#### We solve the material reality they kritik. The energy companies are allowed to produce endlessly because of the profit margin, and is upheld because citizens are too compliant with the material benefits from this mentality- fracturing this breaks down these dominant notions.

Crome 09

(Keith, Parrhesia, Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at Manchester Metropolitan university, “The Nihilistic Affirmation of Life: Biopower and Biopolitics in the Will to Knowledge,” 2009, <http://www.parrhesiajournal.org/parrhesia06/parrhesia06_crome.pdf//wyo-mm>)

Whilst the great institutions of the state ensured the maintenance of the relations of production, biopolitics and anatomo-politics as techniques of power ensured the development of the economic processes and the forces that supported those processes. That is, if the disciplinary techniques that emerged in the classical age facilitated the insertion of bodies into the processes of industrial production, ordering and mechanising bodies, increasing their productivity, maximising their utility without at the same time making them harder to govern, then the techniques and technologies of biopower enabled the adjustment of the population to the same economic processes. However, where the focus of disciplinary techniques is to train the individual by working at the level of the body, the focus of biopower is upon regularising the basic phenomena affecting species life. In this sense, biopower is not only concerned with demographics, but also with a whole series of related phenomena which affect, or better incapacitate, individuals, rendering them incapable of productive activity, of labouring in order to obtain the basic conditions requisite for continuing to live, such as accidents, illnesses and old-age. Thus as an expression of biopower there is the wide-spread development of such measures as “insurance, individual and collective savings, and safety measures”, 36 all of which were not mere epiphenomena of capitalism, but intrinsic to its possibility2

#### Dissent allows us unique agency to embrace other modes of identity: micro activism allows us to engage in processes that are productive and ever-expanding.

Drache 08

(Daniel, Associate Director of the Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies and Professor of Political Science at York University, Toronto, Defiant Publics, Chapter 4: “Nixers, Fixers, and the Axes of Conformity,” pgs 116-117//wyo-mm)

Defiant publics want to reclaim their voices and assert their ideas in the public domain. These nagging, hectoring, persistent publics have a presence we can feel and an impact we can see. What makes them unique is that they exist “by virtue of their imagining” and their ideas are almost infinite in number. They live through texts, debate, and discursive communities. They embody civil society’s predilection to be engaged when something seems to be wrong, unjust, in need of fixing – or something bolder, to destroy and build anew. In the expanding universe of modern dissent, diversity of political identity is the rule. The choices seem infinite. There is a style and identity tool-kit for every position on the political spectrum. You no longer have to choose between an identity as a capitalist or a socialist. You can be a deep environmental paradigm shifter, a radical feminist, an anti-racist activist, a poverty eradicator, a moral crusader, a gay rights campaigner, a globalization fixer, a populist blogger, an anti-fascist agitator, a back-to-basics localist, an online “hacktivist,” a union militant, a libertarian skeptic, an anarchist spoiler, an anti-war demonstrator, or a corporate culture-jammer, just to name a few of the emergent on- and offline political identities. Micro-activism thrives in this environment. If your cause if not on this list, start your own network, connect with others, organize your own community, and raise awareness.4

#### Socialism must embraces the causes of other oppressions if it is to ever be successful

John Bellamy **Foster**, University of Oregon, “The Renewing of Socialism: An Introduction,” THE MONTHLY REVIEW v. 57 n. 3, July-August 20**05**. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0705jbf.htm>, accessed 4/12/06.

Socialism cannot survive unless it transcends not only class divisions that divide off those who run the society from those that are compelled to work mainly on their behalf, but also all other major forms of oppression that cripple human potential and prevent democratic, social alliances. If any lesson was learned from the experiences of twentieth-century attempts to create socialism it is that class struggle must be inseparable from the struggles against gender, race, and national oppressions—and against other forms of domination such as those directed against gays or against those politically designated as “the disabled.” Socialism also cannot make any real headway unless it is ecological in the sense of promoting a sustainable relation to the environment, since any other approach threatens the well-being and even survival of the human species, along with all other species with which we share the earth. The various forms of non-class domination are so endemic to capitalist society, so much a part of its strategy of divide and conquer, that no progress can be made in overcoming class oppression without also fighting—sometimes even in advance of the class struggle—these other social divisions. If the political emancipation of bourgeois society constituted one of the bases upon which a wider human emancipation could be built, a major obstacle to the latter has been the fact that political emancipation—the realm of so-called inalienable human rights—has remained incomplete under capitalism. That obstacle must in all cases be overcome as a necessary part of the struggle for a socialist society.

