## 1ac

### Contention 1: The Status Quo

**It’s been 45 years since Dr. King visited the mountaintop but we still live in a society where whole communities are rendered irrelevant. We have no illusions of grandeur regarding our ability to change federal policy, but what we can do, is debate. We’re here to bring those oppressed that are traditionally kept in the backroom of the debate space to its center.**

**In the context of this year’s topic, that means energy justice.**

**Amongst our discussions of SMRs and the Agenda disad, it’s easy to forget that “Green” isn’t the only color relevant to the modern energy system. Black and brown communities are on the front lines of a war with the planet. Our discussions about the environment and energy incentives take place against a backdrop of structural racism that is often invisible**

**Wiley 6**

(Maya Wiley, Director of the Center for Social Inclusion, Summer 2006, “Overcoming Structural Racism,” Race, Poverty, and the Environment, Vol. 13, No. 1, online: http://www.urbanhabitat.org/node/504, accessed July 12, 2008)

Last winter, the ground never froze in Brooklyn, New York. In January, I was digging up dandelions that had taken over my yard and preparing new flowerbeds.  Climate change is hitting close to home. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has predicted eight to 10 hurricanes in the North Atlantic Ocean this season—about half-a-dozen of them expected to be at least a category three. Katrina was a category three hurricane. So, New York could be the next New Orleans. One thing climate change makes clear: what happens to one community can happen to all—across neighborhoods, across cities, across countries. But we can stop the tragedy of New Orleans from repeating itself. We can even turn New Orleans’ tragedy into an opportunity to understand better the human landscape that for so long has been sowed with the poisonous seeds of racism. By understanding and addressing the inequities brought on by structural racism, we can and will improve our environment in every possible way, including socially and economically. Often, when we talk about global warming, issues of racial inequity are left out. We focus on “dirty” energy, our government’s failure to regulate corporate polluting and reluctance to create incentives for clean and renewable energy alternatives. We criticize our consumer culture with its insatiable appetite for SUVs, and our preference for suburban living with its long commutes. All of these are, of course, important factors in creating and perpetuating a climate crisis that is finally being acknowledged in the U.S., thanks to the hard work of environmental activists. While no one can say for sure that global warming caused hurricane Katrina, the science strongly suggests that storms are getting fiercer and more destructive because of carbon emissions. A Hurricane’s Eye View of Global Warming New Orleans has given us an opportunity to understand and address the racial causes and consequences of global warming. The broken levees are a metaphor for a weakened and fragmented government. Over the last four years alone, the US Congress has aggressively cut the revenue sources that enable government at all levels to invest in communities. Tax cuts of over a trillion dollars for the wealthiest five percent (annual income over $300,000) has meant severe cutbacks for disaster relief and a safety net.2 Consider, for example, President Bush’s proposed $708 million cut to the Army Corps of Engineers budget. A whopping $71.2 million of that money was earmarked for hurricane and flood prevention in New Orleans. Unfortunately, such budget cuts have become common and are part of a larger attack on federal responsibility for a social safety net.3Public willingness to accept the notion of a small, limited federal government developed in the historical context of slavery. The more powerful slaveholding families used these concepts to oppose abolition.  The Republican Party’s infamous “Southern Strategy” of using racism to win the ideological fight for corporate prerogatives and limited social investments began in earnest in 1928.4 The limited government, self-help ideology translated into the explicit exclusion of Black people from the New Deal social safety net policies, like Social Security and unemployment benefits. Post-World War II government policies that created and preserved racially segregated white suburbs and the white middle class, intentionally excluded African Americans in particular, and people of color in general. (One of the many consequences of these policies has been the environmental degradation brought on by an increased dependency on automobiles to commute from suburbs to job centers.) It is still the case that public support for social safety net programs, like welfare, decreases if the perceived beneficiaries of such programs are African American.5 New Orleans (and the U.S.) by Numbers In 1970, 54 percent of the New Orleans metropolitan regional population lived in the city, was much more racially integrated, and had fewer neighborhoods of concentrated poverty.6 By 2000, the city had only 36 percent of the region’s population—over two-thirds of which was Black7—indicating a loss of both jobs and revenues for New Orleans. In fact, between 1970 and 2000, the city saw a shocking 24 percent decline in jobs. National and international studies show that fairer, more equitable countries and states have better environmental quality. Fairness and equality are measured by such indicators as income distribution, political rights, civil liberties, level of education, and access to healthcare.8 When we look at the major structural impediments to improving income distribution, political rights, and other indicators of a vibrant and healthy democracy in the U.S., we have to look at the policies affecting communities of color. When entire communities of color are marginalized and excluded from a region’s civic and political life, they become invisible to the white communities. Whites will fight tooth and nail against the location of a waste treatment facility or an incinerator in their own neighborhoods, but accept their location in the “invisible” poor neighborhoods. (One example of an environmental insult is the attempt to create a landfill in the East New Orleans wetlands, strongly opposed by the Black and Vietnamese communities who wish to rebuild their homes there.)9  These privileged communities are thus able to avoid the questions raised by their unbridled consumerism and its effect on the environment. On the other hand, if the government works to reduce poverty in urban communities of color, it has the effect of creating more jobs and reducing poverty in surrounding regions.10  When communities of color are able to participate in civic and political life, they are better able to attract investments to build and strengthen local economies and defend themselves against environmental insults.  Racialized Poverty and Global Warming At a recent conference on the racial and socio-economic implications of the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast, Laurie David, a Hollywood producer and tireless anti-global warming activist, spoke passionately about the climate crisis we face and the importance of U.S. leadership on carbon emissions reduction. When asked about the role of racialized poverty in New Orleans, David responded that the reality of global warming was such that a lot of people will get hurt. David is certainly right, and we all have to care about climate change. But we also need to have a better answer to the question of race and poverty in global warming.The floodwaters of Lake Ponchartrain washed away any illusions of a racially equitable society. Although about 28 percent of New Orleans’ population was poor, there were many more poor African Americans (35 percent) than poor Whites (11.5 percent).11 And  of all city dwellers, nearly one-third of all Black households did not have access to a car while only 10 percent of White households lacked auto access.13 While there were no evacuation plans for the poor, the elderly, and the disabled either, it was common knowledge that the lowest ground in New Orleans was occupied by communities of color, which made up nearly 80 percent of the population in these flooded neighborhoods.14 It is no wonder then that most of the faces in the Superdome were Black. Racialized poverty puts the poor communities of color at the **frontlines of our war with our planet**. They are, as Professor Lani Guinier points out, our miner’s canaries. Their vulnerabilities shine a light on everyone’s vulnerabilities and we should pay careful attention to them when dealing with our public resources. How do our Gardens Grow?The environmental justice community understands that racial inequity is one of the biggest barriers to healthy communities and a healthy nation.15 Nature is not bound by governmental jurisdiction. It may, however, be influenced by race and political privilege. So it is up to the privileged, the resourced, and the included, to work with communities of color, and not  just for them. It requires funders to resource communities of color for civic engagement. It also requires us to build a public will for a government that will strengthen the social safety net for our most vulnerable communities and rein in corporate prerogative.

**This is especially true in the context of alternative energy incentives:**

**Poor communities of color are being systematically excluded from this new wave of renewable energy perpetuating oppressive disparities**

**Anderson 12**

Elsie Harper-Anderson, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University

(“Exploring What Greening the Economy Means for African American Workers, Entrepreneurs, and Communities”, May 2012, http://edq.sagepub.com/content/26/2/162)

Unfortunately, many of the neediest people and communities (particularly African Americans) are not receiving their proportional share of the green recovery resources and are not benefiting at the same rate as others. The first two stated purposes of ARRA are (a) to preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery and (b) to assist those most affected by the recession (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009). Gimpel, Lee, and Thorpe (2010, p. 9) analyze ARRA spending data and argue that “Clearly, the ARRA did target federal resources to particular locations, just the wrong ones from a need perspective.” Their regression analysis results show that the counties most negatively affected by the recession (as measured by job loss and foreclosure) did not receive anymore ARRA funds than others, and in fact, counties with greater increases in unemployment between 2007 and 2009 on average, received fewer stimulus dollars. Both African-American workers and Black-owned businesses have benefited less from current economic and environmental policy interventions than their White counterparts despite being disproportionately affected by both the economic recession and environmental injustices. To start, African Americans and Latinos account for less than 30% of workers employed in the green economy (Liu & Keleher, 2009). In addition, the persistent and increasing gap between Black and White unemployment rates suggests that Black workers may not be benefiting from the new jobs created by the ARRA stimulus at the same rate as Whites. Figure 1 uses BLS data to trace quarterly unemployment rates by race from 2007 to 2010. Although the unemployment rate for all groups has followed similar increasing trends, the Black unemployment rate has remained well above other groups. In fact, the Black to White unemployment ratio has hovered consistently between 1.75 and 2.12. In the third quarter of 2010, although the White unemployment rate stood at 8.5%, the Black rate was 16.3%, 92% higher. Some argue that in cities such as Milwaukee and Detroit, the actual joblessness rate 3 for Black men is as high as 53% and 59%, respectively (Levine, 2010). Similar impact disparities can be found among Black owned businesses. Data from the Federal Procurement Data System confirm that as of September 2010, Black-owned firms represented 7.1% of all business in the United States but had only been awarded 3.5% of the ARRA total procurement contracts (which amounted to 2.6% of funds), whereas White firms that make up 83% of all firms had been awarded nearly 83% of all contracts (Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, 2010a). The same patterns can be seen at the state level as well. In the state of New York, for example, as of June 2010, Black-owned firms comprised 10.4% of all businesses but had only received 3.1% of all ARRA-awarded contracts, which were worth 1.4% of the state’s ARRA awarded funds. White-owned firms, on the other hand, comprised 76% of the state’s firms but were awarded 85% of government contracts (Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, 2010b). Trends in employment and among firms are intricately linked as several studies have shown that Black firms are more likely to hire Black workers than firms owned by Whites (Bates, 1994; Boston, 2005; Boston & Ross, 1997). Hence, the lack of benefit that Black owned businesses reap from ARRA and other green-related funds also lessens the likelihood that Black workers will be hired in green jobs.

**This isn’t a problem restricted to the urban poor-Women, Native Americans, Latinos, and those in rural areas are all burdened by injustice uniquely. Thus, change must be manifested in different ways within these contexts to meet specific goals.**

**Kirk 97**

Schloar/Activist. chaired the women’s studies program at Antioch College (1992-95) and has taught courses in women’s studies, environmental studies, political science, and sociology at a range of academic institutions, including Rutgers, the University of Oregon, University of San Francisco, Colorado College, Hamilton College, and Mills College.

(“Ecofeminism and Environmental Justice: Bridges across Gender, Race, and Class”, 1997, http://people.reed.edu/~ahm/Courses/Reed-POL-372-2011-S3\_IEP/Syllabus/EReadings/15.1/15.1.Kirk1997Ecofeminism.pdf)

