required in 2012, to fully renew the 2,130,000 vouchers they estimated are being used by low-income families in 2011. The Berkeley Housing Authority website states that they administer approximately 1,939 subsidized rental-housing units through the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program and the Moderate Rehabilitation SRO program, however according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) their records reveal that there are 1,866 Section 8 units in Berkeley. In addition, according to HUD's records for parts of the Bay Area, there are 13,259 Section 8 units in Oakland, plus 8,611 Section 8 units in San Francisco, plus 1,845 Section 8 units in the City of Alameda, plus 6,097 Section 8 units being administered by the Housing Authority of Alameda County, plus 1,750 Section 8 units in Richmond, plus 2,290 Section 8 units in Vallejo, plus 6,763 Section 8 units being administered by the Contra Costa Housing Authority, and 2,145 Section 8 units administered by the Marin Housing Authority. The 8.2% in spending cuts (sequestration) scheduled to kick in on January 2, 2013, will make it much more difficult for the nation's Public Housing Authorities to administer the Public Housing Program, and the nation's subsidized housing programs, including the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program. Activists are urging all low-income families in the nation's federal subsidized housing programs to immediately contact their representatives, and to urge the Obama Administration and Congress to stop the automatic 8.2% across-the-board spending cuts scheduled to kick in on January 2, 2013, that will result in the eviction of 200,000 federally subsidized voucher holders in HUD's subsidized housing programs. Additionally, Rep. Dick Norman, the panels ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, further states that cuts to the Homeless Assistant Grant account would result in approximately 100,000 more people on the streets if sequestration goes into effect. Click on link for Dear Colleague letter: http://tinyurl.com/9q8m7cy

### Cap K

#### 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 endorse a historical material method and the socialization of nuclear power. This wrests decision making power from the elites, preventing the destructive use of nuclear power against the working class – it also eliminates the continuous drive for growth which has made nuclear power necessary in the first place

Socialist Labor Party of America 79 (“The Socialist Alternative to Nuclear Catastrophe” http://www.slp.org/res\_state\_htm/nuc\_catas79.html)

While the Three Mile Island accident dramatically reconfirms that conclusion, the conflict between the commercial use of nuclear technology and the well-being of the American people has for years been obvious to anyone willing to review the facts. Scores of scientific studies and a host of commercial accidents had long ago obviated any need to doubt the dangers posed by nuclear plants. The capitalist class would like workers to believe that the Three Mile Island accident will result in stiffer regulations and standards that will render such plants safe, but what the crippled Pennsylvania reactor really attests to is the wanton irresponsibility of those who own and control nuclear technology. Even if nuclear plant operations could somehow be rendered fail-safe, the nuclear industry has found no solution to the stockpiles of nuclear waste that have already mortgaged the health and safety of generations to come.¶ Business as Usual¶ In fact, while calling for additional federal regulations and increased government policing of nuclear power plants, capitalist politicians and bureaucrats have already demonstrated that even a near-catastrophe like the one that occurred near Harrisburg will have no substantive impact on the manner in which the nuclear industry does business. Dozens of nuclear plants, a number of them virtual “clones” of the Three Mile Island installation, continue to operate in callous disregard for the public safety. And the Carter administration has already announced that it will push ahead with legislation to streamline the procedure to license new nuclear facilities.¶ The recent nuclear accident again supports the Socialist Labor Party’s position that nothing less than the abolition of the profit system and the socialist reconstruction of society will make it possible for the American people to restore and maintain a safe and healthful environment. Only with the elimination of private ownership in the means of production and the establishment of a socialist industrial democracy will the working-class majority of Americans be able to harness technology while giving due consideration to its health, safety and environmental implications.¶ The call for a socialist solution to the nuclear energy problem has nothing in common with calls for the nationalization of the nuclear industry. Such a step would neither alter the profit motivations which dictate how nuclear technology is implemented nor take control of such technology out of the hands of a small minority and place it under the collective control of the working class. Indeed, the fact that the current nuclear peril has been overseen by government agencies for years provides ample proof that a resolution of the problem is not to be found in government ownership by the capitalist state.¶ Socialist Solution¶ In a socialist society, the government would consist of the industrial organization of the working class at the workplace, where workers would democratically make the decisions on how the resources available to society are to be used, what energy sources are to be developed, what goods are to be produced, etc. Workers would collectively hold full decision-making power over the use of all technology, nuclear or otherwise. With the abolition of the profit motive and the transformation of the means of production from private into social property, such decisions would be made not by a minority to serve its own vested interests, but by the working-class majority, which could rationally assess the overall impact any decision would have on the general welfare.¶ Moreover, putting the nation on a socialist foundation based on production for use would free the economy of the capitalist economic imperatives that have fueled the drive toward nuclear energy. A socialist economy would be characterized by the planning and rational allocation of resources that are rendered impossible by the profit motive. A socialist society would reduce the need for all sources of energy by eliminating the enormous waste that takes place today under capitalism. Planned obsolescence, shoddy products and other manifestations of the waste that permeate capitalist production would be eliminated. Mass transit systems would be developed. And a socialist society would accelerate the development of safe, nonpolluting, renewable sources of energy. These efforts—coupled with the dismantling of U.S. imperialism’s massive nuclear arsenal—would rapidly eliminate the social peril nuclear energy now poses.¶ Workers today continue to live under the shadow of nuclear disaster, but in a socialist society workers could enjoy a material abundance without in any way compromising their health and safety. Outrages like the one that occurred near Harrisburg continue to expose the antisocial nature of the capitalist system for all workers to see. And as the manifold social problems of capitalism increasingly threaten the lives and well-being of workers, it becomes more and more imperative that they recognize the need to organize politically and economically to take control of the economy, abolish class-divided capitalism and administer production through their own democratic bodies.