#### Marxism fails: they’ll just put the bourgeoisie up against the wall.

Agamben, 98 (Giorgio, philosopher and bad ass, “Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.” 1998, Stanford University Press, MB)

Carl Schmitt's definition of sovereignty ("Sovereign is he who decides on the state of exception") became a commonplace even before there was any understanding that what was at issue in it was nothing less than the limit concept of the doctrine of law and the State, in which sovereignty borders (since every limit concept is always the limit between two concepts) on the sphere of life and becomes indistinguishable from it. As long as the form of the State constituted the fundamental horizon of all communal life and the political, religious, juridical, and economic doctrines that sustained this form were still strong, this "most extreme sphere" could not truly come to light. The problem of sovereignty was reduced to the question of who within the political order was invested with certain powers, and the very threshold of the political order itself was never called into question. Today, now that the great State structures have entered into a process of dissolution and the emergency has, as Walter Benjamin foresaw, become the rule, the time is ripe to place the problem of the originary structure and limits of the form of the State in a new perspective. The weakness of anarchist and Marxian critiques of the State was precisely to have not caught sight of this structure and thus to have quickly left the *arcanum imperii*'aside, as if it had no substance outside of the simulacra and. the ideologies invoked to justify it. But one ends up identifying with an enemy whose structure one does not understand, and the theory of the State (and in particular of the state of exception, which is to say, of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the transitional phase leading to the stateless society) is the reef on which the revolutions of our century have been shipwrecked.This book, which was originally conceived as a response to the bloody mystification of a new planetary order, therefore had to reckon with problems—first of all that of the sacredness of life— which the author had not, in the beginning, foreseen. In the course of the undertaking, however, it became clear that one cannot, in such an area, accept as a guarantee any of the notions that the social sciences (from jurisprudence to anthropology) thought they had defined or presupposed as evident, and that many of these notions demanded—in the urgency of catastrophe—to be revised without reserve.

#### Perm solves: understanding the complexity of energy requires us to combine different perspectives to render possible the best possible solution.

O’Neill-Carrillo et al 12

(E., H.R. Zamot, M. Hernandez, A.A. Irizarry-Rivera and L.O. Jimenez-Rodriguez, O’Neill-Carrillo is with the University of Puerto Rico-Mayagüez (UPRM), Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, Zamot and Hernandez were graduate students at UPRM, Irizarry-Rivera and Jimenez-Rodriguez are with UPRM, Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, “Beyond Traditional Power Systems: Energy Externalities, Ethics and Society,” May 2012, <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=6228003&tag=1//wyo-mm>)

As we discover more and more the complexity of some realities, we realize that the perspective of one sole discipline is not enough to describe a situation, explain the causes or solve problems. A problem as complex as the global dependence on non-renewable energy sources and its social an environmental impacts requires to be analyzed and understood from different perspectives. These different perspectives are what some scholars call “horizons” (suggests a superior vision of a higher universality from which an interpreter overcomes his particularities, enabling the interpreter to “see” better in a larger whole [21]), “mentality” [22] or “mental situations” from where we retrieve different although complementary understanding of an event, situation or problem. In terms of disciplines, the global dependence on non-renewable energy sources must be analyzed and studied from different horizons, mentalities or perspectives, e.g., engineering-technology, economics, sociology, ecology, politics, etc. However, the perspectives are not reduced to academic disciplines. There are perspectives or mentalities related to personal or social goals, interests and values grounded in the ordinary life of the different stakeholders living in different and perhaps conflicting socio-economical situations. Consider, for example, the differences between the perspective brought by a poor community that requires some infrastructure to promote their development, the perspective brought by an industry and the perspective brought by ecologists about the impact to the environment. The challenge is how to articulate and integrate these different mental horizons with the objective of developing concrete public policies. Currently, our main objective is to study the foundations that render possible productive dialogues, interactions, articulation and integration between researchers, engineers, public policy makers and stakeholders. This work involves research on the diversity of ideas, values and disciplinary perspectives that may contribute in the development of modern sustainable infrastructure solutions and a shared responsibility with respect to the environment and future generations. There are a series of issues that makes that articulation and integration very difficult: each discipline studies different aspects of the same problems from different systems of reference, there are differences of languages, different methods and different objectives. For that reason we require mediation between these perspectives and mentalities. We consider that ethics can play the role of mediation across multiple disciplines, values and mentalities. For us, following the Belgium philosopher and mathematician Jean Ladrière, ethics is inscribed in the structure of the human existence, decisions, actions and their achievement [23]. The objective of ethics is the construction of a world authentically human and reasonable [24]. Ethics should inspire us to seek a human, social and global project that is reasonable, responsible and in solidarity with the environment. Consequently, it is a form of life that seeks to achieve human and social existence through concrete decisions and actions in concrete situations with norms that have universal pretension. For example, Hans Jonas’ imperative: that there be a humankind. This means that our actions should not harm the conditions that render possible the existence of our human species [25].