The people most affected by poor physical environments in the United States are women and children, particularly African Americans, Native Americans, and Latinas. Many women of color and poor white women are active in hundreds of local organizations campaigning for healthy living and working conditions in working-class communities, in communities of color, and on Native American reservations, which are all disproportionately affected by pollution from incinerators, toxic dumps, pesticides, and hazardous working conditions in industry and agriculture.10 This movement draws on concepts of civil rights, and its orga- nization, too, has roots in the civil rights movements as well as in labor unions, Chicano land grant movements, social justice organizations, and Native American rights organizations. Its tactics include organizing demonstrations and rallies, educating the public, researching and monitoring toxic sites, preparing and presenting expert testimony to government agencies, reclaiming land through direct action, and maintaining and teaching traditional agricultural practices, crafts, and skills. Specific organizations represent different mixes of these strands, depending on their memberships, geographical locations, and key issues. Examples include West Harlem Environmental Action, the Mothers of East L.A., the Southwest Organizing Project (Albuquerque), and the Citizens' Clearing- house for Hazardous Wastes (Virginia). Besides opposing hazardous conditions, the environmental justice movement also has a powerful reconstructive dimension, involving sustainable projects that intertwine ecological, economic, and cultural survival. The 4-H Urban Gardening project in Detroit, for example, coordinates well over one hundred small gardens citywide and relies on the expertise of local people, mostly elderly African American women, who raise vegetables, both for individual use and to supplement food prepared at senior centers, as well as crops for sale: loofah sponges, fresh herbs, honey, and worm boxes for fishing." Many of these women were brought up in rural areas in the southern United States where they learned about gardening before coming to Detroit for work in the 1930s and 1940s. By drawing on local people's knowledge, these gardening projects provide fresh produce at little financial cost, contribute to the revitalization of inner-city communities, and give a sense of empowerment that comes from self-reliance. When people are outdoors working they also make neighborhoods safer by their presence, watchfulness, and care. An additional goal is to teach young people about gardening, strengthening connections between the generations and helping young people to become more self-supporting. Examples of sustainable projects in rural areas include the White Earth Land Recovery Project, a project that produces wild rice and maple sugar on Native American land in Minnesota, and Tierra Wools, a New Mexico worker cooperative of twenty people-most of them women-that owns some three thousand head of Churro sheep and produces high quality, hand-woven rugs and clothing and organically produced lamb.12 Their objectives include economic development and environmental protection, as well as cultural revival and conservation.13 Women make up the majority of local activists in environmental justice organizations, sometimes because they have a sick child or because they have become ill themselves. Illnesses caused by toxins are often difficult to diagnose and treat because they affect internal organs and the balance of body function- ing. Women have been persistent in raising questions and searching for plausible explanations for such illnesses, sometimes discovering that their communities have been built on contaminated land or tracing probable sources of pollution affecting the neighborhood.'4 They have publicized their findings and taken on governmental agencies and corporations responsible for contamination. In so doing they are often ridiculed as "hysterical housewives" by officials and report- ers who have trivialized their research as emotional and unscholarly. By contrast, Lin Nelson honors this works as kitchen table science. In October 1991 women were 60 percent of the participants at the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in Washington, D.C. Many urban gardeners in northern cities are elderly women, while in rural areas women work on family garden plots, planting, harvesting, and processing fruit and vegetables for home use.15 As ethnobotanists, women know backcountry areas in great detail because they go there at different seasons to gather herbs for medicinal purposes. Among Mexican Americans, for example, curanderas-traditional healers-continue to work with herbal remedies.16 This detailed knowledge is learned from older people, as is also the case with some Native Americans and others who live in rural areas. Gender is significant for women in the environmental justice movement, but this is not a concept of gender divorced from race and class. Women activists see their identity as women integrated with their racial and class identities, with race and/or class often more of a place of empowerment for them than gender. Although they recognize their own subordination based on gender, they are not interested in separating themselves from the men in their communities and frame their perspectives, as women, in class-and race-conscious ways. Ecofeminism does not seem relevant to these activists because it pays much more attention to gender than to race or class. Moreover, it is not a land-based movement, is not currently involved in promoting sustainable development, and is not directly involved in struggles for healthy living and working conditions, though there are individuals who define themselves as ecofeminists active on these issues. Some ecofeminist writers and the editors of ecofeminist anthologies have attempted to bridge this gap by including a few contributions by women of color. 17 In an attempt to make connections, these editors inadvertently appropriate the activism of women of color whose work is marginal to collections that assume a unitary framework. Alliances in practice between ecofeminists and environmental justice activists still need to be made. Devo'n Pena took me to meet farmers in the San Luis valley. Typically the farms include well-watered bottomland for pasture and crops and dry upland areas that seem to grow little more than sage. We sat in Joe Gallegoss kitchen and talked; more accurately, they talked and I listened. One crucial issue was thefact that a gold min- ing company located in the hills, Battle Mountain Gold, waspolluting the river with cyanide. The riverfeeds an intricate network of irrigation ditches-acequias-that link all thefarms in the valley. They talked about the importance ofclean water. They opposed "centerpivot" irrigation systems that draw waterfrom underground aquifers. This was the lunacy ofliving on capital-squandering a nonrenewable resource. They talked about the relationship between crops and wildplants that support birds, rab- bits, and other small animals. They described the soils in the valley in a way I'd never heard soil described before, the sensuous feel of sandy loam and Alamosa clay, what you need to know to cultivate them well. They explained why its increasingly hard to make ends meet financially, despite working hardfor long hours, and the traps and contradictions of rampant capitalism that is only interested in quick profits. They talked about their families working this land for seven or eight generations, from before it was part of the United States, always respecting that it is alive. I also listened to a lot of sexist talk and sexist assumptions, even chivalrous notions, about womens place and capabilities. Late at night, I finally said, "Yes, butyou ve got to think about gender. The liberation of women andgirls has to bepart ofa truly sustainable future. " And there are women in San Luis, of course, who are saying the same thing. The vagaries ofthe academicjob market meant that I left Colorado, torn by the realization that connections between people, especially across lines of race, class, and culture, need time to develop and a real life context to grow in. This was a limitation of aproject I'd been part of some years earlier: WomanEarth, a multiracial network of women who wanted to link spirituality andpolitics, with a focus on health, ecology, andpeace. We also adopted the principle of racial parity, meaning that there should always be equal numbers of women of color and white women. A core group of eight women met and talked and met and talked. We invited a larger group to a four-day working meeting. We were long on ideas but short on making them happen. Ironi- cally, WomanEarth was profoundly unecological in a very basic way: We were a bicoastal group, spread out across this vast continent from California to New York with no strong roots in a place. Like many would-be groups and partnerships, we found it hard to confront difficult issues between us for fear that the alliance would fall apart. It did, of course, but I still dream of a workable Woman Earth some day. This project was crucial to my developing understandings about race and my commitment to multicultural projects in the future. We had high hopes for Woman Earth. Like many tough experiences, it's been a source of seeds, some of which are still waiting for the right place, time, and people to sprout. Building Alliances for a Sustainable Future Given the widespread and profoundly serious nature of environmental degradation, environmental issues have great potential for bringing people together across lines of race and class. For such collaboration to work, people need to have some basis for knowing one another, some shared stake in the community, and the prospect for developing trust despite differences in culture, ethnicity, and class. There needs to be authentic connection based on honesty and mutual respect. Much has been written about building bridges across lines of difference in the past decade or so.18 One obstacle is ignorance-simply not knowing each other's experience as well as not understanding its significance-though people in oppressed groups always know more about dominant groups than the other way around. Other obstacles include treating other groups' concerns as less meaningful than one's own and a lack of trust between people separated by profound differences in class and culture. The bridges to be built are emotional as well as intellectual, making personal connections that reach across our segregated lives. Alliances require conscientious listening, honesty, active compassion, and a will- ingness to be self-critical. Learning about others means being open to uncer- tainty and surprise, an ability to suspend disbelief, and a sense of ease with our- selves so that we can be fully present to each other.'9 This requires settings and projects where people can work together to develop a shared political culture and language, providing a key role for individuals whose experiences and connec- tions enable them to cross lines. Women of color point out to white women that we conveniently ignore our privilege as white while emphasizing our oppression as women. To build bridges across gender and race for white feminists means understanding that women of color cannot separate race and ethnicity from gender, any more than we can ourselves. We have to make alliances with women and men of color and, in the process, may have to deal with what we consider to be sexist attitudes and behavior. White women need to acknowledge the ways we sustain, perpetuate, and benefit from racism, albeit often unknowingly-in itself an aspect of privilege. Those of us who write and teach about ecofeminism need to remedy the class, race, and ethnic limitations of our perspectives so as to build authentic alliances that cross race and class lines. We need to use our privilege in the interests of social justice. It is important to make a distinction here between a politics of solidarity, implying support for others in struggle, and a politics of engagement where we are in struggle together. a group of community activists in Detroit started Detroit Summer, a multicultural, intergenerational youth program/movement to rebuild, redefine, and respirit Detroit from the ground up. It was based on Freedom Summer (1964) when young people from northern states went to the South to register people to vote. Detroit Summer invited young people to spend three weeks working on community projects, talking to community activists in their seventies and eighties as well as to their peers, visioning a new kind of community and economy, not based on the whims of corporate investors but instead on local projects that provide for peoples basic needs. The young people painted houses, cleared trash from empty lots, made playgrounds, planted gardens, and painted a mural. But this was much more than a paint-it, fix-it summer program. It was a volunteer program with a clear agenda of political education. On the last day the whole group toured the work sites and showed each other their handi- work. Less tangible, but equally important, was the fact that they had lived and worked together: white suburban teenagers and college students; African Americans and Latinos from the city, half of them young women; a few lesbian or gay. Shea Howell, one of the founders of Detroit Summer, had said to me some years earlier: Come to Detroit and see the future! In 1993 I volunteered to cookf or Detroit Sum- mer, a practical way that I, as an outsider and adult, could support the project. Detroit brought many things together for me: the opportunities as well as the severe challenges posed by postindustrial cities with their devastated physical infrastructure, poverty, and racial segregation; the need to rethink the economy and to initiate eco- logically sound projects that could support local people; and the importance of work- ing together to rebuild communities across generations, but with young people cen- trally involved. The group who initiated Detroit Summer had a history of working together politically. They'd been in Detroit at least twenty years, some much longer; they had connections, reputations, and a track record. Standing on Common Ground Coalitions and alliances need practical contexts as well as processes where people can work together and grow in their knowledge and trust of each other. The following issues are just a few examples that have the potential to bring ecofeminists and environmental justice activists together in a much more concerted way than is happening currently. Environmental Health Working in toxic workplaces is a serious health hazard for women, especially women of color. Some industrial firms have kept women of child-bearing age out of the most hazardous work-often the best paid in the factory-or required that they be sterilized first, to avoid being sued if these workers later give birth to babies with disabilities. High incidences of lead posioning in young children, cancer clusters in various parts of the country, and environmental illnesses involving sensitivity to chemicals are just a few environmental health issues that can bring together women's health advocates and grassroots environmental groups.20 Food Production A specific example of environmental illness is pesticide poisoning of farmworkers, many of whom are Mexicans and Mexican American. Contaminated produce is not good for consumers either. Middle-class mothers were very effective in get- ting the pesticide Alar banned in the United States in the late 1980s because it can damage children's health, but they showed no apparent awareness of or con- cern for farmworkers exposed to it in the course of their work.21 In many areas mainly white, middle-class consumers choose to buy organically grown produce, which does nothing to improve conditions for farmworkers. Much more needs to be done to build alliances between farmworkers and consumers, for example by supporting farmworkers' campaigns for better working conditions, shopping at local farmers' markets, investing in producer/consumer cooperatives, as well as by increasing public awareness of the dangers of pesticides. Making Cities Liveable The literature on Green cities emphasizes air pollution, auto congestion, urban sprawl, energy overconsumption, toxins, deteriorated buildings, and an absence of open space as key issues.22 These problems are seen in terms of the physical design of cities, which is based on cars. Though mention is sometimes made of political, economic, and cultural obstacles to ecologically sound cities, planners and architects tend to emphasize new or revamped architectural designs and trans- portation technologies. Other aspects of urban life-affordable housing, em- ployment, amenities, environmental health, and personal safety-are equally critical. People organizing around such issues in urban neighborhoods, often women, understand only too well the connections between poor physical environments, poverty, and racism. As exemplified by Detroit Summer, this is a fruitful area for building alliances between ecofeminists and environmental justice activists.

**These disparities called us to investigate how society has historically gone about social change:**

**Change is organic, and movements are ecological. They encompass various actors, interests, and methods all of which work towards a common goal. A constant threat to this delicate ecosystem is the lack of attention to the role of privilege and experiential understanding play in understandings of structural and material realities.**

**For example, movements not based on race have tended to sidestep the issue through either tokenization or outright exclusion, resulting in the destruction of communities of color under the guise of overall progress. This false neutrality not only divides movements, but it stops true progress by preventing us from challenging the most pervasive systems of oppression**

**Olson 11**

Joel, Founder Bring the Ruckus, associate professor of [political theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_theory) at [Northern Arizona University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern_Arizona_University) in [Flagstaff](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flagstaff,_Arizona) and a [social justice](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice) [activist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Activist).

