### 2ac long

The status quo conceptualizes Mexico’s ecosystem specifically the Tijuana River as devoid of intrinsic value, this manifests itself in destructive ecological practices such as toxic waste dumping, voting affirmative ruptures the legitimacy of such violence, couple of impacts

-arbitrary hierarchies between forms of life underlie all forms of violence, this is the root cause of oppression

-separating the environment from humanity precludes ones ability to feel that they belong in the universe eviscerating ontology

Thus the role of the ballot is who has a better methodology to relate to Mexico’s ecosystem through a conceptual approach to environmental praxis, our approach is superior

-solution rather than problem oriented (Castello)

-identifies debates that really matter (Reitan)

-opens up new contingencies for problem solving (hirokawa)

-takes responsibility for environmental destruction (lichatovich)

-ruptures epistemic construction of nature in the border region (orihuela)

-problematizes the narratives the legitimize violence against nature (bell and russel)

### 2ac framework v t

Wm status quo conceptualizes nature as economic our affirmative engages that conceptualization

Counterinterp the aff can have a discussion about the topic rather than a topical discussion solves their offense because the debates they want to occur still happen

Our advocacy is a precondition to education

-Castellano indicates that interrogating how people institutions and ecosystems interact is a prerequisite to good policy

-Reitan indicates that problem solving requires a change in worldview and that pragmatism is key to identify which debates really matter and how to mediate those debates

-Bell and Russel indicate that as an educator you should promote discussion about societal narratives that legitimize environmental destruction

-role of the ballot is to relate to mexico’s ecosystem not to win hypothetical implementation of a topical action is good means we precede T

### 2ac t proper

We meet there’s no condition for doing the plan/foreign policy is inherently conditional

engagement may be unconditional if it offers modifications in US policy towards a country without the explicit expectation that a reciprocal act will follow

#### Counter interpretation Economic engagement is academic analysis of economic areas

Bond and Paterson, 5 – \*lecturer in Sociology in the School of Social and Political Studies, University of Edinburgh AND \*\*professor of educational policy at the University of Edinburgh (Ross and Lindsay, “Coming down from the ivory tower? Academics’ civic and economic engagement with the community”; September 2005)

We now turn our attention to a more specific form of interaction with the nonacademic community: economic engagement. As stated earlier, this should not be thought of as completely distinct from civic engagement. Nevertheless, given the contemporary interest in academia’s economic role outlined above, economic engagement merits separate and detailed analysis. Our definition here is somewhat different from that of civic engagement, in that we will consider the extent to which the more routine academic activities of research and teaching, as well as those which transcend these areas, are perceived to have economic relevance. Importantly, we will also consider beliefs about the extent to which they should have economic relevance.

-neg ground, they still get the status quo, alternate methodologies, a critique of ecopragmatism, disads to our method etc

-topic literature, our evidence is in the context of US economic engagement policies towards Mexico

-Schlossberg indicates that in the status quo academia does NOT engage environmental praxis, our framework is key to that because debate is fundamentally an academic game

-They arbitrarily exclude the affirmative, that’s a voting issue because the neg will always win, terminally impacted by the Bryant evidence this empirically leads to silencing the voice of marginalized groups ensuring oppression

Reasonability -avoids infinite regress

### Social studies

Lol no link toxic waste dumping is scientifically supported, aff is empirical

K is an impact turn to this they’ve double turned themselves

### 2ac framing top

Conceded that your role as an academic is to evaluate conceptual approaches to environmental praxis – the alternative is not an environmental practice all I need to win is that the aff practice is comparatively better than status quo environmental praxis

The role of the ballot is which team best develops a relationship to Mexico’s ecosystem we’ll win that our methodology is superior to theirs

-Castellano indicates that interrogating how people institutions and ecosystems interact is a prerequisite to good policy

-Reitan indicates that problem solving requires a change in worldview and that pragmatism is key to identify which debates really matter and how to mediate those debates

-Bell and Russel indicate that as an educator you should promote discussion about societal narratives that legitimize environmental destruction

