### 1NC---First

#### Nuclear energy is an expression of capitalist tendencies to “innovate” its way out of the problems it creates. Their “green capitalism” funds wars and executives, while devastating Indigenous and working class futures.

Butler 21 [Simon (climate justice activist based in Sydney, Australia; coeditor of Green Left Weekly, the country’s leading source of anticapitalist news, analysis, discussion, and debate; ecosocialist, award-winning author of Too Many People? Population, Immigration, and the Environmental Crisis), “10 reasons why climate activists should not support nuclear,” Climate and Capitalism, Jun. 23, 2021, https://climateandcapitalism.com/2021/06/23/10-reasons-why-climate-activists-should-not-support-nuclear/, DOA 03-21-2025]//abhi

\ 7. Nuclear power means nuclear weapons. A big rollout of nuclear power would mean a big expansion of fissile materials that could be used for nuclear weapons. It would multiply the facilities such as enrichment and reprocessing plants that these weapons need. The spread of civil nuclear programs to more countries would make more states capable of quickly producing nuclear weapons.¶ In countries such as the US and the UK keeping civil nuclear power is a **strategic military** choice, **not** a **savvy** **green** **policy**. Consumers pay a **higher** energy price to **maintain** **nuclear** **power** **infrastructure**, which **subsidizes** **nuclear** **weapons** **programs**.¶ 8. Nuclear waste is forever. The most hazardous nuclear waste decays so slowly that it won’t be safe for millions of years. Ramping up nuclear power will produce a lot more waste and there is no safe way to store it. It’s irresponsible to make this waste a problem for our descendants.¶ In some places nuclear waste is a very present problem. In the 1970s, the US army built a concrete cap to seal away 3.1 million cubic feet of radioactive waste on Runit Island, which is part of the Marshall Islands. Today, rising sea levels threaten to bring down the entire structure, releasing the radioactive waste into the lagoon. The US government has refused to help, saying it’s the Marshall Islanders’ problem now.¶ 9. Uranium mining is unsafe. There is no safe way to mine uranium or other radioactive elements. Building more nuclear power will result in more leakage of radioactive materials into the environment and more workers exposed to unsafe conditions and preventable deaths.¶ 10. Nuclear means dispossession. About **70%** of the uranium used for nuclear power plants worldwide is **mined from the lands of Indigenous minorities**. For too long, **Indigenous** peoples’ **lands** **and** **culture** have been treated as **nuclear** **industry** **sacrifice zones**. We should not support any expansion.¶ Mirarr Traditional Owners, whose country lies in the north of Australia’s Northern Territory and encompasses the Ranger and Jabiluka uranium deposits, released a statement in March that “expressed their continued sadness” at the ongoing disaster at Fukushima. The uranium for the Fukushima reactor came from the Ranger mine on Mirarr lands, which they had always opposed.¶ In a 2011 open letter to the United Nations, Mirarr senior Traditional Owner Yvonne Margarula said that the Mirarr believe uranium mining globally “constitutes an unfair impact on Indigenous people now and into the future. We suffer the dangers and long term impacts of the front end of the nuclear fuel cycle so that others overseas may continue to enjoy lives without the awareness of the impacts this has on the lives of others.”¶ What’s the allure of nuclear?¶ It’s obvious why people connected with the **failing nuclear industry** will keep desperately pushing the “nuclear is a climate solution” argument. But there are also other people genuinely worried about climate change who might still stubbornly back nuclear power despite the arguments put above. There are several reasons for this.¶ For some, the mistake is to short-sightedly treat lowering greenhouse gas emissions in isolation from other concerns. This leads them to dismiss objections, which point out nuclear power’s close ties with environmental racism, militarism and the poisoning of Indigenous lands. Their mistake is to think of nuclear power, which is bound up in social systems of production, in a non-social way.¶ For others, nuclear power appeals because it aligns with fixed **notions** of **progress** and **modernity**, in which **technological** **know**-**how** is meant to lead to **human mastery over nature**. This ecomodernist outlook tends to treat nature as an **enemy to conquer** rather than a complex **living system to defend and nurture**. Their mistake is to think of nuclear power, which is an expression of **capitalism’s** **alienation** **from** **natural** **needs**, in a non-ecological way.¶ For others still support for nuclear power may best be explained as a studied lack of solidarity. When **corporate** **executives**, professors or journalists say we should build more nuclear power plants, they **never** **volunteer to work in uranium mines, live near nuclear power plants, or host radioactive waste in their neighborhoods. Those burdens will always be borne by others.**

#### And nuclear is a distraction from the root cause of the crisis, reliant on a cult of technology that’s doomed to fail.

**Klein 11** [Naomi Klein, Canadian author and climate justice/alter-globalization activist, 11-28-2011, "Capitalism vs. the Climate," The Nation, https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/capitalism-vs-climate/, DOA 3-11-2025] JH

This is where the intersection between hard-right ideology and climate denial gets truly dangerous. It’s not simply that these “cool dudes” deny climate science because it threatens to upend their dominance-based worldview. It is that their dominance-based worldview provides them with the intellectual tools to write off huge swaths of humanity in the developing world. Recognizing the threat posed by this empathy-exterminating mindset is a matter of great urgency, because climate change will test our moral character like little before. The US Chamber of Commerce, in its bid to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating carbon emissions, argued in a petition that in the event of global warming, “populations can acclimatize to warmer climates via a range of behavioral, physiological, and technological adaptations.” These adaptations are what I worry about most.¶ How will we adapt to the people made homeless and jobless by increasingly intense and frequent natural disasters? How will we treat the climate refugees who arrive on our shores in leaky boats? Will we open our borders, recognizing that we created the crisis from which they are fleeing? Or will we build ever more high-tech fortresses and adopt ever more draconian antiimmigration laws? How will we deal with resource scarcity?¶ We know the answers already. The corporate quest for scarce resources will become more rapacious, more violent. Arable land in Africa will continue to be grabbed to provide food and fuel to wealthier nations. Drought and famine will continue to be used as a pretext to push genetically modified seeds, driving farmers further into debt. We will attempt to transcend peak oil and gas by using increasingly risky technologies to extract the last drops, turning ever larger swaths of our globe into sacrifice zones. We will fortress our borders and intervene in foreign conflicts over resources, or start those conflicts ourselves. “**Free-market climate solutions**,” as they are called, will be a magnet for speculation, **fraud** and **crony capitalism**, as we are already seeing with carbon trading and the use of forests as carbon offsets. And as climate change begins to affect not just the poor but the wealthy as well, we will increasingly look for **techno-fixes** to turn down the temperature, **with massive** and unknowable **risks**.¶ As the world warms, the reigning ideology that tells us it’s everyone for themselves, that victims deserve their fate, that we can master nature, will take us to a very cold place indeed. And it will only get colder, as theories of racial superiority, barely under the surface in parts of the denial movement, make a raging comeback. These theories are not optional: they are necessary to justify the hardening of hearts to the largely blameless victims of climate change in the global South, and in predominately African-American cities like New Orleans.¶ In The Shock Doctrine, I explore how the right has systematically used crises—real and trumped up—to push through a brutal ideological agenda designed not to solve the problems that created the crises but rather to enrich elites. As the climate crisis begins to bite, it will be no exception. This is entirely predictable. Finding **new ways to privatize the commons** and **to profit** from disaster are what our current system is built to do. The process is already well **under way**¶ The only wild card is whether some countervailing popular movement will step up to provide a viable alternative to this grim future. That means not just an alternative set of policy proposals but an **alternative worldview** to rival the one at the heart of the ecological crisis—this time, embedded in **interdependence** rather than hyper-**individualism**, **reciprocity** rather than **dominance** and **cooperation** rather than **hierarchy**.¶ Shifting cultural values is, admittedly, a tall order. It calls for the kind of ambitious vision that movements used to fight for a century ago, before everything was broken into single “issues” to be tackled by the appropriate sector of business-minded NGOs. Climate change is, in the words of the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, “**the greatest example of market failure we have ever seen**.” By all rights, this reality should be filling progressive sails with conviction, breathing new life and urgency into longstanding fights against everything from free trade to financial speculation to industrial agriculture to third-world debt, while elegantly weaving all these struggles into a coherent narrative about how to protect life on earth.¶ But that isn’t happening, at least not so far. It is a painful irony that while the Heartlanders are busily calling climate change a left-wing plot, most leftists have yet to realize that climate science has handed them the most powerful argument against capitalism since William Blake’s “dark Satanic Mills” (and, of course, those mills were the beginning of climate change). When demonstrators are cursing out the corruption of their governments and corporate elites in Athens, Madrid, Cairo, Madison and New York, climate change is often little more than a footnote, when it should be the coup de grâce.¶ Half of the problem is that progressives—their hands full with soaring unemployment and multiple wars—tend to assume that the big green groups have the climate issue covered. The other half is that many of those **big green groups** have **avoided**, with phobic precision, any serious debate on the blindingly obvious roots of the climate crisis: globalization, deregulation and contemporary **capitalism’s quest for perpetual growth** (the same forces that are responsible for the destruction of the rest of the economy). The result is that those taking on the failures of capitalism and those fighting for climate action remain two solitudes, with the small but valiant climate justice movement—drawing the connections between racism, inequality and environmental vulnerability—stringing up a few swaying bridges between them.¶ The right, meanwhile, has had a free hand to exploit the global economic crisis to cast climate action as a recipe for economic Armageddon, a surefire way to spike household costs and to block new, much-needed jobs drilling for oil and laying new pipelines. With virtually no loud voices offering a competing vision of how a new economic paradigm could provide a way out of both the economic and ecological crises, this fearmongering has had a ready audience.¶ Far from learning from past mistakes, a powerful faction in the environmental movement is pushing to go even further down the same disastrous road, arguing that the way to **win on climate** is to make the cause more **palatable to conservative** value**s**. This can be heard from the studiously **centrist** Breakthrough Institute, which i**s** calling for the movement to embrace industrial agriculture and **nuclear power** instead of **organic farming and decentralized renewables**. It can also be heard from several of the researchers studying the rise in climate denial. Some, like Yale’s Kahan, point out that while those who poll as highly “hierarchical” and “individualist” bridle at any mention of regulation, they tend to like **big,** centralized **technologies** that **confirm their belief** that humans **can** **dominate nature**. So, he and others argue, environmentalists should start emphasizing responses such as nuclear power and geoengineering (deliberately intervening in the climate system to counteract global warming), as well as playing up concerns about national security.¶ The first problem with **this strategy** is that **it doesn’t work**. For years, big green groups have framed climate action as a way to assert “energy security,” while “free-market solutions” are virtually the only ones on the table in the United States. Meanwhile, denialism has soared. The more troubling problem with this approach, however, is that rather than challenging the warped values motivating denialism, it reinforces them. **Nuclear power** and geoengineering are not **solutions** to the ecological crisis; they are a **doubling down** on exactly the kind of **short-term hubristic** thinking that **got us in**to **this mess.**¶It is not the job of a transformative social movement to reassure members of a panicked, megalomaniacal elite that they are still masters of the universe—nor is it necessary. According to McCright, co-author of the “Cool Dudes” study, the most extreme, intractable climate deniers (many of them conservative white men) are a small minority of the US population—roughly 10 percent. True, this demographic is massively overrepresented in positions of power. But the solution to that problem is not for the majority of people to change their ideas and values. It is to attempt to change the culture so that this small but disproportionately influential