(“Whiteness and the 99%”, 2011 http://bringtheruckus.org/files/OWS\_Whiteness.pdf”)

The white democracy exists today. Take any social indicator—rates for college graduation, homeownership, median family wealth, incarceration, life expectancy, infant mortality, cancer, unemployment, median family debt, etc.—and you’ll find the same thing: whites as a group are significantly better off than any other racial group. Of course there are individual exceptions, but as a group whites enjoy more wealth, less debt, more education, less imprisonment, more health care, less illness, more safety, less crime, better treatment by the police, and less police brutality than any other group. Some whisper that this is because whites have a better work ethic. But history tells us that the white democracy, born in the 1600s, lives on.¶ The distorted white mindset¶ No one is opposed to good schools, safe neighborhoods, healthy communities, and economic security for whites. The problem is that in the white democracy, whites often enjoy these at the expense of communities of color. This creates a distorted mindset among many whites: they praise freedom yet support a system that clearly favors the rich, even at the expense of poor whites. (Tea Party, I’m talking to you.)¶ The roots of **left colorblindness** lie in the **white democracy** and the **distorted mindset it creates**. It encourages whites to think that **their issues are “universal” while those of people of color are “specific**.” But that is exactly backwards. The struggles of people of color are the problems that **everyone shares**. Anyone in the occupy movement who has been treated brutally by the police has to know that Black communities are terrorized by cops every day. Anyone who is unemployed has to know that Black unemployment rates are always at least double that of whites, and Native American unemployment rates are far higher. Anyone who is sick and lacks healthcare has to know that people of color are the least likely to be insured (regardless of their income) and have the highest infant mortality and cancer rates and the lowest life expectancy rates. Anyone who is drowning in debt should know that the median net wealth of Black households is twenty times less than that of white households. Only left colorblindness can lead us to ignore these facts.¶ This is the sinister impact of white democracy on our movements. It **encourages a mindset that insists that racial issues are “divisive**” when they are at the absolute center of everything we are fighting for.¶ To defeat left colorblindness and the distorted white mindset, we must come to see any form of favoritism toward whites (whether explicit or implicit) as an evil attempt to perpetuate the cross-class alliance rather than build the 99%.¶ The only thing that can stop us is us¶ Throughout American history, attacking the white democracy has always opened up radical possibilities for all people. The abolitionist movement not only overthrew slavery, it kicked off the women’s rights and labor movements. The civil rights struggle not only overthrew legal segregation, it kicked off the women’s rights, free speech, student, queer, Chicano, Puerto Rican, and American Indian movements. When the pillars of the white democracy tremble, everything is possible.¶ The only thing that can stop us is us. What prevents the 99% from organizing the world as we see fit is not the 1%. The 1% cannot hold on to power if we decide they shouldn’t. What keeps us from building the new world in our hearts are the divisions among us.¶ Our diversity is our strength. But left colorblindness is a rejection of diversity. It is an effort to keep white interests at the center of the movement even as the movement claims to be open to all. Urging us to “get over” so-called “divisive” issues like race sound inclusive, but they are really efforts to maintain the white democracy. It’s like Wall Street executives telling us to “get beyond” “divisive” issues like their unfair profits because if you work hard enough, you too can get a job on Wall Street someday!¶ Creating a 99% requires putting the struggles of people of color at the center of our conversations and demands rather than relegating them to the margins. To fight against school segregation, colonization, redlining, and anti-immigrant attacks is to fight against everything Wall Street stands for, everything the Tea Party stands for, everything this government stands for. It is to fight against the white democracy, which stands at the path to a free society like a troll at the bridge.

**Additionally, modern political debates usually frame energy in terms of the interest of either the polar bears or the profiteers. However, we think it’s time for these deliberations to take into account the plight of the marginalized. The unjust nature of the modern energy system has created a vicious cycle of energy poverty. Households are faced with the prospect of “heat or eat” as they are denied equitable access to affordable energy.**

**Murphy, No Date**

Pastor, Cross demoninational organizer, and Recent Recipient of the Sierra Club’s Distinguished Special Service Award

(Reverend Robert F., “GOD’S CURRENCY: ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE” EJ Conference, http://www.ejconference.net/images/Murphy.pdf)

In the midst of this energy revolution - or perhaps there are two or three or even more energy ¶ revolutions, all developing at the same time - who speaks for human rights and environmental justice? There are plenty of people who speak for the polar bears and there are others who speak for General Motors and Halliburton. And, yet, when American leaders talk about energy issues - and, apparently, it doesn’t matter if they’re on the political right or the political left - ¶ very little is said about human needs. “Trust us. We’re all in the same boat,” is the energy message that is delivered in most places in America.. We’ve heard that message before. ¶ In Ireland, and in the United Kingdom and in much of Europe, the leaders who talk about energy ¶ policy are compelled, at some point, to address the topic of fuel poverty. “Fuel poverty” is a ¶ term that is seldom heard on the American side of the Atlantic so it’s necessary to pause at this ¶ point to provide a definition. Fuel poverty exists when a household is spending an excessive amount of its income on the basics of home heating and lighting. There are different opinions ¶ about what “excessive amount” involves but, in most places, it’s agreed that a family is in trouble when it has to pay 15% or more of its net income for a home energy supply. When families ¶ are faced with high energy bills that are difficult to pay, they go into debt or they start to make compromises. Sometimes, families are pushed into what sailors call “harm’s way.” (4) I’m a parish minister, on Cape Cod, in Massachusetts. The term “fuel poverty” is still new in ¶ Massachusetts. However, on Cape Cod, there is a familiar phenomenon known as, “Heat or eat?” Energy costs in our region are very high. When fuel bills rise, the poor people in our ¶ region are squeezed very hard. In order to pay for food, or for medical care and prescription ¶ drugs, or for other basics, families make difficult choices and, frequently, they are forced into ¶ dangerous situations. Thermostats are turned down to levels that are much too low for winter ¶ in New England. In extreme cases, families stop heating their homes in order to save money. ¶ Or people try to survive with candles and space heaters. Trash is burned in home fireplaces. ¶ Many people turn to religious organizations for fuel assistance. As early as Labor Day, members ¶ of the clergy start to receive calls from the needy. “Reverend, my family needs a load of fuel oil ¶ in order to heat our house and we still haven’t paid for the last one.” “The electric company is ¶ threatening to turn the power off.” And, also, a pastor on Cape Cod is likely to hear from a man ¶ or a woman who says, “I’ve got a junker for a car but I need it in order to get to work. Can you ¶ help me with the repair bills? If I can’t get to work, I’ll lose my job and I’ll be on the street.” ¶ Human rights and human dignity are energy dependent. **All people need adequate sources of energy that are safe, affordable, and sustainable. Americans need to declare these simple points at the beginning of the new debates about energy** independence and global warming. Let ¶ us acknowledge, also, that many Americans need more energy, not less, in order to survive ¶ How many Americans die each year because of the effects of extreme cold? Medical reports indicate that an estimated 30,000 people die each year in the United Kingdom because of the ¶ ¶ impact of cold weather. Most of the deceased are elderly and most die from respiratory diseases ¶ ¶ or coronary conditions that are caused or aggravated by fuel poverty. Children under the age of ¶ ¶ three are also at special risk in situations that involve the extremes of heat and cold. Medical ¶ ¶ librarians and health care workers on Cape Cod have helped me to better understand how fuel poverty injures low-income people, the very young, and the very old, but there is surprisingly ¶ ¶ little information on this subject in American medical journals and the problem is seldom, if ¶ ¶ ever, mentioned in journals that focus their attention on energy and the environment. (5) ¶ ¶ Look beyond the United States to see the varieties of “energy injustice.” In many of the ¶ ¶ developing nations, energy production has changed very little since the night that Mary and ¶ ¶ Joseph came into Bethlehem. United Nations agencies estimate that over two billion people in ¶ ¶ the world lack access to adequate sources of energy that are safe, affordable, and sustainable. ¶ ¶ Women and children are prominent among the energy scavengers of the world, and, in some ¶ ¶ places, a mother and her children will spend five hours or more each day searching for ¶ ¶ something to burn. An estimated 1.4 million people die each year because of long exposures to ¶ ¶ home fires fueled by animal dung, crop waste, and other traditional biomass fuels. (6) The whole world is engaged in a struggle for energy. Nations fight with each other to control ¶ ¶ oil and natural gas reserves. And, meanwhile, in nations like Haiti and Brazil, the peasants tear apart forests and hillsides in desperate attempts to obtain fuel. The Niger Delta in Nigeria has ¶ ¶ some of the largest oil deposits in the world, but the marshlands are being poisoned by major energy companies, most of the Nigerian people live in poverty, and many ask, “Where did the oil ¶ ¶ money come from and where did it go?” In parts of the Middle East and in other places in Asia, ¶ ¶ and in parts of Latin America, people ask the same question. Meanwhile, in China and in ¶ ¶ India, political leaders call for more industry and for more energy production in order to support ¶ ¶ national development. In twenty years, as industrial growth and consumer energy use increases, ¶ ¶ these two Asian nations may be the major users of fossil fuels on the globe. And, at times, I’m ¶ ¶ almost sympathetic. China and India both have long histories of incredible poverty. (7) ¶ ¶ “Save the planet!” is the slogan that American conservationists often use. “Stop wasting energy!” “Turn down your thermostats!” “Buy one of the new fuel-efficient automobiles!” Champions of the wilderness lecture about climate change and then tell their audiences, “Save the polar bears!” Low-income families in Haiti and in Nigeria, and in Nashville and in ¶ ¶ Oakland and in Washington, DC, must be astonished when they hear American business ¶ ¶ leaders and conservationists, and even some religious leaders, condemn global warming while ¶ ¶ calling for American energy independence. And, by now, it’s possible that low-income ¶ ¶ families in the United States and in the larger world are starting to feel a bit uneasy. What ¶ ¶ moves American energy policy? Will the poor be sacrificed in order to help “save the earth”?

Poverty kills 232 million a year and neither the law nor politics is neutral-They have been a weapon of the elite. The system is waging a war on the poor everyday and the casualties far surpass those on any “conventional” battlefield

Abu-Jamal 98

(Mumia, Political Activist, “A Quiet and Deadly Violence”, September 19, [http://www.angelfire.com/az /catchphraze/mumiaswords.html](http://www.angelfire.com/az%20/catchphraze/mumiaswords.html))

It has often been observed that America is a truly violent nation, as shown by the thousands of cases of social and communal violence that occurs daily in the nation. Every year, some 20,000 people are killed by others, and additional 20,000 folks kill themselves. Add to this the nonlethal violence that Americans daily inflict on each other, and we begin to see the tracings of a nation immersed in a fever of violence. But, as remarkable, and harrowing as this level and degree of violence is, it is, by far, not the most violent features of living in the midst of the American empire. **We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural' violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness.** Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James **Gilligan observes; By "structural violence" I mean the increased rates of death** and disability **suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society**, as contrasted by those who are above them. **Those excess deaths** (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) **are a function of** the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective **human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society.** These are not acts of God. I am contrasting "structural" with "behavioral violence" by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. --(Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) **This form of violence**, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, **is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious.** How dangerous is it--really? Gilligan notes: [E]very fifteen years, on the average**, as many** people die because of relative poverty **as** would be killed in a nuclear war that caused **232 million deaths; and every** single **year,** two to **three times** as many people **die from poverty** throughout the world **as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews** over a six-year period. **This is**, in effect**, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending**, in fact **accelerating, thermonuclear war,** or genocide **on the** weak and **poor every year** of every decade, throughout the world. [Gilligan, p. 196] Worse still, in a thoroughly capitalist society, **much of that violence became internalized, turned back on the Self,** because, in a society based on the priority of wealth, **those who own nothing are taught to loathe themselves, as if something is inherently wrong with themselves**, instead of the social order that promotes this self-loathing. **This intense self-hatred was often manifested in familial violence** as when the husband beats the wife, the wife smacks the son, and the kids fight each other. **This** vicious, **circular, and invisible violence, unacknowledged by the corporate media, uncriticized in substandard educational systems, and un- understood by the very folks who suffer** in its grips, feeds on the spectacular and more common forms of violence that the system makes damn sure -that we can recognize and must react to it. **This fatal and systematic violence may be called The War on the Poor**. It is found in every country, submerged beneath the sands of history, buried, yet ever present, as omnipotent as death. In the struggles over the commons in Europe, when the peasants struggled and lost their battles for their commonal lands (a precursor to similar struggles throughout Africa and the Americas), this violence was sanctified, by church and crown, as the 'Divine Right of Kings' to the spoils of class battle. Scholars Frances Fox-Piven and Richard A Cloward wrote, in The New Class War (Pantheon, 1982/1985): They did not lose because landowners were immune to burning and preaching and rioting. They lost because the usurpations of owners were regularly defended by the legal authority and the armed force of the state. It was the state that imposed increased taxes or enforced the payment of increased rents, and evicted or jailed those who could not pay the resulting debts. It was the state that made lawful the appropriation by landowners of the forests, streams, and commons, and imposed terrifying penalties on those who persisted in claiming the old rights to these resources. It was the state that freed serfs or emancipated sharecroppers only to leave them landless. (52) **The "Law", then, was a tool of the powerful to protect their interests**, then, as now. **It was a weapon against the poor and impoverished,** then, as now. **It punished retail violence, while turning a blind eye to the wholesale violence daily done by their class masters. The law was, and is, a tool of state power, utilized to protect the status quo, no matter how oppressive that status was, or is**. Systems are essentially ways of doing things that have concretized into tradition, and custom, without regard to the rightness of those ways. **No system that causes this kind of harm to people should be allowed to remain**, based solely upon its time in existence. Systems must serve life, or be discarded as a threat and a danger to life. **Such systems must pass away, so that their great and terrible violence passes away with them.**

**Justice must be our overriding imperative-All communities are interconnected. Damage in one sows seeds of destruction in another. In return, we reap wars, and environmental destruction – Intellectual and political expediency is flypaper to progress. Making energy justice our intellectual strategy is key to incorporating these communities and non-human nature into decision making while laying the foundation for a sustainable politics**

**Bryant 95**

(Bunyan Bryant**,** Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, and an adjunct professor in the Center for Afro-American and African Studies at the University of Michigan, 1995, Environmental Justice: Issues, Policies, and Solutions, p. 209-212)