#### 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.

### Climate Denialism

#### Nuclear power increase CFCs which contribute more to warming than carbon dioxide and depletes the ozone.

Stein, Chairman of Three Mile Island Alert Inc., ‘8

[Eric Joseph, “The "Brown Side" of Nuclear Power,”

http://www.depweb.state.pa.us/ news/cwp/view.asp?A=3&Q=501756]

Nuclear advocates argue that the problem of greenhouse gases can be solved by nuclear power plants which do not emit carbon dioxide - at the point of production. What they don¹t tell you is what happens to the nuclear wonder pill before it is magically transformed into green penicillin. The nuclear-carbon shell game only works if you ignore the environmental cost on the "front end" of nuclear power production. From the moment uranium is mined - then milled, enriched, fabricated and transported - it releases large of airborne pollutants. How much? Glad you asked. The enrichment of uranium at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion plant releases massive amounts of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) which are more damaging as a global warmer than carbon dioxide. Nuclear fuel production in America creates at least 800,000 pounds of CFCs annually. CFCs remain the primary agent for stratospheric ozone depletion. The industry's official strategy to reduce CFC emissions was to close its Portsmouth enrichment plant and eliminate "roughly half as many miles of leaky pipes." The Ohio fuel plant is closed, but is undergoing a massive site cleanup to recover uranium, treat and isolate contaminated water and sewage, and decontaminate and remove miles of radioactive tubes, pipes and equipment. The production of fuel for nuclear reactors is extremely energy intensive. The Paducah plant, which is currently the plant is also undergoing a $191 million cleanup, requires the electrical output of two 1000-megawatt carbon dioxide producing, coal-fired plants.

#### Independently, Ozone depletion causes extinction.

Williams, Author of Tetron Natural Unified Field Theory, ‘96

[David Crockett, “THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRITUAL REVOLUTION”, 2-7-96,

http://www.angelfire.com/on/GEAR2000/video96.htmls]

Today all life on earth is threatened by many problems associated with the materialistic and shortsighted human activities out of harmony with nature that have led to an oxygen crisis from massive deforestation and fossil fuel combustion which has created global warming responsible for increased weather extremes, flooding, droughts, disease vectors, etc., and an ozone layer depletion that threatens all life on earth by the imminent destruction of the ocean's phytoplankton which produce over half of earth's oxygen and form the beginning of the oceanic food chain. Nuclear testing has caused lasting increases in seismic and volcanic activity, explainable by free energy science, which threatens cataclysmic earth changes. The danger of nuclear conflagration still exists. All these conditions have been predicted independently by many different religious prophecies since many hundreds of years ago. How can this be understood and resolved?

#### Nuclear power produces heat emissions which exacerbate global warming

Science Daily 9 (July 13th, Trapping Carbon Dioxide Or Switching To Nuclear Power Not Enough To Solve Global Warming Problem, Experts Say, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090713085248.htm)

Attempting to tackle climate change by trapping carbon dioxide or switching to nuclear power will not solve the problem of global warming, according to energy calculations published in the July issue of the International Journal of Global Warming. Bo Nordell and Bruno Gervet of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Luleå University of Technology in Sweden have calculated the total energy emissions from the start of the industrial revolution in the 1880s to the modern day. They have worked out that using the increase in average global air temperature as a measure of global warming is an inadequate measure of climate change. They suggest that scientists must also take into account the total energy of the ground, ice masses and the seas if they are to model climate change accurately. The researchers have calculated that the heat energy accumulated in the atmosphere corresponds to a mere 6.6% of global warming, while the remaining heat is stored in the ground (31.5%), melting ice (33.4%) and sea water (28.5%). They point out that net heat emissions between the industrial revolution circa 1880 and the modern era at 2000 correspond to almost three quarters of the accumulated heat, i.e., global warming, during that period. Their calculations suggest that most measures to combat global warming, such as reducing our reliance on burning fossil fuels and switching to renewables like wind power and solar energy, will ultimately help in preventing catastrophic climate change in the long term. But the same calculations also show that trapping carbon dioxide, so-called carbon dioxide sequestration, and storing it deep underground or on the sea floor will have very little effect on global warming. "Since net heat emissions accounts for most of the global warming there is no or little reason for carbon dioxide sequestration," Nordell explains, "The increasing carbon dioxide emissions merely show how most net heat is produced. The "missing" heat, 26%, is due to the greenhouse effect, natural variations in climate and/or an underestimation of net heat emissions, the researchers say. These calculations are actually rather conservative, the researchers say, and the missing heat may be much less. The researchers also point out a flaw in the nuclear energy argument. Although nuclear power does not produce carbon dioxide emissions in the same way as burning fossil fuels it does produce heat emissions equivalent to three times the energy of the electricity it generates and so contributes to global warming significantly, Nordell adds.

#### Obsession with White Supremacy is bad – white racists have mastered that game. The result of their project is to reinscribe whites as the principal point of reference.

West, ultimate badass, 1993 [Cornel, Race Matters, p. 98-99]

**The project of black separatism** -- to which Malcolm X was beholden for most of his life after his first psychic conversion to the Nation of Islam -- **suffered from deep intellectual and organizational problems**. Unlike Malcolm X's notion of psychic conversion, Elijah **Muhammad's idea of religious conversion was predicated on an obsession with white supremacy. The basic aim of black Muslim theology** -- with its distinct black supremacist account of the origins of white people -- **was to counter white supremacy**. **Yet this** preoccupation with white supremacy **still allowed** white people **to serve as the** principal point of reference**. That which fundamentally motivates one still dictates the terms of what one thinks and does** -- **so the motivation of a black supremacist doctrine reveals how obsessed one is with white supremacy. This is understandable** in a white racist society -- **but it is crippling for a despised people struggling for freedom, in that** one's eyes should be on the prize, not **on the perpetuator of one's oppression. In short**, Elijah **Muhammad's project remained captive to the supremacy game** -- **a game mastered by the white racists he opposed and imitated with his black supremacy doctrine**.

#### Reject identity politics – recreates its own harms.

Minow, Professor of Law @ Harvard, 1997

[Martha, Not Only For Myself: Identity, Politics, and the Law, p. 22-23]

This book explores issues of identity politics not as questions of tactics but instead as clues to collective social experiences in the United States as the twentieth century closes. Amid assertions and rejections of group membership and struggles for both liberty and equality, some people worry about a fragmenting, disuniting America while others urge a more finely categorized collection of subgroups.65 Both approaches imply that some notion of identity—whether broad like "American" or narrower like "bisexual biracial"—can do important work in addressing issues of politics, justice, and orderly social change. I will suggest instead that preoccupations with identity replicate, rather than resolve, conflicting conceptions of individual freedom and social meaning, self-creation and patterns beyond personal control. For none of us have individual identities except by reference to collective social experiences, and yet all of us retain some degrees of freedom for self-invention out of the found materials of biographical and social life. The questions worth attention, I suggest, do not concern fixing or selecting the right identities for use in politics and law but instead ask how to strike a productive stance toward the paradoxes of individual and social meaning.66 Practice with paradox can decrease a tendency to seize one or another side, only to be hit by the other side in arguments with others, or with ourselves.67 Noticing and thinking about paradoxes of identity can reduce the likelihood of polarized discussions while also reorienting attention from desires to fix or solve issues of identity toward attending to the circumstances that make identities seem so salient.