#### Capitalism’s bad:

#### A. VIOLENCE. Capitalism escalates compounding climate and military crises that make extinction inevitable.

Peter Handel and Charles Derber 23, Peter Handel, a freelance writer, interviewing Charles Derber, a professor of sociology at Boston College and the author of 26 books on politics, democracy, war, corporations, capitalism, and climate change, 12-30-2023, "We Must Reckon With the Most Dangerous System of Extinction Humans Ever Created," Truthout, https://truthout.org/articles/we-must-reckon-with-the-most-dangerous-system-of-extinction-humans-ever-created/, accessed: 6-20-2024//OA

Dying for Capitalism shows the existential threat has grown faster than I had imagined. This is not simply because of the acceleration of climate tipping points but the escalating risk of nuclear war arising from an increasingly unstable and militarized international and American world order. Witness not just Ukraine after U.S.-driven NATO expansion to the Russian border but the bipartisan new Cold War with China and today’s erupting wars in the Middle East. As people are dying for capitalism in the sense that they want ever more of it, they are also literally dying for the consequences of craving a literal death system. The “triangle of extinction” exposes what many on the left have suspected but never fully understood. U.S. capitalism fuels both climate change and militarism for five core reasons: 1) elevating profit over all other aims; 2) commitment to unfettered economic growth; 3) expanding to control markets and resources domestically and internationally; 4) producing commodities for sale on the market rather than public goods; and 5) concentrating political power among corporate elites, notably the military-industrial complex and the carbon-industrial complex. All of these forces lead capitalist elites and the market to ignore the existential risks and treat them as what economists call “externalities” — which include the ultimate costs externalized from producers and paid by the general public. How climate and military threats fuel each other is a major neglected subject. Ironically, the Pentagon itself annually reports that climate change is the biggest national security threat, with environmental disasters and sea rise driving people from endangered residences toward inhabitable land. Such migrations — along with intensifying floods, droughts and extreme temperatures — set up violent competition among people desperate for land and resources. Moreover, many U.S. wars have been fought to secure more oil. Protecting the U.S. right to create climate change is thus fueling “forever” wars. The Pentagon also does not tell us that it is the world’s biggest institutional creator of carbon emissions. While climate change drives war, militarism drives climate change. This is not just about the obvious environmental destruction wrought by war. The modern military is a monster carbon producer, with massive carbon burned every day in training and wartime military flights; in fueling huge naval carriers, submarines and tanks; in producing planes and munitions; and in running more than a thousand military bases. Most of us realize that the fossil fuel industry makes massive amounts of money while destroying the environment, but you show how the development of the fossil fuel industry is inextricable from the advent of modern capitalism. Tell us about this. While fossil fuels were central to capitalist development, it didn’t have to be that way. Early industrial capitalism could have developed without fossil fuels. Indeed, 19th century British factories initially used water-powered steam engines but shifted away toward coal and oil. This had less to do with technological efficiency than social and political factors. Owners were worried that water would be viewed as part of the commons and subject to public controls or appropriation, threatening profits. Coal and oil were less likely to be viewed as part of the commons, since they were not as historically central to public use and well-being as water. The long historical shift from coal toward oil was also driven by social and political interests rather than technological advantages. Coal miners were rebellious at an early stage, mobilized by communities formed working under adverse and dangerous conditions. Fear of unions helped shift industrial capitalism in the late 19th and 20th centuries toward oil. Oil became the central energy source of U.S. 20th century capitalism largely because of wars, especially World War I and World War II. Tank warfare and the new importance of planes in World War I was a major catalyst for the 20th century shift toward oil. World War II sealed the deal. Enormous amounts of oil were needed to power the planes and produce the arms to win this huge conflagration. And U.S. interests in both securing and selling oil in Asia were a major factor fueling U.S. interest in war in the Pacific. The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists has set the Doomsday Clock at 90 seconds to midnight, the closest it has ever been. Why has the risk of nuclear catastrophe become so heightened? The Bulletin issued a statement saying the change was “largely but not exclusively” due to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. They also now connect nuclear doomsday with environmental doomsday, noting that climate change and other environmental-linked threats such as COVID-19 played a role in resetting the clock. They are pulling the curtain back to reveal some of the “triangle of extinction.” The Doomsday Clock is an important symbol, recognized around the world as a crucial indicator of potential imminent extinction. Founded in Chicago after the U.S. development of the nuclear bomb — a subject popularized in the film Oppenheimer — the Bulletin’s scientists, despite their major contributions, have their own limitations. They are not political economists or social theorists, and their U.S. roots have shaped their thinking. This may explain why they have not portrayed the full “triangle of extinction,” nor focused on the unique U.S. role in supercharging the race to extinction. This goes beyond their relative lack of attention to the historical role of the U.S. and NATO in leading up to the Ukraine war. They have not offered a strong critique of the extinction risks inherent in building U.S. hegemony throughout the nuclear era. Nor have they highlighted the U.S. role in catalyzing Middle Eastern wars for oil and now heating up the new Cold War with both Russia and China, as well as playing a role in the current Israel-Hamas-Iran-U.S. military crisis, all intensifying extinction perils. Nor does the Bulletin highlight how capitalist economies, and especially U.S. militarized capitalism, are crucial structural extinction forces. We hope that the Bulletin’s scientists will read Dying for Capitalism. If the nuclear scientists were to discuss the need to transform U.S. militarized capitalism, it would expose more of the “triangle of extinction,” and help mobilize both scientists and the public. While you are focused mostly on the disastrous impact of capitalism, you also take on elements of American culture in Dying for Capitalism. In particular, you discuss the myth of American exceptionalism. How did this idea come to be so ingrained in American culture and how does it undermine solutions to the dire problems we face today? American exceptionalism — the idea that the U.S. is the only nation equipped to manage world affairs and preserve freedom and democracy — goes back to the foundation of the nation. The Puritans defined their settlement in America as a blessed “city on the hill.” George Washington stated that the U.S. was destined to become a great empire. The Monroe Doctrine confirmed that empire would begin in the Americas itself. Soon thereafter, the U.S. embraced the doctrine of Manifest Destiny, perhaps the most seductive military and moral doctrine of American exceptionalism, legitimating military expansion into the Pacific, including the murderous colonization of the Philippines. Teddy Roosevelt’s idealization of himself as a “rough rider” was part of the new 20th century U.S. drive to global empire; Roosevelt’s idealization of war, tied to his close relation to robber baron capitalists, such as the Morgan and Rockefeller financial and oil interests, helped fuel the long drive to a U.S.-led global fossil fuel, militarized capitalism. Empires need what I have called “immoral morality,” the use of lofty moral ideals to legitimate evil behavior. U.S. exceptionalism cloaked the rise of U.S. fossil fuel-based, militarist global empire as a crusade for democracy. The building of a world economy around U.S.-dominated oil and arms is the heart of today’s “extinction triangle,” shrouded in immoral morality. Instead of seeing extinction, many in the U.S. see a chosen people’s defense of liberty. You write that “green capitalism is an oxymoron.” Why? Americans have long been taught that technology is the solution to everything. Green capitalism exploits this seductive approach, which tells Americans not to worry: our technological prowess will solve climate change. Instead of helping Americans see capitalism as a leading cause of climate change, it flips the equation and says that capitalism is the solution, since only capitalism can create the technological innovations — whether electric cars, carbon capture, geo-engineering or cheap wind and solar energy — that will save the planet. Technology is obviously important in dealing with climate change. But even if capitalism delivers many green technologies, it will not prevent climate disaster. Our book explains why “green capitalism” is a dangerous illusion. Without changes in capitalist appetites for insatiable profit, growth, consumerism, expansion and war, the system will continue to place an infinite burden on a finite planet. This awareness is beginning to surface. People note that electric cars require scarce lithium that can generate militarized competition; moreover, building all the other parts of the car and the roads they depend on will continue to deplete the planet. It makes far more sense to build walkable cities than a new interstate highway system connecting suburbs with big lawns. The oxymoron derives from the reality that capitalism is designed for accumulating wealth and living big on a small planet, the perfect recipe for environmental death.

#### B. ETHICS. Capitalism undermines the foundations of ethical life by reducing individuals to commodities to be exploited and tools of production.

Morgareidge 98, Clayton. Dr. Morgareidge is a Professor of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College. Capitalism is Evil. The Old Mole Variety Hour 90.7 FM in Portland, Broadcast 8/22/1998. Transcript archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20080408145816/http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html //MD

In recent commentaries for the Old Mole I have been trying to make capitalism look bad -- as bad as it really is. I have argued that capitalism is war, and that those of us who do not own capital suffer from it just as do civilian populations caught between opposing armies, or as foot soldiers conscripted into armies fighting for interests that are not our own. I've tried to show that capitalism is the violent negation of democracy, for it is the interests of those who own capital that determine how we live: their jobs, products, services, manufactured culture, and propaganda shape our lives and our minds. Today I'd like to point to the ways in which capital undermines the foundation of moral life. Well, what is the foundation of moral life? What makes it possible for human beings to recognize that they have responsibilities to each other and to their communities? For example: What could possibly make anyone willing to pay living wages to workers in Indonesia or Haiti if you can get them to work for less? The 18th Century philosopher David Hume asks, What reason can anyone give me to not to prefer the annihilation of all mankind to a scratch on my finger? Hume is one of many philosophers who argue that no such reason can be given. This means that the foundation of ethics lies not in reason, but rather in our passions or our hearts. For Hume it is part of our nature that we feel sympathy for each other, and this sympathy counters our narrow self-interest. Other philosophers have taken similar positions. Josiah Royce an American philosopher of the last century argued that you do not really understand another person if you do not understand her aspirations, fears, and needs. But to understand someone's feelings is, in part, to share them. And you cannot share an aspiration or a need without wanting to see it fulfilled, nor can you share a fear without hoping that it will not come to pass. So the mere recognition of what other human beings are involves us in wanting to see them live and prosper. The French-Jewish philosopher Emmanual Levinás whose major work appeared in 1961 claims that ethics arises in the experience of the face of the other. The human face reveals its capacity for suffering, a suffering we are capable of either inflicting or opposing. So to look into the face of another human being is to see the commandment, Thou shalt not kill. Another American philosopher, Nel Noddings, in her 1984 book Caring, argues that the ethical commitment arises out of the caring response that most of us feel towards those who, like children, are in need. Most parents encourage this caring response in their children, with the result that we grow up with an interest in cultivating our own capacity to care for others. Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior. The 20th century proves otherwise. What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other. So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response? This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism. But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care. Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism. Nevertheless, I want to claim, the putting the world at the disposal of those with capital has done more damage to the ethical life than any thing else. To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.[1] If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.