Although the post-World War II economy was designed when environmental consideration was not a problem, today this is no longer the case; we must be concerned enough about environmental protection to make it a part of our economic design. Today, temporal and spatial relations of pollution have drastically changed within the last 100 years or so. A hundred years ago we polluted a small spatial area and it took the earth a short time to heal itself. Today we pollute large areas of the earth – as evidenced by the international problems of acid rain, the depletion of the ozone layer, global warming, nuclear meltdowns, and the difficulties in the safe storage of spent fuels from nuclear power plants. Perhaps we have embarked upon an era of pollution so toxic and persistent that it will take the earth in some areas thousands of years to heal itself. To curtail environmental pollutants, we must build new institutions to prevent widespread destruction from pollutants that know no geopolitical boundaries. We need to do this because pollutants are not respectful of international boundaries; it does little good if one country practices sound environmental protection while its neighbors fail to do so. Countries of the world are intricately linked together in ways not clear 50 years ago; they find themselves victims of environmental destruction even though the causes of that destruction originated in another part of the world. Acid rain, global warming, depletion of the ozone layer, nuclear accidents like the one at Chernobyl, make all countries vulnerable to environmental destruction. The cooperative relations forged after World War II are now obsolete. New cooperative relations need to be agreed upon – cooperative relations that show that pollution prevention and species preservation are inseparably linked to economic development and survival of planet earth. Economic development is linked to pollution prevention even though the market fails to include the true cost of pollution in its pricing of products and services; it fails to place a value on the destruction of plant and animal species. To date, most industrialized nations, the high polluters, have had an incentive to pollute because they did not incur the cost of producing goods and services in a nonpolluting manner. The world will have to pay for the true cost of production and to practice prudent stewardship of our natural resources if we are to sustain ourselves on this planet. We cannot expect Third World countries to participate in debt-for-nature swaps as a means for saving the rainforest or as a means for the reduction of greenhouse gases, while a considerable amount of such gases come from industrial nations and from fossil fuel consumption. Like disease, population growth is politically, economically, and structurally determined. Due to inadequate income maintenance programs and social security, families in developing countries are more apt to have large families not only to ensure the survival of children within the first five years, but to work the fields and care for the elderly. As development increases, so do education, health, and birth control. In his chapter, Buttel states that ecological development and substantial debt forgiveness would be more significant in alleviating Third World environmental degradation (or population problems) than ratification of any UNCED biodiversity or forest conventions. Because population control programs fail to address the structural characteristics of poverty, such programs for developing countries have been for the most part dismal failures. Growth and development along ecological lines have a better chance of controlling population growth in developing countries than the best population control programs to date. Although population control is important, we often focus a considerable amount of our attention on population problems of developing countries. Yet there are more people per square mile in Western Europe than in most developing countries. “During his/her lifetime an American child causes 35 times the environmental damage of an Indian child and 280 times that of a Haitian child (Boggs, 1993: 1). The addiction to consumerism of highly industrialized countries has to be seen as a major culprit, and thus must be balanced against the benefits of population control in Third World countries. Worldwide environmental protection is only one part of the complex problems we face today. We cannot ignore world poverty; it is intricately linked to environmental protection. If this is the case, then how do we deal with world poverty? How do we bring about lasting peace in the world? Clearly we can no longer afford a South Africa as it was once organized, or ethnic cleansing by Serbian nationalists. These types of conflicts bankrupt us morally and destroy our connectedness with one another as a world community. Yet, we may be headed on a course where the politically induced famine, poverty, and chaos of Somalia today will become commonplace and world peace more difficult, particularly if the European Common Market, Japan, and the United States trade primarily among themselves, leaving Third World countries to fend for themselves. Growing poverty will lead only to more world disequilibrium to wars and famine – as countries become more aggressive and cross international borders for resources to ward off widespread hunger and rampant unemployment. To tackle these problems requires a quantum leap in global cooperation and commitment of the highest magnitude; it requires development of an international tax, levied through

the United nations or some other international body, so that the world community can become more involved in helping to deal with issues of environmental protection, poverty, and peace. Since the market system has been bold and flexible enough to meet changing conditions, so too must public institutions. They must, indeed, be able to respond to the rapid changes that reverberate throughout the world. If they fail to change, then we will surely meet the fate of the dinosaur. The Soviet Union gave up a system that was unworkable in exchange for another one. Although it has not been easy, individual countries of the former Soviet Union have the potential of reemerging looking very different and stronger. Or they could emerge looking very different and weaker. They could become societies that are both socially and environmentally destructive or they can become societies where people have decent jobs, places to live, educational opportunities for all citizens, and sustainable social structures that are safe and nurturing. Although North Americans are experiencing economic and social discomforts, we too will have to change, or we may find ourselves engulfed by political and economic forces beyond our control. In 1994, the out-sweeping of Democrats from national offices may be symptomatic of deeper and more fundamental problems. If the mean-spirited behavior that characterized the 1994 election is carried over into the governance of the country, this may only fan the flames of discontent. We may be embarking upon a long struggle over ideology, culture, and the very heart and soul of the country. But despite all the political turmoil, we must take risks and try out new ideas – ideas never dreamed of before and ideas we thought were impossible to implement. To implement these ideas we must overcome institutional inertia in order to enhance intentional change. We need to give up tradition and “business as usual.” To view the future as a challenge and as an opportunity to make the world a better place, we must be willing to take political and economic risks. The question is not growth, but what kind of growth, and where it will take place. For example, we can maintain current levels of productivity or become even more productive if we farm organically. Because of ideological conflicts, it is hard for us to view the Cuban experience with an unjaundiced eye; but we ask you to place political differences aside and pay attention to the lyrics of organic farming and not to the music of Communism. In other words, we must get beyond political differences and ideological conflicts; we must find success stories of healing the planet no matter where they exist – be they in Communist or non-Communist countries, developed or underdeveloped countries. We must ascertain what lessons can be learned from them, and examine how they would benefit the world community. In most instances, we will have to chart a new course. Continued use of certain technologies and chemicals that are incompatible with the ecosystem will take us down the road of no return. We are already witnessing the catastrophic destruction of our environment and disproportionate impacts of environmental insults on communities of color and low-income groups. If such destruction continues, it will undoubtedly deal harmful blows to our social, economic, and political institutions. As a nation, we find ourselves in a house divided, where the cleavages between the races are in fact getting worse. We find ourselves in a house divided where the gap between the rich and the poor has increased. We find ourselves in a house divided where the gap between the young and the old has widened. During the 1980s, there were few visions of healing the country. In the 1990s, despite the catastrophic economic and environmental results of the 1980s, and despite the conservative takeover of both houses of Congress, we must look for glimmers of hope. We must stand by what we think is right and defend our position with passion. And at times we need to slow down and reflect and do a lot of soul searching in order to redirect ourselves, if need be. We must chart out a new course of defining who we are as a people, by redefining our relationship with government, with nature, with one another, and where we want to be as a nation. We need to find a way of expressing this definition of ourselves to one another. Undeniably we are a nation of different ethnic groups and races, and of multiple interest groups, and if we cannot live in peace and in harmony with ourselves and with nature it bodes ominously for future world relations. Because economic institutions are based upon the growth paradigm of extracting and processing natural resources, we will surely perish if we use them to foul the global nest. But it does not have to be this way. Although sound environmental policies can be compatible with good business practices and quality of life, we may have to jettison the moral argument of environmental protection in favor of the self-interest argument, thereby demonstrating that the survival of business enterprises is intricately tied to good stewardship of natural resources and environmental protection. Too often we forget that short-sightedness can propel us down a narrow path, where we are unable to see the long-term effects of our actions. The ideas and policies discussed in this book are ways of getting ourselves back on track. The ideas presented here will hopefully provide substantive material for discourse. These policies are not carved in stone, nor are they meant to be for every city, suburb, or rural area. Municipalities or rural areas should have flexibility in dealing with their site-specific problems. Yet we need to extend our concern about local sustainability beyond geopolitical boundaries, because dumping in Third World countries or in the atmosphere today will surely haunt the world tomorrow. Ideas presented here may irritate some and dismay others, but we need to make some drastic changes in our lifestyles and institutions in order to foster environmental justice. Many of the policy ideas mentioned in this book have been around for some time, but they have not been implemented. The struggle for environmental justice emerging from the people of color and low-income communities may provide the necessary political impulse to make these policies a reality. Environmental justice provides opportunities for those most affected by environmental degradation and poverty to make policies to save not only themselves from differential impact of environmental hazards, but to save those responsible for the lion’s share of the planet’s destruction. This struggle emerging from the environmental experience of oppressed people brings forth a new consciousness – a new consciousness shaped by immediate demands for certainty and solution. It is a struggle to make a true connection between humanity and nature. This struggle to resolve environmental problems may force the nation to alter its priorities; it may force the nation to address issues of environmental justice and, by doing so, it may ultimately result in a cleaner and healthier environment for all of us. Although we may never eliminate all toxic materials from the production cycle, we should at least have that as a goal.

### Contention 2: Energy Justice and You

We can create change by challenging the spaces we occupy:

This debate is about changing the way oppressed communities in general, and poor people of color in particular are systematically excluded from intellectual discussions and decision-making regarding energy policy. Our solution is environmental justice.

Too often students get caught up in questions of the “what” and the “how” as opposed to the “why”. There is an assumed neutrality within various systems that does not exist. This is damning because it belies the way in which our actions and solutions negatively effect marginalized populations. Often times that marginalization is intrinsically tied to the problem we seek to address.

This mode of decision-making turns debate into an arena in which we argue about the best way to treat the symptoms of an illness, while ignoring the disease. We seemingly craft better energy policies, doing so at the cost of tackling the social systems that created them. This leads us to feel accomplished in addressing any given singular issue as it appears, while overlooking it’s deeper causes and how that makes newer manifestations of the problem inevitable. This reduces the educational value of any theorization or problem solving because in overlooking underlying causes, we’re prone to error replication.

So in affirming this year’s topic, Crowe **and I advocate that oppressed communities be placed at the center of our energy production policy.**

Our role as academics is to prioritize questions of environmental justice in the debate space. Not only is this key to solve, but also to understand the foundations that create the need for new energy and environmental policies. Our method lays the groundwork for political action anemic to injustice. It’s time to bring the movement to the classroom

**Rodriguez 6**

Ph.D., Social Science Prof @ The University of Puerto Rico

(Jose, RE-VALUING NATURE:ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PEDAGOGY,ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ECOCRITiCISM ANDTHE TEXTUAL ECONOMIES OF NATURE”, 2006, )