Aff can never win under their interp

Ecoprag is an impact turn to this

Lack is inevitable the alt doesn’t change that

#### Even if their ideas are good, their presentation fails. The perm frames the alt in a persuasive manner

Hirokawa 2 (Keith Hirokawa, J.D. from the UConn and LL.M. from the Northwestern School of Law, 2002, "Some Pragmatic Observations About Radical Critique In Environmental Law," Stanford Environmental Law Journal, Volume 21, June; lexis; Kristof)

**Pragmatism's success in** the **environmental debate is owed to its** [\*257] **understanding of the operation of context as a constraint on persuasion and discourse**. **Persuasion** between foundational theories **may result from the attempt to reconcile differing approaches**. **Pragmatists rely on a reconciliation-based description of how paradigms** and belief systems **transform in the face of competing paradigmatic structures**, n147 **in which new** problems, predictions and **solutions can be translated into an existing structure** of beliefs **by displacing the fewest other beliefs**. **Effective dialogue** on solutions espoused from otherwise incommensurable positions simply **requires** a touch of **flexibility toward traditional philosophical questions**. n148 **In applying this** maxim **to legal change, the lesson** to be learned from the pragmatist's understanding of paradigm shifts **is that revolutionary ideals can be presented in light of dominant beliefs,** rather than in spite of them.

### ---bare life

#### Their authors votes aff

Wadiwel 4 (Dinesh Joesph, completing a doctorate at the University of Western Sydney “Animal by Any Other Name? Patterson and Agamben Discuss Animal (and Human) Life” Borderlands E-Journal Vol 3 No. 1; Kristof)

Both of these ‘brushes’ with the animal point to the same thing: **for Agamben** the political is caught between a ceaseless constitution of the human and the in-human, the human and the animal. Homo sacer or **‘bare life’ is the meeting point of this threshold, where** the pre-eminent political question, above all other forms of inquiry, is life and how it is defined. It is no coincidence therefore that **Agamben continues this theme** in The Open, **when he remarks that "**it is more urgent to work on these divisions, to ask in what way − within man − has man been separated from non-man, and the animal from the human, than it is to take positions on the great issues, on so called human rights and values."

### at bare life

#### No impact – people can assert agency in the face of state control – ignoring this disempowers the alt

Cesare **Casarino**, professor of cultural studies and comparative literature at the University of Minnesota AND Antonio Negri, author of numerous volumes of philosophy and political theory. “It’s a Powerful Life: A Conversation on Contemporary Philosophy” Cultural Critique 57. **2004**

AN: I believe Giorgio is writing a sequel to Homo Sacer, and I feel that this new work will be resolutive for his thought—in the sense that he will be forced in it to resolve and find a way out of the ambiguity that has qualified his understanding of naked life so far. He already attempted something of the sort in his recent book on Saint Paul, but I think this attempt largely failed: as usual, **this book** is extremely learned and elegant; it **remains**, however, somewhat **trapped within** Pauline **exegesis, rather than constituting a full-fledged attempt to reconstruct naked life as a potentiality for exodus,** to rethink naked life fundamentally in terms of exodus. **I believe that the concept of naked life is not an impossible**, unfeasible **one**. I believe it is possible to push the image of power to the point at which a defenseless human being [un povero Cristo] is crushed, to conceive of that extreme point at which power tries to [End Page 173] eliminate that ultimate resistance that is the sheer attempt to keep oneself alive. From a logical standpoint, it is possible to think all this: the naked bodies of the people in the camps, for example, can lead one precisely in this direction. **But this is** also **the point at which this concept turns into ideology: to conceive of the relation between power and life in such a way** actually **ends up bolstering and reinforcing ideology**. **Agamben**, in effect, **is saying that such is the nature of power: in the final instance, power reduces each and every human being to such a state of powerlessness. But this is absolutely not true!** On the contrary: **the historical process takes place and is produced thanks to a continuous constitution and construction, which** undoubtedly **confronts the limit over and over** again—**but this is an extraordinarily rich limit, in which desires expand, and** in which **life becomes** increasingly **fuller**. Of course it is possible to conceive of the limit as absolute powerlessness, especially when it has been actually enacted and enforced in such a way so many times. And yet, isn't such a conception of the limit precisely what the limit looks like from the standpoint of constituted power as well as from the standpoint of those who have already been totally annihilated by such a power—which is, of course, one and the same standpoint? Isn't this the story about power that power itself would like us to believe in and reiterate? **Isn't it far more politically useful to conceive of this limit from the standpoint of those who are not yet or not completely crushed by power, from the standpoint of those still struggling to overcome such a limit, from the standpoint of the process of constitution**, from the standpoint of power [potenza]? I am worried about the fact that **the concept of naked life as it is conceived by Agamben might be taken up by political movements and in political debates**: I find this prospect quite troubling, which is why I felt the need to attack this concept in my recent essay. Ultimately, I feel that nowadays **the logic of traditional eugenics is attempting to saturate and capture the whole of human reality**—even at the level of its materiality, that is, through genetic engineering—and **the** ultimate **result of such a process of saturation and capture is a capsized production of subjectivity within which ideological undercurrents continuously try to subtract or neutralize our resistance**. [End Page 174]