#### Other countries won’t model.

Levi 11

[Michael A. Levi David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment Why Don’t States Cooperate More on Energy and Climate? Posted on Tuesday, January 18, 2011 http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2011/01/18/why-dont-states-cooperate-more-on-energy-and-climate/?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+mlevi+%28Michael+Levi%27s+Blog%29&utm\_content=Google+Reader]

I spent Friday and Saturday at an excellent (largely academic) workshop on international institutions and global governance. In our discussions about why states do and don’t cooperate, I was struck by how absent states’ capacity to cooperate was from the discussion. In particular, when it comes to energy and climate, it’s one of the bigger blind spots in how both practitioners and scholars think about cooperation. Here’s a simple example of what I’m referring to: People argue that international oil markets would function more smoothly if states would publish basic data on their domestic markets (supply, demand, stocks, etc). They observe that China (among others) doesn’t do that. The immediate conclusion is that Beijing doesn’t want to. The only policy recourse, then, is to pressure or persuade China to change tack. But in more than one recent conversation, people have emphasized to me that Beijing doesn’t have many of the needed statistics itself (though it’s working on developing its capacity). Badgering them won’t change that; until they develop the capacity to collect the right statistics, cooperation will fail. The same thing is true much more broadly. India, for example, won’t be able to force power plants to internalize pollution costs until it develops a serious environmental regulator. Brazil won’t get deforestation properly under control without stronger capacity to enforce the laws that it puts on the books. One might even argue that China won’t improve its IPR protection until its innovation system becomes much more capable of developing technologies itself. Our view of international politics, though, tends to focus much more on pure ambition.

### Dialogue

#### Thorium doesn’t solve waste – creates a whole new set of problems.

Rees, Staff Writer, ‘11

[Eifon, “Don't believe the spin on thorium being a greener nuclear option”, The Guardian, 6-23-11,

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/23/thorium-nuclear-uranium>, RSR]

All other issues aside, thorium is still nuclear energy, say environmentalists, its reactors disgorging the same toxic byproducts and fissile waste with the same millennial half-lives. Oliver Tickell, author of Kyoto2, says the fission materials produced from thorium are of a different spectrum to those from uranium-235, but 'include many dangerous-to-health alpha and beta emitters'. Tickell says thorium reactors would not reduce the volume of waste from uranium reactors. 'It will create a whole new volume of radioactive waste from previously radio-inert thorium, on top of the waste from uranium reactors. Looked at in these terms, it's a way of multiplying the volume of radioactive waste humanity can create several times over.'

#### Policy analysis should trump discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Taft-Kaufman 95 (Jill, Speech prof @ CMU, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, “Other Ways”)

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

### Militarism

#### They can’t solve – already exists discussions on the proliferation threat of thorium.

FEA no date

[Friends of the Earth Australia is a group that campaigns for environmental sustainability http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power-weapons/thorium, “thorium and wmd proliferation risks”]

Thorium fuel cycles are promoted on the grounds that they pose less of a proliferation risk compared to conventional reactors. However, whether there is any significant non-proliferation advantage depends on the design of the various thorium-based systems. No thorium system would negate proliferation risks altogether.¶ Neutron bombardment of thorium (indirectly) produces uranium-233, a fissile material which can be used in nuclear weapons (1 Significant Quantity of U-233 = 8kg).¶ The USA has successfully tested weapon/s using uranium-233 cores. India may be interested in the military potential of thorium/uranium-233 in addition to civil applications. India is refusing to allow safeguards to apply to its entire 'advanced' thorium/plutonium fuel cycle, stongly suggesting a military dimension.¶ The possible use of highly enriched uranium (HEU) or plutonium to initiate a thorium-232/uranium-233 reaction, or proposed systems using thorium in conjunction with HEU or plutonium as fuel, present risks of diversion of HEU or plutonium for weapons production as well as providing a rationale for the ongoing operation of dual-use enrichment and reprocessing plants.¶ Thorium fuelled reactors could also be used to irradiate uranium to produce weapon grade plutonium.

#### Realism makes securitization inevitable—the alternative can’t convince states to abandon power

Mearsheimer 1 (John, Prof of Poli Sci @ UChi, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, <http://www.irchina.org/xueke/fangfa/view.asp?id=114>, accessed 7/13/10 //shree)

The optimists' claim that security competition and war among the great powers has been burned out of the system is wrong. In fact, all of the major states around the globe still care deeply about the balance of power and are destined to compete for power among themselves for the foreseeable future. Consequently, realism will offer the most powerful explanations of international politics over the next century, and this will be true even if the debates among academic and policy elites are dominated by non-realist theories. In short, the real world remains a realist world. States still fear each other and seek to gain power at each other's expense, because international anarchy—the driving force behind great-power behavior—did not change with the end of the Cold War, and there are few signs that such change is likely any time soon. States remain the principal actors in world politics and there is still no night watchman standing above them. For sure, the collapse of the Soviet Union caused a major shift in the global distribution of power. But it did not give rise to a change in the anarchic structure of the system, and without that kind of profound change, there is no reason to expect the great powers to behave much differently in the new century than they did in previous centuries. Indeed, considerable evidence from the 1990s indicates that power politics has not disappeared from Europe and Northeast Asia, the regions in which there are two or more great powers, as well as possible great powers such as Germany and Japan. There is no question, however, that the competition for power over the past decade has been low-key. Still, there is potential for intense security competition among the great powers that might lead to a major war. Probably the best evidence of that possibility is the fact that the United States maintains about one hundred thousand troops each in Europe and in Northeast Asia for the explicit purpose of keeping the major states in each region at peace.