For various educators, the act of teaching environmental justiceshould not stray the field from its roots and status as a social movement.^ Indeed, educators advocate a closer relationship between the environmental justice movement and the academy, especiallysince the teaching of environmental justice, as Mighty noted by Robert Figueroa, brings the teacher to a critical! position in the teachingprocess, a spot from which the teacher must place the classroom and its teaching within the context of the environmental justice movementand the environmental inequalities that characterizes our world today(311) .^ For environmental justice educators the classroom is a "space” where citizens can generate and discuss their visions for transformingour social and political worlds in ways that ameliorate environmental injustices" (Figueroa 311).Within a politicized classroom, environmental! justice teachersaim at what Paulo Freire calls conscientization, by which he means theprocess whereby learners, not as mere receivers, but as meaningful and knowing subjects, accomplish a deepening awareness both of the social and cultural! reality that shapes their lives and of their ability to change that reality (27).\*\* It means achieving understanding of their existence in and with the world. For students of environmental!justice It means achieving a better and deeper understanding of the reality of environmental! inequalities and of their ability to ameliorate these inequalities.This same process of eco-justice conscientization underlies,for example, Figueroa's transformative teaching and his concept of "moral imagination" (325-326). Figueroa's goal in teaching environmental justice is to stretch his students' moral imagination, their cognitive ability to apprehend the moral experience, feelings, and judgment of others, to recognize environmental inequalities and to envision social and political changes to overcome these inequalities.He describes his radical teaching thus:Radical pedagogy may be understood as teaching with attitudes andapproaches that politicize the classroom and the curriculum. By identifying the classroom as a place of reproducing institutional processes in a political economy, which in turn generates political actors, we can enliven the student's political imagination. The academic's pursuit of environmental justice carries political baggage and obligation thatmany subjects lack. The study of a contemporary social movement lends itself to the use of pedagogy as a form of activism. The social activism is a consciousness raising that utilizes the moral and political imagination of the student to seriously consider the options for transforming current social conditions. Students feel compelled toask, "What can we do?" and "What is our responsibility?" By askingthese questions, the classroom is transformed into a place where citizens can think these matters through without losing sight that the matters are upon us. (326)Politicizing the classroom in order to aid his students achieve adeeper awareness and understanding of the actuality of environmental inequalities and of their ability to defeat these inequalitiesalso inspires Steve Chase's "constructivist pedagogy" (355-357).Two books. The Human Rights Education Handbook edited by NancyFlowers and Jacqueline G. Brooks and Martin G. Brooks' In Searchof Understanding inspire Chase's teaching. Based on the former.Chase's teaching stresses the concrete experience of his students,active learning activities, student participation, horizontal communication, critical thinking, the expression of feelings, cooperationamong students, and the integration of knowledge, action and feelings (356). Furthermore, Chase's environmental justice education is not just about liberatory knowledge but also about liberatory practices—thus, training students as activists. Finally, the constructivistdimension of Chase's teaching, based on In Search of Understanding,inquires about his students' understanding of concepts before sharing his own understanding of these concepts; encourages students'inquiry by asking thoughtful, open-ended questions; and engagesstudents in experiences that might engender contradictions to theirinitial positions about a particular issue (360-361).Jia-Yi Cheng Levine also implements this idea of conscientizationin her classroom, her goal being the production of "critical consciousness," which in her view is essential to help students "be responsible and responsive world citizens" (371). That is, assisting her students95attain a deeper consciousness and knowledge of environmental! inequalities and of their ability to develop alternatives to the structuresof environmental! inequalities is what motivates Jia-YI Cheng Levine'seducational efforts to form political subjects capable of opposingenvironmental injustices and Inequalities. In her essay "TeachingLiterature of Environmental! Justice in an Advanced Gender Studies Course," Jia-Yi Cheng Levine refers to a particular course aboutwomen and the environment in which she introduced the !literature ofthe environmental justice movement to her students, exposing themto various political, social and ecological issues. As she explains:"By introducing literature of environmental justice to our students,we help form political subjects who would seek to dismantle racism,sexism, classism, and unbridled capitalism, which wreak havoc on our planet and our people" (378). Her teaching is certainly aimed atconscientization, as she makes dear:Teaching is more than transmitting knowledge or modes of thinking; it helps form political subjects who will determine the future of this planetwe call home. My goal for teaching literature of environmental justicewas to foster a literacy of the environment in my students' everydaylives, to call their attention lo the power structures of society and the political struggles of the impoverished, as well as to encourage them to examine configurations of knowledge and the dispensation of power. By addressing the interrelated issues of race, gender, class,and the environment, I wanted to bring environmental and socialjustice education into the class. (368)Jia-Yi Cheng Levine's teaching then seeks to empower students as critical and conscientious political subjects while asking them tostudy, question and confront the history, and ideological! frameworksthat have contributed both to the environmental degradation we experience nowadays and to the production of environmental inequalities.In her particular gender studies course, literature greatly facilitatedthe process of conscientization, thus assigning a significant role toliterature as a liberatory pedagogical tool for environmental justiceeducators. Although perhaps more suitable for literature courses,the study of literature helps students in any course reach a reflective awareness and a thoughtful understanding of the material andideological character of environmental inequalities and of their abilityto transform unequal! conditions. The usefulness and effectivenessof literature as a pedagogical tool, t insist, is not !limited to !literaturecourses. Rather, !literature, and its analysis, is a practical, helpful andconstructive toot in a wide variety of courses, especially if we use theword "literature" vaguely to include not just poetry, fictional proseand nature writing but also non-fictional writing and any other kindsof texts in which issues of environmental justice appear, or that might provide us with the opportunity to address these issues in the classroom.^ Enabling students to examine how texts produce meaningand value provides them with a larger picture of political, social andcultural processes that shape daily life and various social struggles,including environmental justice struggles Integrating Environmental Justice Eco criticism to theCiassroomThe fundamental question behind environmental justice educators integrating texts containing environmental justice issues andits analysis into their classrooms is this: **H**ow can texts and textual analysis further our efforts as teachers to help our students achieve a deeper awareness and understanding of the reality of environmental inequities and of their ability to ameliorate these inequalities? Hence,these teachers presuppose, as Jia-Yi Cheng Levine's teaching exemplifies, that the introduction of texts, including environmental justiceliterature and its study and criticism, into the classroom is useful inhelping our students grow to be political subjects who would seek toquestion and challenge environmental inequalities while proposingalternatives that promote justice, equality and democracy.

**Equitable solutions regarding energy production require making justice our first priority. Placing disadvantaged communities at the center of our decision-making ensures the inevitable transition to renewables is a mechanism for emancipatory change and community empowerment. The alternative is the solidification of exclusionary distributional systems and newer forms of violence**

**Abramsky 10**

Abramsky (visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Science, Technology and Society; fmr. coordinator of the Danish‑based World Wind Energy Institute) 10

(Koyla, SPARKING AN ENERGY REVOLUTION Building New Relations of Production, Exchange, and Livelihood in Sparking A Worldwide Energy Revolution, ed. Koyla Abramsky, pg. 642)

The global flows of knowledge, raw materials, money, and labor that shape the sector are undergoing a far‑reaching and highly‑uneven restructuring. The division of labor, workforce, and market ‑associated with the renewable energies sector globally is still relatively small and young compared to most other global industries The long term evolution of the global workforce, market, and ownership structures within the industry is still a very open question; it could develop in many different directions. However, this outcome will not be determined either by chance or by good intentions, but rather by the outcome of struggles for control of the sector. It will be a struggle that places states and companies in competition with one another. It will also be a competition between workers (both waged and unwaged) and their communities. Much depends on the degree to which technology transfer is a commercial process or a non‑commercial one, which itself will only be determined by the outcome of struggle. Five key factors that decide the outcome of the transition will be: the struggle for territorial control over areas rich in renewable energy resources; the ability to create a skilled worked force; the struggle to control workers in the sector, and their struggles against being controlled; control over the knowledge and technology; and access to the necessary capital. Since we are in such an early phase, it is still possible for communities, social and workers' organizations to have a major influence in shaping the future renewable energy economy. There is a great need to understand and support the emerging movements working for the collective, autonomous, and decentralized control of the expanding sector. It is still very small relative to other energy sectors, and the bulk of the renewable energy infrastructure remains to be built. As such, the next years offer a window of opportunity to ensure that a significant share of the sector can, in fact, come under common ownership and benefit emancipatory social processes. However, time is short, and unless appropriate, globally‑reaching interventions are made very soon the window will likely be quickly dosed. As the book has sought to make dear, a transition to renewable energies might well be carried out on the backs of communities who live in territories that are rich in renewable energy sources, and workers who produce the necessary infrastructure. This is already leading to new forms of exclusion, dispossession, violence, and exploitation, or at best the draining of these resources for use elsewhere. The current expansion of the world‑market is an attack on rural communities throughout the world. Whereas fossil fuels and nuclear energy resources are found in a small number of locations, renewable energy resources are broadly spread throughout much of the planet, giving increased strategic importance to large parts of the rural world. This means that the quest far renewable energy could result in a new and perhaps unprecedented landgrab by companies and investors, which would create the potential for even more extreme patterns of displacement and appropriation of land than other forms of energy have done. This is already occurring with alarming rapidity and brutality due to the rapid global expansion of agrofuels produced for trade in the world‑market (rather than for local community‑controlled consumption). To a lesser extent, it is also occurring in relation to wind. In particular, the dependency of urban areas (where large quantities of energy are consumed) on rural ones (who produce it) is becoming an increasing point of conflict, Therefore renewable energies, in addition to offering emancipating possibilities for constructing autonomous and decentrilized energy systems, also represent a new threat for rural communities (especially indigenous and Afro‑descendent), making them increasingly vulnerable to loss of control of their territories and even displacement. As described in these pages, struggles over territory; labor, and ownership, ate all becoming central in shaping the global expansion of the renewable energy sector. A transition, predominantly based on the collective and democratic harnessing of renewable energies, has the potential to result in a significant decentralization of energy production and equalization of access. Communities and individuals could assume greater control over their territories, resources, and lives enabling an emancipatory social change that is based on the construction of autonomous relations of production, exchange, and livelihood. This is especially so for rural communities, which, in theory at least, are ideally located to benefit from renewable energies and to lead the way, since they are richest in natural resources such as wind, sun, biomass, rivers, seas, animal wastes, etc. And this can happen astonishingly fast if communities are given the appropriate tools.

**Frameworks that focus on instrumental energy policy making leads to symptom-focused solutions – We should sequence the question of why exclusion in policy happens – key to opening space for marginalized voices and revealing the racism inherent in energy production policy**

**Scrase and Ockwell 10** (J. Ivan - Sussex Energy Group, SPRU (Science and Technology Policy Research), Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, David G - Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, SPRU, Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, “The role of discourse and linguistic framing effects in sustaining high carbon energy policy—An accessible introduction,” Energy Policy: Volume 38, Issue 5, May 2010, Pages 2225–2233)

The way in which **energy policy is “framed**” refers to the **underlying assumptions policy is based on** and the ways in which **policy debates ‘construct’, emphasise and link particular issues**. For example energy ‘security of supply’ is often emphasised in arguments favouring nuclear-generated electricity. A more limited framing effect operates on individuals in opinion polls and public referendums: here the way in which questions are posed has a strong influence on responses. The bigger, **social framing** effect referred to here **colours societies’ thinking** about whole areas of public life, in this case energy use and its environmental impacts. A **key element** of the proposed reframing advanced by commentators concerned with decarbonising energy use (see, for example, [Scrase and MacKerron, 2009](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib25)) is to cease treating energy as just commercial units of fuel and electricity, and instead **to focus on the energy ‘services’ people need** (warmth, lighting, mobility and so on). This paper helps to explain why any such reframing, however logical and appealing, is politically very challenging if it goes against the perceived interests of powerful groups, particularly when these interests are aligned with certain imperatives which governments must fulfil if they are to avoid electoral defeat. There is a **dominant conception** of **policy-making as an objective, linear process**. In essence the process is portrayed as proceeding in a series of steps from facts to analysis, and then to solutions (for a detailed critique of this linear view see [Fischer, 2003](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib11)). In reality, **policy-making** is usually messy and political, rife with the exercise of **interests and power**. **The veneer of objective, rational policy-making**, that the dominant, linear model of policy-making supports is therefore cause for concern. It effectively sustains energy policy ‘business as usual’ and excludes many relevant voices that might be effective in opening up space to reframe energy policy problems and move towards more sustainable solutions (see, for example, [Ockwell, 2008](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib21)). This echoes concerns with **what counts as knowledge** and **whose voices are heard in policy debates** that have characterised strands of several literatures in recent decades, including science and technology studies, sociology of scientific knowledge, and various strands of the political science and development literatures, particularly in the context of knowledge, discourse and democracy. An alternative to the linear model is provided by a ‘discourse’ perspective. This draws on political scientists’ observations of ways in which politics and policy-making proceed through the use of language, and the expression of values and the assumptions therein. Discourse can be understood as: ‘… a shared way of apprehending the world. Embedded in language it enables subscribers to interpret bits of information and put them together into coherent stories or accounts. Each discourse rests on assumptions, judgements and contentions that provide the basic terms for analysis, debates, agreements and disagreements…’ [Dryzek (1997, p.8)](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib5). A discursive approach rejects the widely held assumption that policy language is a **neutral medium** through which ideas and an objective world are represented and discussed ([Darcy, 1999](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib4)). Discourse analysts examine and explain language use in a way that helps to **reveal the underlying interests, value judgements and beliefs** that are often **disguised by policy actors’** factual claims and the arguments that these are used to support. For example UK energy policy review documents issued in 2006–2007 are criticised below for presenting information in ways that subtly but consistently favoured new nuclear power while purporting to be undecided on the issue. People (including scientific and policy experts) **base their understanding of problems and solutions on their knowledge, experiences, interpretations and value judgements**. These are **coloured and shaped** by social interactions, for example by what is considered an ‘appropriate’ perspective in one's work life within certain institutions. Policy actors therefore expend considerable effort on influencing the design and evolution of institutions in order to ensure problems and solutions are framed in ways they favour. Thus discourse is fundamental to the way that institutions are created, but in the short-term institutions also have a constraining or structuring effect. At a more fundamental level there are even more rigid constraints, which can be identified as a set of core imperatives, such as sustained economic growth and national security, which states and their governments, with very few exceptions, must fulfil in order to ensure their survival ([Dryzek et al., 2003](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471" \l "bib6)—these are explored in detail further below).

## 2ac

### framework 2ac

**Resolved is just to come to a concrete decision**

**Dictionary.com**

http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved

re·solve   [ri-zolv] Show IPA verb, -solved, -solv·ing, noun

verb (used with object)

1.

to come to a definite or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full.