### Triv

#### They trivialize the holocaust – reject them

Dr. Manfred **Gerstenfeld**, Holocaust TrivializationApril 9, **2008**

Those abusing Holocaust comparisons for their ideological purposes want to exaggerate the evil nature of a phenomenon they condemn. With the Holocaust symbolizing absolute evil for many, they use it as an instrument for their purposes. Holocaust trivialization manifests itself partly in the growing use of language concerning a large number of disparate events that have no connection to genocide. Other trivializers operate out of commercial or artistic considerations. Unlike in the case of most other distortions of the Holocaust, the trivializers usually do not target Jews. Holocaust distortion has been increasing in recent years. It manifests itself in a great variety of manipulations of history.1 Among the best known are Holocaust denial,2 Holocaust depreciation, and Holocaust inversion3-the portraying of Israel, Israelis, and Jews as Nazis. Most of these distortions aim at harming Jews or Israel. Holocaust trivialization is a tool for some ideologically or politically motivated activists to metaphorically compare phenomena they oppose to the industrial-scale destruction of the Jews in World War II by Germans, Austrians, and their allies. Examples include environmental problems, abortion, the slaughter of animals, the use of tobacco, and human rights abuses. None of these bear any fundamental resemblance to the manmade genocide of the 1940s. Those who abuse Holocaust comparisons for their ideological purposes wish to exaggerate the evil nature of a phenomenon they condemn. With the Holocaust symbolizing absolute evil for many, they use it as an instrument for their purposes and thus abuse the centrality of the Holocaust discourse in contemporary society. The perceived evil to which they compare the Holocaust, however, does not share its major characteristics. These include the systematic defamation, exclusion, torturing, and destruction of specific people in a society. Another element is that all belonging to this category are targeted. Trivialization goes beyond hurting the sensitivities of Jews, by abusing the memory of the murdered victims as well. Holocaust trivialization also manifests itself partly in the growing use of comparisons of disparate events to elements bearing no resemblance to the Holocaust. Many trivializers operate out of commercial or artistic considerations; others are just insensitive. Distortions Overlap Several Holocaust distortions overlap. Comparisons of current wars, specific actions, or individuals to Nazi actions or leaders should be treated as a separate category, namely, postwar Holocaust equivalence. Examples are comparisons of U.S. presidents such as Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush to Hitler, or of the actions of the United States and its allies in Iraq and Afghanistan to those of Nazi Germany. The Holocaust-equivalence category encompasses a broad range of other incidents. In early 2008 Daniel Hannan, a British Conservative Member of the European Parliament, said there that the powers given the Parliament’s president reminded him of the tactics used by the Nazi government of Germany to govern without parliamentary consent.4 As aforementioned, among the better-known ideological or political causes of the trivializers are, for instance, environmentalism, animal rights or pro-life activism, the stopping of smoking, or human rights abuses. What binds the heterogeneous perpetrators of Holocaust trivialization together is their methods. These distortions and others led Nobel Laureate and Holocaust survivor Eli Wiesel to write as early as 1988: I cannot use [the word Holocaust] anymore. First, because there are no words, and also because it has become so trivialized that I cannot use it anymore. Whatever mishap occurs now, they call it “holocaust.” I have seen it myself in television in the country in which I live. A commentator describing the defeat of a sports team, somewhere, called it a “holocaust.” I have read in a very prestigious newspaper published in California, a description of the murder of six people, and the author called it a holocaust. So, I have no words anymore.5 The trivializing comparisons to the Holocaust are rarely elaborated on. This manipulation differs in its mode of distorting from Holocaust denial, in part