## Local/Global

#### Privileging the local undermines effective movements – alliances can’t exist without global visions\

Grossberg 92 (Lawrence, Professor of Communication Studies – UNC-Chapel Hill and Chair – Executive Committee of the University Program in Cultural Studies, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture, p. 387)

The demand for moral and ideological purity often results in the rejection of any hierarchy or organization. The question-can the master's tools be used to tear down the master's house?-ignores both the contingency of the relation between such tools and the master's power and, even more importantly, the fact that there may be no other tools available. Institutionalization is seen as a repressive impurity within the body politic rather than as a strategic and tactical, even empowering, necessity. It sometimes seems as if every progressive organization is condemned to recapitulate the same arguments and crisis, often leading to their collapse. For example, Minkowitz has described a crisis in Act Up over the need for efficiency and organization, professionalization and even hierarchy," as if these inherently contradicted its commitment to democracy. This is particularly unfortunate since Act Up, whatever its limitations, has proven itself an effective and imaginative political strategist. The problems are obviously magnified with success, as membership, finances and activities grow. This refusal of efficient operation and the moment of organization is intimately connected with the Left's appropriation and privileging of the local (as the site of democracy and resistance). This is yet another reason why structures of alliance are inadequate, since they often assume that an effective movement can be organized and sustained without such structuring. The Left needs to recognize the necessity of institutionalization and of systems of hierarchy, without falling back into its own authoritarianism. It needs to find reasonably democratic structures of institutionalization, even if they are impure and compromised.

#### Kills Solvency

Best and Kellner 1 (Steven, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Humanities – University of Texas and Douglas, Philosophy of Education Chair – UCLA, “Postmodern Politics and the Battle for the Future,” Illuminations, http://www.uta.edu/huma/illuminations/kell28.htm)

The emphasis on local struggles and micropower, cultural politics which redefine the political, and attempts to develop political forms relevant to the problems and developments of the contemporary age is extremely valuable, but there are also certain limitations to the dominant forms of postmodern politics. While an emphasis on micropolitics and local struggles can be a healthy substitute for excessively utopian and ambitious political projects, one should not lose sight that key sources of political power and oppression are precisely the big targets aimed at by modern theory, including capital, the state, imperialism, and patriarchy. Taking on such major targets involves coalitions and multi-front struggle, often requiring a **politics of alliance** and solidarity that cuts across group identifications to mobilize sufficient power to struggle against, say, the evils of capitalism or the state. Thus, while today we need the expansion of localized cultural practices, they attain their real significance only within the struggle for the transformation of society as a whole. Without this systemic emphasis, cultural and identity politics remain **confined to the margins** of society and are in danger of **degenerating into narcissism, hedonism, aestheticism**, or personal therapy, where they **pose no danger** and are **immediately coopted** by the culture industries. In such cases, the political is merely the personal, and the original intentions of the 1960s goal to broaden the political field are inverted and perverted. Just as economic and political demands have their referent in subjectivity in everyday life, so these cultural and existential issues find their ultimate meaning in the demand for a new society and mode of production. Yet we would insist that it is not a question of micro vs macropolitics, as if it were an either/or proposition, but rather both dimensions are important for the struggles of the present and future.[15] Likewise, we would argue that we need to combine the most affirmative and negative perspectives, embodying Marcuse's declaration that critical social theory should be both more negative and utopian in reference to the status quo.[16] There are certainly many things to be depressed about is in the negative and cynical postmodernism of a Baudrillard, yet **without a positive political vision** merely citing the negative might lead to **apathy and depression** that only benefits the existing order. For a dialectical politics, however, positive vision of what could be is articulated in conjunction with critical analysis of what is in a multioptic perspective that focuses on the forces of domination as well as possibilities of emancipation.

#### Aff’s local focus locks in structural oppression – only global focus can solve

Collins 98 (Patricia Hill, Professor of Sociology – University of Cincinnati, Fighting Words, p. 135-137)