#### C. TURNS CASE. “Green capitalist” solutions and “innovation” reinvest in emissions and rely on the wholesale destruction of the Global South.

O’Sullivan 23, A., Omukuti, J. and Ryder, S.S. (2023), “Global Surpluses of Extraction and Slow Climate Violence: A Sociological Framework. Sociol Inq., 93:320 – 340. https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12518 //  https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/soin.12518 MD (OA recut)

The financialized solutions to climate change fail to adequately interrogate how the market continuously promotes the interests of major donor countries. It is ineffective in the face of imminent tipping points. These solutions focus on accumulation and expanded Gross Domestic Product (Hickel and Hallegatte 2022). In Africa, solutions presented under the Clean Development Mechanism did not result in tangible benefits for countries on the continent, and instead created subsidies for for-profit activities that benefited multinational corporations based in core countries, mostly in Europe and the United States (Bond et al. 2012). This sustainable capital is then invested elsewhere in carbon intensive sectors of the economy (York, Rosa, and Dietz 2010). The financialization of responses to climate change has led to more rent-seeking behavior as opposed to prioritization of tangible solutions for averting climate collapse. Financialization of solutions to climate change, for example, through solutions based on carbon markets, are unlikely to result in absolute reductions in emissions (Jerneck 2017). These proposed solutions implemented in collaboration with State elites in periphery countries offer “narrow opportunit[ies]” for development, (Du Bois, quoted in Karenga 2003:142) as well as exploitation that accompanied the experience of nations of color. This demonstrates how technical fixes, usually proposed by core countries, do not contribute to, and even impede, climate justice (Gross 2022). What we see is a weakness in the capacity for international global mechanisms to enable tangible progress on climate change. Instead, actions touted as solutions facilitate the unequal exchange of surplus accumulation and violence. States’ power determines whether their interests are met in international negotiations and governance of climate change (Betzold 2010). Core countries often lead in formulating these responses, mostly through their collective power and influence at international fora for climate change decision making. The outcomes are solutions that favor the interests of core countries which have historically constructed the climate crisis and response (Bonneuil and Fressoz 2017). Instead of reparations or any form of redress for harms caused by the core’s emissions, what is offered are Green Keynesian solutions for peripheral countries. The latter must also engage in mitigation despite holding a minimal amount of historical carbon emissions (Bonneuil and Fressoz 2017; Mann and Wainwright 2018). Hence, climate violence is not only enacted through activities which cause climate change in the first place. It is further perpetuated by the pursuit of market-based, “business as usual” solutions to the ongoing climate crisis. These strategies fail to challenge endless capital accumulation and subsequent carbon emissions. Pursuing climate solutions that align with a capitalist economic system means that these solutions too will be bound by the need to seek opportunities for extracting surplus value, market growth, and capital accumulation. This assures the continuous recreation of “green” capitalism and surplus climate violence. In so doing, political interventions for adaptation and mitigation will exacerbate suffering in the periphery, where there are fewer resources for adaptive capacity (see Mann and Wainwright 2018). The relationship between solutions for climate change and the system of racial capitalism they endorse mirrors the feedback loops that intensify the physical causes of climate change. Feedback cycles increase in high CO2 emission scenarios. These then result in further emissions that drive global warming (IPCC 2021). In a similar feedback loop, capital can cause climate change, then it can view it as an investment or reinvestment opportunity and find new investment opportunities in the crisis that it itself created. This further increases the pace of climate change, creating an invisible treadmill of climate violence. This means that both decision maker and decisions around carbon emissions, GDP growth, capital accumulation and the rise of carbon emissions in the pursuit of climate solutions need to be made more wholly visible and critically assessed.

#### Vote neg for a democratic centralist model of communism that provides accountability, praxis, and endurance---a unified national party corrects for past failures.

Alyson Escalante, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist; 9-21-2018, "Party Organizing In The 21st Century," Forge News, https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/, date accessed: 8-4-2023 //OA

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. ¶ My goal in this essay is to argue that **base building** and **dual power strategy** can be **best forwarded** through **party organizing**, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a **powerful revolutionary socialist tendency** in the United States. ¶ One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. ¶ The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. ¶ The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? ¶ Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. ¶ By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by **democratic centralist decision making**. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members **accountable, unifying** party member action around **democratically determined goals**, and for **educating** party members in **communist theory and praxis**. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is **not** simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. ¶ Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from **democratic consensus**. ¶ Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held **accountable** for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the **U**nited **S**tates, such **accountability is crucial**. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, **imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing**. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. ¶ Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. ¶ We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. ¶ What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. ¶ In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the **most useful method** for achieving these ends. ¶ The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. ¶ It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. ¶ Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is **not** pursuing a cooperative economy **alongside capitalism, but** is pursuing a **revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism**. ¶ The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. ¶ I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the team who best advances counter-hegemonic struggle against capitalism. We must actualize anti-capitalist futures today and experiment with alternatives in debate---forming new mental conceptions of the future and paths to achieve them. Only our method combatting capitalist inertia in every instance can solve.

Panagiotis Sotiris 14, Department of Sociology, University of the Aegean, 8-6-2014," University movements as laboratories of counter-hegemony," Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, Volume 12, Number 1, http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/12-1-01.pdf, accessed: 3-19-2024 //OA