#### Human nature makes realist securitization inevitable.

Solomon 96 (Hussein, Senior Researcher, Human Security Project, “In Defense of Realism: Confessions of a Fallen Idealist,” African Security Review 5:2, <http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/ASR/5No2/5No2/InDefense.html> //shree)

The post-modern/critical theory challenge to realism has been tested, and proved wanting. Realism remains the single most reliable analytical framework through which to understand and evaluate global change. Post-modernism can provide no practical alternatives to the realist paradigm. We know what a realist world looks like (we are living in one!); but what does a post-modernist world look like? As long as humanity is motivated by hate, envy, greed and egotism, realism will continue to be invaluable to the policy-maker and the scholar. In this regard it has to be pointed out that from the end of World War II until 1992, hundreds of major conflicts around the world have left some twenty million human beings dead.109 Neither has the end of the Cold War showed any sign that such conflict will end. By the end of 1993 a record of 53 wars were being waged in 37 countries across the globe.110 Until a fundamental change in human nature occurs, realism will continue to dominate the discipline of international relations. The most fundamental problem with post-modernism is that it assumes a more optimistic view of human nature. Srebrenica, Bihac, Tuzla, Zeppa, Goma, Chechnya, Ogoniland, and KwaZulu-Natal all bear testimony to the folly of such a view.

## 2NC

### Cap K

#### 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.

#### A focus on discourse is an abandonment of real change – we must use a materialist focus to solve oppression

Cloud 1 (Dana L. Cloud, Associate Professor, Communication Studies UT Austin, “The Affirmative Masquerade,” American Communication Journal, Volume 4, Issue 3, Spring 2001, <http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol4/iss3/special/cloud.htm>)

At the very least, however, it is clear that **poststructuralist discourse theories have left behind** some of **historical materialism’s most valuable conceptual tools for** any **theoretical and critical practice that aims at informing practical, oppositional political activity on behalf of** historically exploited and **oppressed groups**. As Nancy Hartsock (1983, 1999) and many others have argued (see Ebert 1996; Stabile, 1997; Triece, 2000; Wood, 1999), **we need to retain concepts such as standpoint epistemology** (wherein truth standards are not absolute or universal but arise from the scholar’s alignment with the perspectives of particular classes and groups) **and fundamental, class-based interests** (as opposed to understanding class as just another discursively-produced identity). We need extra-discursive reality checks on ideological mystification and economic contextualization of discursive phenomena. Most importantly, **critical scholars bear the obligation to explain the origins and causes of exploitation and oppression in order** better **to inform the fight against them**.  In poststructuralist discourse theory, **the "retreat from class**" (Wood, 1999) **expresses an unwarranted pessimism about what can be accomplished in late capitalism with regard to** understanding and **transforming** system and **structure at the level of the economy and the state**. **It** substitutes meager cultural freedoms for macro-level social transformation even **as millions of people around the world feel the global reach of capitalism more deeply than ever before**. At the core of the issue is a debate across the humanities and social sciences with regard to whether we live in a "new economy," an allegedly postmodern, information-driven historical moment in which, it is argued, organized mass movements are no longer effective in making material demands of system and structure (Melucci, 1996). In suggesting that global capitalism has so innovated its strategies that there is no alternative to its discipline, arguments proclaiming "a new economy" risk inaccuracy, pessimism, and conservatism (see Cloud, in press). While a thoroughgoing summary is beyond the scope of this essay, there is a great deal of evidence against claims that capitalism has entered a new phase of extraordinary innovation, reach, and scope (see Hirst and Thompson, 1999).  Furthermore, both class polarization (see Mishel, Bernstein, and Schmitt, 2001) and the ideological and management strategies that contain class antagonism (see Cloud, 1998; Parker and Slaughter, 1994) still resemble their pre-postmodern counterparts. A recent report of the Economic Policy Institute concludes that in the 1990s, inequality between rich and poor in the U.S. (as well as around the world) continued to grow, in a context of rising worker productivity, a longer work week for most ordinary Americans, and continued high poverty rates.  Even as the real wage of the median CEO rose nearly 63 percent from 1989, to 1999, more than one in four U.S. workers lives at or below the poverty level. Among these workers, women are disproportionately represented, as are Black and Latino workers. (Notably, unionized workers earn nearly thirty percent more, on average, than non-unionized workers.) Meanwhile, Disney workers sewing t-shirts and other merchandise in Haiti earn 28 cents an hour. Disney CEO Michael Eisner made nearly six hundred million dollars in 1999--451,000 times the wage of the workers under his employ (Roesch, 1999). According to United Nations and World Bank sources, several trans-national corporations have assets larger than several countries combined. Sub-Saharan Africa and the Russian Federation have seen sharp economic decline, while assets of the world’s top three billionaires exceed the GNP of all of the least-developed countries and their combined population of 600 million people (Shawki and D’Amato, 2000, pp. 7-8).  **In this context of a real** (and clearly bipolar) **class divide in** late **capitalist society,** the postmodern party is a masquerade ball, in which theories claiming to offer ways toward emancipation and progressive critical practice in fact **encourage scholars** and/as activists **to abandon** any **commitment to crafting oppositional political blocs** with instrumental and perhaps revolutionary potential. Instead, on their arguments, we must recognize agency as an illusion of humanism and settle for playing with our identities in a mood of irony, excess, and profound skepticism. Marx and Engels’ critique of the Young Hegelians applies equally well to the postmodern discursive turn: "They are only fighting against ‘phrases.’ They forget, however, that to these phrases they themselves are only opposing other phrases, and that they are in no way combating the real existing world when they are merely combating the phrases of this world" (1976/1932, p. 41).  Of course, the study of "phrases" is important to the project of materialist critique in the field of rhetoric. The point, though, is to explain the connections between phrases on the one hand and economic interests and systems of oppression and exploitation on the other. Marxist ideology critique, understands that classes, motivated by class interest, produce rhetorics wittingly and unwittingly, successfully and unsuccessfully. Those rhetorics are strategically adapted to context and audience. Yet **Marxist theory is not naïve in** its **understanding** of intention or individual **agency**. Challenging individualist humanism, **Marxist** ideology **critics regard people as "products of circumstances**" (and changed people as products of changed circumstances; Marx, 1972b/1888, p. 144).  Within this understanding, **Marxist** ideology **critics can describe and evaluate cultural discourses** such as that of racism or sexism **as strategic and complex expressions of both their moment in history and of their class basis**. Further, this mode of critique seeks to explain both why and how social reality is fundamentally, systematically oppressive and exploitative, exploring not only the surface of discourses but also their often-complex and multi-vocal motivations and consequences. As Burke (1969/1950) notes, **Marxism is both a method of rhetorical criticism and a rhetorical formation** itself (pp. 109-110). There is no pretense of neutrality or assumption of transcendent position for the critic.  Teresa Ebert (1996) summarizes the purpose of materialist ideology critique:   Materialist critique is a mode of knowing that inquires into what is not said, into the silences and the suppressed or missing, in order to uncover the concealed operations of power and the socio-economic relations connecting the myriad details and representations of our lives. It shows that apparently disconnected zones of culture are in fact materially linked through the highly differentiated, mediated, and dispersed operation of a systematic logic of exploitation. In sum, materialist critique disrupts **‘what is’ to explain how social differences**--specifically gender, race, sexuality, and class--**have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation, so that we can ch**