In this academic context, postmodern treatment of power relations suggested by the rubric of decentering may provide some relief to intellectuals who wish to resist oppression in the abstract without decentering their own material privileges. Current preoccupations with hegemony and microlevel, local politics—two emphases within post­modern treatments of power—are revealing in this regard. As the resurgence of interest in Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci’s work illustrates (Forgacs 1988), postmodern social theorists seem fascinated with the thesis of an all-powerful hegemony that swallows up all resistance except that which manages to survive within local interstices of power. The ways in which many postmodernist theorists use the heterogeneous work of French philosopher Michel Foucault illustrate these dual emphases. Foucault’s sympathy for disempowered people can be seen in his sustained attention to themes of institutional power via historical treatment of social structural change in his earlier works (see., e.g., Foucault’s analysis of domination in his work on prisons [‘979] and his efforts to write a genealogy linking sexuality to institu­tional power [ii98oa]). Despite these emphases, some interpretations of his work present power as being everywhere, ultimately nowhere, and, strangely enough, growing. Historical context is minimized—the prison, the Church, France, and Rome all disappear—leaving in place a decontextualized Foucauldian “theory of power.” All of social life comes to be portrayed as a network of power relations that become increasingly analyzed not at the level of large-scale social structures, but rather at the local level of the individual (Hartsock 1990). The increasing attention given to micropolitics as a response to this growing hegemony, namely, politics on the local level that are allegedly plural, multiple, and fragmented, stems in part from this reading of history that eschews grand narratives, including those of collective social movements. In part, this tendency to decontextualize social theory plagues academic social theories of all sorts, much as the richly textured nuances of Marx’s historical work on class conflict (see, e.g., The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte [1963]) become routinely recast into a mechanistic Marxist “theory of social class.” This decontextualization also illustrates how academic theories “empty out the more political and worldly substance of radical critiques” (West 1993, 41) and thus participate in relations of ruling. In this sense, postmodern views of power that overemphasize hegemony and local politics provide a seductive mix of appearing to challenge oppression while secretly believing that such efforts are doomed. Hegemonic power appears as ever expanding and invading. It may even attempt to “annex” the counterdiscourses that have developed, oppositional discourses such as Afrocentrism, postmod­ernism, feminism, and Black feminist thought. This is a very impor­tant insight. However, there is a difference between being aware of the power of one’s enemy and arguing that such power is so pervasive that resistance will, at best, provide a brief respite and, at worst, prove ultimately futile. This emphasis on power as being hegemonic and seemingly absolute, coupled with a belief in local resistance as the best that people can do, flies in the face of actual, historical successes. African-Americans, women, poor people, and others have achieved results through social movements, revolts, revolutions, and other collective social action against government, corporate, and academic structures. As James Scott queries, “What remains to be explained is why theories of hegemony…have…retained an enormous intellectual appeal to social scientists and historians” (1990, 86). Perhaps for colonizers who refuse, individualized, local resistance is the best that they can envision. Overemphasizing hegemony and stressing nihilism not only does not resist injustice but participates in its manufacture. Views of power grounded exclusively in notions of hegemony and nihilism are not only pessimistic, they can be dangerous for members of historically marginalized groups. Moreover, the emphasis on local versus structural institutions makes it difficult to examine major structures such as racism, sexism, and other structural forms of oppression.7 Social theories that reduce hierarchical power relations to the level of representation, performance, or constructed phenomena not only emphasize the likelihood that resistance will fail in the face of a pervasive hegemonic presence, they also reinforce perceptions that local, individualized micropolitics constitutes the most effective terrain of struggle. This emphasis on the local dovetails nicely with increasing emphasis on the “personal” as a source of power and with parallel attention to subjectivity. If politics becomes reduced to the “personal,” decentering relations of ruling in academia and other bureaucratic structures seems increasingly unlikely. As Rey Chow opines, “What these intellectuals are doing is robbing the terms of oppression of their critical and oppositional import, and thus depriving the oppressed of even the vocabulary of protest and rightful demand” (1993, 13). Viewing decentering as a strategy situated within a larger process of resistance to oppression is dramatically different from perceiving decentering as an academic theory of how scholars should view all truth. When weapons of resistance are theorized away in this fashion, one might ask, who really benefits? Versions of decentering as presented by postmodernism in the American academy may have limited utility for African-American women and other similarly situated groups. Decentering provides little legitimation for centers of power for Black women other than those of preexisting marginality in actual power relations. Thus, the way to be legitimate within postmodernism is to claim marginality, yet this same marginality renders Black women as a group powerless in the real world of academic politics. Because the logic of decentering opposes constructing new centers of any kind, in effect the stance of critique of decentering provides yet another piece of the new politics of containment. A depoliticized decentering disempowers Black women as a group while providing the illusion of empowerment. Although individual African-American women intellectuals may benefit from being able to broker the language and experiences of marginality in a commodified American academic marketplace, this in no way substitutes for sustained improvement of Black women as a group in these same settings. In contrast, groups already privileged under hierarchical power relations suffer little from embracing the language of decentering denuded of any actions to decenter actual hierarchical power relations in academia or elsewhere. Ironically, their privilege may actually increase.