All these transformations can also account for the counter – hegemonic potential of current struggles within universities. If we manage to have alternative practices, collectivities, sensitivities within struggles in Universities, if we manage to intensify the contradictions of its functioning, if we manage to have major victories against current restructurings, then we can say that we are actually affecting the balance of forces in a process that goes beyond simple demands and can affect the whole of society. ¶ Of course this also requires redefining what constitutes a potential counter-hegemony. Simply articulating resistances to neo-liberalism, or defences of the public university is not enough. If we associate counter hegemony as the strategic condensation of a new politics of labour, an attempt at social experimentation beyond capitalism, new forms of democracy and collectivity and new forms or social interaction, in sum what one might describe a socialist perspective, then we need to think in a more radical way. I am not referring to revolutionary reveries or artificial intellectual constructions, but to the elaboration and projection of the traces of communism evident – as material potentialities – in today’s struggles against austerity, privatization, commodification and entrepreneurialization. But such a perspective cannot be reduced to defending public universities, in their present form, especially if we take into consideration that the current form of public university is also pervaded by market practices, is also subject to pressures to present marketable results, and represents a certain hegemonic function. That is why Alberto Toscano is right to insist that we cannot simply demand a formal democratization of universities and instead search for the subversive potential of contemporary struggles in the sense of a search for a different practice of the University (Toscano 2013). ¶ What we need is a strategy to defend, re-appropriate and transform university through struggles and movements. Instead of the dual schematic reactions of either selflimitation within the contours of academic functioning and trade unionism or of an exodus from the university – a recurring theme in radical student politics from 1968 onwards, with students trying to move from university politics to society – I would like to suggest a strategy of dual power within universities. Usually, we associate dual power simply with a situation of a catastrophic equilibrium between the revolutionary movement and the forces of capital. However, even if we take Lenin’s definition of a ‘power directly based [...] on the direct initiative of the people from below, and not on law enacted by a centralised state power’ (Lenin 1975, 34), and think about it in the more positive sense of movements creating alternative spaces of struggle but also of alternative new social and political forms, collective practices and configurations, based exactly upon the initiative of the people from below, then indeed we can see the relevance of a dual power reference. This would imply not simply mounting resistances, but also experimenting with attempts to make use of the university, its people, its resources in a manner antagonistic to the dominant entrepreneurial model, offering concrete examples of critical and emancipatory social and educational practices. Moreover, only in this way can contemporary movements actually become experimental sites for a new socialist perspective, sites of collective experimentation with new social forms. This experimental and learning aspect of contemporary movements is one of the most challenging aspects of contemporary movements ¶ What is more important is to realize that we must think of socialism not as a project, but as constant and conscious experimentation. And we should not wait until working class seizing power to start this experimentation. [...] Running a self-management factory, organizing the collapse of the public health system, using school facilities to offer gratis tutorials, creating networks of distribution based on fair trade or even non-monetary exchange, resisting contemporary enclosures in cultural products or software, and even the numerous single acts of solidarity, using general assemblies as a decision process, all these should not be seen simply in an instrumental way. They must be seen as the necessary learning processes for alternative non-capitalist social configurations. (Hill et al. 2013, p. 316) ¶ So what we need is to combine the development of movements and resistances to the current wave of neoliberal entrepreneurial reforms with the full flourishing of alternative knowledge practices. What is important is that these alternative practices are already part of the current repertoire of struggles within universities. The new solidarity between students and professors as apprehension of the common demands for public education but also of the importance of a critical pedagogical relation, the experimentation with collective knowledge practices as part of sit-ins and occupations, the very concept of the Occupation as a re-appropriation of space (in both its material and symbolic function), the extended use of new media in order to disseminate critical discourses, the new desire to produce not only demands but also discourses, visions even theory from the part of striking students, all these attest to new possibilities for counter-hegemonic practices within university movements. This also makes imperative a different approach from the part of radical academics, a new collective ethos of research, teaching and working within the movement. This demands that we go beyond simply trying to be critical and radical in what we produce as theoretical outcome. I am not denying the need for high standards of academic writing, but we must think beyond simply being the left-wing or radical limit of contemporary academic scenery. Nor do I think that what we need is simply having more ‘public intellectuals’ as Russel Jacoby suggested some years ago (Jacoby 1987) (one is tempted to think how do figures like Žižek or Badiou – undoubtedly public intellectuals – fit into Jacoby’s conception). What we need is new intellectual and theoretical practices. ¶ First of all we need a new form of militant research, new forms of theoretical research on the side of movements, in collaboration with militants, with militants actually being part of the research process in the sense of both suggesting ideas and for research and offering help in the very research process. There is a wealth of such experiences to study from the 1960s experiments in radical alternative education and research practices, such as the Kritische Universität in Berlin of the Negative University at Trento (Socorso Rosso 1976), to more contemporary experiences. In this sense, it is important to study the experience of Higher Education reforms in Latin America and especially Venezuela and the experiences of alternative higher education structures giving emphasis on the refusal of economic efficiency in favor of integration within the community (Muhr and Verger 2006; MacLaren 2013). Experiences such as the Unitierra in Oaxaca and the Unitierra at Chiapas point to this direction of a radically different collective conception of teaching, knowledge and research, of working along mass movements and of using the experience of people themselves (Esteba 2007). The same goes for experiences such as the Workers and Punks’ University in Slovenia, a radical collective of students, researchers and activists that has had an important theoretical and practical contribution in radical socialist politics in Slovenia. ¶ Secondly we need a new wave of popularization of knowledge and theory. One of the most important aspects of contemporary mass movements is the emphasis they lay on public debate and discussions of ideas. From New York to Athens people have been opening up their ears to alternative projects and militant academics have a moral obligation to contribute with ideas, information, and analyses of the conjuncture. Radical and progressive academics must contribute to this emerging alternative public sphere. ¶ Thirdly, we need new forms of collective theoretical production within movements: a movement to fight precariousness of labour must also include the production of knowledge on contemporary capitalist restructurings; a movement to fight environmentally dangerous mining practice must also produce knowledge on the economics and tactics of the mining industry; a movement in favour of public health must also produce research on the social and health costs of neoliberalism. To all these alternative knowledge practices possible we can still make good use of universities, especially in times of struggles. It is true that university authorities in the past years have done whatever they can in order to limit these possibilities. From measures such as the abolishing the university sanctuary in Greece, to increasingly higher costs for the use of university rooms for purposes other than teaching, to moves such as the dismantling of the University of London Union (ULU) , to all forms of institutional barriers to such practices, we can see all signs of this preemptive authoritarian transformation of the university. But we can still find ways to re-appropriate the university as public space. Moreover, there is also the possibility of linking or coordinating such practices with other alternative public spaces within or outside of academia (exemplified in the presence of radical academics in the Occupy! meetings). The same can be said for the use of other aspects of the infrastructure of public universities. For example in Greece the battle around whether athens.indymedia.org, a radical alternative collective news-website could be hosted in the servers of the Athens Polytechnic was such an example. ¶ At the same time it is necessary to see how also movements can also be knowledge sites and processes how we can combine activism with collective learning and also forms of militant research. As radical academics we have much to offer to this direction. In a way, this will be our opportunity to work towards processes helping the emergence of new ‘organic intellectuals’ as envisaged by Antonio Gramsci. Today’s ‘organic intellectuals’ of the forces of labour should not be conceived only in terms of articulate propagandists of the general political line or of political theorists. We can also see other forms: from software engineers dedicated to open source code to radical educators involved in alternative forms of schooling to radical historians bringing forward new forms of subaltern histories, to doctors bringing forward and fighting the devastation to public health brought by neoliberalism. This is the contemporary version of Kant’s insistence on the public use of reason, of the use of knowledge and expertise within the framework of social and political movements. And all these must accomplished through a new collective practice of the university that should follow the lines suggested by Gramsci in 1917. ¶ Let us organize culture in the same way that we seek to organize any practical activity. Philanthropically, the bourgeoisie have decided to offer the proletariat the Popular Universities. As a counterproposal to philanthropy, let us offer solidarity, organization. Let us give the means to good will, without which it will always remain sterile and barren. It is not the lecture that should interest us, but the detailed work of discussing and investigating problems, work in which everybody participates, to which everybody contributes, in which everybody is both master and disciple. (Gramsci 1985, 25) ¶ All these should not be read as an attempt at simply creating parallel structures and avoiding direct confrontation with the forces of capital. On the contrary, we are refereeing to a process that goes along central struggles, supports them, and helps their politicization. The aim of all these practices is not simply to create alternative knowledge practices, but to create conditions of counter-hegemony. Political projects cannot be conceived simply in terms of catch phrase and general directions. Producing again ‘concrete utopias’ and ‘archaeologies of the future’ of emancipation, cannot be the responsibility of party leaderships or of enlightened leaders, as it was the conception in traditional left-wing politics. Nor is it enough to seek the advice of experts, as it is the tendency in many cases of left wing reformism. What we need is a collective process of experimentation and knowledge production. People learn during movements. They are forced to learn the terrain of struggle. They are forced to understand their situation. They are forced to think of alternatives. This learning aspect of movements of protest and social emancipation is usually underestimated by the political Left. ¶ Movements can therefore become ‘hotbeds’ of new projects, can dialectically and critically incorporate the experiences of militant action and self-management into a critique of capitalist socialist relations that leads to radical alternatives, both in the sense of a projects, analysis, transition programs, but also of a changed ‘common sense’, of transformed collective representations. That is why we must go back to Gramsci who insisted on political organizations and movements being the elaborators of new forms of mass intellectuality (Sotiris 2013a). Only under such conditions can we talk about the emergence of not only mass movements but of a new ‘historical bloc’, to borrow Gramsci’s term, namely of the encounter of a radicalized alliance of the subaltern class, with programs of social emancipation and transformation, through new forms of collective organizing, of subjectivity, of new forms of mass critical intellectuality. It is only in this sense that we can contribute to a profound social and cultural transformation, in the terms that Gramsci described: ¶ The educative-formative work that a homogeneous cultural centre carries out, the elaboration of a critical consciousness that it promotes and favours on a specific historical base which contains the concrete premises for such an elaboration, cannot be limited to the simple theoretical enunciation of ‘clear’ methodological principles: this would be to proceed merely in the manner of the eighteenthcentury ‘philosophes’. The work needed is complex and must be articulated and graduated. It requires a combination of deduction and induction, formal logic and dialectic, identification and distinction, positive demonstration and the destruction of the old. And not in the abstract but in the concrete, on the basis of the real and of actual experience. (Gramsci 1985, 417-418 Gramsci 1977, 2268 (Q24, §3)) ¶ Of course this is not to be conceived simply in terms of the role to be played by militant radical academics with a moral commitment to working within the movement. It will be a much broader, more collective experience. But radical academics have the opportunity to be part of this process, to face this challenge, to beyond simply academic dignity towards their contribution to the creation of an alternative future.

#### Debates about capitalism are key to deconstructing capitalist relations through the role of education in shaping labor and politics. Outweighs their education on scope---most people aren’t policymakers but can shape capitalism.

McLaren 12, Peter. Dr McLaren is an Emeritus Professor of Urban Education at the University of California, Los Angeles. “The Future of the Past: Reflections on the Present State of Empire and Pedagogy.” Counterpoints 422 (2012): 184–212. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42981759. // MD + OA

It is important to note that Rikowski has described capital not only as the subsumption of concrete, living labor by abstract alienated labor but also as a mode of being, as a unified social force that flows through our subjectivities, our bodies, our meaning-making capacities. Schools educate labor power by serving as a medium for its constitution or its social production in the service of capital. But schools are more than this; they do more than nourish labor power because all of capitalist society accomplishes that. In addition to producing capital in general, schools additionally condition labor power in the varying interests of the market- place. But because labor power is a living commodity, and a highly contradictory one at that, it can be reeducated and shaped in the interests of building socialism; that is, in creating opportunities for the self-emancipation of the working class. Labor power, as the capacity or potential to labor, doesn't have to serve its current master - capital. It serves the master only when it engages in the act of laboring for a wage . Because individuals can refuse to labor in the interests of capital accu-mulation, labor power can therefore serve another cause - the cause of socialism. Critical pedagogy can be used as a means of finding ways of transcending the contradictory aspects of labor-power creation and creating different spaces where a dereification, decommodification, and decolonization of subjectivity can occur. Critical pedagogy is an agonistic arena where the development of a discerning po-litical subjectivity can be fashioned (recognizing that there will always be socially and self-imposed constraints). Revolutionary critical pedagogy is multifaceted in that it brings a Marxist humanist perspective to a wide range of policy and curriculum issues. The list of topics includes the globalization of capitalism, the marketization of education, neoliberalism and school reform, imperialism and capitalist schooling, and so on. Revolutionary critical pedagogy (as I am developing it) also offers an alter- native interpretation of the history of capitalism and capitalist societies, with a particular emphasis on the United States. Revolutionary classrooms are prefigura-tive of socialism in the sense that they are connected to social relations that we want to create as revolutionary socialists. The organization of classrooms generally tries to mirror what students and teachers would collectively like to see in the world outside of schools - respect for everyone's ideas, tolerance of differences, a commitment to creativity and social and educational justice, the importance of working collectively, a willingness and desire to work hard for the betterment of humanity, and a commitment to antiracist, antisexist, and antihomophobic practices. If, within the social universe of capital, we are inevitably lashed to the very conditions we as critical educators hope to abolish, then there is no sense in trying to strike a delicate equipoise between capital and labor. The time has come to look beyond the value form of labor and seek alternatives to capitalism. Those of us who work in the field of education cannot afford to sit on the sidelines and watch this debate over the future of education as passive spectators. We need to take direct action, creating the conditions for students to become critical agents of social transformation. This means subjecting social relations of everyday life to a different social logic - transforming them in terms of criteria that have not already seeped in the logic of commodification. Students can - and should - be- come resolute and intransigent adversaries of the values that lie at the heart o commodity capitalism. This implies a new social culture, control of work by the associated producers, and also the very transformation of the nature of work itself. Critical educators need to move beyond the struggle for a redistribution of value, because such a position ignores the social form of value and assumes a priori the vampirelike inevitability of the market. We need to transcend value, not redistribute it, since we cant build a socialist society on the principle of selling one s labor for a wage. Nor will it suffice to substitute collective capital for private capital. We are in a struggle to negate the value form of mediation, not to produce it in different degrees, scales, or registers. We need freedom, not to revert to some pristine substance or abstract essence prior to the point of production, but the freedom to learn how to appropriate the many social developments formed on the basis of alienated activity, to realize our human capacities to be free, to be a self- directed subject and not merely an instrument of capital for the self-expansion of value, and to be a conscious and purposeful human being with the freedom to determine the basis of our relationships. Here, subjectivity would not be locked into the requirements of capitals valorization process. Revolutionary critical pedagogy operates from an understanding that the ba-sis of education is political, and that spaces need to be created where students can imagine a different world outside of capitalisms law of value (i.e., social form of labor), where alternatives to capitalism and capitalist institutions can be discussed and debated, and where dialogue can occur about why so many revolutions in past history turned into their opposite. It looks to create a world where a new mode of distribution can prevail, not based on socially necessary labor time, but on actual labor time; where alienated human relations are subsumed by authentically transparent ones; where freely associated individuals can successfully work towards a permanent revolution; where the division between mental and manual labor can be abolished; where patriarchal relations and other privileging hierarchies of oppression and exploitation can be ended; where, to paraphrase Marx, we can truly exercise the principle "from each according to his or her ability and to each according to his or her need." It looks to create a world where we can traverse the terrain of universal rights unburdened by necessity, moving sensu-ously and fluidly within that ontological space where subjectivity is exercised as a form of capacity building and creative self-activity within and as a part of the social totality: a space where labor is no longer exploited and becomes a striving that will benefit all human beings, where labor refuses to be instrumentalized and commodified and ceases to be a compulsory activity, and where the full development of human capacity is encouraged (Hudis, 2005). It also builds upon forms of self-organization that are part of the history of liberation struggles worldwide, such as the 1871 Paris Commune, Cubas Consejos Populares formed in 1989, those that developed during the civil rights, feminist, and worker movements, and those organizations of today that emphasize participatory democracy. Critical pedagogy is by no means commensurate with the attention it excites in the academic literature, yet it continues to provide an important site of praxis- making which can be used to educate and agitate about crucial issues that affect our collective future. We need more than powerful exhortations; we need actions that can transform existing concrete situations into socialist solutions. We cant blithely conjure exploitation out of existence with benevolent abstractions - with words that are treated as revolutionary acts in themselves, no matter how universal their reach (Amoo-Adare, in press). Neither can we comfortably rest in our assur-ance that populism is the answer.