#### Their single-issue resistance provides a route for capitalism to co-opt their resistance – labor is the only issue that cannot be integrated and destroyed by capital

Meszaros 95 [Istavan, Prof. Emeritus at Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition] p. 40

To aggravate the situation, everything is further complicated by the fact that it is not feasible to find partial solutions to the problems that must be faced. Thus, no ‘single issue’ can be realistically considered a ‘single issue.’ If nothing else, this circumstance has been forcefully highlighted by the disconcerting marginalization of the Green movement on the success of which so much hope has been placed in recent times, even among former socialists. In the past up to a few decades ago it was possible to squeeze out of capital what appeared to be significant concessions—such as relative gains for the socialist movement (which later turned out to be reversible both as legislative measures for working class action and as gradually improving standard of living), obtained through the defensive organizations of labour: its trades unions and parliamentary parties. These gains could be conceded by capital so long as they could be assimilated and integrated by the system as a whole and turned to its productive advantage in the course of its self-expansion. Today, by contrast, confronting even partial issues with any hope of success implies the necessity of challenging the capital system as such. For in our own historical epoch, when productive self-expansion is no longer a readily available way out of the accumulating difficulties and contradictions (hence the purely wishful thinking of getting rid of the black hope of indebtedness by ‘growing out of it’), the global capital system of necessity frustrates all attempts at interfering even to a minimal extent with its structural parameters. In this respect the obstacles to be overcome are actually shared by labour—that is, labour as the radical alternative to capital’s social metabolic order—and the ‘single issue’ movements. For the historic failure of social democracy clearly underlined that only integrable demands can gain legitimacy under the rule of capital. Environmentalism by its very nature—just like the great historic cause of women’s liberation—is non-integrable. Consequently no such cause will for the capital system conveniently fade way, irrespective of how many setbacks and defeats the politically organized forms of ‘single issue’ movements might have to suffer in the foreseeable future. However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naive. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable causes, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but — precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital — can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

#### Use of the state guarantees cooption and commodification by capitalism, reinforcing domination and hierarchy.

Holloway 5 professor at Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences at the Autonomous University of Puebla John, Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?, 5 April 05,

http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=98)

I don’t know the answer. Perhaps we can change the world without taking power. Perhaps we cannot. The starting point—for all of us, I think—is uncertainty, not knowing, a common search for a way forward. Because it becomes more and more clear that capitalism is a catastrophe for humanity. A radical change in the organisation of society, that is, revolution, is more urgent than ever. And this revolution can only be world revolution if it is to be effective. But it is unlikely that world revolution can be achieved in one single blow. This means that the only way in which we can conceive of revolution is as interstitial revolution, as a revolution that takes place in the interstices of capitalism, a revolution that occupies spaces in the world while capitalism still exists. The question is how we conceive of these interstices, whether we think of them as states or in other ways.In thinking about this, we have to start from where we are, from the many rebellions and insubordinations that have brought us to Porto Alegre. The world is full of such rebellions, of people saying NO to capitalism: NO, we shall not live our lives according to the dictates of capitalism, we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable and not what capital tells us to do. Sometimes we just see capitalism as an all-encompassing system of domination and forget that such rebellions exist everywhere. At times they are so small that even those involved do not perceive them as refusals, but often they are collective projects searching for an alternative way forward and sometimes they are as big as the Lacandon Jungle or the Argentinazo of three years ago or the revolt in Bolivia just over a year ago. All of these insubordinations are characterised by a drive towards self-determination, an impulse that says, ‘No, you will not tell us what to do, we shall decide for ourselves what we must do.’ These refusals can be seen as fissures, as cracks in the system of capitalist domination. Capitalism is not (in the first place) an economic system, but a system of command. Capitalists, through money, command us, telling us what to do. To refuse to obey is to break the command of capital. The question for us, then, is how do we multiply and expand these refusals, these cracks in the texture of domination?There are two ways of thinking about this. The first says that these movements, these many insubordinations, lack maturity and effectiveness unless they are focused, unless they are channelled towards a goal. For them to be effective, they must be channelled towards the conquest of state power—either through elections or through the overthrowing of the existing state and the establishment of a new, revolutionary state. The organisational form for channelling all these insubordinations towards that aim is the party. The question of taking state power is not so much a question of future intentions as of present organisation. How should we organise ourselves in the present? Should we join a party, an organisational form that focuses our discontent on the winning of state power? Or should we organise in some other way?The second way of thinking about the expansion and multiplication of insubordinations is to say, ‘No, they should not be all harnessed together in the form of a party, they should flourish freely, go whatever way the struggle takes them.’ This does not mean that there should be no coordination, but it should be a much looser coordination. Above all, the principal point of reference is not the state but the society that we want to create. The principal argument against the first conception is that it leads us in the wrong direction. The state is not a thing, it is not a neutral object: it is a form of social relations, a form of organisation, a way of doing things which has been developed over several centuries for the purpose of maintaining or developing the rule of capital. If we focus our struggles on the state, or if we take the state as our principal point of reference, we have to understand that the state pulls us in a certain direction. Above all, it seeks to impose upon us a separation of our struggles from society, to convert our struggle into a struggle on behalf of, in the name of. It separates leaders from the masses, the representatives from the represented; it draws us into a different way of talking, a different way of thinking. It pulls us into a process of reconciliation with reality, and that reality is the reality of capitalism, a form of social organisation that is based on exploitation and injustice, on killing and destruction. It also draws us into a spatial definition of how we do things, a spatial definition which makes a clear distinction between the state’s territory and the world outside, and a clear distinction between citizens and foreigners. It draws us into a spatial definition of struggle that has no hope of matching the global movement of capital. There is one key concept in the history of the state-centred left, and that concept is betrayal. Time and time again the leaders have betrayed the movement, and not necessarily because they are bad people, but just because the state as a form of organisation separates the leaders from the movement and draws them into a process of reconciliation with capital. Betrayal is already given in the state as an organisational form. Can we resist this? Yes, of course we can, and it is something that happens all the time. We can refuse to let the state identify leaders or permanent representatives of the movement, we can refuse to let delegates negotiate in secret with the representatives of the state. But this means understanding that our forms of organisation are very different from those of the state, that there is no symmetry between them. The state is an organisation on behalf of, what we want is the organisation of self-determination, a form of organisation that allows us to articulate what we want, what we decide, what we consider necessary or desirable. What we want, in other words, is a form of organisation that does not have the state as its principal point of reference. The argument against taking the state as the principal point of reference is clear, but what of the other concept? The state-oriented argument can be seen as a pivoted conception of the development of struggle. Struggle is conceived as having a central pivot, the taking of state power. First we concentrate all our efforts on winning the state, we organise for that, then, once we have achieved that, we can think of other forms of organisation, we can think of revolutionising society. First we move in one direction, in order to be able to move in another: the problem is that the dynamic acquired during the first phase is difficult or impossible to dismantle in the second phase. The other concept focuses directly on the sort of society we want to create, without passing through the state. There is no pivot: organisation is directly prefigurative, directly linked to the social relations we want to create. Where the first concept sees the radical transformation of society as taking place after the seizure of power, the second insists that it must begin now. Revolution not when the time is right but revolution here and now.

