# Round 6 vs. UCF JV (Neg)

## 1NC

### 1

#### First is off is T:

#### A. Our interpretation is that the affirmative should have to instrumentally defend the institutional implementation of a topical plan.

#### B. Violation – the aff generates impacts off the epistemological focus of the aff which is not based off of institutional implementation.

#### C. Standards – Extra Topicality. Their epistemological impacts are extra topical and could be anything so the impact is that you reject all their epistemological impacts or CP gets them as well.

#### D. Voting issue for fairness and education.

### 2

#### Second off is the cap K:

#### 1. Energy production drives capitalism – it enables the capitalist cycle of growth and exploitation of the working class

ICC 11 (International Communist Current, “Nuclear energy, capitalism and communism” August 16th, World Revolution no.347, September 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear#\_ftnref30)

The increasing use of energy has been a feature of industrialisation around the world. It expresses not only the increase in scale of production and the impact of rising population, but also the development of productivity with the increase in the quantity of the means of production, including energy, that each worker is able to set in motion. This trend has continued today: between 1973 and 2008 total energy consumption increased by 80%.[18] The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. Energy is used to drive the development of productivity but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy. Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production. Increased productivity tends to require increased energy, so the capitalists (other than those in the oil industry) are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy. On the one hand this results in the profligate use of energy for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters of the Thames that characterised 19th century London to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.

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

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

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

#### 3. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear

Foster 5 [John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol. 57, Issue 4, “Naked Imperialism”, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>]

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China,that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

#### 4. Vote negative to adopt the historical material criticism of the 1NC - historical analysis of the material conditions of capital is the only way to break free from is contradictions and social inequalities it causes

Tumino 1 (Steven, teaches at the City University of New York, Spring, What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before)

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### 5. Class divisions are the root of all other oppressions

Kovel 2 (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124)

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

#### 6. Historical materialism must come first - it predetermines consciousness and the very possibilities of reflective thinking

**Marx 1859** (Karl, a pretty important dude. “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface” http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm) JM

>edited for gendered language<

In the social production of their existence, [people] inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which [people] become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

### 3

#### Next off is the counterplan:

#### The United States federal government should ban all nuclear power. The USFG will initiate public dialogues for all affected communities in which they will explain that nuclear siting decisions have been made inequitably.

#### CP meets the threshold for your epistemology claims – we agree with your claims that nuclear power siting is bad and should be rejected. We fix the epistemologically suspect decisions that drive siting of nuclear power by rejecting the ENTIRETY of nuclear power.

#### The net benefits are our nuclear power bad arguments.

### 4

#### Next off is the renewables DA:

#### Transition from nuclear to renewables now – industry will be dead worldwide now unless the US provides more subsidies.

Wasserman, author or co-author of a dozen books, ‘12

[Harvey, “Nuclear Power's Green Mountain Grassroots Demise”, 3-20-12, The Huffington Post,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harvey-wasserman/post_3127_b_1353253.html>, RSR]

In the wake of Fukushima, grassroots citizen action is shutting the worldwide nuclear power industry. A Solartopian tipping point is upon us in the U.S., Europe and Japan which will re-define how the human race gets its energy. States rights and local democracy are at the core of the battle. The definitive breaking point looms in Vermont. By mid-March a state board is likely to deny the Yankee reactor licenses to operate or to create radioactive waste. If that happens, a Vermont shutdown could mark a critical moment in establishing state power over an atomic reactor. A critical domino would fall -- as it has in Japan and Europe -- and we will begin taking down old reactors all across the U.S. Four new reactors barely under construction will go down with them, making inevitable the end America's age of atomic power. In Vermont, the New Orleans-based Entergy bought the Yankee reactor in 2002. Entergy agreed to shut it if the state's Public Service Board denied it a Certificate of Public Good to continue to operate and generate radioactive waste. That decision is due by March 21, the forty-year anniversary of the reactor's 1972 opening. Entergy has horrified many of its staunchest Green Mountain supporters. One of its cooling towers has simply collapsed from ancient rot and basic negligence. It has leaked tritium and other radioactive isotopes from pipes the company has said -- under oath -- do not exist. Entergy sued Vermont after the legislature voted (26 to 4) to shut the reactor. When its lawyers won in federal court, Entergy demanded the public pay it $4 million in legal fees. But the company miscalculated. It welcomed Federal Judge Garvan Murtha's ruling that the legislature could not shut Yankee (the state is appealing). But Murtha also upheld the right of the Public Service Board to deny Entergy those operating and waste production permits. So after lauding the decision, Entergy's lawyers now want Murtha to change it. Entergy has also asked the Public Service Board for a stay in its expected denial of the permits. The case is clearly headed to the corporate-owned U.S. Supreme Court. But for Entergy to win, the Roberts majority would have to rule that the company was temporarily insane when signed its agreements with the state, and that a state agency can be forced (against its will) to issue reactor operating and waste creating permits. The history of U.S. courts denying states the right to shut reactors dates back to the 1954 Atomic Energy Act. But deferral to the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission's bent for keeping rush-bucket reactors on line is rapidly eroding. The Commission granted Vermont Yankee a license extension one day before the Fukushima disaster. A state-mandated shut down could seriously impact the political calculus for an industry whose grassroots opposition has become a full-on tsunami. New York's Indian Point reactors are under assault from Governor Andrew Cuomo, whose father cut the 1988 deal that forced Long Island's Shoreham reactor to shut without ever achieving commercial operation. Cuomo is being pushed by a fierce grassroots anti-nuke groundswell. Entergy does need state permits that would let two remaining reactors at Indian Point (Unit One went down long ago) continue heating and irradiating the Hudson River. New York could demand Entergy build extremely expensive cooling towers,which may force it to shut down for economic reasons. Similar forces are at work in New Jersey and other states. In Florida, botched multi-billion dollar repairs to the Crystal River reactor near Tampa have forced a brutal grassroots battle over soaring electric rates which must be approved by increasingly beleaguered state regulators. It is highly likely that reactor will never operate again. At Pilgrim, Mass., is strongly intervening against a license extension. Both remaining reactors are currently shut at California's San Onofre (Unit One there also went down long ago), where grassroots activists -- including local surfers -- are in pitched battle against re-opening. Ohio's Davis-Besse is having its containment dome sliced for the fourth time. Two reactors in Nebraska are still recovering from major flooding. All across the country, dozens of rust-bucket nukes stagger on their last legs even as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hands them extended licenses in the face of escalating state and local opposition. Once the firewall against recourse from the states is breached, a flood of shutdowns could well follow. In Japan, utilities must have permits from a host prefecture to re-open after refueling or repairs. Of 54 licensed reactors nationwide, only two now operate. Both could be shut soon, rendering Japan nuke-free for the first time in four decades. Germany has shut eight reactors and will take down 11 more by 2012. Except for Great Britain and a number of eastern holdouts, the "nuclear renaissance" has been all but abandoned in Europe, with an escalating cascade of elderly nukes going cold and proposed new projects being abandoned. The accelerating revolution in renewables has allowed solar, wind and other green sources to outstrip atomic reactors in cost, time to build, ecological impact and safety. As billions pour into Solartopian sources, private investment in atomic energy has all but disappeared -- except where there are massive taxpayer subsidies. Even that's not enough. In 2011, President Obama handed $8.33 billion in federal loan guarantees to the builders of two reactors at Georgia's Vogtle. But Peach State ratepayers are already being soaked for billions more in pre-payments, and the cost of the project is soaring. A parallel financial disaster looms at the Robinson site in neighboring South Carolina. Though the industry assumes these four reactors will eventually be finished, economic realities may say otherwise. Cost estimates for new nukes have been soaring even before construction begins. Even with federal money, the builders still demand that state ratepayers foot the bill as the process proceeds, meaning consumers are on the hook for multiple billions even if the reactors never open. Pitched battles over this Construction Work in Progress scam have already been won by consumers in Missouri and are being fought in Iowa and elsewhere. As the years of building drag on, costs will escalate while renewables continue to become cheaper. Sooner or later, construction is likely to stop, as it did at numerous projects in the 1970s and 1980s which were never finished. Today the Department of Energy still sits on some $10 billion in available guarantees without a recipient ready to build a new nuke. For the first time since early in the George W. Bush years, there has been no executive request for additional reactor construction loan guarantees. In Finland and Flamanville, France, new reactor projects are years behind schedule and billions over budget. With new construction virtually abandoned, and the continued operation of old reactors under intense attack in Japan, Europe and the U.S., only China and India remain as likely sites for large numbers of new nukes. Russia is doing its best to peddle them throughout the Third World. South Korea wants to sell reactors to the United Arab Emirates. But grassroots resistance in India has been fierce. China is still mulling a post-Fukushima decision on whether to proceed with reactors already under construction. Signs of a popular uprising against rampant pollution -- including nuclear reactors -- indicate growing public opposition. But here in the U.S., we are at the fall-off-the-cliff moment for atomic energy, new and old. Entergy, says Deb Katz of the Citizens Awareness Network, has been "blinded by its arrogance and contempt for the state of Vermont." The company, she says, "is attempting to establish that corporations are more powerful than the states they operate in." If the citizens of Vermont can shut Yankee, a dam will be breached and the post-Fukushima power of a rising grassroots tsunami will be made tangible. Solartopia will be that much closer. And the grassroots No Nukes campaign will begin to take its place as one of history's most successful popular movements. Let's just make sure these shut-downs happen before the next Fukushima irradiates us all.

#### Renewable energy decreases the perceived need for global nuclear power, meets Article IV requirements, and solves climate best. Promoting nuclear power only encourages other states to build dual use nuclear energy and delays an energy transition.