#### Underview: except counter-interps, all theory interps and impact turns must be read in each teams constructive speech---otherwise second rebuttal can sandbag procedurals that make it impossible to extend an argument and answer all of them. The summary bottleneck creates the only irreparable time skew because new arguments can’t be introduced. Fairness and education both depend on a conception of the good which capitalism destroys---that’s Morgadige. That means the K is a prior question to theory.

### 2NC

### 1NC---Link---National Security

#### The aff is a national security project to bolster US industry, militarism, and hegemony under the rule of capital---the USFG tells you so.

**Department of Energy 20** [No Author, xx-xx-2020, “Restoring America’s Competitive Nuclear Energy Advantage,” U.S. Department of Energy, https://www.energy.gov/articles/restoring-americas-competitive-nuclear-energy-advantage, DOA 3-11-2025]

**Nuclear power** is **intrinsically tied** to **National Security**. ¶ America has **lost** its **competitive global** position as the **world leader** in nuclear energy to **state-owned enterprises**, notably Russia and China, with other competitor nations also aggressively moving to surpass the United States (U.S.). ¶ The Strategy to Restore American Nuclear Energy Leadership is designed to restore America’s competitive nuclear advantages.¶ It is in the U.S. national security interest to **preserve** and **grow** the **assets and investments** of the entire U.S. nuclear **enterprise**. We can do so by addressing domestic and international security interests, **expanding nuclear generation**, minimizing commercial fleet fiscal vulnerabilities, assuring defense needs for uranium, and leveling the playing field against state-owned enterprises. ¶ First, the U.S. Government will take bold action to revive and strengthen the **uranium mining industry**, support uranium conversion services, end reliance on foreign uranium enrichment capabilities, and sustain the current fleet, removing strategic vulnerabilities across the nuclear fuel cycle and restoring a world-class workforce to provide benefits to the U.S. and **to compete in the international market**. ¶ Next, the U.S. Government will leverage American **technological innovation** and advanced nuclear Research, Development, and Demonstration (**R**D**&D**) **investments** to accelerate technical advances and **regain American** nuclear energy **leadership**. ¶ Finally, the U.S. Government **will move into markets** currently **dominated** by Russian and Chinese State Owned Enterprises (SOE) and recover our position as the world leader in **exporting** best-in-class nuclear energy technology, and with it, strong non-proliferation standards. We will restore American nuclear credibility and demonstrate American **commitment to competing** in contested markets and repositioning America as the responsible nuclear energy partner of choice. ¶ The Nuclear Fuel Working Group recognizes the importance of taking focused, deliberate action to prevent the **near-term collapse** of the domestic uranium mining, milling, and conversion industries and the need to support US strategic fuel cycle capabilities. This strategy includes concrete actions that the Administration has already taken through its Fiscal Year 2021 Budget that demonstrate its commitment to these principles as well as recommendations for additional action that can be used by the Administration to inform future policy decisions. Any recommendations in this strategy beyond those already reflected in the President’s Budget will be subject to relevant budgetary, regulatory, and policy development processes before adoption or execution. Given the dynamic nature of the challenges facing the front-end of the nuclear fuel cycle, the Administration will continue to monitor market conditions and track progress. The NFWG supports implementation of focused, carefully executed policy measures that achieve the Administrations goals and ensure deployment of the most effective and efficient solutions. ¶ Congress has provided broad bipartisan and bicameral support for U.S. nuclear energy. ¶ It is within our power to pull America’s **nuclear industrial base** back from the **brink of collapse** and **restore our place** as the global leader in nuclear technology – **ensuring** a strong **national security** position and buttressing our **economic strength** for generations

### 1NC---Link---AId

#### Their narratives of international development are an effort to naturalize capitalism while excusing centuries of exploitation. The aid industry works for profit, not public good.

Harrison 22, Graham 1-19-2022, Dr. Harrison teaches political economy at the School of Government and International Affairs at Durham University "Development is capitalist development – violent, coercive and brutal," Review of African Political Economy, https://roape.net/2022/01/19/development-is-capitalist-development-violent-coercive-and-brutal/ //MD + OA

One of the most powerful bourgeois ideological sleights of hand has been the naming of capitalist development as simply development. ‘Development’ discursively serves to naturalise what is a profoundly disruptive and political transformation, a transformation based in an imposed reallocation of property and wealth that relies on an invigorated and restless putting to work of people, requiring sustained and muscular state action. A transformation, above all, that is extremely risky and unlikely to succeed. Development is capitalist development. This means not only that it is very risky and likely to fail but also that it is very unpleasant. The bourgeois coinage of development is that it is stable, incremental, and positive sum. In a word: liberal. Liberal development strategies—operationalised through a massive institutionalisation of international aid from the late 1950s—is in essence a theatre of global fantasy, a fantasy in which capitalist development is reimagined as a planned, inclusive, and socially just modernisation. The ideological erasure of enclosure, corporal punishment in law, forced labour, slavery, genocidal frontier expansion, theft and fraud, and war from the concrete manifestations of capitalist development has been sustained through the rolling out of a multi-trillion-dollar aid industry underpinned by an international elite institutionalism. The fact is that capitalist development is fundamentally Hobbesian: nasty and brutish; destructive of existing community and extremely exploitative. It is in the DNA of capital’s ascendance that it remakes societies for its own purpose and the foundation of that purpose is not ‘making money’ or ‘earning income’ (the liberal vocabulary) but maximising profit, and extracting surplus labour: again and again, maximally and forever. This brings me to two cardinal points that address our focus back to Tanzania or many other African countries. Firstly, that capitalist development requires the emergence of strong, purposeful, and well-resourced capitals. Secondly, that the conditions under which these emerge are, vitally, politically secured. Let me comment briefly on each. In relation to the first point, we should note that much of the more progressive mainstream development discourse revolves around capabilities, microfinance, poverty reduction strategies, participatory development, empowerment, and resilience. All of these aid-driven devices are variations on a theme which the book describes as strategies to allow mass populations to ‘enjoy poverty’. That is, to live in an enduring and untransformed condition of material scarcity in meagre relative comfort. This discourse is at heart—and despite the often pleasing imagery it purveys—neoliberal. The story goes something like this: the enhanced capabilities of an individual lead them to secure a loan that allows them to earn a little more money that brings them to purchase a second-hand motorbike, a solar panel, a corrugated roof or a three-month class at a night school to learn accounting methods. Often told in vignette, these narratives bear slender connection to the major engines of poverty reduction which reside in those zones of capitalist industrialisation in northeast Asia and elsewhere in which tens of millions of people have experienced increases in income. All of the evidence indicates that capitalist industrialisation generates poverty reduction not through individual or community vignettes but through the structural changes wrought by capitalist industrialisation. So, capitalist development is nasty, brutish, and impoverishing and also the world’s most tenacious engine of poverty reduction. It might seem that there is a contradiction here, but it is only apparent, not substantive. Capitalist development is the rolling out of what Anwar Shaikh calls turbulent trends: a collision of disorders set in unstable social relations that in their own dynamics generate the conditions of possibility for a generalised improvement in mass material well-being. Conditions of possibility, no more than this. There is no modernisation-style certainty of mass consumption; there is, pace The Economist, no inexorable rise of a global middle class. But, in a way that is historically unprecedented, capitalism presents the possibility that a level and breadth of shared wealth can be achieved. This possibility depends on levels of economic growth and productivity and the strength of social mobilisation to makes claims on the commonwealth that capitalism generates and alienates. The second point indicates what is, intellectually, a considerable lacuna in studies of capitalist development: its normative foundations. The major attraction of liberal visions of (capitalist) development resides in its ability to suture over the violence. The liberal vision is, to twist Rousseau, all freedom, and no force. This is a seductive fiction. It evades what is the most important political question facing any state that aspires to achieve capitalist development: how to engineer the social transformation within which capital can ascend into a dominant position within a national political economy. But this question is unavoidable. The book goes through variants of an answer to this question: England, America, Japan, Taiwan, Israel, China. All different; all the same. All extreme, not exceptional. All coercive, all risky. Only enjoying success after generations of uncertainty, chaos, and violence, and even then, success is not permanent. Developmentalism argues that, in radically different geographical and historical circumstances, all of these states only succeeded in forging capitalist transformation when this transformation was seen as inextricably integrated into a major-order or existential threat to sovereignty. Forging a nation, securing a border, or consolidating a besieged elite’s rule… in these circumstances in which states are seen as inextricably part of a project to promote the ascendance of capital one can identify the emergence of ideologies where capitalist development is not desirable but necessary. This ideological family is developmentalism. So, the core question for African states that wish to pursue capitalist development is political-strategic. It is not about ‘getting the institutions right’ or good governance. It is broader and more ambitious than that and set in a temporality that is generational, not what economists call medium-term. It requires authoritarian state action—as it did in almost all other cases. The book’s argument here is unlikeable: that there is no implicit commensurability between capitalist development and rights. If a ruling elite wishes to promote capitalist development it will only succeed if it deploys top-down and coercive state action—through law, programmes of social engineering, and also police action—to reallocate property, discipline workforces, secure exploitation, and push money into ascending capitals. One of the most unhelpful conflations in development studies in Amartya Sen’s development as freedom. To see development as an expanding freedom is to define away the central feature of capitalist development. This is, of course, normatively very troubling. Does this perspective serve as an apology for forced resettlement, the detention of labour leaders, the top-down enclosure of land and resources for capital? No, it does not. There are three co-ordinates here. In the first place, a theoretical orientation towards political realism. Realism is not amoral—this is a caricature that cannot really be found centrally in major Realist texts. Realism simply argues that normative politics is contextual: the modes of address to justice and right are not ideally-derived but produced in specific circumstances. So: the normativity of development does not disappear, it simply relocates into the processes of struggle themselves. This orientation leads to a better awareness of the political norms and normative contestation that accompany capitalist development. This is because the focus on rights is enriched through a recognition that socially-embedded political normativity is only in part about rights. It is also about a stability that allows people to see a better future, a sense of value in community and/or nationhood, religious cosmologies, economic growth, and other situated values which can only be understood through actual research. From a Realist point of view, these other value-clusters enjoy equal status with equally contextualised manifestations of rights norms and their significance and value are empirical matters. As a result, normative investigations from a Realist perspective do not insist on an a priori and idealised derivation from universal and absolute rights. And, they are all the richer for that. Secondly, analytically, the book insists that there must be a separation of rights and development. They are not commensurable. They are antagonistic, or perhaps in the midst of capitalist transformation, highly strained: constantly requiring non-ideal play-offs. Capitalist development requires active deception from states; force strategically deployed; heavy ideological underlabour; secrecy and cronyism. In other words: politics… politics in the sense of making least-worst decisions in the midst of incomplete information and risk. Human rights scholars and activists work within a very well-specified moral universe that is founded on a meta-norm of justice. But this is not the province of the development scholar. Thirdly, the political agencies that drive justice claims and indeed underpin the sustained demands for generalised material improvement emerge from concrete situations, not idealised norms. Consequently, we need to situate them in the very turbulence of capitalist transformation itself. As political economies change, so do the possibilities for political mobilisation. Normative agency itself develops within organisation, mobilisation, debate, and public action. This is, historically, a story of the changing organisation of labourers, but also of middle-class organisations, and mobilisations that intersect across poverty, race, gender, and other identities. None of these mobilisations exist because they are intrinsically or ideally right; they exist because they are produced within the transformations themselves.