#### Capitalism racializes subjects to divide social groups - a race based epistemology and theory of oppression breaks down the concept of class as an all encompassing theory of exploitation that is the only way to enable the unification of the proleteriat

Zavarzadeh 3 (Mas’ud, “The Pedagogy of Totality” p.11-13, in “JAC: A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture, and Politics”, Volume 23.1, http://www.jaconlinejournal.com/archives/vol23.1.html)

The pedagogy of appearance focuses on cultural representation and the role of representation in constructing the represented. By centering teaching in the machinery of "representation,"it obliterates the objective. Reducing pedagogy to lessons in cultural semiotics, it makes "experi- ence" of the pleasures of "depthless" surfaces the measure of reality and thus obscures the social relations of production that are the material conditions of that experience. However, "This 'lived' experience is not a given, given by a pure 'reality,' but the spontaneous 'lived experience' of ideology in its peculiar relationship to the real" (Althusser 223). The ideological value of the concept of "experience" in de-concep-ualizing pedagogy will perhaps become more clear in examining the way bourgeois radical pedagogues, such as Giroux, deploy experience as an instance of spontaneity to eviscerate class as an explanatory concept by which the social relations ofproperty are critiqued. In his Impure A cts- a book devoted to marginalizing explanatory concepts and popularizing "hybrids" and that, in effect, justifies political opportunism in peda- gogy- Giroux repeats the claims of such other cultural phenomenologists as Stuart Hall, Judith Butler, and Robin Kelley that "class" is "lived through race" (28). Class, in other words, is an affect. He represents this affective view ofclass as epistemological resistance against class which, he claims, is a universal category that takes the "difference" ofrace out of class. As I have already argued, epistemology is used in mainstream pedagogy as a cover for a reactionary class politics that does several things, as Giroux demonstrates. First, it segregates the "black" proletariat from the "white" proletariat and isolates both :from other "racial" prole- tariats. In doing so, Giroux's pedagogy carries out the political agenda of capital - to pit one segment ofthe proletariat against the other and to tum the unity of the working class into contesting (race) "differences." Second, it rewrites the system of wage labor itself into a hybrid. Giroux's experience-ism obscures the systematicity of wage labor and argues that there is no capitalism operating with a single logic of exploitation. Instead, there are many, aleatory, ad hoc, local arrangements between employees and employers depending on the color of the worker not the laws ofmotion ofcapital. Third, it converts capitalism from an economic system based on the"exploitation"of humans by humans(wagelabor)- through the ownership ofthe means ofproduction-into an institution of cultural "oppression" based on "power." Fourth, since class is lived through race, it is not an objective fact (the relation of the worker to ownership ofthe means ofproduction) but a subjective experience. The experience of ("living") class through race, like all experiences, is contingent, aleatory, and indeterminate. Class (lived through the experi- ence of race) is thus reconstituted as contingent - an accident not a necessity of wage labor. Fifth, since capitalism is not a system but a series of ad hoc arrangements of exchange with various workers of diverse colors, it does not produce an objective binary class system but only cultural differences. One cannot, therefore, obtain objective knowledge of capitalism. There are, in short, no laws ofmotion ofcapital; there are only "experiences" ofwork influenced by one's color. Consequently, to say-as I have said-that capitalism is a regime ofexploitation is simply a totalitarian closure. We cannot know what capitalism is because, according to Giroux's logic, it is fraught with differences (ofrace) not the singularity of"surplus labor." In Giroux's pedagogy, there is no capital- ism ("totality"), only cultural effects of capitals without capitalism ("differences"). Giroux represents his gutting of class as a radical and groundbreaking notion that will lead to liberation ofthe oppressed. However, he never completes the logic of his argument because in the end it will de-ground his position and turn it into epistemological nonsense and political pantomime. Ifclass is a universal category that obliterates the difference of race, there is (on the basis of such a claim) no reason not to say that race is also a universal category because it obliterates the difference of sexuality (and other differences), which is, by the same logic, itself a universal category since it obliterates the difference of age (and other differences), which is itselfa universal category because it obliterates the difference of (dis)ability (and other differences), which is itselfa univer- sal category because it obliterates the difference of class (and other differences). In short, the social, in Giroux's pedagogy is a circle of oppressions, none of whose components can explain any structural relations; each simply absorbs the other ("class is actually lived through race," paraphrasing Giroux) and thus points back to itself as a local knowledge ofthe affective, difference, and contingency. Class explains race; it does not absorb it as an experience (see Butler, "Merely"), nor does i t reduce it to the contingencies o f ethnicities (Hall, "New") or urban performativities (Kelley, Yo '). To put it differently, since in this pluralism of oppressions each element cancels out the explanatory capacity of all others, the existing social relations are reaffirmed in a pragmatic balancing of differences. Nothing changes, everything is resignified. The classroom of experience reduces all concepts (which it marks as "grand narratives") to affects ("little stories") and, instead of explaining the social in order to change it, only "interprets" it as a profusion of differences. Teaching becomes an affirmation of the singular-as-is; its lessons "save the honor of the name" (see Lyotard, Postmodern 82). Giroux's program is a mimesis ofthe logic of the ruling ideology: as in all pedagogies of affect, it redescribes the relation of the subject of knowledge with the world but leaves the world itselfintact byreifying the signs of"difference" (see Rorty, Contingency 53, 73). The subject, as I will discuss later in my analysis ofCary Nelson's radical pedagogy, feels differently about itself in a world that remains what it was. Giroux is putting forth a class-cleansing pedagogy: he erases class from teaching in the name ofepistemology ("totalization"). But as I have already argued, epistemology is not an issue for Giroux; it is an alibi for hollowing out from class its economic explanatory power. Epistemology in bourgeois pedagogy is class politics represented as "theory"-whose aim is to tum class into a cultural aleatory experience. In Giroux's phenomenological experientialism, lived experience is an excuse for advancing the cause of capital in a populist logic (respect for the ineluctable "experience" of the student) so that the student, the future worker, is trained as one who understands the world only through the sense-able - his own "unique" experience as black, white, or brown; man or woman; gay or straight - but never as a proletariat: a person who, regardless of race, sexuality, gender, age, or (dis)ability has to sell his or her labor power to capital in order to obtain subsistence wages in exchange. Experience, in Giroux's pedagogy, becomes a self-protecting "inside" that resists world-historical knowledge as an intrusion from "outside"; it thus valorizes ignorance as a mark of the authenticity and sovereignty ofthe subject-as independence and free choice.