Lovins, Founder – RMI, ‘10

[Amory, “On Proliferation, Climate and Oil”, Foreign Policy, 1-21-10,

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/21/a_roadmap_to_our_energy_future>]

Similar adherence to outmoded orthodoxies now cripples nonproliferation. Policy still rests on the fatally contradictory assumption that nuclear power is economical, necessary, and experiencing a revival. This makes the proliferation problem insoluble. Fortunately, that assumption is counterfactual -- and correcting it can make the proliferation problem largely soluble. Here's how. In a 1980 Foreign Affairs article, I first set out with two coauthors an economically based, logically consistent approach to nonproliferation. Eerily presaging today's conditions, the article said:¶ For fundamental reasons ... nuclear power is not commercially viable, and questions of how to regulate an inexorably expanding world nuclear regime are moot....¶ [T]he collapse of nuclear power in response to the discipline of the marketplace is to be welcomed, for nuclear power is both the main driving force behind proliferation and the least effective known way to displace oil: indeed, it retards oil displacement by the faster, cheaper and more attractive means which new developments in energy policy now make available to all countries. So far, nonproliferation policy has gotten the wrong answer by persistently asking the wrong questions, creating "a nuclear armed crowd" by assuming its inevitability. We shall argue instead that acknowledging and taking advantage of the nuclear collapse, as part of a pragmatic alternative program, can offer an internally consistent approach to nonproliferation, as well as a resolution to the bitter dispute over Article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).¶ On the eve of the second NPT Review Conference, to be held in Geneva in August 1980, fatalism is becoming fashionable as the headlines show proliferation slipping rapidly out of control. Yet...an effective nonproliferation policy, though impossible with continued commitments to nuclear power, may become possible without it -- if only we ask the right questions.¶ Thirty years later, as the eighth NPT Review Conference prepares to convene in Vienna on April 30, 2010, just one word needs updating: now that oil generates less than 6 percent of the world's electricity, today's nuclear expansion is meant instead to displace coal to protect climate.¶ That rationale is identically unsound. In principle, quadrupling today's global nuclear power capacity -- to replace, then triple, retiring units -- could provide up to one-tenth of needed carbon reductions. But nuclear power is the least effective method: using it does save carbon, but about 2-20 times less per dollar and 20-40 times less per year than buying its winning competitors (mentioned below). Nuclear expansion would thus reduce and retard climate protection. We must invest judiciously, not indiscriminately, to get the most climate solution per dollar and per year. Expanding nuclear power does the opposite. The 1980 article's logic remains sound:¶ We can have proliferation with nuclear power, via either end of any fuel cycle: "every form of every fissionable material in every nuclear fuel cycle can be used to make military bombs, either on its own or in combination with other ingredients made widely available by nuclear power."¶ We can't have nuclear power without proliferation, because its vast flows of materials, equipment, skills, knowledge, and skilled people create do-it-yourself bomb kits wrapped in innocent-looking civilian disguise. Safeguards to prevent that misuse "cannot succeed either in principle or in practice," because national rivalries, subnational instabilities, and human frailties trump treaties and policing.¶ We can have proliferation without nuclear power -- but needn't if we do it right: with unimportant exceptions, "every known civilian route to bombs involves either nuclear power or materials and technologies whose possession, indeed whose existence in commerce, is a direct and essential consequence of nuclear fission power."¶ Crucially, in a world without nuclear power, the ingredients needed to make bombs by any known method would no longer be ordinary items of commerce. They'd become harder to get, more conspicuous to try to get, and politically costlier to be caught trying to get (or supply), because their purpose would be unambiguously military. This disambig­u­a­tion would make proliferation not impossible but far harder -- and easier to de­tect timely, because intelligence resources could focus on needles, not haystacks. Thus phas­ing out nuclear power is a necessary and nearly sufficient condition for nonproliferation.¶ The American Academy of Arts and Sciences' 2009 nuclear study, confident of nuclear power's necessity and viability, ignored its decades-long collapse in market economies due to unsupportable economic costs and financial risks. That study simply overlooked the data: shrinking global nuclear output, less than 5 percent nuclear share of capacity under construction, retirements outpacing additions for decades to come, every plant under construction bought by central planners (none by conventional free-market transactions), and zero equity investment despite extremely generous new subsidies in the United States, roughly equivalent to or greater than construction cost.¶ The fact is, nuclear investment has no business case: With or without a price on carbon, nuclear power and big fossil-fueled power plants simply cost far more than "micropower" generation (renewables except big hydropower, plus cogenerating electricity with useful heat) or saving electricity through efficient use. Micropower has surpassed nuclear output since 2006, when it produced one-sixth of global electricity, one-third of new electricity, and 16-52 percent of all electricity in a dozen industrial countries.¶ In 2007 alone, the United States added more megawatts of wind power than it added in coal generation from 2003 through 2007, or than the world added nuclear power in 2007. And in 2008, renewables attracted more global investment than fossil-fueled generation; dis­tributed renewables added 40 billion watts and got $100 billion of private investment while nuclear added and got zero. In each year since 2005, nuclear power has added only a few percent as much output as micropower, and since 2008, less than photovoltaics.¶ No policy can change this: even France's uniquely dirigiste 1970-2000 nuclear program suffered 3.5-fold capital escalation, nearly doubled construction time, and acute strains. "New" reactor types aren't materially different, though they often pose more proliferation danger. Even more today than when I wrote in 1980, nuclear power's "risks, including proliferation, are ... not a minor counterweight to enormous advantages but rather a gratuitous supplement to enormous disadvantages."¶ Micropower has surpassed nuclear output since 2006, when it produced one-sixth of global electricity, one-third of new electricity, and 16-52 percent of all electricity in a dozen industrial countries.¶ In 2007 alone, the United States added more megawatts of wind power than it added in coal generation from 2003 through 2007, or than the world added nuclear power in 2007. And in 2008, renewables attracted more global investment than fossil-fueled generation; dis­tributed renewables added 40 billion watts and got $100 billion of private investment while nuclear added and got zero. In each year since 2005, nuclear power has added only a few percent as much output as micropower, and since 2008, less than photovoltaics.¶ No policy can change this: even France's uniquely dirigiste 1970-2000 nuclear program suffered 3.5-fold capital escalation, nearly doubled construction time, and acute strains. "New" reactor types aren't materially different, though they often pose more proliferation danger. Even more today than when I wrote in 1980, nuclear power's "risks, including proliferation, are ... not a minor counterweight to enormous advantages but rather a gratuitous supplement to enormous disadvantages."¶ Today, these market realities present a brief opportunity to align U.S. nonproliferation policy with the Obama administration's emphasis on efficient energy use and renewable, distributed sources.¶ If a country with America's wealth, infrastructure, skills, and fuels claims it needs more nuclear power, all countries gain a strong excuse to follow suit. But U.S. acknowledgement of the market verdict favoring non-nuclear alternatives would encourage less richly endowed countries to seek profit and prestige from similar modernity. Aligning America's energy words, deeds, and offers would transform her journey beyond fossil fuels from a seeming plot to choke global development into routine, rational, replicable pursuit of least cost, green jobs, and industrial renewal.¶ Nobody need be antinuclear. The issue, just as I framed it in 1980, "is not whether to maintain a thriving [nuclear] enterprise, but rather whether to accept the verdict of the very calculations on which free market economies rely." Making nuclear power compete on a level playing field, after 56 years of enormous subsidies, would be a good start. De-subsidizing all energy across the board would be an even sounder approach. Since Washington proposes nuclear fuel security initiatives, why not broader energy security initiatives? What if the Obama administration announced it would help spread the best buys it's adopting -- efficien­cy, renew­ables, distributed energy systems -- to all desirous developing coun­tries, unconditionally and nondiscriminatorily? Most such countries are renewable-rich, but infrastructure-poor. They could welcome "Sunbeams for Peace" for the same hard-nosed reasons that made China the world leader in five renewable technologies, with energy efficiency its top strategic priority -- not forced by treaty, but informed by Premier Wen Jiabao's and his fellow-leaders' understanding that otherwise Beijing can't afford to develop.¶ Perhaps the United States, which invented many of these technologies, could even try to reclaim part of the burgeoning market it abandoned to China, Japan, and Europe.¶ Attendees at the upcoming NPT Review Conference are expected to clash on implementation of two main points in the original treaty: weapons states' underfulfilled obligation under Article VI to pursue nuclear disarmament, and developing-country signatories' right under Article IV to access nuclear technology for exclusively peaceful purposes.¶ Progress in and beyond the new round of Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty talks between the United States and Russia should help on Article VI; policy shifts building on Obama's Nobel Peace Prize speech can help too. But progress on Article IV depends on recognizing one simple yet unnoticed fact. When the NPT was drafted in 1958-68, nuclear power was widely expected to be cheap, easy, abundant, and indispensable. Non-weapons states' reward for forgoing nuclear weapons was therefore framed as access to nuclear power -- but only, as I explained in 1980:¶ ... because of the nuclear context and background of the negotiators, not as an expression of the essential purpose of Article IV. ... The time is therefore ripe to reformulate the bargain in the light of new knowledge. Instead of denying or hedging their obligations, the exporting nations should fulfill it -- in a wider sense based on a pragmatic reassessment of what recipients say their real interests are.¶ Having adjured bombs, recipients want reliable and affordable energy for development. The past half-century has revealed manifestly cheaper, faster, surer, more flexible methods than nuclear power, so now, just as I put it in 1980, "recipients should insist on aid in meeting their declared central need: not nuclear power per se but rather oil [and now coal] displacement and energy security." Reinterpreting Article IV in light of a half century of energy experience can isolate legitimate from illegitimate motives and help smoke out proliferators, advancing the treaty's central goal. Let countries that still want specifically nuclear energy, rather than cheaper and more suitable options, explain why.¶ Now let's solve for pattern. The help developing countries expect under NPT Article IV is exactly the same help they sought in Copenhagen to get off fossil fuels, and the same help many also want to escape oil dependence. President Obama's Copenhagen pledge of climate mitigation aid must now echo in Vienna's NPT context. That linkage would attain many big policy goals for the price of one, and remove the contradiction undermining the NPT.¶ Launching this new energy conversation in Vienna is America's best opportunity to inhibit the spread of nuclear bombs and start breaking the Copenhagen political logjam on climate justice.¶ At home, proposals to expand nuclear subsidies -- whether to buy Senate climate-bill votes, or motivated by a sincere but mistaken belief that nuclear expansion will help protect climate -- will amount to lose-lose scenarios; that approach will only prop up a failed climate non-solution that also makes proliferation unstoppable and weakens American values of free markets and a free society.¶ Yet applying internationally the sound non-nuclear elements of current domes­tic energy policy could profitably and simultaneously help solve the proliferation, climate, and oil problems. It would reinforce global development, transparency, democracy, women's advancement, energy resilience, and economic and political stability. It makes sense. It makes money. It would expose and discomfit only those who lack competitive offerings or harbor ulterior motives.¶ The surest path to a richer, fairer, cooler, safer world -- where energy insecurity, oil, climate change, most proliferation, and many development problems fade away -- would be a U.S. energy policy that takes economics seriously. It would let all ways to save or produce energy compete fairly, at honest prices, regardless of their type, technology, location, size, or ownership. Who's not in favor of that? Why don't we find out? And why can't such a least-cost domestic energy strategy inform, integrate, and inspire foreign policy too?