## On Heg

#### NQ: trump thumps he’s literally bringing together north korea

#### No war---transition brings stable bipolarity---postdates.

Paudel 20[September 3, 2020, Paudel, Sirish, Sirish Paudel is currently studying B. Sc. CSIT (Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and Information Technology) at New Summit College., “Decline in US Hegemony: Will this Result in Hegemonic War or not?”, Modern Diplomacy, <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2020/09/03/decline-in-us-hegemony-will-this-result-in-hegemonic-war-or-not/>, Arzoumanidis]

One of the contemporary issues in international relations is that the current hegemon, the United States, has undergone a relative decline. It is argued that American hegemony that emerged aftermath the Second World War is undergoing a decline and with the rise of a potential challenger in China looming, one major issue concerning IR scholars is whether or not the relative decline of US hegemony will result in a hegemonic war. Hegemonic wars occur when a rising challenger – revisionist power – isn’t content with the current international order and wants to change it so as to become a preponderant force and dictate terms of a new world order. This article assumes that **although the US is in a relative decline it is still a dominant power and the rising power is content with the current status quo so no war occurs between the dominant and the rising power.** In order to support the argument that a hegemonic war does not occur, this article provides explanation using several theoretical perspectives. Structural Realism and Balance of Power To begin with, prominent neorealist Kenneth Waltz contends that the end of the Cold War has changed the structure of international politics from bipolar to unipolar with the US being the dominant power. According to Waltz, days of US being unipolar force in world politics is numbered and slowly the world is moving towards bipolarity or multipolarity because changes in the structure of international system brings about changes in state behavior. It does not matter how much self-restraint and self-control a preponderant power is in its conduct of international relations; states are always wary and fear the dominant power and thus he maintains that balancing is universal. [1] In order to explain why, he has resorted to the Balance of Power (theory). In most basic sense, international politics is a state of anarchy where there is no central government and states rely on themselves to protect their autonomy and perpetuate their survival. Balance of Power contends that states involve in a balancing act to check the powers of preponderant force so that no any single state has enough power to become a global hegemon. [2] **With the relative decline of US, China and America can enter into bipolar relationship** much like the US and the USSR during the Cold War. Since **Waltz** himself **posits bipolarity as the most stable of international configurations**, it can be argued that act of **balancing** between the US and China brings the international distribution of power into an equilibrium and **averts the risk of war.** Socialization of Hegemonic Power Most scholars posit that hegemons use threats and rewards to get compliance from secondary states. Contrary to popular wisdom, scholars Ikenberry and Kupchan have contended that in addition to material power, hegemons also have the power of socialization to achieve compliance from secondary states. They call this the socialization process which involves ‘altering of the belief systems’ of elites. Basically, hegemons project their vision of international order through normative principles (norms and values) and not by material incentives; elites in secondary states internalize them, and devise policies that are compatible to the hegemon’s ideal of the international order. The authors contend that **the world order thus created can sustain even when hegemon undergoes a decline** because the world order created is relatively inexpensive to maintain in the sense that altering of states preferences are by virtue of ideals rather than use of coercion. Thus, by virtue of socialization of hegemonic power, relative changes in hegemon’s distribution of material power (military and economy) does not put strain on the international system. So, on viewing the world from the lens of socialization, it can be argued that the expansion of US normative principles on liberal economic norm to its former allies and enemies aftermath the second world war that led to the formation of the current liberal economic world order provides an explanation as to why in spite of US’ relative decline there is continuity for America’s liberal economic order. [3] The rising challenger China can be considered to have been socialized – it has accepted US led international norms, and participates in various International Organizations. Thus, it makes less sense for China to wage war against the hegemon whose ideals it has internalized. Hegemonic Stability Theory According to this theory, a hegemon creates a stable international economic order characterized by market openness but its decline results in global instability. This hegemonic effect of open trade benefits all participants, especially, weaker states that do not have any burden of public goods. In this sense, global economic stability is born out of hegemony and provides provision of collective public goods and in doing so facilitates a stable international system. The motivation to create an economic openness lie in the interest of the hegemon – it has the largest economy and so benefits most from open markets. In addition, only hegemons have the material capability (political and military) to provide public goods and induce other states to embrace open trade. [4] By virtue of the Hegemonic Stability Theory, the hegemon is an important element in creation and maintenance of the international system. As stated earlier, open trade benefits all participants, even the rising challengers that are accommodated in the system. In contemporary world politics, China is the fastest rising power and it is also reaping the benefits of the open economic order created by the US. By participating in the globalized economy, China has earned a comparative advantage in labor-market and its economy has been growing. On top of that China is an export-based economy and thus, it has very little incentive to jeopardize this benefit by engaging with the hegemon and thereby disrupting the order. In his article, Artur Stein has argued that decline in hegemony does not bring about a complete collapse of the trade regime as long as hegemonic power is committed to economic openness. Taking these two points in consideration, it can be argued that it is not in the interest of China to challenge US hegemony. On account, likelihood of war is averted. [5] Robert Keohane and Institutionalist Approach In After Hegemony, Robert Keohane uses an institutional approach to explain inter-state cooperation. He posits that states have common interest and in order to realize it requires achieving mutually beneficial agreements which is where international regimes come in. These regimes foster cooperation by making it easier to reach mutually beneficial inter-state agreements. They help overcome the problem of lack of qualitative and asymmetrical information, through institutional embeddedness reduces transaction costs, legal costs reduce incentive to cheat thereby reducing uncertainty and building confidence among states. Since hegemonic leadership is required to create regimes in the first place, even after the erosion of hegemony, they have high stakes and play important role in fostering cooperation (US role in the IMF and WTO). Because cooperation fosters absolute gain, all participants are benefitted. [6] By this approach, states see cooperation more beneficial than conflict. Thus, it can be argued from institutionalist approach that **international regimes foster cooperation thereby reducing likelihood of conflict in the event of hegemonic decline.** Conclusion The article provided four distinct perspectives with regards to declining US hegemony and potential of a hegemonic war. Using these approaches the article concludes that **in spite of decline in American hegemony there will not be a significant change in the current structure of the international system mainly due to power differentials between the US and its nearest challenger China.** The US is undergoing a relative decline but still, it is the largest economy boasts strongest military and has highest political leverage. In sum, **prospect of a hegemonic war in contemporary world politics is only a far-fetched dream.**

## On Aid

#### NQ: other causes to food war

#### Capitalism requires constant, compounding growth, making efforts at tech substitution and efficiency improvements useless. This takes out their impact defense.

Ståle HOLGERSEN AND Rikard WARLENIUS 16, \*research fellow at the Institute for Housing and Urban Research at Uppsala University, Sweden; \*\*PhD candidate at the Human Ecology Division at Lund University [“Destroy what destroys the planet: Steering creative destruction in the dual crisis,” *Capital & Class*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 2016, p. 511-532, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

It is beyond doubt that all capitalist economies so far have been growing, with the exception of relatively short periods of crises. This is no coincidence, but follows from foundational aspects of the economic system; it is a ‘generally accepted consensus figure in the financial press and elsewhere of 3 per cent as a minimum acceptable rate of growth’ (Harvey 2014: 227). This growth is endless, as profit and capital accumulation are not only desires for single capitalists but also absolute necessities for the system at large. Individual companies live by the same rule as the macro-economy – growing or dying (Sandler 1994) – while a stationary capitalism is an oxymoron (Blauwhof 2012; Harvey 1999; Marx 1976; Schumpeter 1962[1942], 1983[1934]). As to why capitalism is growing, we lean towards Marxist theory that affirms the economy is growing due to the production of surplus value, derived from productive labour.3 Through this process, as profit is realized in the market, more capital is thrown back into production of more things and commodities, as well as more factories, more infrastructure, more urbanization: more of everything (Harvey 2014).

We do not claim that economic growth is the goal of capital. It rather seems that capital accumulation and profits drive the system. Capital will therefore tend to prefer an accumulation mode with mediocre growth but high profits (neoliberalism) before a mode with high growth but decreasing returns (Keynesianism). But no growth at all is simply incompatible with capitalism.

Furthermore, its growth is compound. The economy does not grow with a constant sum over time; it grows in percentages. If the economy grows with 3% per year, the absolute growth will be larger the second year than the first. From this follows that the economy is not only growing but also growing more and more each year. If we assume a moderate annual growth rate of 2.5%, the combined global economy will be 12 times larger in one century and 140 times larger in 200 years!