## Renewables Bad

#### **People living near wind turbines are subject to a myriad of health problems.**

Martin 10, Calvin Luther Martin Ph.D., former professor, Rutgers, Guggenheim Fellow and Senior National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow July 2010, “Your Guide to Wind Turbine Syndrome: a roadmap to this complicated subject” <http://www.saskatoonwindturbine.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/WTSguide.pdf>

Wind Turbine Syndrome (WTS) is the clinical name Dr. Nina Pierpont has given to the constellation of symptoms experienced by many (not all) people ¶ who find themselves living near industrial wind turbines.¶ • sleep disturbance¶ • headache¶ • tinnitus (pronounced “tin-uh-tus”: ringing or buzzing in¶ the ears)¶ • ear pressure¶ • dizziness (a general term that includes vertigo, lightheadedness, sensation of almost fainting, etc.)¶ • vertigo (clinically, vertigo refers to the sensation of spinning, or the room moving)¶ • nausea¶ • visual blurring¶ • tachycardia (rapid heart rate)¶ • irritability¶ • problems with concentration and memory¶ • panic episodes associated with sensations of internal pulsation or quivering, which arise while awake or asleep¶ As wind turbines spring up like ¶ mushrooms around people’s ¶ homes, Wind Turbine Syndrome ¶ has become an industrial plague. ¶ (See victims’ Diaries & Reports and ¶ Videos). Nina Pierpont has been researching this “plague” for the past ¶ five years, and in November 2009 ¶ she published her results, Wind Turbine Syndrome: A Report on a Natural ¶ Experiment (Santa Fe, NM: K-Selected Books, 2009). Click on Read Peer ¶ Reviews to read the referee reports ¶ (all by medical school and university faculty). For purchase information, see Buy the book. For an in-depth radio interview with Dr. Pierpont, ¶ wherein she explains what’s going on with WTS, click here. (With thanks to ¶ Radio CFCO, Ontario, Canada, 2-28-08, “Ask the Health Expert.” Be sure your ¶ speakers are turned up.)

#### Low frequency noise resulting from the operation of wind turbines causes physical and psychological problems.

Martin 10, Calvin Luther Martin Ph.D., Former associate professor Rutgers, Guggenheim Fellow and Senior National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow, July 2010, “Your Guide to Wind Turbine Syndrome: a roadmap to this complicated subject” <http://www.saskatoonwindturbine.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/WTSguide.pdf>

To understand Wind Turbine Syndrome one must first understand the function of the human vestibular system: the utricle, saccule, and semicircular ¶ canals. Three tiny organs in the inner ear. The utricle and saccule, together, ¶ constitute the otolith organs. The otolith organs and the semicircular canals ¶ are not involved in hearing per se—that would be the cochlea—but are ¶ dedicated to detecting balance and motion and position, with far-reaching ¶ consequences for parts of the brain controlling cognition, mood, and certain ¶ physiologic functions (such as vertigo and nausea). ¶ The vestibular system happens to be an ancient “command and control” ¶ center dreamed up and refined by Mother Nature over millions of years, long ¶ before there were human beings. We find a nearly identical command and ¶ control apparatus in fish and amphibians and a host of other vertebrates ¶ (back-boned animals), for whom it continues to perform important functions ¶ of cognition and behavior—just as it does in you and me.¶ Inner Ear (illustration ©Max Brodel 1934)¶ Drawing by R. Forrest Martin¶ Expose Mother Nature’s vestibular command and control center to wind ¶ turbines and the result is chaos. Low frequency noise (LFN) from turbines ¶ appears to send false signals to these exquisitely sensitive structures, causing dizziness, vertigo, and nausea, along with cognitive and memory deficits, ¶ along with anxiety and panic attacks. Yes, the latter behavioral symptoms are ¶ in fact tied to the inner ear, as any up-to-date otolaryngologist (Ear, Nose, ¶ Throat surgeon) can tell you. ¶ Bear in mind that WTS is a constellation of symptoms, including sleeplessness and tinnitus (caused by cochlear disturbance). And bear in mind that ¶ WTS appears to derail several of the body’s sensory systems, besides the inner ear. Even so, the vestibular structures of the inner ear are critical to understanding the pathophysiology of Wind Turbine Syndrome. (The eyes, of course, serve ¶ as another ¶ organ of balance, motion, ¶ and position-sense, and are most definitely disturbed by turbine shadow flicker, resulting in ¶ false signals sent to the brain. Pierpont ¶ explores shadow flicker in her book; I ¶ will not be discussing it further in ¶ this overview.)