#### Warming leads to extinction.

Sify ‘10 (Sify, Sydney newspaper citing Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at University of Queensland and Director of the Global Change Institute, and John Bruno, associate professor of Marine Science at UNC (Sify News, “Could unbridled climate changes lead to human extinction?”, <http://www.sify.com/news/could-unbridled-climate-changes-lead-to-human-extinction-news-international-kgtrOhdaahc.html>)

The findings of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' emerged from a synthesis of recent research on the world's oceans, carried out by two of the world's leading marine scientists. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is further evidence that we are well on the way to the next great extinction event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly if the trend continues. The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added. The 'fundamental and comprehensive' changes to marine life identified in the report include rapidly warming and acidifying oceans, changes in water circulation and expansion of dead zones within the ocean depths. These are driving major changes in marine ecosystems: less abundant coral reefs, sea grasses and mangroves (important fish nurseries); fewer, smaller fish; a breakdown in food chains; changes in the distribution of marine life; and more frequent diseases and pests among marine organisms. Study co-author John F Bruno, associate professor in marine science at The University of North Carolina, says greenhouse gas emissions are modifying many physical and geochemical aspects of the planet's oceans, in ways 'unprecedented in nearly a million years'. 'This is causing fundamental and comprehensive changes to the way marine ecosystems function,' Bruno warned, according to a GCI release. These findings were published in Science.

### Energy Apartheid

#### Shifting siting prevents communities from solving poverty and public health.

Glasgow 5 (Joshua, Yale Law School JD candidate, Buffalo Environmental Law Journal, 13 Buff. Envt’l L.J. 69, Fall, ln)

Some environmental justice advocates oppose compensated siting proposals on moral grounds. Robert Bullard has coined the term "environmental blackmail" to refer to such plans. 210 Vicki Been usefully classifies these moral objections into four broad categories. 211 First, LULUs involve risks to health some argue should not be commodified. 212 This argument is generally unpersuasive. Society commonly allows individuals to take risks in exchange for compensation. Many professions include a risk premium that provides additional compensation for abnormally dangerous jobs. More importantly, it is not clear that a community that accepts a LULU is actually increasing its total level of risk. The increased income that a compensation package provides can decrease countervailing risks associated with poverty. Compensation [\*121] can pay for health-care costs or better nutrition, the benefits of which may exceed the risks associated with a LULU. 213 Second, compensated siting proposals may result in disproportionate siting. Poor communities may value the compensation a LULU offers more than wealthier communities because of the declining marginal utility of capital. Some environmental justice advocates find such an outcome inherently unjust. 214 If compensation mechanisms are carefully crafted to avoid disparities in bargaining power, such a disparity should be recognized as an accurate gauge of community preferences. Siting a LULU in the community that values a compensation package the most increases total utility in the same way any competitive market transaction does.

#### Policies protecting environmental justice only cause minorities to suffer more by denying these groups job opportunities and further suppressing them into racial stereotypes

Payne 2k (Henry http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1568/is\_n5\_v30/ai\_21141903/print?tag=artBody;col1)

The EPA's policy and its application in Louisiana have enraged and confused governors, mayors, and environmental officials across the nation. These officials see the administration's efforts not as environmental justice but as a policy of environmental redlining that effectively excludes minority areas from badly needed business investment. Chris Foreman, a political scientist at the Brookings Institution and author of a forthcoming book on environmental justice, laments the administration's racial politicization of the permitting process. "Environmental justice is not fundamentally racial," Foreman says. "But Title VI invites race-based claims." He says accusations of environmental racism are "dubious, but politically compelling. No one wants to be called a racist." In its zeal to apply Title VI civil rights law to industrial emissions, Foreman contends, the administration has obscured the real health problem that threatens communities like Romeville: poverty. State and local governments across the nation have felt Louisiana s pain. Despite the national economic boom, black unemployment remains over 9 percent, and local governments are scrambling to attract industries to state enterprise zones and brownfields. In addition to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, local organizations and business groups throughout the country have lined up to condemn the EPA's environmental redlining policy. City officials are lobbying the company to build the new facility in one of the majority-black city's many brownfield sites. But as long as the EPA rule is in effect, says Michigan environmental chief Harding, "G.M. will not build in Lansing. They'll buy farmland somewhere instead. The loser won't be the company; the losers will be the workers and cities." Says Steve Serkaian, media relations director for Lansing Mayor David Hollister: "What does this have to do with civil rights? If these plants don't build in these communities, [residents] will suffer from malnutrition, not pollution."Fifty-seven percent of the population living within five miles of Ford's truck assembly plant in Dearborn, for example, is minority, as compared to 16 percent of the state's population. As a result, when Ford sought to update its paint operations this year, local activists threatened it with an environmental racism complaint, delaying the company's permit for four months. In the highly competitive auto marketplace, which measures new model development in months, Ford is concerned that the EPA's policy could create a nightmare of red-tape delays. "It seems like the EPA is setting up an almost endless adversarial process," Ford executive Tim O'Brien told The Detroit News.

#### The reductiveness of environmentally focused justice movements precludes a broader effort to end social and racial injustice.

Shellenberger 8 (Michael, environmental strategist, March/April, Utne Reader, “Complete Interview: The Temperature Transcends Race”, p. 1-2, http://www.utne.com/2008-03-01/Environment/Complete-Interview-The-Temperature-Transcends-Race.aspx)

What started out as an effort to make environmentalism more expansive ended up making it even more narrow. The challenges facing poor communities of color go way beyond air and water pollution. They have far less access to healthy food; they have less health care security, less child care security. They’ve got crappier schools. There’s more stress and disempowerment. So to create a politics that’s centrally focused on toxic contamination or diesel bus pollution is reductive and speaks to a set of things that are very low priorities in comparison to the much bigger factors driving health and life outcomes. Are you saying that low income communities, particularly communities of color, don’t bear a larger burden of environmental degradation? No. We say very clearly that poor communities of color do bear a heavier burden in terms of pollution and environmental impact. The point that we make is that what gets defined by environmental justice advocates as environmental impacts are not the most serious factors determining health outcomes. In other words, smoking, diet, probably even things like stress related to living in an environment that’s high in violence and insecurity. Those are much more powerful factors shaping life and health outcomes and an expansive movement would deal with all of those problems simultaneously, not just with the ones that are defined as “environmental.”

#### Yucca Mountain will be used to store nuclear waste in the long term.

Kasperowicz, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Pete, The Hill, 5-31-12, “House members slam Obama on closing Yucca Mountain nuclear waste site”,

<http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/230397-house-members-slam-obama-on-yucca-mountain-policy>, RSR]

Republicans and Democrats in the House slammed the Obama administration's plan to close the nuclear waste disposal site at Yucca Mountain in Nevada, as both praised a bill that would keep that site open, and indicated they would try to add more money to keep the site active. Members were debating the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act late Thursday. The bill, H.R. 5325, includes $25 million for Yucca Mountain, which Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.) said would keep the site useable in the future. "Research and development activities to support Yucca are permitted," he said. "This will ensure that we keep Congress in the driver's seat for nuclear waste policy." House Appropriations Committee ranking member Norm Dicks (D-Wash.) added that he supports that language, and would try to add more money to send a signal that Congress opposes efforts to close the site. "I want to applaud the chairman and ranking member for continuing the funding for the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste storage facility," Dicks said. He said adding money in an amendment would "underscore the strong bipartisan support in the House for moving ahead with a plan to open the nation's high-level waste storage facility." "I believe as many do in the House that administration's position to close the Yucca Mountain site runs counter to the letter and spirit of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act passed by the Congress," he said.