... and growth increases environmental pressures

We maintain, as above, that economic growth causes ecological pressures. This claim is, however, more controversial than the first part of the hypothesis and needs to be dealt with more carefully. The fundamental premise (and promise) of ecological modernization is the ‘decoupling’ of economic growth from increased environmental pressure through ‘dematerialization’ and continuous efficiency improvements. The EKC, for example, with the shape of an U turned upside down, claims that the historically observed correlation between economic growth and increased environmental pressure is broken at an undefined point, and from that point on further economic growth is instead inversely correlated with ecological damage (for overviews, see, for example, Stern 2004 or Carson 2010). One typical example is the fading of the air pollution and heavy smog over many cities in global North, which, according to this theory, was enabled by and a consequence of economic growth.4

But despite that EKC intuitively makes some sense due to the apparent progress that has occurred in rich countries, there is unfortunately no empirical evidence for decoupling between growth and overall throughput of matter and fuels, or between growth and the carbon footprint of nations.5 As we will see, the premise and promise that the EKC would be a more or less spontaneous process under the current economic system must therefore be regarded as false. To start with, a growing economy has always been related to growing material throughput, and the economy has always been and still is highly physical, based on production of commodities, buildings, infrastructure and so on. Although places in the global North turned ‘post-industrial’ – in the sense that these economies have experienced decreased industrial production – there are no signs of a genuine ‘de-materialization’. And globally, which is the most interesting scale concerning global warming, the industrial workforce is still rising.6 Furthermore, the consumption in the global core continues to increase, along with its environmental ‘weight’. This is absolutely crucial to bear in mind, as the global division of labour, production and consumption have altered so that certain cities and countries look far less responsible for environmental change than is actually the case (cf. Holgersen 2014). For example, Sweden’s territorial emissions of greenhouse gases have been decreasing for almost 20 years, but the carbon footprint as well as overall ecological footprint, that is, including the net effects of trade and international travel, is still rising. In 2004, we would have needed 3.4 planets if everyone would consume like Swede’s; today 3.7 planets are needed (Borgström-Hansson & Wirtén 2014; Stockholm Environmental Institute (SEI) 2012).

Another crucial aspect is that increased environmental efficiency is easily outnumbered by overall growth. As it seems, the economic system continues to improve efficiency and implement more environmental friendly techniques of all kinds – while still increasing ecological pressure. This is highly counter-intuitive, but was elaborated already by Stanley Jevons (2001[1865]) in The Coal Question from 1865, where he explains why the increasing efficiency of steam engines did not reduce demand for coal – but quite the opposite.

If an old steam engine were exchanged for a more efficient one, the machine would require less coal for the same production and therefore constitute an environmental improvement. But this argument is only valid as long as the aim of the activity is to produce a certain amount of something. If the aim is to generate profits, as under capitalism, another logic takes over. Then, the efficiency gain will lower costs since less coal is needed and profits will increase – profits that will be thrown into the next round of capital accumulation. This leads inevitably to the employment of more steam engines that will have to be fuelled with more coal.

The tendency in capitalism of efficiency improvements to spark larger environmental pressures, rather than less, is often referred to as Jevons paradox (cf. Foster et al. 2010). This is an important explanation for why a dematerialized, truly green capitalism has not yet evolved and perhaps never will.

Tim Jackson (2009) shows exactly how fast the carbon intensity of the economy must decrease if the 2°C target (interpreted as a maximum concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere of 450 ppm) should be reached.

Extrapolating the historical tendency, global emissions will rise about 80% until 2050. But to reach the 2°C target, Jackson argues, global emissions will have to be reduced by 85% until 2050, or 4.9% annually. If we assume, as is normally done, that neither population growth nor economic growth can be influenced, the change in carbon intensity alone will have to make sure emissions are reduced at a pace fast enough. Thus, the carbon intensity will have to decrease almost 7% annually – 10 times faster than the last years. In real figures, current carbon intensity of 768 gCO2/US $ will have to sink to 36 gCO2/US $ in 2050. In a stable economy without economic growth, the carbon intensity would ‘only’ have to fall to 115 g in 2050.

If we assume that the developing world will – or at least should have the right to – catch up to the average EU economic level in 2050, then the economic growth must be larger and the carbon intensity must decrease by 11%/year to reach 6 gCO2/$ in 2050 – 130 times less than in 2007. That is very challenging.

To use Sanne’s (2012) metaphor: we need to go down the stairs towards low or no emissions rapidly, but if we descend on a rising escalator – a metaphor for economic growth – we will have to run much quicker to reach the target in time. And we could add: as the economic growth is compound, the escalator will go faster and faster.. A similar utopian fervor in the late sixties and early seventies-emerging out of the countercultural upheaval, when young people were questioning just about everything-laid the groundwork for feminist, lesbian and gay, and environmental breakthroughs.

## Climate DA

#### LT. Nuclear is too slow and raises net emissions.

Ramana 24 [M.V. Ramana, Simons Chair in Disarmament, Global and Human Security and Professor of Public Policy and Global Affairs @ University of British Columbia, 7-29-2024, "Atomic Fallacy: Why Nuclear Power Won’t Solve the Climate Crisis" Literary Hub, https://lithub.com/atomic-fallacy-why-nuclear-power-wont-solve-the-climate-crisis/, accessed: 4-1-2025] OA

Some might argue that these risks are the price we must pay to counter the threat of climate change. I disagree, but even if one were to adopt this position, my research shows that nuclear energy is just not a feasible solution to climate change. A nuclear power plant is a really expensive way to produce electricity. And nuclear energy simply cannot be scaled fast enough to match the rate at which the world needs to lower carbon emissions to stay under 1.5 degrees Celsius, or even 2 degrees.¶ Cost and the slow rate of deployment largely explain why the share of global electricity produced by nuclear reactors has been steadily declining, from around 16.9 percent in 1997, when the Kyoto Protocol was signed, to 9.2 percent in 2022. In contrast, as the costs of wind and solar energy declined dramatically, and modern renewables (which do not include large dams) went from supplying 1.2 percent of the world’s electricity in 1997 to 14.4 percent in 2022.¶ Another contrast is revealing. When pro-nuclear advocates talk about solving climate change with nuclear energy, they call for building lots and lots of reactors. The World Nuclear Association, for example, proposes building thousands of nuclear reactors, which would together be capable of generating a million megawatts of electricity, by 2050. Such a goal is completely at odds with historical rates of building nuclear reactors.¶ Some proponents of nuclear energy refuse to give up on the technology. They blame the decline in nuclear energy and the high costs and long construction periods on the characteristics of older reactor designs, arguing that alternative designs will rescue nuclear energy from its woes. In recent years, the alternatives most often advertised are small modular (nuclear) reactors—SMRs for short. These are designed to generate between 10 and 300 megawatts of power, much less than the 1,000–1,600 megawatts that reactors being built today are designed to produce.¶ For over a decade now, many of my colleagues and I have consistently explained why these reactors would not be commercially viable and why they would never resolve the undesirable consequences of building nuclear power plants. I first started examining small modular reactors when I worked at Princeton University’s Program on Science and Global Security. Our group largely comprised physicists, and we used a mixture of technical assessments, mathematical techniques, and social-science-based methods to study various problems associated with these technologies. My colleague Alex Glaser, for example, used neutronics models to calculate how much uranium would be required as fuel for SMRs, which we then used to estimate the increased risk of nuclear weapons proliferation from deploying such reactors. Zia Mian, originally from Pakistan, and I showed why the technical characteristics of SMRs would not allow for simultaneously solving the four key problems identified with nuclear power: its high costs, its accident risks, the difficulty of dealing with radioactive waste, and its linkage with the capacity to make nuclear weapons. My colleagues and I also undertook case studies on Jordan, Ghana, and Indonesia, three countries advertised by SMR vendors as potential customers, and showed that despite much talk, none of them were investing in SMRs, because of various country-specific reasons such as public opposition and institutional interests.¶ We were not the only people coming up with reasons for not believing in the claim that new reactor designs would solve all these problems. Other scientists and analysts also highlighted the dangers and false promises of SMRs.¶ Nuclear advocates are not deterred by such arguments. They insist that this time it will be different. Nuclear plants would be cheap, would be quick to build, would be safe, would never have to be shut down in unplanned ways, and would not be affected by climate-related extreme weather events. The evidence from the real world, which I elaborate on later, suggests otherwise. Nuclear reactors are unlikely to possess any of these characteristics, let alone all of them. Thus, what is actually being advocated might be termed faux nuclear plants, existing only in the imagination of some, not in the real world.¶ My bottom line is that nuclear energy, whether with old reactor designs or new faux alternatives, will simply not resolve the climate crisis. The threat from climate change is urgent. The world has neither the financial resources nor the luxury of time to expand nuclear power. Meanwhile, even a limited expansion would aggravate a range of environmental and ecological risks. Further, nuclear energy is deeply imbricated in creating the conditions for nuclear annihilation. Expanding nuclear power would leave us in the worst of both worlds.

#### LT. Every step of the nuclear process releases GHGs.

Horvitz 24 [Leslie Alan Horvitz (), 1-19-2024, "The Nuclear Energy Dilemma: Climate Savior or Existential Threat?", Socialist Project, https://socialistproject.ca/2024/01/nuclear-energy-dilemma-climate-savior-or-existential-threat/ (accessed 3-14-2025)] ME

Carbon Emissions¶ Nuclear power is indeed a low-carbon source of energy. Even so, nuclear power plants emit carbon-14, a radioactive isotope. Moreover, the processes used in all stages of the nuclear power cycle release carbon emissions: “uranium mining and milling, conversion of ore to uranium hexafluoride, enrichment, fuel fabrication, reactor construction and decommissioning, fuel reprocessing, waste management, rehabilitation of mining sites, and transport,” all of which require the use of fossil fuels, states an article in the OpenMind.¶ According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the emissions from these processes are close to the emissions produced in constructing facilities for renewables like solar and wind power – an average figure of 65 grams of CO2 per kilowatt-hour. (Gas and coal, by comparison, produce 450 and 900 grams, respectively, to generate the same amount of energy.)¶ However, few studies have been conducted on the carbon emissions produced in the entire lifecycle of a nuclear power plant, from uranium extraction to nuclear waste storage. According to one measurement carried out by the state-run German Environment Agency (UBA), as well as figures provided by the Netherlands-based World Information Service on Energy, nuclear power releases 3.5 times more CO2 per kilowatt-hour than photovoltaic solar panel systems, 13 times more than onshore wind power, and 29 times more than electricity produced by hydropower installations.¶ It’s estimated that each nuclear-generating station discharges about two-thirds of the energy it burns in its reactor core into the environment while only a third is used for energy (and 10 percent of that is lost in transmission).“To produce the 25 [metric tons] or so of uranium fuel needed to keep your average reactor going for a year entails the extraction of half a million [metric tons] of waste rock and over 100,000 [metric tons] of mill tailings,” wrote David Thorpe in the Guardian in 2008, then-news editor for the Energy, Resource, Sustainable, and Environmental Management magazine of the UK’s Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. “These are toxic for hundreds of thousands of years.”¶ Water Usage¶ The profligate use of water (used as a coolant in nuclear plants) is another concern for skeptics of nuclear power. For example, large reactors like the two at Diablo Canyon, California, individually dump about 1.25 billion gallons of water into the ocean daily. (These are the last reactors still operating in California.)¶ A statement by the Union of Concerned Scientists warned: “The temperature increase in the bodies of water can have serious adverse effects on aquatic life. Warm water holds less oxygen than cold water, thus, discharge from once-through cooling systems can create a ‘temperature squeeze’ that elevates the metabolic rate for fish.”¶ Alternatively, many nuclear reactors rely on cooling towers to recycle water, although these, too, can cause an adverse environmental impact by emitting vast quantities of steam and water vapor, warming the atmosphere.