**Should is to an obligation used for criticism**

**Oxford Dictionaries**

1used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness, typically when criticizing someone’s actions:

#### we must reject the hegemony of governmental policy making – our role as energy policy researchers should be making visible exclusion – our methodology is key to effective policy making

**Scrase and Ockwell 10** (J. Ivan - Sussex Energy Group, SPRU (Science and Technology Policy Research), Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, David G - Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, SPRU, Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, “The role of discourse and linguistic framing effects in sustaining high carbon energy policy—An accessible introduction,” Energy Policy: Volume 38, Issue 5, May 2010, Pages 2225–2233)

This paper has provided several examples where central elements of energy policy have been discursively constructed so as to speak directly to core **government priorities, such as economic growth and national security**. This has served to **maintain the dominance of the current framing of energy policy** and to **promote certain political interests**. This is a challenging observation if one argues that energy policy needs to be **reframed**. The transition to a low carbon economy may be a good idea. Indeed, it is one that is increasingly central in policy discourses in both developed and developing countries. This does not, however, necessarily mean that this discursive shift will have any specific material impact on energy policy. The institutional constraints on discursive developments here still exist and must be **confronted** (or conformed to) **before new policy ideas are likely to gain** any **influence**. Having an impact on the core of energy policy requires **confronting the** dominance, or ‘**discursive hegemony’** of the existing way in which policy is framed – within the context of the constraints that have shaped and **f**acilitated this existing framing. This is almost a ‘Catch-22’ situation if one wants to see urgent action to tackle climate change: to be radical but excluded (and potentially right only with hindsight), or gradualist and engaged in a process that may move too slowly to avert disaster. This argument suggests that reframing energy policy is only likely to be successful if the arguments that support it are discursively constructed in such a way as to speak to core government imperatives. If climate change is one of the central reasons behind needing to reframe energy policy, then the fact that the environment sits outside of the core imperatives that governments have to deliver against to ensure their survival implies that this could be very challenging indeed. It is, of course, possible that future events might transpire to alter this. As mentioned above, catastrophic climate impacts might well mean that protecting the environment becomes a core government imperative. But by this point it may well be too late for any reframing of energy policy to be effective in tackling climate change. Of course there is the possibility in the shorter term that the government imperative to sustain representative legitimacy will put tackling climate on an equal footing with security or economic growth. For this to happen in a relevant timeframe, however, will require extraordinary popular pressure and institutional changes. Ideas serving expansion of fossil fuel markets are strongly embedded in today's predominantly technocratic and nationalistic energy policy discourses. We hope that this article has served to provide an accessible introduction to the ways in which discourse and linguistic framing effects might be playing a role in sustaining **energy policy frameworks** that are **resistant to** the many insightful **changes** often advocated in the pages of Energy Policy. If the influence of such framing effects is accepted, we begin to see how the process of effecting changes in energy policy is not just a technical or economic task, but also a political task. Moreover, this highlights an urgent need for civil society to engage directly with the existing framing of energy policy and the problems it seeks to address in an effort to reframe it around more sustainable, low carbon principles and concerns. The demonstration of the value of a **discourse analytic approach** in this paper, together with other emerging contributions in this field (cited above), also serves to highlight some **important considerations for energy policy researchers**. Moving away from the traditional linear understanding of the policy process **requires researchers to critically reflect** on the interplay of values, beliefs, entrenched interests and institutional structures that serve to **facilitate or constrain the policy traction** of certain framings of **energy policy problems and solutions**. Further than this, it also highlights the **role** in this process that we ourselves play as **researchers**, and the extent to which our own values, beliefs and interests influence the **framing of our research practice and communication**. This has important and far reaching implications, both methodological and normative, raising considerations that are likely to continue to **gain traction** as researchers and policy makers alike increasingly appreciate the need for reflexivity in our approach to **framing**, interpreting and implementing **energy policy** in the decades to come.[2](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#fn2)

We’re a prerequisite-We must account for the role racism and oppression play in our society in order have any true understanding of policy

DeGroat 95

Bernie, News and Information Services, quoting Cornell West, Prof at Princeton

(Education should be a 'training ground for citizenship,' West says, June 5, 1995, http://www.ur.umich.edu/9495/Jun05\_95/west.htm)

Academia is an integral component in overcoming multicultural problems that plague American society today**,** Harvard scholar Cornell West told administrators at a recent campus meeting. "I believe, frankly, that we're living among the most frightening and terrifying moments in history," he said. "The level of polarization and increase in cold-heartedness and mean-spiritedness is, in fact, the making of the unraveling of democracy. "I do believe that institutions of higher learning, especially elite institutions of higher learning, can play a very important role in trying to renew, regenerate and rejuvenate democratic responsibility." West, professor of religion and Afro-American studies at Harvard, said that academic institutions must be committed to high-quality scholarly input in the quest for truth and knowledge. "With issues of race, gender and sexual orientation, it's very important to cast any such reflection on those issues at an intellectual level," he said. "So when we're talking about race and the legacy of white supremacy, the ways in which that legacy is inseparable from the rest of the development ofdemocracy inAmerica isnot a matter of being psychologically sensitive, it'san intellectual issue. "We can't understand modernity**,** we can't understand the age of Europe, we can't understand the American experience without understanding the legacy of white supremacy, which includes the suffering of people of color, but also includes the various moral choices and political commitments of Americans of all colors**,** vis-a-vis this dividing issue, both in this country and in Europe. These are not in any way PC issues to be jettisoned, but rather to understand these issues as part of what it is to be human, what it is to be modern, what it is to be New World, what it is to be American." West said that institutions of higher learning must try to facilitate "a broad intellectual conversation based, in part, on the high-quality, scholarly inputthat goes far beyond the academy, contributing to the public culture to ensure that we're confronting some of the most difficult facts and tragic truths of the past and present." Many academicians, he added, must have a broad sense of the interrelationships and interdependence of different peoples and institutions. "This is not the calling of every academic and ought not to be, since there's a division of labor," West said. "But at the same time, if we lose sense of the whole of how things hold together or what it means to relate life to the mind or what it means to be a citizen in a highly intellectual civilization, then I think we are in deep trouble." West also said that public service, in terms of shaping and molding the minds of students, plays an important role in fosteringunderstanding of multiculturalism. "Education should not simply be a site where we acquire skills, but should be a training ground for citizenship," he said. "Public service forces us to affirm the way in which we are linked, are bound together. We have to convince each other that we're all on the same ship, even if it has a huge leak in it."

#### **They short-circuit a holistic understanding of the topic – interrogations of exclusion and racism are key to effective decision-making**

Singer 89

(Joseph William, Associate Professor Boston University of Law, Duke Law Journal)

Spelman argues that the categories and forms of discourse we use, the assumptions with which we approach the world, and the modes of analysis we employ have important consequences in channeling our attention in particular directions. The paradigms we adopt affect what we see and how we interpret it. They determine to a large extent, who we listen to and what we make of what we hear. They determine what questions we ask and the kinds of answers we seek. Investigation into such matters is important, **according to Spelman**, because the seemingly neutral and innocuous assumptions with which we approach the world may blot from our view facts we ourselves would consider to be important. In this way, we may unconsciously recreate or express forms of hierarchy **that we intended to criticize**. Self-reflection about such matters may enable us to ferret out the political effects of seemingly neutral premises. We should be on the lookout for ways in which our approaches to problems of illegitimate power relations reinforce those very relations. Good intentions do not immunize against the illegitimate exercise of power. **In fact**, a great impetus to the exercise of power is the inability to recognize that one is exercising it; when this happens, one need not worry about whether power is being used wisely. One goal of philosophic inquiry, therefore is to understand concretely where privilege lodges in our thought.

**Centering the USFG masks the way violence is locked into the law. This precludes emancipatory knowledge and makes continued knowledge ineviable**

Schlag 93

(Professor of Law @ U of Colorado (Pierre Michigan Law Review p. lexis)

With so much violence at the heart of law, the discipline of law is, in some sense, constantly driven to try to escape from or deny its own violent ontology. Law is thus constantly in flight from itself - seeking to represent itself as some highly purified, chastened, idealized, or redemptive version of itself. This is why in the "law" of the academy we get so much happy talk jurisprudence - promises of law as "a grand conversation," promises of law as subservient to "progressive  [\*2061]  legal thought," promises of law as responsive to the imperatives of "efficiency," promises of a law that is always already one way or another becoming the very best it can be. Of course,this desire for flight from the violent character of law is also why legal thinkers continually confuse and conflate "really **good" legal thought** with legal thought that makes them feel really good. Making the law feel really good - or, in more technical terms, "making the law the best it can be" - is not some mere side effect of legal academic enterprise: it is the legal academic enterprise. It is the perfected expression of a law that is in flight from its own violent ontology. This same pattern is also enacted when we move from the normative celebrations of law to the normative criticisms of law. Indeed, the constitution of law as in flight from its own violent and destructive character helps account for why normative protests that law should be more self-conscious, more empathic, more moral, more sensitive to context, and so on, always resonate with the academic audience and simultaneously always already miss their mark.These claims always resonate because law is always lacking in the humane qualities to which its academic custodians aspire.In this endlessly repeated observation, the academic custodians of the law could not be more right. But the claims also always already miss their mark because, as mere normative or epistemic criticisms, they leave the violent ontology of law completely untouched. Hence, whether cast as celebration or as criticism, the normative prescriptions of the "law" of the academy generally end up as part of the cheerful, happy, self-congratulatory celebration of a law whose violence and destructiveness thus become obscured.

### anthro 2ac

#### **Anthropocentrism is not the root cause of the violence we’re talking about – marginalization occurs for other reasons**

Hayward 97 – Dept of Politics, University of Edinburgh (Tim, Feb., “Anthropocentrism: A Misunderstood Problem,” Environmental Values, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 49-63, JSTOR)

V. WHAT IS WRONG WITH 'OVERCOMING ANTHROPOCENTRISM' The argument so far would suggest that the aim of completely overcoming anthropocentrism in ethics is at best of rhetorical value, since all it does is draw attention to problems which are in fact better conceptualised in narrower and more precise terms. I shall now argue, though, that even as rhetoric the critical employment of the term can be unhelpful, and even positively counterproduc- tive. Proposals for the 'rejection' of anthropocentrism are unhelpful because they cloud the real problem they think to address. The problem has to do with a lack of concern with nonhumans but the term anthropocentrism can all too plausibly be understood as meaning an excessive concern with humans.4 The latter, however, is not the problem at all. On the contrary, a cursory glance around the world would confirm that humans show a lamentable lack of interest in the well- being of other humans. Moreover, even when it is not other humans whose interests are being harmed, but other species or the environment, it would generally be implausible to suggest that those doing the harm are being 'human- centred'. To see this, one only has to consider some typical practices which are appropriately criticised. Some examples would be: hunting a species to extinc- tion; destroying a forest to build a road and factories; animal experimentation. In the case of hunting a species to extinction, this is not helpfully or appropriately seen as 'anthropocentrism' since it typically involves one group of humans who are actually condemned by (probably a majority of) other humans who see the practice not as serving human interests in general, but the interests of one quite narrowly-defined group, such as poachers or whalers. A similar point can be made regarding the destruction of the forest - for those who derive economic benefit from the destruction oppose not only the human interests of indigenous peoples whose environment is thereby destroyed, but also the interests of all humans who depend on the oxygen such forests produce. The case of animal experimentation, however, brings to the fore a feature which looks as if it could more plausibly be said to be anthropocentric: for if we suppose that the benefits of the experimentation are intended to accrue to any and all humans who might need the medicine or technique experimented, then there would seem to be a clear case of humans benefiting as a species from the use and abuse of other species. But the 'if is important here. A reason why I am inclined to resist calling this anthropocentrism is that the benefits may in fact not be intended or destined for humans generally, but only for those who can afford to pay to keep the drug company in profit. As in the other two cases, it is unhelpful to cover over this fundamental point and criticise humanity in general for practices carried out by a limited number of humans when many others may in fact oppose them. There is in any case no need to describe the practice as anthropocentric when it is quite clearly speciesist - it is not the concern with human welfare per se that is the problem here, but the arbitrary privileging of that welfare over the welfare of members of other species. So a reason why critiques of anthropocentrism are unhelpful is that the problems the term is used to highlight do not arise out of a concern of humans with humans, but from a lack of concern for non-humans. I earlier explained why this lack of concern is not appropriately termed anthropocentrism; I now add the further consideration that practices manifesting a lack of concern for nonhumans very often go hand in hand with a lack of concern for other humans too.

#### Perm – do both, but reject the negative’s root cause framing – it misrepresents the intersectionality of oppression and causes ideological backlash – only the perm can successfully subvert dominant structures

Hayward 97 – Dept of Politics, University of Edinburgh (Tim, Feb., “Anthropocentrism: A Misunderstood Problem,” Environmental Values, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 49-63, JSTOR)

Taking this line of argument a step further it becomes evident that anti-anthropocentric rhetoric is not only unhelpful, but positively counterproductive. It is not only conceptually mistaken, but also a practical and strategic mistake, to criticise humanity in general for practices of specific groups of humans. If the point of anti-anthropocentric rhetoric is to highlight problems, to make them vivid in order to get action, then misrepresenting the problem is liable to make solutions all the harder. Something particularly to emphasise is that when radical critics of anthropocentrism see themselves as opposed to defenders of human interests they are seriously in error. From what has just been said about the specificity of environmental, ecological or animal harms merely being disguised by putting the blame on humans in general, it should be evident that those who are concerned about such harms in fact make common cause with those concerned with issues of social justice. The real opponents of both sorts of concern are the ideologists who, in defending harmful practices in the name of 'humans in general', obscure the real causes of the harms as much as the real incidence of benefits: the harms seldom affect all and only nonhumans; the benefits seldom accrue to all humans.5 Yet by appearing to accept the ideolo- gists' own premises, anti-anthropocentric rhetoric plays right into their hands: by appearing to endorse the ideological view that 'humans in general' benefit from the exploitative activities of some, the anti-anthropocentrists are left vulnerable to ideological rejoinders to the effect that challenging those activities is merely misanthropic. The opposite is in fact nearer the truth, I believe, because it will more often be the case that challenging such practices is in the interests of humans more generally.