because the trivializers do not target Jews and also because it rarely develops any detailed arguments about the Holocaust. One hardly sees statements explaining what the defining elements of the Holocaust were and how the phenomenon metaphorically compared to it has all or most of the same components. This characteristic of the manipulation is due to the fact that the desired effect is achieved mainly by the abusive mention of the Holocaust. The manipulation is therefore relatively easy to expose, by pointing out that crucial criminal components of the Holocaust are lacking in what is being compared to it. A consideration of some examples of trivialization, and reactions to them, indicates both the manipulative character of this distortion and how it can be deconstructed. The Environmental Holocaust Environmentalists are one group among which Holocaust trivializers are found. They often regard global warming as the main contemporary threat to humanity. Ellen Goodman, a Boston Globe columnist, wrote that it is no longer possible to deny global warming. She invoked the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which claimed it was 90 percent certain that global warming was the result of human activity. From there she moved on: “I would like to say we’re at a point where global warming is impossible to deny. Let’s just say that global warming deniers are now on a par with Holocaust deniers, though one denies the past and the other denies the present and future.”6 Well-known talk-show host Dennis Prager responded by castigating Goodman’s statement. He first noted that it reflected the fact that most people on the Left see “their ideological adversaries as bad people.” On the other hand, “those on the Right tend to view their adversaries as wrong, perhaps even dangerous, but not usually as bad.” It might be inconceivable to Goodman, Prager observed, that one could disagree with global warming forecasts without evil motives. He further asserted that contemporary liberalism would tend to question the moral authority of Judeo-Christian religions or of any secular conservative authority, but not of “any other authority” such as the United Nations. Prager also pointed out that “If questioning global warming is on ‘a par’ with questioning the Holocaust, how bad can questioning the Holocaust really be?” He added that while liberal and left-wing organizations had agreed with Goodman’s statements, none had condemned her Holocaust comparison. Prager concluded that Goodman’s assertion marked the “beginning of what is becoming one of the largest campaigns of vilification of decent people in history-the global condemnation of…anyone who questions global warming.”7 Many others abuse the Holocaust to promote environmental aims. Bob Burnett, who defines himself as a writer, activist, and Quaker, claimed in an attack on a televangelist who had written about the dirty politics of the “environmental movement” that “It took less than ten years for Nazi anti-Semitism to produce the death of six million European Jews. How long will it take for the effects of global climate change to result in similar loss of life?”8 It is similarly easy to claim that many people in the world die as a result of poor health, malnourishment, and inappropriate diets. Given today’s societal mood we may well read one day about the “diet Holocaust” or the “hamburger Holocaust.” Al Gore Comparing potential ecological disaster to the Holocaust is not a new phenomenon. On 19 March 1989, the then senator from Tennessee, Al Gore, published an op-ed in the New York Times titled “An Ecological Kristallnacht. Listen.” Gore called upon all humankind to heed the warning: “…the evidence is as clear as the sounds of glass shattering in Berlin.”9 In 2007 Gore, by then a Nobel Laureate and former vice-president, continued to use Holocaust imagery for environmental purposes. As part of his advocacy, twice in December 2007, he criticized many world leaders for ignoring the threat of climate change in the same way that former British prime minister Chamberlain and other world leaders had ignored the dangers posed by Hitler. Gore voiced the same sentiments as almost two decades earlier: “Once again world leaders waffle, hoping the danger will dissipate.” Canadian Green Party leader Elizabeth May justified Gore’s remarks, explaining: “It’s not a literal comparison that says