#### Even the smallest acts of refusal contribute to the revolutionary dismantling of capitalism.

Holloway 5(John, professor at Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences at the Autonomous University of Puebla, “Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?” http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=98)

I don’t know the answer. Perhaps we can change the world without taking power. Perhaps we cannot. The starting point—for all of us, I think—is uncertainty, not knowing, a common search for a way forward. Because it becomes more and more clear that capitalism is a catastrophe for humanity. A radical change in the organisation of society, that is, revolution, is more urgent than ever. And this revolution can only be world revolution if it is to be effective. But it is unlikely that world revolution can be achieved in one single blow. This means that the only way in which we can conceive of revolution is as interstitial revolution, as a revolution that takes place in the interstices of capitalism, a revolution that occupies spaces in the world while capitalism still exists. The question is how we conceive of these interstices, whether we think of them as states or in other ways. In thinking about this, we have to start from where we are, from the many rebellions and insubordinations that have brought us to Porto Alegre. The world is full of such rebellions, of people saying NO to capitalism: NO, we shall not live our lives according to the dictates of capitalism, we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable and not what capital tells us to do. Sometimes we just see capitalism as an all-encompassing system of domination and forget that such rebellions exist everywhere. At times they are so small that even those involved do not perceive them as refusals, but often they are collective projects searching for an alternative way forward and sometimes they are as big as the Lacandon Jungle or the Argentinazo of three years ago or the revolt in Bolivia just over a year ago. All of these insubordinations are characterised by a drive towards self-determination, an impulse that says, ‘No, you will not tell us what to do, we shall decide for ourselves what we must do.’ These refusals can be seen as fissures, as cracks in the system of capitalist domination. Capitalism is not (in the first place) an economic system, but a system of command. Capitalists, through money, command us, telling us what to do. To refuse to obey is to break the command of capital.

#### Our education is crucial---politics have been reduced to feedback loops of algorithmic regulation which kills aff solvency and turns education claims. Only by reclaiming radical imagination through democratic debate can we form new futures that challenge biopolitical inertia.

Henry Giroux 15, 10-23-2015, Culture of Cruelty: the Age of Neoliberal Authoritarianism, CounterPunch.org, 9-4-2023, https://www.counterpunch.org/2015/10/23/culture-of-cruelty-the-age-of-neoliberal-authoritarianism/ GHS-DM (OA recut)

What role might education and critical pedagogy have in a society in which the social has been individualized, emotional live collapses into the therapeutic, and education is relegated to either a private affair or to a kind of algorithmic mode of regulation in which everything is reduced to a desired measureable outcome. How might education function to reclaim a notion of the democratic imagination and the importance of the social under a system that celebrates and normalizes the assumption that individuals are “greedy, self-interested animals [and that] we must reward greedy, self-interested behaviour to create a rational and efficient economic system?”[32] There is more at work here than a pedagogy of repression, there is an ideology of barbarism, one that flirts dangerously with irrationality and removes itself from any vestige of solidarity, compassion, and care for the other or the planet. Feedback loops now replace politics and the concept of revolution is defined through the culture of measurement and efficiency.[33] In a culture drowning in a new love affair with empiricism and data collecting, that which is not measurable—such as compassion, vision, the imagination, care for the other, and a passion for justice—withers. In its place emerges what Goya called in one of his engraving “The Sleep of Reason Produces Monster.” Goya’s title is richly suggestive particularly about the role of education and pedagogy in compelling students, to be able to recognize, as my colleague David Clark points out, “that an inattentiveness to the never-ending task of critique breeds horrors: the failures of conscience, the wars against thought, and the flirtations with irrationality that lie at the heart of the triumph of every-day aggression, the withering of political life, and the withdrawal into private obsessions.”[34] What is not so hidden about the tentacles of power that are clumsily tucked behind the vacuous claims to democratic governance manifest in the rise of a punishing state and a totalitarian paranoia in which everyone is considered a potential terrorist or criminal. How else to explain the increasing criminalization of social problems ranging from homelessness and the failure of the poor to pay off court costs to say nothing of arresting students for trivial infractions such as doodling on a desk or throwing peanuts at a bus, all of which can land the most vulnerable in jail. In fact, I have long argued that there is a hard and soft war being waged against young people. The hard war is taking place in many schools, which now resemble prisons in light of their lockdown procedures, zero tolerance policies, metal detectors, and the increasing presence of police in the schools.[35] The soft war is the war is the war of consumerism and finance. Partnered with a massive advertising machinery and variety of corporate institutions, the soft war targets all youth by treating them as yet another “market” to be commodified and exploited, while attempting to create a new generation of hyper-consumers. The soft war is waged by a commercial culture that commodifies every aspect of kids’ lives, while teaching them that their only responsibility to citizenship is to consume. A more subtle form of this type of repression burdens and normalizes them with a life time of debt and does everything possible to depoliticize them and remove them from being able to imagine a more just and different society. In the United States the average student graduates with a loan debt of $27,000. Debt bondage is the ultimate disciplinary technique of casino capitalism to rob students of the time to think, dissuade them from entering public service, and reinforce the debased assumption that they should simply be efficient cogs in a consumer economy. If neoliberal authoritarianism is to be challenged and overcome, it is crucial that intellectuals, unions, workers, young people, and various social movements unite to reclaim democracy as a central element in fashioning a radical imagination. Such action necessitates interrogating and rupturing the material and symbolic forces that hide behind a counterfeit claim to participatory democracy. This requires rescuing the promises of a radical democracy that can provide a living wage, quality health care for all, public works, and massive investments in education, child care, housing for the poor, along with a range of other crucial social provisions that can make a difference between living and dying for those who have been relegated to the ranks of the disposable. The growing global threat of neoliberal authoritarianism signals both a crisis of politics and a crisis of beliefs, values, and individual and social agency. One indication of such a crisis is the fact that the economic calamity of 2008 has not been matched by a shift in ideas about the nature of finance capital and its devastating effects on American society. Banks got bailed out, and those everyday Americans who lost their houses bore the brunt of the crisis. The masters of finance capital were not held accountable for their crimes and many of them received huge bonuses paid for by American taxpayers. Matters of education must be at the heart of any viable notion of politics, meaning that education must be at the center of any attempt to change consciousness, not just the ways in which people think, but also how they act, and construct relationships to others and the larger world. Politics is an imminently educative task and it is only through such recognition that initial steps can be taken to challenge the powerful ideological and affective spaces through which market fundamentalism produces the desires, identities, and values that bind people to its forms of predatory governance. The noxious politics of historical, social and political amnesia and the public pedagogy of the disimagination machine must be challenged and disassembled if there is any hope of creating meaningful alternatives to the dark times in which we live. Young people need to think otherwise in order to act otherwise, but in addition they need to become cultural producers who can produce their own narratives about their relationship to the larger world, what it means to sustain public commitments, develop a sense of compassion for others, locally and globally. But the question remains regarding how a public largely indifferent to politics and often paralyzed by the need to survive, and caught in a crippling cynicism can be moved from “an induced state of stupidity” to a political formation willing to engage in various modes of resistance extending from “mass protests to prolonged civil disobedience.”[36] This terrifying intellectual and moral paralysis must be offset by the development of alternative public spheres in which educators, artists, workers, young people and others can change the terms of the debate in American culture and politics. Ideas matter but they wither without institutional infrastructures in which they can be nourished, debated, and acted upon. Any viable struggle against casino capitalism must focus on those forms of domination that pose a threat to public spheres, such as public and higher education and the new media, that are essential to developing the critical formative cultures, identities, and desires that nourish modes of engaged thinking necessary for a the production of critically engaged citizens. If such a politics is to make any difference, it must be worldly; that is, it must incorporate a critical disposition that both addresses social problems and tackles the conditions necessary for modes of democratic political exchange that enable new forms of agency, power, and collective struggle. Until politics can be made meaningful in order to be made critical and transformative, there will be no significant opposition to casino capitalism. I want to conclude by pointing to a few initiatives, though incomplete, that might mount a challenge to the current oppressive historical conjuncture in which many Americans now find themselves.[37] In doing so, I want to address what I have attempted to map as a crisis of memory, agency, and education and reclaim what I call a pedagogy of educated hope that is central to any viable notion of change that I am suggesting. First, there is a need for what can be called a revival of the radical imagination and the defense of the public good, especially higher education, in order to reclaim its egalitarian and democratic impulses. This call would be part of a larger project “to reinvent democracy in the wake of the evidence that, at the national level, there is no democracy—if by ‘democracy’ we mean effective popular participation in the crucial decisions affecting the community.”[38] One step in this direction would be for young people, intellectuals, scholars and others to go on the offensive against a conservative led campaign “to end higher education’s democratizing influence on the nation”[39] Higher education should be harnessed neither to the demands of the warfare state nor the instrumental needs of corporations. Clearly, in any democratic society, education should be viewed as a right, not an entitlement. Politically, this suggests defining higher education as a democratic public sphere and rejecting the notion that the culture of education is synonymous with the culture of business. Pedagogically, this points to modes of teaching and learning capable of producing an informed public, enacting and sustaining a culture of questioning, and enabling a critical formative culture that advances at least in the schools what Kristen Case calls moments of classroom grace.[40] Pedagogies of classroom grace should provide the conditions for students and others to reflect critically on commonsense understandings of the world, and begin to question, however troubling, their sense of agency, relationship to others, and their relationships to the larger world. This can be linked to broader pedagogical imperatives that ask why we have wars, massive inequality, a surveillance state, the commodification of everything, and the collapse of the public into the private. This is not merely a methodical consideration but also a moral and political practice because it presupposes the creation of critically engaged students who can imagine a future in which justice, equality, freedom, and democracy matter. In this instance, the classroom should be a space of grace—a place to think critically, ask troubling questions, and take risks, even though that may mean transgressing established norms and bureaucratic procedures.