#### Yucca explosion likely and results in extinction – top geologists agree.

Broad, ‘90

[William, Staff, The New York Times, November 18]

One scientist, however, has quietly but persistently warned that this vision of a safe repository is little more than a delusion.¶ Jerry S. Szymanski (pronounced sha-MAN-ski) is a geologist who works on the Yucca Mountain project for the United States Department of Energy, which is in charge of evaluating the site and would run the repository. For years, he has argued that ground water under the mountain could eventually well up, flood the facility and prompt a calamity of vast proportions. The geological action is easy to visualize. Crustal stresses in the area slowly open fractures and faults under and within the mountain. Water seeps into them. An earthquake occurs, compressing the fractures and forcing the ground water upward into the dump. As the inrushing water comes into contact with the hot canisters of nuclear waste, the water is vaporized, threatening to cause explosions, ruptures and the release of radioactivity.¶ Szymanski has worked for the D.O.E. since 1983. He takes pains to distance himself from foes of nuclear power. "This report is not the act of a disgruntled employee or an antinuclear freak," he wrote in the preface of a study he made on Yucca Mountain. "Rather, it is the act of a deeply concerned scientist, a public servant and a pro-nuclear activist."¶ He chain-smokes Winstons and drinks Scotch, neither of which seems to impair his ability to take brisk hikes up the mountain with his dog Max, a fierce-looking but friendly creature that is half Labrador, half pit bull. Szymanski's eyes flash when he speaks of those who oppose his view of the evidence. "It's banality of thought," he growls, "absence of depth." That same kind of banality, he says, was responsible for the Holocaust, around which his earliest memories revolve, and for a brutal crackdown in his native Poland, which prompted him to flee that country two decades ago with his wife and 6-month-old son. Today, he says, banality is prompting the Federal Government to court disaster.¶ Squinting in the bright Nevada sunlight, a cigarette firmly in his mouth, Szymanski walks into Trench No. 8, a deep scar on the side of Yucca Mountain dug at the behest of the Energy Department. It runs across a fault. He bends down to examine a one-yard-wide vein of rock whose creamy color stands in contrast to the dark, surrounding earth tones. His fingers play over its surface. The vein was deposited, he says, by mineral-laden water that welled up and turned this desolate site into an oasis.¶ "This is above the repository level," he says with studied understatement. The implication is clear and troubling -- where water once flowed, it might flow again.¶ The repository would hold up to 70,000 metric tons of waste. A large release would have an environmental impact that, by some estimates, would exceed that of a nuclear war. For perspective, the explosion of the Chernobyl reactor in the Soviet Union shot into the atmosphere just a few dozen pounds of highly radioactive nuclear waste, one of the most dangerous components of which was cesium 137 (it would also be a significant part of the waste at Yucca Mountain). Various studies say the consequences of Chernobyl will eventually be somewhere between 17,000 and 475,000 deaths from cancer, as well as an alarming number of serious ailments.¶ For half a decade, Szymanski's was a lone voice. His grim appraisal was opposed by almost everyone else on the Yucca Mountain project, who let their displeasure be known in subtle and not-so-subtle ways. But recently, growing ranks of geologists have backed his view. The dispute is by no means resolved.¶ If Szymanski is right and his warnings are heeded, it could mark the end of the Yucca Mountain project. The retreat would be a stunning setback for the Government and the nuclear-power industry, which is poised for a revival. If he is right and his warnings go unheeded, some experts say it might be the beginning of the ultimate end.¶ "You flood that thing and you could blow the top off the mountain," says Charles B. Archambeau, a geophysicist at the University of Colorado who has reviewed Szymanski's work and found it persuasive. "At the very least, the radioactive material would go into the ground water and spread to Death Valley, where there are hot springs all over the place, constantly bringing water up from great depths. It would be picked up by the birds, the animals, the plant life. It would start creeping out of Death Valley. You couldn't stop it. That's the nightmare. It could slowly spread to the whole biosphere. If you want to envision the end of the world, that's it."

#### Nuclear power increase CFCs which depletes the ozone.

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

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

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

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

#### Ozone depletion causes extinction.

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

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

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

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

### Neoliberal Epistemology

#### Government’s epistemology must be one of institutional control. It cannot be reduced to be that of the individuals occupying it.

Wight – Professor of IR @ University of Sydney – 6

(Colin, Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology, pgs. 48-50

One important aspect of this relational ontology is that these relations constitute our identity as social actors. According to this relational model of societies, one is what one is, by virtue of the relations within which one is embedded. A worker is only a worker by virtue of his/her relationship to his/her employer and vice versa. ‘Our social being is constituted by relations and our social acts presuppose them.’ At any particular moment in time an individual may be implicated in all manner of relations, each exerting its own peculiar causal effects. This ‘lattice-work’ of relations constitutes the structure of particular societies and endures despite changes in the individuals occupying them. Thus, the relations, the structures, are ontologically distinct from the individuals who enter into them. At a minimum, the social sciences are concerned with two distinct, although mutually interdependent, strata. There is an ontological difference between people and structures: ‘people are not relations, societies are not conscious agents’. Any attempt to explain one in terms of the other should be rejected. If there is an ontological difference between society and people, however, we need to elaborate on the relationship between them. Bhaskar argues that we need a system of mediating concepts, encompassing both aspects of the duality of praxis into which active subjects must fit in order to reproduce it: that is, a system of concepts designating the ‘point of contact’ between human agency and social structures. This is known as a ‘positioned practice’ system. In many respects, the idea of ‘positioned practice’ is very similar to Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus*. Bourdieu is primarily concerned with what individuals do in their daily lives. He is keen to refute the idea that social activity can be understood solely in terms of individual decision-making, or as determined by surpa-individual objective structures. Bourdieu’s notion of the *habitus* can be viewed as a bridge-building exercise across the explanatory gap between two extremes. Importantly, the notion of a habitus can only be understood in relation to the concept of a ‘social field’. According to Bourdieu, a social field is ‘a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions objectively defined’. A social field, then, refers to a structured system of social positions occupied by individuals and/or institutions – the nature of which defines the situation for their occupants. This is a social field whose form is constituted in terms of the relations which define it as a field of a certain type. A *habitus* (positioned practices) is a mediating link between individuals’ subjective worlds and the socio-cultural world into which they are born and which they share with others. The power of the habitus derives from the thoughtlessness of habit and habituation, rather than consciously learned rules. The habitus is imprinted and encoded in a socializing process that commences during early childhood. It is inculcated more by experience than by explicit teaching. Socially competent performances are produced as a matter of routine, without explicit reference to a body of codified knowledge, and without the actors necessarily knowing what they are doing (in the sense of being able adequately to explain what they are doing). As such, the *habitus* can be seen as the site of ‘internalization of reality and the externalization of internality.’ Thus social practices are produced in, and by, the encounter between: (1) the *habitus* and its dispositions; (2) the constraints and demands of the socio-cultural field to which the habitus is appropriate or within; and (3) the dispositions of the individual agents located within both the socio-cultural field and the *habitus*. When placed within Bhaskar’s stratified complex social ontology the model we have is as depicted in Figure 1. The explanation of practices will require all three levels. Society, as field of relations, exists prior to, and is independent of, individual and collective understandings at any particular moment in time; that is, social action requires the conditions for action. Likewise, given that behavior is seemingly recurrent, patterned, ordered, institutionalised, and displays a degree of stability over time, there must be sets of relations and rules that govern it. Contrary to individualist theory, these relations, rules and roles are not dependent upon either knowledge of them by particular individuals, or the existence of actions by particular individuals; that is, their explanation cannot be reduced to consciousness or to the attributes of individuals. These emergent social forms must possess emergent powers. This leads on to arguments for the reality of society based on a causal criterion. Society, as opposed to the individuals that constitute it, is, as Foucault has put it, ‘a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of reaction, its regulations as well as its possibility of disturbance. This new reality is society…It becomes necessary to reflect upon it, upon its specific characteristics, its constants and its variables’.

#### Governments have to act from a utilitarian calculus.

Harries, 94 – Editor @ The National Interest

[Owen, Power and Civilization, The National Interest, Spring, lexis]

Performance is the test. Asked directly by a Western interviewer, “In principle, do you believe in one standard of human rights and free expression?”, Lee immediately answers, “Look, it is not a matter of principle but of practice.” This might appear to represent a simple and rather crude pragmatism. But in its context it might also be interpreted as an appreciation of the fundamental point made by Max Weber that, in politics, it is “the ethic of responsibility” rather than “the ethic of absolute ends” that is appropriate. While an individual is free to treat human rights as absolute, to be observed whatever the cost, governments must always weigh consequences and the competing claims of other ends. So once they enter the realm of politics, human rights have to take their place in a hierarchy of interests, including such basic things as national security and the promotion of prosperity. Their place in that hierarchy will vary with circumstances, but no responsible government will ever be able to put them always at the top and treat them as inviolable and over-riding. The cost of implementing and promoting them will always have to be considered.

#### Their conception of structural violence is not the root cause.

Boulding 77

 Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung

Author(s): Kenneth E. BouldingReviewed work(s):Source: Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1977), pp. 75-86Published

 Kenneth Ewart Boulding (January 18, 1910 – March 18, 1993) was an economist, educator, peace activist, poet, religious mystic, devoted Quaker, systems scientist, and interdisciplinary philosopher.[1][2] He was cofounder of General Systems Theory and founder of numerous ongoing intellectual projects in economics and social science.

 He graduated from Oxford University, and was granted United States citizenship in 1948. During the years 1949 to 1967, he was a faculty member of the University of Michigan. In 1967, he joined the faculty of the University of Colorado at Boulder, where he remained until his retirement.