#### **The alt solves nothing and bites the K link harder – use of human benchmarks makes their non-anthropocentric value scheme impossible**

Hayward 97 – Dept of Politics, University of Edinburgh (Tim, Feb., “Anthropocentrism: A Misunderstood Problem,” Environmental Values, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 49-63, JSTOR)

But if the project of overcoming speciesism can be pursued with some expectation of success, this is not the case with the overcoming of anthropocentrism. What makes anthropocentrism unavoidable is a limitation of a quite different sort, one which cannot be overcome even in principle because it involves a non-contingent limitation on moral thinking as such. While overcoming speciesism involves a commitment to the pursuit of knowledge of relevant similarities and differences between humans and other species, the criteria of relevance will always have an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism about them. Speciesism is the arbitrary refusal to extend moral consideration to relevantly similar cases; the ineliminable element of anthropocentrism is marked by the impossibility of giving meaningful moral consideration to cases which bear no similarity to any aspect of human cases. The emphasis is on the 'meaningful' here: for in the abstract one could of course declare that some feature of the nonhuman world was morally valuable, despite meeting no determinate criterion of value already recognised by any human, but because the new value is completely unrelated to any existing value it will remain radically indeterminate as a guide to action. If the ultimate point of an ethic is to yield a determinate guide to human action, then, the human reference is ineliminable even when extending moral concern to nonhumans. So my argument is that one cannot know if any judgement is speciesist if one has no benchmark against which to test arbitrariness; and, more specifically, if we are concerned to avoid speciesism of humans then one must have standards of comparison between them and others. Thus features of humans remain the benchmark. As long as the valuer is a human, the very selection of criteria of value will be limited by this fact. It is this fact which precludes the possibility of a radically nonanthropocentric value scheme, if by that is meant the adoption of a set of values which are supposed to be completely unrelated to any existing human values. Any attempt to construct a radically non-anthropocentric value scheme is liable not only to be arbitrary - because founded on no certain knowledge - but also to be more insidiously anthropocentric in projecting certain values, which as a matter of fact are selected by a human, onto nonhuman beings without certain warrant for doing so. This, of course, is the error of anthropomorphism, and will inevitably, I believe, be committed in any attempt to expunge anthropocentrism altogether. But is admitting this unavoidable element of anthropocentrism not tanta- mount to admitting the unavoidability of human chauvinism? My claim is that it is not. What is unavoidable is that human valuers make use of anthropocentric benchmarks; yet in doing so, they may find that in all consistency they must, for instance, give priority to vital nonhuman interests over more trivial human interests. For the human chauvinist, by contrast, interests of humans must always take precedence over the interests of nonhumans. Human chauvinism does not take human values as a benchmark of comparison, since it admits no comparison between humans and nonhumans. Human chauvinism ultimately values humans because they are humans. While the human chauvinist may officially claim there are criteria which provide reasons for preferring humans - such as that they have language, rationality, sociality etc. - no amount of evidence that other beings fulfil these criteria would satisfy them that they should be afforded a similar moral concern. The bottom line for the human chauvinist is that being human is a necessary and sufficient condition of moral concern. What I am pointing out as the ineliminable element of anthropocentrism is an asymmetry between humans and other species which is not the product of chauvinist prejudice. To sum up, then, what is unavoidable about anthropocentrism is precisely what makes ethics possible at all. It is a basic feature of the logic of obligation: if an ethic is a guide to action; and if a particular ethic requires an agent to make others ' ends her ends, then they become just that - the agent' s ends. This is a non-contingent but substantive limitation on any attempt to construct a completely nonanthropocentric ethic. Values are always the values o/the valuer:3 so as long as the class of valuers includes human beings, human values are ineliminable. Having argued that this is unavoidable, I also want to argue that it is no bad thing.

**Their pedagogy is bad – they’re telling people of color that their progress must take a backseat to that of non-human animals. The material struggles of oppressed people are then tokenized and trivialized to irrelevance, and racism is footnoted**

**Wise 10**

American anti-racism activist and writer.

(“[With Friends Like These, Who Needs Glenn Beck? Racism and White Privilege on the Liberal-Left](http://www.timwise.org/2010/08/with-friends-like-these-who-needs-glenn-beck-racism-and-white-privilege-on-the-liberal-left/)” August 17th, http://www.timwise.org/2010/08/with-friends-like-these-who-needs-glenn-beck-racism-and-white-privilege-on-the-liberal-left/)

Or consider animal rights activists, especially the folks at PETA, who seem to [go out of their way](http://www.timwise.org/2005/08/animal-whites-peta-and-the-politics-of-putting-things-in-perspective/) to appropriate the suffering of racialized minorities (as with their infamous “Holocaust on Your Plate,” and “Are Animals the New Slaves?” campaigns, the latter of which compared factory farming to the lynching of blacks). While trying to make a perfectly legitimate point about the way that cruelty to non-human animals contributes to an ethic of exploitation that is connected to cruelty to humans, such efforts disregard or minimize the suffering of racialized minorities, exploit that suffering to score cheap emotional points, and do all of this with little or no regard for the strategic wisdom of alienating millions of people deliberately. After all, to say (as PETA chief Ingrid Newkirk has) that “At least the Nazis didn’t eat the objects of their derision” as a way to convince people of the wisdom of vegetarianism, suggests not only a level of indecency and a lack of perspective that is disturbing, but more to the point, a strategic incompetence so mind-boggling as to defy rational description.

**Identity politics key to group survival**

**Ross 2k**

[Marlon B., Professor, Department of English and Carter G. Woodson Institute for African-American and African Studies, “Commentary: Pleasuring Identity, or the Delicious Politics of Belonging,” New Literary History, Vol. 31, No. 4, pages 836-837]

More to the point, Professor Michaels cleverly inverts the operative logic of the "politics of survival." People do not struggle to survive as a group in order to possess a culture—that is, they do not struggle to survive in order to preserve their cultural identity. To the contrary, they struggle to preserve their cultural identity as a way of surviving, as individuals, the acts committed against them as a cultural group. They recognize that to survive as individuals depends on their ability to cohere, politick, and speak as a collective body experiencing assault because of their group identity. That there is greater strength in numbers and greatest strength in unified numbers is a harsh reality of politics, one not invented by "identity politics," but understood well by those who have had to practice "identity politics" in order to survive and thus to increase the odds of garnering a fair share of the country's resources. Moreover, cultural practices often serve as the glue bonding together disparate individuals in a group, oppressed or otherwise, through an economy of pleasure in a sort of deliriously kindred know commentary: pleasuring identity how. For racially oppressed groups like American Blacks, for instance, such cultural practices constitute a means for survival as well as pleasurable ends whereby the pleasure taken in identificatory cultural practices cements the bonds enabling survival. Call and response, shouting, the spiritual, Black preaching, oratory, signifying, blues, jazz, loud-talk, churchiness, and many other culturally specified manners help to perform and reproduce a will to struggle together against the common foe of racism, always under conditions in which actual solidarity of identity, much less of purpose, is in fact impossible.Many social scientists have been worrying over why so many college students identified as Black on historically white campuses willfully choose to socialize among themselves, usually represented as sharing a table in the cafeteria. In offering reasons for this behavior, they reference ongoing social segregation by race even within the US middle class, cultural differences that promote minority marginalization, comfort in numbers in alien territory, and other such constraints of racial identification. The laughter, arguing, loud-talk, specifying, and other gestures of identity bonding are rarely seen as resulting/row an economy of pleasure in itself. To say that Black students are behaving this way because they are constrained by the challenges of racial minority psychology seems a rather roundabout way of treating this question. Such explanations tend to stress the struggle over identity by sacrificing the delights of identification. To say that Black students do this because they enjoy the process of racial identity recognition seems to trivialize the racial struggle to survive, out of which those pleasing cultural practices were forged, and yet in reality the racial struggle is fed by the pleasures of identification in a variety of complicated ways by Blacks, whites, and all other groups.6 To insist that there is pleasure in identification does not have to discount its dangers. Indeed, oppressed groups take pleasure in identification because their lives are often dangerously defined by identity assault. Nor does acknowledging the pleasures of identification disallow other sorts of pleasure taken in crossing perceived identities, the curiosity of exploring relations with individuals defined as external to one's group. In fact, identity's economy of pleasure dictates that the perceived and actual danger of identity trespassing must produce its own curious delights.

### cap 2ac

#### Only combining specific struggle and the alt can solve---the alt alone totalizes capitalism which makes resistance impossible

Leonardo 3 (Zeus, UC Berkeley Graduate School of Education, Associate Professor Language and Literacy, Society and Culture at UC Berk, Resisting Capital: Simulationist and Socialist StrategiesCritical Sociology, Volume 29, issue 2)

The dialectical tension between discourse and historical materialism is productive, but the “end of the real” thesis appears unsustainable, and worse, complicit with relations of exploitation. In fact, ludic postmodernists may have succeeded in dodging Scylla only to strengthen Charybdis. It is fair to assume that if the United States were to become a socialist state, white men will likely hold the important bureaucratic positions, therefore racism will still be a problem and women will ?nd themselves ?ghting for gender rights. The ugliest forms of racist and patriarchal relations may signi?cantly decrease through economic transformation, but race and gender relations will not become insignificant in socialist America (Hunter 2002). Thus, social theory must incorporate an analysis of differences, especially in their commodi?ed form. Here, postmodern theorizing has been helpful. Discourses of difference remind us that although gender, sexual, and race issues do not exist autonomously from material relations, they are articulated in meaningful ways that have their particular concerns. For example, we notice that socialist Cuba had to reconstruct the family, Mao’s China instituted the cultural revolution, and the elite in the former Soviet Union was all but male. Difference is in?ected by the economy, but is not determined by it in the orthodox sense of Marxism. To the extent that Marxist praxis **neglects** the specific discourses of identity formation, it is guilty of subsuming the social meanings that racialized, gendered, and sexualized subjects experience on a daily basis, some of which inform the epistemological work of revolutionary movements. Re- ducing identity politics to an individual’s experience minimizes the institu- tional aspect of a subject’s identity. But asserting identity in its traditionally vague way assumes an a priori sameness between those who invoke it, some of whom may experience a rude awakening when they discover the pane of difference (Brubaker and Cooper 2000). Rather, the process of identi?- cation may be preferable to the apparent condition of having an identity. This is where Nancy Fraser’s (1998) ideas on the politics of (mis)recognition ameliorate the otherwise vulgar suggestion that identity is private and only particular. She deploys a neo-Weberian model for addressing the differ- ential status and rights of gays and lesbians in the context of heterosexist capitalism. This is an area where orthodox Marxism has been criticized for its refusal to address identity discourses with respect to rights, prestige, and status. Although Baudrillard’s theories did not create the notion of difference, they attend to its contours. The politics of identity is based on the notion that groups of people have been treated as merely different in patterned ways that have material sources and consequences (Leonardo 2000, 2002). For example, the social movement we know as the Civil Rights Movement was supra-individual. It was the recognition by masses of people of color, women, and gays and lesbians that the white, male, heterosexual state was deliberately thwarting their rights as groups of people. There is also a sense that the 1960’s identity politics movement extended beyond identity as politics-of-the-self when white Americans joined hands with people of color and acknowledged that minorities were being oppressed on the basis of their identity. Looked at in this way, we can avoid relegating identity politics to the margins of theory as a form of privatized discourse having no ties with material life. There is something to suggest that the “new identity politics” and materialist politics are compatible. For the very notion of identity is traceable to the material ?ow of life and how, for example, the black body is commodi?ed as the sexualized subject. In other words, a materialist identity politics is part of an overall and more complete transformation of objective life insofar as it leaves its stamp on our subjectivity. Identity is real because it is part of the productive process insofar as workers gain an identity through their practical activity. To the extent that identity is abstract, it is imagined. It is very much like the sort of thing that Levi-Strauss described as a “‘virtual center (foyer virtuel) to which we must refer to explain certain things, but without it ever having a real existence”’ (cited by Brubaker and Cooper 2000: 9; italics in original). Keeping in mind the dialectic between the real and imagined aspects of identity, theorists avoid a fetishism of either pole.