#### Capitalism is the root cause of racism

McLaren and Torres 99 (Peter Mclaren, professor of education at U of California, and Rudolfo Torres, Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, Chicano/Latino Studies, and Political Science, “Racism and Multicultural Education: Rethinking ‘Race’ and ‘Whiteness’ in Late Capitalism”, Chapter 2 of “Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education”, edited by Stephen May, p.49-50, Questia)

According to Alex Callinicos (1993), racial differences are invented. Racism occurs when the characteristics which justify discrimination are held to be inherent in the oppressed group. This form of oppression is peculiar to capitalist societies; it arises in the circumstances surrounding industrial capitalism and the attempt to acquire a large labour force. Callinicos points out three main conditions for the existence of racism as outlined by Marx: economic competition between workers; the appeal of racist ideology to white workers; and efforts of the capitalist class to establish and maintain racial divisions among workers. Capital's constantly changing demands for different kinds of labour can only be met through immigration. Callinicos remarks that 'racism offers for workers of the oppressing “race” the imaginary compensation for the exploitation they suffer of belonging to the “ruling nation”' (1993, p. 39). Callinicos notes the way in which Marx grasped how 'racial' divisions between 'native' and 'immigrant' workers could weaken the working-class. United States' politicians like Pat Buchanan, Jesse Helms and Pete Wilson, to name but a few, take advantage of this division which the capitalist class understands and manipulates only too well-using racism effectively to divide the working-class. At this point you might be asking yourselves: Doesn't racism pre-date capitalism? Here we agree with Callinicos that the heterophobia associated with precapitalist societies was not the same as modern racism. Pre-capitalist slave and feudal societies of classical Greece and Rome did not rely on racism to justify the use of slaves. The Greeks and Romans did not have theories of white superiority. If they did, that must have been unsettling news to Septimus Severus, Roman Emperor from Ad 193 to 211, who was, many historians claim, a black man. Racism emerged during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from a key development of capitalism-colonial plantations in the New World where slave labour stolen from Africa was used to produce tobacco, sugar, and cotton for the global consumer market (Callinicos, 1993). Callinicos cites Eric Williams who remarks: 'Slavery was not born of racism: rather, racism was the consequence of slavery' (cited in Callinicos, 1993, p. 24). In effect, racism emerged as the ideology of the plantocracy. It began with the class of sugar-planters and slave merchants that dominated England's Caribbean colonies. Racism developed out of the 'systemic slavery' of the New World. The 'natural inferiority' of Africans was a way that Whites justified enslaving them. According to Callinicos: Racism offers white workers the comfort of believing themselves part of the dominant group; it also provides, in times of crisis, a ready-made scapegoat, in the shape of the oppressed group. Racism thus gives white workers a particular identity, and one which unites them with white capitalists. We have here, then, a case of the kind of 'imagined community' discussed by Benedict Anderson in his influential analysis of nationalism. (1993, p. 38) In short, to abolish racism in any substantive sense, we need to abolish global capitalism

#### The collapse of capitalism is inevitable – the aff just delays it which makes any transition war comparatively worse

**Mészáros 1** (István, Hungarian Marxist philosopher, and Professor Emeritus at the University of Sussex. He held the Chair of Philosophy at Sussex for fifteen years and was earlier Professor of Philosophy and Social Science for four years at York University. “Socialism or Barbarism.” New York : The Monthly Review Press, 2001. Pgs 9-10) JM

We have just left the twentieth century, described by capital's most vocal apologists as "the American century." This view is voiced as if the October Revolution of 1917, or the Chinese and Cuban Revolutions and the colonial liberation struggles in the following decades had never taken place, not to mention the humiliating defeat directly suffered by the mighty United States in Vietnam. Indeed, the uncritical defenders of the established order confidently anticipate that not only the coming century but the whole of the next millennium is destined to conform to' the unchallengeable rules of Pax Americana. Yet, no matter how much the relation of forces has been realigned in capital's favor in the last decade, the deep-seated causes beneath the major social earthquakes of the twentieth century mentioned above-to which one could add quite a few more, positive and negative alike, including two world wars-have not been resolved by subsequent developments. On the contrary, with every new phase of forced postponement the capital system's contradictions can only be aggravated, bringing with them ever greater danger for the very survival of humanity. The insolubility of our social antagonisms, coupled with capital's uncontrollability, may well continue to generate for some time the atmosphere of triumphalism as well as the disorienting illufuns of permanency, as they did in the recent past. But in due course the accumulating and destructively intensifying problems must be confronted. For if the next century is really going to be capital’s triumphant "American century," there will be no more centuries for humans afterwards, let alone a full millennium. Saying this has nothing to do with "anti-Americanism." In 1992 I expressed my conviction that, “The future of socialism will be decided in the United States, however pessimistic this may sound. I try to hint at this in the last section of The Power of Ideology where I discuss the problem of universality. J Socialism either can assert itself universally and in such a way that it embraces all areas, including the most developed capitalist areas of the world, or it won't succeed.”2

#### Elites won’t block change – if aware of impending doom, fear of extinction will spur a mindset change

Kassiola 3 ( Dean at San Francisco State, Joel Jay, “Questions to Ponder in Understanding the Modern Predicament”, Explorations in Environmental Political Theory, ed. Kassiola, M.E. Sharpe)