 Finally, we come to the great Galtung metaphors of 'structural violence' 'and 'positive peace'. They are metaphors rather than models, and for that very reason are suspect. Metaphors always imply models and metaphors have much more persuasive power than models do, for models tend to be the preserve of the specialist. But when a metaphor implies a bad model it can be very dangerous, for it is both persuasive and wrong. The metaphor of structural violence I would argue falls right into this category. The metaphor is that poverty, deprivation, ill health, low expectations of life, a condition in which more than half the human race lives, is 'like' a thug beating up the victim and 'taking his money away from him in the street, or it is 'like' a conqueror stealing the land of the people and reducing them to slavery. The implication is that poverty and its associated ills are the fault of the thug or the conqueror and the solution is to do away with thugs and conquerors. While there is some truth in the metaphor, in the modern world at least there is not very much. Violence, whether of the streets and the home, or of the guerilla, of the police, or of the armed forces, is a very different phenomenon from poverty. The processes which create and sustain poverty are not at all like the processes which create and sustain violence, although like everything else in 'the world, everything is somewhat related to everything else. There is a very real problem of the structures which lead to violence, but unfortunately Galitung's metaphor of structural violence as he has used it has diverted attention from this problem. Violence in the behavioral sense, that is, somebody actually doing damage to somebody else and trying to make them worse off, is a 'threshold' phenomenon, rather like the boiling over of a pot. The temperature under a pot can rise for a long time without its boiling over, but at some 'threshold boiling over will take place. The study of the structures which underlie violence are a very important and much neglected part of peace research and indeed of social science in general. Threshold phenomena like violence are difficult to study because they represent 'breaks' in the systenm rather than uniformities. Violence, whether between persons or organizations, occurs when the 'strain' on a system is too great for its 'strength'. The metaphor here is that violence is like what happens when we break a piece of chalk. Strength and strain, however, especially in social systems, are so interwoven historically that it is very difficult to separate them. The diminution of violence involves two possible strategies, or a mixture of the two; one is Ithe increase in the strength of the system, 'the other is the diminution of the strain. The strength of systems involves habit, culture, taboos, and sanctions, all these 'things which enable a system to stand lincreasing strain without breaking down into violence. The strains on the system 'are largely dynamic in character, such as arms races, mutually stimulated hostility, changes in relative economic position or political power, which are often hard to identify. Conflicts of interest 'are only part 'of the strain on a system, and not always the most important part. It is very hard for people ito know their interests, and misperceptions of 'interest take place mainly through the dynamic processes, not through the structural ones. It is only perceptions of interest which affect people's behavior, not the 'real' interests, whatever these may be, and the gap between percepti'on and reality can be very large and resistant to change. However, what Galitung calls structural violence (which has been defined 'by one unkind commenltator as anything that Galitung doesn't like) was originally defined as any unnecessarily low expectation of life, on that assumption that anybody who dies before the allotted span has been killed, however unintentionally and unknowingly, by somebody else. The concept has been expanded to include all 'the problems of poverty, destitution, deprivation, and misery. These are enormously real and are a very high priority for research and action, but they belong to systems which are only peripherally related to 'the structures whi'ch produce violence. This is not rto say that the cultures of violence and the cultures of poverty are not sometimes related, though not all poverty cultures are cultures of violence, and certainly not all cultures of violence are poverty cultures. But the dynamics lof poverty and the success or failure to rise out of it are of a complexity far beyond anything which the metaphor of structural violence can offer. While the metaphor of structural violence performed a service in calling attention to a problem, it may have d'one a disservice in preventing us from finding the answer.

#### Prioritizing epistemology reifies, rewards extremism and causes self-serving scholarship – turns the aff.

Lake, Jerri-Ann and Gary E. Jacobs Professor of Social Sciences and Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California – San Diego, ‘11

[David, “Why ‘‘isms’’ Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress”, International Studies Quarterly, 2011, 55, 465-480, RSR]

The question of epistemology in international studies suffers from the same pathologies for theories outlined earlier, and which I need not repeat here. We reify each approach, reward extremism, fail to specify research designs completely, apply epistemologies selectively where they are most likely to work, and then claim universality. Through these pathologies, we not only create academic religions of different theories but also become committed to academic sects with different epistemologies. Like our theories, these epistemologies have become increasingly politicized and used as criteria and even weapons in power struggles within the discipline. Gatekeepers increasingly use one’s adherence to this or that epistemological religion to determine who gets hired where, who gets access to resources, and who is accepted in various professional networks. We increasingly talk and interact only with others of our same epistemological persuasion. Yet, although it may disappoint partisans, I can think of no objective reason to prefer one epistemology over another. Rather, the choice of epistemology by scholars appears to be largely subjective. We appear to be drawn to one or the other approach by intuition: one form of explanation simply feels right. Some are satisfied only when an event is placed in its full historical perspective with all the conjunctures and counterfactuals accounted for. Others are satisfied only when events accord with an appropriately derived hypothesis that has passed many demanding experimental tests. For myself, I read a lot in history—far more than I read in political science—and benefit from and enjoy these mostly narrative accounts immensely. But at the same time, I am usually not persuaded by causal claims that lack well-specified theories and experimental tests. In turn, while most of my own research has focused on the history of US foreign policy, the cases are treated within a nomological approach (see Lake 1988, 1999). One can move across the divide without finding the causal claims on the other side especially satisfying.

## 2NC

### Cap K

#### Ethics DA – We have ethical obligation to repudiate capitalism – this means any risk a link is a reason to reject the permutation

Marsh 95 (James, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, “Critique, Action, Liberation” p. 334-335)

An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed it may seem unlikely, given this particular person’s past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over **our** capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations**.** I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but i remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. Ideologies of scientific elitism, therefore, as they function in capitalist society are correct if there is no such thing as ethical, constitutive reason operating in community**.** If such constitutive reason is possible and actual in human beings as human in community, then scientific elitism is false. Men and women acting democratically and participatively do have a capacity to understand themselves and their lives in a way that is cogent and in touch with reality. Indeed, many of the popular movements in Europe, England, and the United States in the last twenty years such as feminism, environmentalism, civil rights, and antiwar movements, often acting against the advice or opinion of experts have shown themselves to be right and effective. In the Vietnam War, for example, millions of people in the united states taking to the streets in protest proved the “best and the brightest” in the white house, pentagon, and state department wrong. The “best and the brightest” according to the standards of scientific elitism proved to be deluded. The presence of an ethical, political rationality in all of us as human invalidates scientific elitism at its core. As I am arguing it here, a fundamental link exists among dialectical phenomenology, ethical, constitutive rationality, and democracy. Philosophy and ethics, properly understood, are antielitist. To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental, indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial**.** What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet’s “to be or not to be” speech? What does an empirical of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx’s capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso’s Guernica? To the extend, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason by the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factural, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

#### The priority link. Only seizing by first seizing control of the means of production can we effectively deal with nuclear technology. That means only the alt solves the destructive use of nuclear power against the working class

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

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

#### Their perm will be coopted - it will be used demonstrate the superiority of capitalism by validating the ability of capitalism to fix its own problems – this makes it even worse than the plan and actually short circuits any attempt at a more radical form of politics

Meszaros 95 [Istavan, Prof. Emeritus at Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition] p. 930

THE difficulty is that the ‘moment’ of radical politics is strictly limited by the nature of the crises in question and the temporal determinations of their unfolding. The breach opened up at times of crisis cannot be left open forever and the measures adopted to fill it, from the earliest steps onwards, have their own logic and cumulative impact on subsequent interventions. Furthermore, both the existing socioeconomic structures and their corresponding framework of political institutions tend to act against radical initiatives by their very inertia as soon as the worst moment of the crisis is over and thus it becomes possible to contemplate again ‘the line of least resistance’. And no one can consider ‘radical restructuring’ the line of least resistance, since by its very nature it necessarily involves upheaval and the disconcerting prospect of the unknown. No immediate economic achievement can offer a way out of this dilemma so as to prolong the life-span of revolutionary politics, since such limited economic achievements made within the confines of the old premises — act in the opposite direction by relieving the most pressing crisis symptoms and, as a result, reinforcing the old reproductive mechanism shaken by the crisis. As history amply testifies, at the first sign of ‘recovery’, politics is pushed back Into its traditional role of helping to sustain and enforce the given socio-economic determinations. The claimed ‘recovery’ itself reached on the basis of the ‘well tried economic motivations’, acts as the self-evident ideological justification for reverting to the subservient, routine role of politics, in harmony with the dominant institutional framework. Thus, radical politics can only accelerate its own demise (and thereby shorten, instead of extending as it should, the favourable ‘moment’ of major political intervention) if it consents to define its own scope in terms of limited economic targets which are in fact necessarily dictated by the established socioeconomic structure in crisis

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

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

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

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

#### Capitalism appeals to individual experience in order to divide social groups - a experience based epistemology and theory of oppression breaks down the concept of class as an all encompassing theory of exploitation that is the only way to enable the unification of the proleteriat

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

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

#### No value to life under capitalism—it reduces everything to consumerist decision calculus

Cerni 7 (Paula, cultural logic electronic collection of Marxist Theory and Practice independent writer, “The Age of Consumer Capitalism”, <http://clogic.eserver.org/2007/Cerni.pdf>, accessed 7/8/09)

Thus the powerlessness of the consumer vis-à-vis the production process is experienced as the active tyranny of the finished object — as an object-sized moral law. Morality is now restricted to the single and immediate dimension of “is,” no longer transcended by means of its negation, “ought” ( Marcuse, 1991); while reason similarly limits itself to the set of available options. “If people very strongly desire what they cannot get, they will be unhappy; such desires, therefore, are irrational,” says Jon Elster (1986: 15). In the age of consumer capitalism, then, morality and reason submit to a reality principle that no longer defers pleasure and accepts pain for the sake of future achievements, but asserts the pleasure and pain of the actually experienced world. And so we find the materiality of a there-to-be-consumed world perfectly aligned with the malleable performances of post-modern reflexivity. Dehumanized things and immaterial meanings are two sides of one coin, the objective and subjective aspects of social experience under consumer capitalism.19 That is why the authority of the given material world co-exists with notions of contemporary society as somehow uniquely “cultural,” “virtual,” even “immaterial.” It is why unknowable and impenetrable objects end up reflecting our constructed desires; mere things turn into carriers of social meaning (Douglas and Isherwood, 1996), aesthetic objects (Haug, 1986), or stuff embedded in social narratives (Harré, 2002); people become post-human “informational-material” entities (Hayles, 1999: 11); and an economy of physical plenty melts away into intangible flows of information and knowledge.