Plan solves cap-We break down energy monopolies

Scheer 2

(Hermann, Fmr. Asst. Prof. of Economics @ Technical Univ. of Stuttgart, Member of German Parliament,

General Chairman of the World Council for Renewable Energy, President of EUROSOLAR, The Solar

Economy: Renewable Energy for a Sustainable Global Future, Pg. 87-89)

The representatives of the fossil energy industry have been written out of the script for the renewable energy story, or allotted at most a secondary role; the market for renewable energy will no longer have a niche for conventional sources at least, not with turnover at high as it is at present. Conventional energy companies are bound to old fossil fuel structures by the sheer scale of their investments; their business models, based on large-scale industrial plant, will prove their own undoing in the transition to renewable energy. A solar resource base makes it impossible to retain or ever re-create the power structure that has hitherto prevailed in the energy sector. The extent to which industrial concentration and monopolization is inevitable with fossil fuels and avoidable or impossible with solar energy is compared in Table 2.2 The short supply chains for renewable energy sources will end the pressure to globalize that comes from the fossil resource base. The dense interconnections between individual energy companies and between energy companies and other industries that result from fossil fuel supply chains will no longer be necessary. Shorter renewable energy supply chains also make it impossible to dominate entire economies. Renewable energy will liberate society from fossil fuel dependency and from the webs spun by the spiders of the fossil economy.

**Racism affects lives apart from the class system. Their class reductionism foot notes races and privileges white friendly perspectives that perpetuate racism and capitalism. Whiteness is held on to as an “alternate property”-We’re a prerequisite**

**Wise 10**

American anti-racism activist and writer.

(“[With Friends Like These, Who Needs Glenn Beck? Racism and White Privilege on the Liberal-Left](http://www.timwise.org/2010/08/with-friends-like-these-who-needs-glenn-beck-racism-and-white-privilege-on-the-liberal-left/)” August 17th, http://www.timwise.org/2010/08/with-friends-like-these-who-needs-glenn-beck-racism-and-white-privilege-on-the-liberal-left/)

Class-Based Reductionism on the LeftPerhaps the most common way in which folks on the left sometimes perpetuate racism is by a vulgar form of class reductionism, in which they advance the notion that racism is a secondary issue to the class system, and that what leftists and radicals should be doing is spending more time focusing on the fight for dramatic and transformative economic change (whether reformist or revolutionary), rather than engaging in what they derisively term “identity politics.” The problem, say these voices, are corporations, the rich, the elite, etc., and to get sidetracked into a discussion of white supremacy is to ignore this fact and weaken the movement for radical change.But in fact, racism affects the lives of people of color quite apart from the class system. Black and brown folks who are not poor or working class — indeed those who are upper middle class and affluent — are still subjected to discrimination regularly, whether in the housing market, on the part of police, in schools, in the health care delivery system and on the job. True enough, these better-off folks of color may be more economically stable that their poor white counterparts, but in the class system they compete for stuff against whites in the same economic strata: a competition in which they operate at a decided and unfair disadvantage. So too, poor and working class whites, though they suffer the indignities of the class system, still have decided advantages over poor and working class people of color: their spells of unemployment are typically far shorter, their ability to find affordable and decent housing is far greater, and they are less likely to find themselves in resource-poor schools than even blacks and Latinos in middle class families. In fact, lower income whites are more likely to own their own home than middle class blacks, and most poor whites in the U.S. do not live in poor neighborhoods — rather they are mostly to be found in middle class communities where opportunities are far greater — whereas most poor people of color are surrounded by concentrated poverty. And black folks with college degrees, professional occupational status and health insurance coverage actually have worse health outcomes than white dropouts, with low income and low-level if any medical care, thanks to racism in health care delivery and black experiences with racism, which have uniquely debilitating health affects at all income levels.To ignore the unique deprivations of racism (as with sexism, heterosexism, ableism, etc) so as to forward a white-friendly class analysis is inherently marginalizing to the lived experience of black and brown folks in the United States. And what’s more, to ignore racism is to actually weaken the struggle for class unity and economic transformation. Research on this matter is crystal clear: it is in large measure due to racism — and the desire of working class whites to maintain a sense of superiority over workers of color, as a “psychological wage” when real wages and benefits have proven inadequate — that has divided the working class. It is this holding onto the status conferred by whiteness, as a form of “alternate property” (to paraphrase UCLA Law Professor, Cheryl Harris), which has undermined the ability of white and of-color working people to engage in solidarity across racial lines. Unless we discuss the way in which racism and racial inequity weakens our bonds of attachment, we will never be able to forward a truly progressive, let alone radical politics.In other words, unless all of our organizing becomes antiracist in terms of outreach, messaging, strategizing, and implementation, whatever work we’re doing, around whatever important issue, will be for naught. Only by building coalitions that look inward at the way racism and white privilege may be operating within those formations, and that also look outward, at the way racism and privilege affect the issue around which we’re organizing (be that schools, health care, jobs, tax equity, the environment, LGBT rights, reproductive freedom, militarism or anything else), can we hope to beat back the forces of reaction against which we find ourselves arrayed. The other side has proven itself ready and willing to use racism to divide us. In response, we must commit to using antiracism as a force to unite.

#### Alt fails – their rejection alternative provides no direction and can’t organize collective resistance

**Grossberg 92** – Communication Studies Professor, UNC (Lawrence, We Gotta Get Out of This Place, p 388-90)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be tempered by the realities of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are **not waiting to be led into revolution**, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide-rather undemocratically, I might add-to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain "civility" in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is simply too weak in the current context to effectively organize people, and **too vague to provide** **any** **direction**.

#### Their totalizing representation of capitalism prevent resistance

**Gibson-Graham 96** – feminist professors (Julie and Katherine, The End of Capitalism, p 1-4)

Understanding capitalism has always been a project of the left, especially within the Marxian tradition. There, where knowledges of “capitalism” arguably originated, theory is accorded an explicit social role. From Marx to Lenin to the neo-Marxists of the post-World War II period, theorists have understood their work as contributing — whether proximately or distantly — to anticapitalist projects of political action. In this sense economic theory has related to politics as a subordinate and a servant: we understand the world in order to change it. Given the avowed servitude of left theory to left political action it is ironic (though not surprising) that understandings and images of capitalism can quite readily be viewed as contributing to a **crisis in left politics**. Indeed, and this is the argument we wish to make in this book, the project of understanding the beast has itself produced a beast, or even a bestiary; and the process of producing knowledge in service to politics has estranged rather than united understanding and action. Bringing these together again, or allowing them to touch in different ways, is one of our motivating aspirations. “Capitalism” occupies a special and privileged place in the language of social representation. References to “capitalist society” are a common­place of left and even mainstream social description, as are references — to the market, to the global economy, to postindustrial society — in which an unnamed capitalism is implicitly invoked as the defining and unifying moment of a complex economic and social formation. Just as the economic system in eastern Europe used confidently to be described as communist or socialist, so a general confidence in economic classification characterizes representations of an increasingly capitalist world system. But what might be seen as the grounds of this confidence, if we put aside notions of “reality” as the authentic origin of its representations? Why might it seem problematic to say that the United States is a Christian nation, or a heterosexual one, despite the widespread belief that Christianity and heterosexuality are dominant or majority practices in their respective domains, while at the same time it seems legitimate and indeed “accurate” to say that the US is a capitalist country?1 What is it about the former expressions, and their critical history, that makes them visible as “regulatory fictions,”2 ways of erasing or obscuring difference, while the latter is seen as accurate representation? Why, moreover, have embracing and holistic expressions for social struc­ture like patriarchy fallen into relative disuse among feminist theorists (see Pringle 1995; Barrett and Phillips 1992) while similar concep­tions of capitalism as a system or “structure of power” are still preva­lent and resilient? These sorts of questions, by virtue of their scarcity and scant claims to legitimacy, have provided us a motive for this book.3 The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes "capitalism" as an economic and social descriptor. Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term - passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism - as well as systematic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of "capitalist hegemony" deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelihood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, "capitalist hegemony" operates not only as a constituent of, but also **as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imaginations**. What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted? If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate that world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem). The discursive artifact we call "capitalist hegemony" is a complex effect of a wide variety of discursive and nondiscursive conditions. In this book we focus on the practices and preoccupations of discourse, tracing some of the different, even incompatible, representations of capitalism that can be collated within this fictive summary representation. These depictions have their origins in the diverse traditions of Marxism, classical and contemporary political economy, academic social science, modern historiography, popular economic and social thought, western philosophy and metaphysics, indeed, in an endless array of texts, traditions and infrastructures of meaning. In the chapters that follow, only a few of these are examined for the ways in which they have sustained a vision of capitalism as the dominant form of economy, or have contributed to the possibility or durability of such a vision. But the point should emerge none the less clearly: the virtually unquestioned dominance of capitalism can be seen as a complex product of a variety of discursive commitments, including but not limited to organicist social conceptions, heroic historical narratives, evolutionary scenarios of social development, and essentialist, phallocentric, or binary patterns of thinking. It is through these discursive figurings and alignments that capitalism is constituted as large, powerful, persistent, active, expansive, progressive, dynamic, transformative; embracing, penetrating, disciplining, colonizing, constraining; systemic, self-reproducing, rational, lawful, self-rectifying; organized and organizing, centered and centering; originating, creative, protean; victorious and ascendant; self- identical, self-expressive, full, definite, real, positive, and capable of conferring identity and meaning.

## 1ar

### at: cede the political

#### We control UQ and turn – Energy policy is ceded to dominant conservative knowledge claims – our method is key to reclaiming political agency

Scrase and Ockwell 10 (J. Ivan - Sussex Energy Group, SPRU (Science and Technology Policy Research), Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, David G - Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, SPRU, Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, “The role of discourse and linguistic framing effects in sustaining high carbon energy policy—An accessible introduction,” Energy Policy: Volume 38, Issue 5, May 2010, Pages 2225–2233)

All too often, however, the subjective roles of specialist knowledge, ideas, values, beliefs, and **underlying interests** are **ignored in policy discussions**. As [Adams et al. (2003, p.1915)](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib1) put it: ‘…policy debates are often **flawed** because of the **assumption** that the **actors involved share an understanding of the problem that is being discussed**. They tend to ignore the fact that the assumptions, knowledge, and understandings that **underlie** the definition of [policy] problems are frequently uncertain and contested.’ In this way the ideas of certain actors are often **dismissed** as they fail to fit with **dominant ways of expressing knowledge claims within institutional contexts**. For example, in the aftermath of Chernobyl, Cumbrian sheep farmers’ knowledge about the physical properties of the soil in the Lake District was ignored by government scientists. This led to an ill-informed and ineffective policy response, while creating antagonism and fostering distrust of officials and experts ([Wynne, 1996](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#bib34)). Recognising the ways in which values, beliefs and ideas are shaped and drawn upon in the construction of policy problems and solutions makes it possible to reach a better understanding of the policy process. It is an arena that involves the interplay of different and often competing ‘knowledge claims’ of various actors. Sometimes these conflicts are between the different types of knowledge (‘knowledges’) of lay or local actors and those of experts, but they can equally constitute contests within local or specialist communities.

### anthro

#### **The alt solves nothing and links harder to the K – it insidiously projects a human system of ethics onto non-humans – Hayward says the selection of criteria of value is inevitably limited by their human standpoint – makes any non-anthropogenic value scheme impossible**

#### **And it reinforces ontological anthropocentrism**

Hayward 97 – Dept of Politics, University of Edinburgh (Tim, Feb., “Anthropocentrism: A Misunderstood Problem,” Environmental Values, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 49-63, JSTOR)

The aim of overcoming anthropocentrism is intelligible if it is understood in terms of improving knowledge about the place of humans in the world; and this includes improving our knowledge about what constitutes the good of nonhuman beings. This kind of knowledge is significantly added to by objectivating science. There may also be a role for other kinds of knowledge - for instance, kinds characterised by empathetic imagining of how it might be like to be a member of another species (Cassano,1989); but here one must always be cautious about unwittingly projecting human perceptions on to beings whose actual perceptions may be radically different, since this would be to reintroduce just the sort of error that characterises ontological anthropocentrism. The need for caution is all the clearer when it comes to attempting to gain a non-anthropocentric perspective in ethics. Indeed, it may be that anthropocentrism in ethics, when properly understood, is actually less harmful than harbouring the aim of overcoming it. At any rate, a number of the considerations advanced in this article would tend to suggest this view. I have noted: that the ethical impulse which is expressed as the aim of overcoming anthropocentrism is very imperfectly expressed in such terms; that there are some things about 'anthropocentrism ' which are unavoidable, and others even to be applauded; furthermore, the things which are to condemned are not appropriately called 'anthropocentrism' at all; that the mistaken rejection of anthropocentrism misrepresents the fact that harms to nonhumans, as well as harm to some groups of humans, are caused not by humanity in general but by specific humans with their own vested interests. For these reasons, I suggest that discussions of environmental values would be better conducted without reference to the equivocal notion of anthropocentrism.