somehow climate change is like Hitler. Climate change is not like Hitler. Hitler is an individual who managed to construct a political party and then, through democratic elections, a nation that was prepared to go along with genocide. This is not like that. But the moral failure of those who stand by-that’s the comparison.” A representative of an umbrella organization for Canadian Jewish groups responded that May’s statements supported positions that were “obscene and absolutely unnecessary” for anyone, even Gore.10 Opponents of Environmental Measures Opponents of environmental measures sometimes also refer abusively to the Holocaust. In 2004 Andrei Illarionov, an economic adviser to President Putin, recommended that Russia should not sign the Kyoto Protocol, which he called a death pact that would “strangle economic growth and economic activity in countries that accept the protocol’s requirements.” He likened the protocol to Auschwitz.11 Glenn Beck, a television and radio host and author, compared Gore’s campaign against global warming to elements of the Holocaust, saying: “Al Gore’s not going to be rounding up Jews and exterminating them; it is the same tactic however. The goal is different. The goal is globalization. The goal is global carbon tax. The goal is the United Nations running the world.” The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) denounced Beck’s remarks and said they were part of “a troubling epidemic on the airwaves, where comparisons to Hitler and the Holocaust are becoming all-too facile.” The ADL’s national director Abraham Foxman asserted: “Glenn Beck’s linkage of Hitler’s plan to round up and exterminate Jews with Al Gore’s efforts to raise awareness of global warming is outrageous, insensitive, and deeply offensive.”12 The Abortion Holocaust Abortion opponents have probably mobilized the best-known distorters of the Holocaust. One of these was Pope John Paul II who, in his 2005 book Memory and Identity, compared abortion to the Holocaust. He wrote that both abortion and the murder of six million Jews were the result of humans under the guise of democracy usurping the “law of God.”13 Then-Cardinal Josef Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI, claimed at the launching of the Pope’s book that the Pope was not equating abortion with the Holocaust.14 In another incident involving the Catholic Church, the Archbishop of Cologne in Germany, Cardinal Joachim Meisner, “provoked much unrest when he put women who had had an abortion in a row with mass murderers like Hitler, Stalin and Herod. He compares abortion to the Holocaust and the abortion pill with Zyklon B, the gas used by the Nazis in the extermination camps.” Condemnation came even from groups that some may have expected to be supportive. The ecumenical movement Initiative Kirche told the press, “Meisner has completely lost his authority as a bishop and has publicly done a great wrong to the Catholic Church and to dialogue between Jews and Christians.” Paul Spiegel, the then president of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, said the cardinal had insulted the millions of victims of the Holocaust. He added that “The Catholic Church does not understand or does not want to understand that there is an enormous difference between mass genocide and what women do with their bodies.” Spiegel also linked the Pope’s remarks to the earlier statements by Cardinal Meisner.15 Jim Hughes of the International Right to Life Federation told LifeSiteNews.com, “In today’s relativistic times, it seems the only evil which still touches people whose hearts have grown cold are the atrocities of Hitler. The comparison not only fits like a glove, but is necessary to bring people out of their blissfully ignorant slumber.”16 On many other occasions abortion and other phenomena have been compared to genocide and mass murder, rather than specifically to the Holocaust. The Associated Press reported that “Displays of bloody fetuses next to pictures of the collapsing World Trade Center, a black lynching victim hanging from a tree and corpses at a concentration camp were among the disturbing billboards at the University of New Hampshire put up by a national anti-abortion group, the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform.”17 These billboards liken the genocide of the Holocaust to abortion and victims of 9/11 and racism.