### Case

#### Yucca Mountain will survive in the long term – politically bipartisan.

Kasperowicz, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Pete, The Hill, 5-31-12, “House members slam Obama on closing Yucca Mountain nuclear waste site”,

<http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/230397-house-members-slam-obama-on-yucca-mountain-policy>, RSR]

Republicans and Democrats in the House slammed the Obama administration's plan to close the nuclear waste disposal site at Yucca Mountain in Nevada, as both praised a bill that would keep that site open, and indicated they would try to add more money to keep the site active. Members were debating the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act late Thursday. The bill, H.R. 5325, includes $25 million for Yucca Mountain, which Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.) said would keep the site useable in the future. "Research and development activities to support Yucca are permitted," he said. "This will ensure that we keep Congress in the driver's seat for nuclear waste policy." House Appropriations Committee ranking member Norm Dicks (D-Wash.) added that he supports that language, and would try to add more money to send a signal that Congress opposes efforts to close the site. "I want to applaud the chairman and ranking member for continuing the funding for the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste storage facility," Dicks said. He said adding money in an amendment would "underscore the strong bipartisan support in the House for moving ahead with a plan to open the nation's high-level waste storage facility." "I believe as many do in the House that administration's position to close the Yucca Mountain site runs counter to the letter and spirit of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act passed by the Congress," he said.

#### Yucca mountain use is inevitable unless Congress says no.

Wald, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Matthew, The New York Times, 8-3-12, “Court Weighs an Order on Nuclear Waste Site in Nevada”,

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/04/science/earth/court-weighs-an-order-on-yucca-mountain.html, RSR]

A federal appeals court indicated Friday that it would issue an order for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to resume an evaluation of a possible nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, a volcanic ridge in the Nevada desert, unless Congress acted by December to resolve the legal tangle around the project.

#### Volcano activity causes a nuclear eruption

Mason, staff, ‘2

[Betsy, Yucca Mountain could become nuclear volcano, NewScientist, August 24, p. 10]

IF A volcano ever erupted beneath the planned nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Nevada it could cause a devastating explosion that sent high-level nuclear waste spewing into the atmosphere.¶ Yucca Mountain lies about 145 kilometres north-west of Las Vegas, within an active volcanic field. An eruption at the site is considered extremely unlikely, but it is possible. There are six craters within 20 kilometres of the site, including Lathrop Wells volcano, which formed by eruptions just 80,000 years ago. A study in 2000 estimated that there was a 1 in 1000 chance of an eruption at the site during the 10,000 years it will take for the radioactivity of the waste stored there to dissipate. And a recent report suggests that a more active cluster of volcanoes 100 kilometres to the north could be an even bigger threat .¶ Now Andrew Woods of the BP Institute at the University of Cambridge and his colleagues have found that if an eruption occurred beneath the site, a rising sheet of magma could burst into the proposed storage tunnels 200 to 300 metres below the surface. The pressure in the hollow tunnels would be much lower than in the surrounding rock, so once the magma broke through it would gush into the tunnels at tens or hundreds of metres per second. The heat would be enough to deform and rupture the 7-centimetre-thick walls of the waste canisters in just 20 minutes, the researchers say.¶ Worse, if the storage tunnels were open to the main access tunnel, this could act as an easy escape route for the magma to reach the surface, sending nuclear waste several miles skyward in an explosive eruption. According to Woods's model, even if the tunnels were blocked, the magma could still build up enough pressure to break through to the surface. The study, which was funded by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is published in Geophysical Research Letters (DOI: 10.1029/2002GL014665).¶ The effort to determine whether Yucca Mountain would be a safe place to stash more than 75,000 tonnes of high-level nuclear waste has lasted more than 20 years and cost over $4 billion. The US Congress approved the site earlier this year, and last month President Bush signed a bill giving it the green light. But the state of Nevada is fiercely opposed and has five lawsuits pending against it. And the Department of Energy must still apply for a licence from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to store waste underground at Yucca Mountain -- a process that could last up to five years.¶ Volcanoes aren't the only threat that has Nevada on edge about the plans for Yucca Mountain. Earthquakes and rising groundwater could also bring radioactive material to the surface.

#### Nuclear explosion likely – LANL scientists agree

Marcus, staff, ‘95

[Casey, Nuke Dump Explosion Fear, Courier-Mail, March 7]

SCIENTISTS fear a massive subterranean nuclear waste dump planned near Las Vegas could fail and lead to an enormous atomic explosion. The repository would be built deep underground beneath Yucca Mountain, 140km north of the Nevada gambling city. It is designed to solve the United States's urgent problem of stockpiled nuclear waste. Researchers have been planning the dump for eight years and have spent $US1.7 billion on studies, despite strident opposition from state officials and nuclear opponents. Now two scientists at the Los Alamos National Laboratory \_ birthplace of the nuclear bomb \_ have found a scenario could exist where the dump would fail, setting off a gigantic explosion destroying the mountain and contaminating vast surrounding areas and ground water supplies. Their theory has set off debate among the 30 researchers who are now trying to disprove the claims. The researchers will decide the future of the project which is due to open in 2010 and permanently solve the domestic and military nuclear waste problem. Up to 65,000 tonnes of highly toxic waste would be stored 330m below ground in steel cannisters designed to last 10,000 years. But Dr Charles Bowman and Dr Francesco Venneri, scientists on the project, believe a set of circumstances could arise setting off a chain reaction resulting in a massive atomic explosion. ""We think there's a generic problem with putting fissiles (substances in the nuclear chain reaction) underground," Dr Bowman told the New York Times. Three teams of 10 scientists were assigned to disproving the scenario but had so far failed. ""If we knew how to put a stake through its heart, we'd do it," said Dr John Browne, a project leader. If it can't be disproved the project would have to be abandoned and relocated to an area of more stable geology, such as granite instead of highly porous desert areas, a key factor in the complex theory. Dr Bowman said the project could go ahead if the waste was first treated by particle accelerators but these have not yet been developed. Nuclear waste in the US is an urgent, unsolved and continually growing problem with hundreds of temporary sites around the country coming to or already achieving their use-by dates. Communities near them are becoming increasingly concerned, particularly when leaks and leachings have occurred.

#### 2 Scenarios for our impact

Warrick, Staff, ‘98

[Joby, At Nevada Nuclear Waste Site, The Issue Is One of Liquidity; Studies Citing Risk of Water Seepage Imperil Yucca Mountain Project, The Washington Post, December 15, p. A3]

It's the only man-made project designed to outlast the pyramids: a $ 20 billion monument to durable engineering built to withstand at least 10,000 years and even a direct hit by a nuclear bomb.¶ Yet for all its sturdiness, Nevada's Yucca Mountain, the proposed underground repository for America's most dangerous radioactive waste, could be doomed by something as common as water.¶ That is the predicament the Energy Department faces next week as it weighs how -- and whether -- to proceed with the most elaborate and expensive dump ever dreamed up. As early as next Tuesday, the agency will issue a long-awaited "viability" report on Yucca Mountain that reportedly will give a green light for continued research on the site. The five-volume report is one of the last major hurdles before a final decision in 2001. But even as the government prepares to press ahead, several new reports are renewing questions about Yucca Mountain's suitability as the national graveyard for the deadliest forms of nuclear waste. Two studies by different groups of scientists suggest a future risk from water, the chief nemesis for a repository that is designed to remain dry for millennia.¶ In one worst-case scenario, rainwater would penetrate the mountain's underground vaults and storage casks and rapidly move radioactive material into ground water. In the other, hot water from deep underground would flood the repository -- an event that, in the opinion of a few scientists, could cause an explosion.¶ "You're talking about an unimaginable catastrophe," said Jerry Szymanski, formerly the Energy Department's top geologist at Yucca Mountain and now an outspoken opponent of the Nevada site. "Chernobyl would be small potatoes."

## 1NR

### Renewables

#### Warming is the most probable for extinction.

The New York End Times 6 The New York End Times is a non-partisan, non-religious, non-ideological, free news filter. We monitor world trends and events as they pertain to two vital threats - war and extinction. We use a proprietary methodology to quantify movements between the extremes of war and peace, harmony and extinction. http://newyorkendtimes.com/extinctionscale.asp

We rate Global Climate Change as a greater threat for human extinction in this century. Most scientists forecast disruptions and dislocations, if current trends persist. The extinction danger is more likely if we alter an environmental process that causes harmful effects and leads to conditions that make the planet uninhabitable to humans. Considering that there is so much that is unknown about global systems, we consider climate change to be the greatest danger to human extinction. However, there is no evidence of imminent danger. Nuclear war at some point in this century might happen. It is unlikely to cause human extinction though. While several countries have nuclear weapons, there are few with the firepower to annihilate the world. For those nations it would be suicidal to exercise that option. The pattern is that the more destructive technology a nation has, the more it tends towards rational behavior. Sophisticated precision weapons then become better tactical options. The bigger danger comes from nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists with the help of a rogue state, such as North Korea. The size of such an explosion would not be sufficient to threaten humanity as a whole. Instead it could trigger a major war or even world war. Under this scenario human extinction would only be possible if other threats were present, such as disease and climate change. We monitor war separately. However we also need to incorporate the dangers here .