As we reflect upon the causes of the potentially lethal modern predicament, we face the central question of how modern societal trans­formation will occur. This raises the concomitant, apparently insur­mountable, obstacle of the current elite’s opposition to such change in values and social institutions: How will the rich accept the lower material levels necessitated by environmental limits, and create a more just world order through a redistribution of wealth and power? The unhappy experience and knowledge of increasing environmental degradation with threats to all planetary life should move the industrial rich to recognize the self-defeating and unsatisfactory nature of modern values and social practices. They may come to accept the necessity of a new, postmodern social order, one not so characterized by the ideolo­gies of capitalism, industrialism, and Hobbesianism. In this new order citizens—including the rich—can have more leisure time to experience and contemplate the nonmaterial and more fulfilling aspects of the hu­man condition, like nature. Nature’s value to humans, as Goodin tells us, lies in directing humans to something “outside themselves,” some­thing “larger than themselves,” that “locates the self.”Of course, extensive social learning will have to occur if such a radical change is to occur, but it is precisely such a type of change that is needed to realize sustainability and justice. The crucial role of such social learn­ing to societal transformation is emphasized by both Milbrath’s and Pirages’s contributions. An urgent question remains: What specific agent can transform mod­ern society to an environmentally consistent, moral, and satisfying so­cial order? Several contributors note the role of disappointment, or tragedy (in Oscar Wilde’s sense of “emptiness after success”) on the recognition of mistaken goals. We experience alienation as we work harder and longer “getting and spending” yet increase our anguish and dissatisfaction with life. Some of our authors have remarked about the Wildean tragedy, or irony, of the most materially successful society in world history having success be its downfall. However, just as Zimmer­man admonishes us to preserve what is positive about modernity (for example, freedom from the shackles of feudalism and increased pro­ductivity to meet human biological needs), I feel compelled to re­mind the reader of Paehlke’s discussion of globalization, especially as it pertains to the global industrial elites and the effective spread of their ideology of growthmania and endless consumption. These elites control the global mass media of communications and direct the expanding reach of increasingly large and powerful transnational corporations. The dy­namics of how the current hegemonic rule of the industrial corporate behemoths will be undermined has yet to be written, posing a signifi­cant challenge to all environmental political theorists, environmental researchers and activists (similar to Zimmerman’s unforseen “caterpillar into a butterfly” transformation analogy). As Paehlke fears, we merely may be moving forward between cars on a train as it moves backward without changing its direction! But even the most destination-minded train engineer will stop, change direction, and reassess her/his stated objective when they run out of fuel, see disastrous circumstances ahead, and realize the train’s projected destination does not exist! [p. 185-187]

## 1NR

### T

#### Energy production is a two-step process that includes primary energy (resources) and secondary energy (heat, light, electricity)

Bhattarcharyya 2011 [S.C., Energy Economics, p. 12]

2.2.2.1 Primary and Secondary Forms of Energy

The term primary energy is used to designate an energy source that is extracted¶ from a stock of natural resources or captured from a flow of resources and that has¶ not undergone any transformation or conversion other than separation and cleaning¶ (IEA 2004). Examples include coal, crude oil, natural gas, solar power, nuclear¶ power, etc.¶ Secondary energy on the other hand refers to any energy that is obtained from a¶ primary energy source employing a transformation or conversion process. Thus oil¶ products or electricity are secondary energies as these require refining or electric¶ generators to produce them.¶ Both electricity and heat can be obtained as primary and secondary energies.

#### They conflate restrictions with all regulations. Restrictions refer to access and are distinct from other regulations that cover things like safety.

Bullard-8

Introduction to Homeland Security: Principles of All-Hazards Response p.267 Google Books

The pipeline and distribution segments of the oil and natural gas industries are highly regulated. Oversight includes financial, safety, and site selection regulations. The exploration and production side of the industry is less regulated, but it is affected by safety regulations and restrictions concerning property access. The sidebar "Oil and Gas as Weapons" illustrates a unique side to the oil and gas industry (sec Figure 5-8).

### Climate Denialism

#### Electricity production only accounts for 9% of Greenhouse Gas emissions and nuclear energy would divert resources from other projects that address climate change.

Nuclear Monitor, 5.

(“Nuclear Power: No solution to climate Change” A new report from NIRS/WISE

International. <http://www.nirs.org/mononline/nukesclimatechangereport.pdf>, feb)

Switching the entire world's electricity production to nuclear would still not solve the problem. Moreover, by diverting the world’s resources from sustainable energy production to nuclear power, it would only exacerbate the problem by diverting scare resources away from those technologies which offer real hope for addressing climate change.This is partly because the production of electricity is only one of many human activities that release greenhouse gases. Others include transport and heating, agriculture, the production of cement and deforestation. The CO2 released worldwide through electricity production accounts for only 9% of total annual human greenhouse gas emissions.

### Discourse

#### Thorium doesn’t solve waste – produces long-lived fission products, increased radioactivity,

Makhijani and Boyd, Physicians for Social Responsibility, ‘9

[Arjun and Michele, “Thorium Fuel: No Panacea for Nuclear Power”, Physicians for Social Responsibility,

http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/thorium2009factsheet.pdf, RSR]

Proponents claim that thorium fuel significantly reduces the volume, weight, and long-term radiotoxicity of spent fuel. Using thorium in a nuclear reactor creates radioactive waste that proponents claim would only have to be isolated from the environment for 500 years, as opposed to the irradiated uranium-only fuel that remains dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years. This claim is wrong. The fission of thorium creates long-lived fission products like technetium-99 (half-life over 200,000 years). While the mix of fission products is somewhat different than with uranium fuel, the same range of fission products is created. With or without reprocessing, these fission products have to be disposed of in a geologic repository. If the spent fuel is not reprocessed, thorium-232 is very-long lived (half-life:14 billion years) and its decay products will build up over time in the spent fuel. This will make the spent fuel quite radiotoxic, in addition to all the fission products in it. It should also be noted that inhalation of a unit of radioactivity of thorium-232 or thorium-228 (which is also present as a decay product of thorium-232) produces a far higher dose, especially to certain organs, than the inhalation of uranium containing the same amount of radioactivity. For instance, the bone surface dose from breathing an amount (mass) of insoluble thorium is about 200 times that of breathing the same mass of uranium. Finally, the use of thorium also creates waste at the front end of the fuel cycle.