### 2ac narcissism turn

#### The K cannot be divorced from the narcissism of man – causes us to repeat the tragedy of narcissus

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 14, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

One such vital truth that has long been known is the idea of heroism; but in “normal” scholarly times we never thought of making much out of it, of parading it, or of using it as a central concept. Yet the popular mind always knew how important it was: as William James—who covered just about everything— remarked at the turn of the century: “mankind’s common instinct for reality … has always held the world to be essentially a theatre for heroism.”1 Not only the popular mind knew, but philosophers of all ages, and in our culture especially Emerson and Nietzsche—which is why we still thrill to them: we like to be reminded that our central calling, our main task on this planet, is the heroic.\* One way of looking at the whole development of social science since Marx and of psychology since Freud is that it represents a massive detailing and clarification of the problem of human heroism. This perspective sets the tone for the seriousness of our discussion: we now have the scientific underpinning for a true understanding of the nature of heroism and its place in human life. If “mankind’s common instinct for reality” is right, we have achieved the remarkable feat of exposing that reality in a scientific way. One of the key concepts for understanding man’s urge to heroism is the idea of “narcissism.” As Erich Fromm has so well reminded us, this idea is one of Freud’s great and lasting contributions. Freud discovered that each of us repeats the tragedy of the mythical Greek Narcissus: we are hopelessly absorbed with ourselves. If we care about anyone it is usually ourselves first of all. As Aristotle somewhere put it: luck is when the guy next to you gets hit with the arrow. Twenty-five hundred years of history have not changed man’s basic narcissism; most of the time, for most of us, this is still a workable definition of luck. It is one of the meaner aspects of narcissism that we feel that practically everyone is expendable except ourselves. We should feel prepared, as Emerson once put it, to recreate the whole world out of ourselves even if no one else existed. The thought frightens us; we don’t know how we could do it without others—yet at bottom the basic resource is there: we could suffice alone if need be, if we could trust ourselves as Emerson wanted. And if we don’t feel this trust emotionally, still most of us would struggle to survive with all our powers, no matter how many around us died. Our organism is ready to fill the world all alone, even if our mind shrinks at the thought. This narcissism is what keeps men marching into point-blank fire in wars: at heart one doesn’t feel that he will die, he only feels sorry for the man next to him. Freud’s explanation for this was that the unconscious does not know death or time: in man’s physiochemical, inner organic recesses he feels immortal. None of these observations implies human guile. Man does not seem able to “help” his selfishness; it seems to come from his animal nature. Through countless ages of evolution the organism has had to protect its own integrity; it had its own physiochemical identity and was dedicated to preserving it. This is one of the main problems in organ transplants: the organism protects itself against foreign matter, even if it is a new heart that would keep it alive. The protoplasm itself harbors its own, nurtures itself against the world, against invasions of its integrity. It seems to enjoy its own pulsations, expanding into the world and ingesting pieces of it. If you took a blind and dumb organism and gave it self-consciousness and a name, if you made it stand out of nature and know consciously that it was unique, then you would have narcissism. In man, physiochemical identity and the sense of power and activity have become conscious. In man a working level of narcissism is inseparable from self-esteem, from a basic sense of self-worth. We have learned, mostly from Alfred Adler, that what man needs most is to feel secure in his self-esteem. But man is not just a blind glob of idling protoplasm, but a creature with a name who lives in a world of symbols and dreams and not merely matter. His sense of self-worth is constituted symbolically, his cherished narcissism feeds on symbols, on an abstract idea of his own worth, an idea composed of sounds, words, and images, in the air, in the mind, on paper. And this means that man’s natural yearning for organismic activity, the pleasures of incorporation and expansion, can be fed limitlessly in the domain of symbols and so into immortality. The single organism can expand into dimensions of worlds and times without moving a physical limb; it can take eternity into itself even as it gaspingly dies.

#### This narcissism leads to oppressive systems such as Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia and contemporary capitalism

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 15, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

If we were to peel away this massive disguise, the blocks of repression over human techniques for earning glory, we would arrive at the potentially most liberating question of all, the main problem of human life: How empirically true is the cultural hero system that sustains and drives men? We mentioned the meaner side of man’s urge to cosmic heroism, but there is obviously the noble side as well. Man will lay down his life for his country, his society, his family. He will choose to throw himself on a grenade to save his comrades; he is capable of the highest generosity and self-sacrifice. But he has to feel and believe that what he is doing is truly heroic, timeless, and supremely meaningful. The crisis of modern society is precisely that the youth no longer feel heroic in the plan for action that their culture has set up. They don’t believe it is empirically true to the problems of their lives and times. We are living a crisis of heroism that reaches into every aspect of our social life: the dropouts of university heroism, of business and career heroism, of political-action heroism; the rise of anti-heroes, those who would be heroic each in his own way or like Charles Manson with his special “family”, those whose tormented heroics lash out at the system that itself has ceased to represent agreed heroism. The great perplexity of our time, the churning of our age, is that the youth have sensed—for better or for worse—a great social-historical truth: that just as there are useless self-sacrifices in unjust wars, so too is there an ignoble heroics of whole societies: it can be the viciously destructive heroics of Hitler’s Germany or the plain debasing and silly heroics of the acquisition and display of consumer goods, the piling up of money and privileges that now characterizes whole ways of life, capitalist and Soviet.