#### Allowing warming to continue perpetuates all their impacts

Hoerner 8**—**Former director of Research at the Center for a Sustainable Economy, Director of Tax Policy at the Center for Global Change at the University of Maryland College Park, and editor of Natural Resources Tax Review. He has done research on environmental economics and policy on behalf of the governments of Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United States. Andrew received his B.A. in Economics from Cornell University and a J.D. from Case Western Reserve School of Law—AND—Nia Robins—former inaugural Climate Justice Corps Fellow in 2003, director of Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (J. Andrew, “A Climate of Change African Americans, Global Warming, and a Just Climate Policy for the U.S.” July 2008, http://www.ejcc.org/climateofchange.pdf)

Everywhere we turn, the issues and impacts of climate change confront us. One of the most serious environmental threats facing the world today, climate change has moved from the minds of scientists and offices of environmentalists to the mainstream. Though the media is dominated by images of polar bears, melting glaciers, flooded lands, and arid desserts, there is a human face to this story as well. Climate change is not only an issue of the environment; it is also an issue of justice and human rights, one that dangerously intersects race and class. All over the world people of color, Indigenous Peoples and low-income communities bear disproportionate burdens from climate change itself, from ill-designed policies to prevent it, and from side effects of the energy systems that cause it. A Climate of Change explores the impacts of climate change on African Americans, from health to economics to community, and considers what policies would most harm or benefit African Americans—and the nation as a whole. African Americans are thirteen percent of the U.S. population and on average emit nearly twenty percent less greenhouse gases than non-Hispanic whites per capita. Though far less responsible for climate change, African Americans are significantly more vulnerable to its effects than non- Hispanic whites. Health, housing, economic well-being, culture, and social stability are harmed from such manifestations of climate change as storms, floods, and climate variability. African Americans are also more vulnerable to higher energy bills, unemployment, recessions caused by global energy price shocks, and a greater economic burden from military operations designed to protect the flow of oil to the U.S. Climate Justice: The Time Is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances are forged and traditional movements are transformed. An effective policy to address the challenges of global warming cannot be crafted until race and equity are part of the discussion from the outset and an integral part of the solution. This report finds that: Global warming amplifies nearly all existing inequalities. Under global warming, injustices that are already unsustainable become catastrophic. Thus it is essential to recognize that all justice is climate justice and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the fight to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting a sound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of color as any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice. Climate policies that best serve African Americans also best serve a just and strong United States. This paper shows that policies well-designed to benefit African Americans also provide the most benefit to all people in the U.S. Climate policies that best serve African Americans and other disproportionately affected communities also best serve global economic and environmental justice. Domestic reductions in global warming pollution and support for such reductions in developing nations financed by polluter-pays principles provide the greatest benefit to African Americans, the peoples of Africa, and people across the Global South. A distinctive African American voice is critical for climate justice. Currently, legislation is being drafted, proposed, and considered without any significant input from the communities most affected. Special interests are represented by powerful lobbies, while traditional environmentalists often fail to engage people of color, Indigenous Peoples, and low-income communities until after the political playing field has been defined and limited to conventional environmental goals. A strong focus on equity is essential to the success of the environmental cause, but equity issues cannot be adequately addressed by isolating the voices of communities that are disproportionately impacted. Engagement in climate change policy must be moved from the White House and the halls of Congress to social circles, classrooms, kitchens, and congregations. The time is now for those disproportionately affected to assume leadership in the climate change debate, to speak truth to power, and to assert rights to social, environmental and economic justice. Taken together, these actions affirm a vital truth that will bring communities together: Climate Justice is Common Justice. African Americans and Vulnerability In this report, it is shown that African Americans are disproportionately affected by climate change. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Climate Change and Global Warming Co-Pollutants ¶ • The six states with the highest African American population are all in the Atlantic hurricane zone, and are expected to experience more intense storms resembling Katrina and Rita in the future. ¶ • Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of heat waves or extreme heat events. African Americans suffer heat death at one hundred fifty to two hundred percent of the rate for non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Seventy-one percent of African Americans live in counties in violation of federal air pollution standards, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the white population. Seventy-eight percent of African Americans live within thirty miles of a coal-fired power plant, as compared to fifty-six percent of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Asthma has strong associations with air pollution, and African Americans have a thirty-six percent higher rate of incidents of asthma than whites. Asthma is three times as likely to lead to emergency room visits or deaths for African Americans. ¶ • This study finds that a twenty-five percent reduction in greenhouse gases—similar to what passed in California and is proposed in major federal legislation—would reduce infant mortality by at least two percent, asthma by at least sixteen percent, and mortality from particulates by at least 6,000 to 12,000 deaths per year. Other estimates have run as high as 33,000 fewer deaths per year. A disproportionate number of the lives saved by these proposed reductions would be African American. African Americans Are Economically More Vulnerable to Disasters and Illnesses ¶ • In 2006, twenty percent of African Americans had no health insurance, including fourteen percent of African American children—nearly twice the rate of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • In the absence of insurance, disasters and illness (which will increase with global warming) could be cushioned by income and accumulated wealth. However, the average income of African American households is fifty-seven percent that of non-Hispanic whites, and median wealth is only one-tenth that of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Racist stereotypes have been shown to reduce aid donations and impede service delivery to African Americans in the wake of hurricanes, floods, fires and other climate-related disasters as compared to non-Hispanic whites in similar circumstances. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Energy Price Shocks ¶ • African Americans spend thirty percent more of their income on energy than non-Hispanic whites. • Energy price increases have contributed to seventy to eighty percent of recent recessions. The increase in unemployment of African Americans during energy caused recessions is twice that of non-Hispanic whites, costing the community an average of one percent of income every year. • Reducing economic dependence on energy will alleviate the frequency and severity of recessions and the economic disparities they generate. African Americans Pay a Heavy Price and a Disproportionate Share of the Cost of Wars for Oil • Oil company profits in excess of the normal rate of profit for U.S. industries cost the average household $611 in 2006 alone and are still rising. • The total cost of the war in Iraq borne by African Americans will be $29,000 per household if the resulting deficit is financed by tax increases, and $32,000 if the debt is repaid by spending cuts. This is more than three times the median assets of African American households. A Clean Energy Future Creates Far More Jobs for African Americans • Fossil fuel extraction industries employ a far lower proportion of African Americans on average compared to other industries. Conversely, renewable electricity generation employs three to five times as many people as comparable electricity generation from fossil fuels, a higher proportion of whom are African American. ¶ • Switching just one percent of total electricity generating capacity per year from conventional to renewable sources would result in an additional 61,000 to 84,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030. ¶ • A well-designed comprehensive climate plan achieving emission reductions comparable to the Kyoto Protocol would create over 430,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030, reducing the African American unemployment rate by 1.8 percentage points and raising the average African American income by 3 to 4 percent.

#### Renewables also move away from the harms of centralized energy whereby we have to deal with siting problems. Multiple examples prove there is a growing grassroots movement for DG.

Bronin 10 Sara C. Bronin Associate Professor of Law, University of Connecticut “Curbing Energy Sprawl with Microgrids” December, 2010 Connecticut Law Review 43 Conn. L. Rev. 547 lexis

Lower infrastructure costs, flexible configurations, and the ability to use waste heat result in big savings to microgrid users. It may be important to conclude this section with some thoughts about the feasibility of small-scale energy sharing among neighbors. Some may doubt the ability of neighbors to cooperate enough to conceive, execute, and maintain something as complicated as a microgrid. Reviewing the American experience with district energy systems may assuage these doubts. District energy systems are small-scale systems that offer institutions, groups of individuals, or certain economies of scale to heat and/or cool several buildings at once through a small- or mid-sized facility. 79 Note that heating and cooling are not as regulated as electricity and other energy production. 80 As one example of a successful district energy system, a condominium community in New Hampshire uses a central pellet boiler plant which uses locally produced biomass fuel for heat and hot water. 81 The twenty-nine units range in size, and some are [\*565] freestanding buildings. 82 The central plant has helped the community to obtain the highest rank in the widely-recognized certification system administered by the U.S. Green Building Council. 83 Concerns about the safety, utility, or effectiveness of district energy systems, which like microgrids serve multiple distinct physical spaces, have been greatly reduced as such systems have become more common. Moreover, various groups around the country are building networks that rely on the mutual support of neighbors to achieve alternative energy goals. In the nation's capitol, for example, several solar cooperatives have been established to share information, ideas, and labor. 84 In Maryland, a chamber of commerce has worked with a local clean energy broker to negotiate bulk rates for the purchase of wind power. 85 In New Hampshire, neighbors install alternative energy equipment for neighbors, in "energy rais[ing]" events not unlike the barn raising events of yesteryear. 86 These efforts reveal a growing grassroots initiative among neighbors to mobilize for alternative energy. The time to capitalize on this movement by facilitating the proliferation of microgrids is now.

#### Renewables focusing on localism allows for us to challenge elite control.

Hess 9 David J. professor of sociology at Vanderbilt University and member of the Vanderbilt Institute for Energy and Environment. *Localist Movements in a Global Economy*, Sustainability, Justice, and Urban Development in the United States

The continuities of localism with socialist, communalist, neoliberal, and liberal politics should all be recognized, and likewise any attempts to reduce localism to one or the other strands of political ideologies would best be greeted with questions about oversimpliﬁcation. It is too easy for analysts who have sympathies with positions within the existing political ﬁeld of mainstream and radical politics to misinterpret localism as smallscale socialism or liberalism, an iteration of the communalist politics of the late 1960s and the early 1970s, or an expression of neoliberalism via marketplace reformism. Rather, if one starts with recognition of the diversity of the localist movement, it becomes possible to recognize that the new types of coalitions are being built at the grassroots and to explore both the continuities with and differences from political legacies. Localism can appeal to socialists who want to see more local government ownership, to communalists and decentralists who wish to see the growth of independent local economies, to neoliberals who support the smallbusiness sector as a solution to social and environmental problems, and to liberals who seek greater regulation of local land use and federal legislation that ends corporate handouts. The bluest of Democrats may ﬁnd themselves agreeing with the reddest of Republicans, at least on the strategy of local economic control as a means for improving the environmental, health, and quality of life of their shared, place-based communities. Furthermore, the selection of which strands come to the fore is likely to vary depending on broader political opportunities.26 To some degree, localism reveals the doxa, or the “peace in the feud,” that occurs between advocates of mainstream policies and the radical alternatives. The debates largely assume that the central political issue is the degree of participation of the national government in the economy: from very little at the extreme of anarcho-communalists to signiﬁcantly reduced among neoliberals to moderate and aggressive among liberals to government ownership among socialists. The terms of the radical and mainstream political debate can be used to inform an analysis of the articulations of localist politics with existing political ideologies, but they can also become a template that fails to reveal the departures from those ideologies. Just as the radical critique steps outside the mainstream debate between neoliberalism and liberalism, so the localist perspective cannot be understood as limited by the terms of the debate between mainstream and radical politics. To avoid the misinterpretation and to understand localism on its own terms, it is necessary to develop a more succinct vocabulary for its politics. I suggest that the crucial differences between localist political thought and both radical and mainstream ideologies are the emphasis on the role of small-businesses and nonproﬁt organizations, the call for independent and local ownership, and the goal of extending that project to locations throughout the world in the form of a global economy based on locally owned independent enterprises. Local autonomy translates largely into a concern with ownership, that is, the question of who owns the means of production. However, in contrast with both radical and mainstream traditions, localism does not entail framing the ownership issue in terms of more or less public ownership, as occurs in debates over privatization and nationalization. The mainstream political debates focus on more or less government intervention in the economy, and the radical debate pushes either for federal ownership in the socialist tradition or for municipal and communal ownership in the communalist tradition. Localism departs somewhat from the existing political debates by shifting attention from the government-economy relationship to the relationship between multinational corporations and society. At the heart of concept of local independent ownership is a political project of building an alternative economy that is distinct from the world of the large publicly traded corporation. This position has resonances with radical critiques of capitalism, either from a socialist or an anarchist perspective. However, the focus on small-business development through market development and government programs also has resonances with neoliberalism and liberalism. The strong attention drawn to the shortcomings of a global economy dominated by enormous corporations with little concern for nation-states or for place-based communities, and often with little concern for the environment and hourly workers, represents a kind of politics that seems especially geared toward addressing the problems that have emerged in an era of globalization. In addition to drawing attention to the large publicly traded corporation as the central unit in need of reform, localism also adopts a “oneoff” position from existing political traditions by conﬁguring the problem of justice in a different way. The “peace in the feud” between mainstream and radical debates on justice concerned the problem of social inequality, especially the fates of working-class and poor people. The debate has always been about how to solve the problem of helping those at the bottom of the social ladder, both at home and abroad. The solutions range from neoliberals’ emphasis on enterprise development zones and workfare to welfare-state liberalism to redistribution of proﬁts through communal or government ownership. Although the positions are quite different from each other, the overall debate shares an emphasis on justice in the distributive sense of solving social inequality and poverty. Localist politics broaden the discussion of justice by injecting what might be considered a procedural perspective into the debate. For localist politics the more central justice issue is the loss of economic and political sovereignty of place-based communities to global capital, which implements new regimes of governance through control of federal government policies, continental trade agreements, and global trade and ﬁnancial organizations. By sovereignty I mean nothing more complicated than the traditional understanding of a government’s ability to regulate and otherwise control the economics and politics of its territory and population. In a world dominated by multinational corporations, it has become increasingly difﬁcult for local communities, and even large nation-states, to achieve autonomy from the priorities set by global capital. Localism draws attention to an underlying problem that is a precondition for a community or larger political unit to be able to address issues of distributive justice. If the democratic governance of the economy is broken as a result of corporate control of local, state, national, and international governments and governing bodies, then it will be difﬁcult for governments to address signiﬁcant social and environmental problems. Conversely, a community with high economic sovereignty could be in a better position to address issues of poverty within its boundaries than one that is governed by outside forces. However, the two issues are analytically distinct, and the difference is crucial if one is to understand what localism is about as a form of political thought and action.27 A helpful context for understanding the localist concern with sovereignty is found in the work of the anthropologists James Ferguson and Aihwa Ong, who draw attention to the shifts in sovereignty that have occurred in an era of neoliberal globalization. They note that although governments retain formal sovereignty over a territory, in some cases multinational corporations or non-governmental organizations have achieved de facto control. Their examples are drawn from ﬁeldwork in Asia and Africa, but there are parallels with some cities in the United States. Increasingly cities have ceded territorial control over some areas to enclaves of mostly global capital, such as occurs in ofﬁce parks, shopping malls, and clusters of big-box stores, and other parts of American cities have become largely abandoned to the nonproﬁt sector.

#### Efforts to promote renewables are happening now – nuclear is the only threat.

Charman, environmental journalist and managing editor at the Capitalism Nature Socialism journal, ‘6

[“Brave Nuclear World?/Commentary: Nuclear revival? Don’t bet on it!”, July/august, Vol. 19, pg. 12, Proquest]

Governments and markets are beginning to recognize the potential of renewable energy and its use is growing rapidly. According to Worldwatch Institute's Renewables 2005, global investment in renewable energy in 2004 was about US$30 billion. The report points out that renewable sources generated 20 percent of the amount of electricity produced by the world's 443 operating nuclear reactors in 2004. Renewables now account for 20-25 percent of global power sector investment, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development predicts that over the next 30 years one-third of the investment in new power sources in OECD countries will be for renewable energy.Alternative energy guru Amory Lovins says the investment in alternatives is currently "an order of magnitude" greater than that now being spent on building new nuclear plants. Lovins has been preaching lower-cost alternatives, includingenergy conservation, for more than three decades, and the realization of his vision of sustainable, renewable energy is perhaps closer than ever. He argues that the current moves to re-embrace nuclear power are a huge step backwards, and thatcontrary to claims that we need to consider all options to deal with global warming, nuclear power would actually hinder the effort because of the high cost and the long time it would take to get enough carbon-displacing nuclear plants up and running. "In practice, keeping nuclear power alive means diverting private and public investment from the cheaper market winners-cogeneration, renewables, and efficiency-to the costly market loser. Its higher cost than competitors, per unit of netCO2 displaced, means that every dollar invested in nuclear expansion will worsen climate change," he writes in his 2005 paper "Nuclear Power: Economics and Climate-Protection Potential.

#### Renewables solve warming – Europe proves it can displace emissions.

Sovacool and Cooper, ‘7

[Benjamin (Senior Research Fellow for the Network for New Energy Choices in New York and Adjunct Assistant Professor at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University in Blacksburg, VA) and Christopher (Executive Director of the Network for New Energy Choices), Renewing America: The Case for Federal Leadership on a National Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), Network for New Energy Choices • Report No. 01-07, June, 2007, http://www.newenergychoices.org/dev/uploads/RPS%20Report\_Cooper\_Sovacool\_FINAL\_HILL.pdf]

Carbon Dioxide (CO2) and Other Greenhouse Gases (GHG) In its most recent report released on April, 2007, theIntergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)—a forum made up of thousands of the world’s top climate scientists—concluded that continued emissions of greenhouse gases will contribute directly to global: • Changes in the distribution, availability, and precipitation of water, resulting in severe water shortages for millions of people. • Destruction of ecosystems, especially the bleaching of coral reefs and widespread deaths of migratory species. • Complex, crop productivity and fishing impacts. • Damage from floods and severe storms, especially among coastal areas. • Deaths arising from changes in disease vectors and an increase in the number of heat waves, floods, and droughts.298 Policymakers should not underestimate the impacts of global warming for the United States. The Pew Center on Global Climate Change estimates that, in the Southeast and southern Great Plains, the financial costs of climate change could reach as high as $138 billion by 2100. Indeed, Pew researchers warn that “waiting until the future” to address global climate change might bankrupt the U.S. economy.299 Yet carbon-intensive fuels continue to dominate electricity generation in the **U**nited **S**tates. By 2005, almost 90 percent of the country’s greenhouse gas emissions were energy-related, with the electric utility industry outpacing all other sectors (including transportation)with 38 percent of national carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions. Fossil-fueled power plants in the U.S. emitted 2.25 billion metric tons of C02 in 2003, **more than 10 times** the amount of C02 compared to the next-largest emitter, iron and steel production.301 Put simply, of all U.S. industries, electricity generation is—by substantial margins—the single largest contributor of the pollutants responsible for global warming. In 2004, almost every state in country was home to at least one power plant with significant C02 emissions. Nuclear energy is not much of an improvement, despite recent claims by the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) that nuclear power is “the Clean Air Energy.” Reprocessing and enriching uranium requires a substantial amount of electricity, often generated from fossil fuel-fired power plants. Data collected from one uranium enrichment company alone revealed that it takes a 100- megawatt power plant running for 550 hours to produce the amount of enriched uranium needed to fuel a 1,000 megawatt reactor (of the most efficient design currently available) for one year.302 According to the Washington Post, two of the nation’s most polluting coal plants (in Ohio and Indiana) produce electricity exclusively for the enrichment of uranium.303 Because uranium enrichment consumes so much electricity derived from fossil fuels, many nuclear power plants contributeindirectly, but substantially, to global climate change and do virtually nothing to end U.S. dependence on foreign oil. The International Atomic Energy Agency estimates that when direct and indirect carbon emissions are included,coal plants are around 10 times more carbon intensive than solar and more than 40 times more carbon intensive than wind. Natural gas fares little better, at three times as carbon intense as solar and 20 times as carbon intensive as wind.304 The Common Purpose Institute estimates that renewable energy technologies could offset as much as 0.49 tons of carbon dioxide emissions per every MWh of generation. According to data compiled by the Union of Concerned Scientists, a 20 percent RPS would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by **434 million metric tons** by 2020—a reduction of 15 percent below “business as usual” levels, or the equivalent to taking nearly 71 million automobiles off the road.305 These estimates are not simply theoretical. Between 1991 and 1997 renewable energy technologies in the Netherlands reduced that country’s annual emissions of CO2 by between 4.4 million and 6.7 million tons.§ Marked 14:58 § Renewable technologies were so successful at displacing greenhouse gas emissions that Europe now views renewable energy as “the major tool of distribution utilities in meeting industry CO2 reduction targets.”