## CP

#### Counterplan: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase loan guarantees for wind farms built in high socio-economic areas.

#### Net benefits are our disads against nuclear power.

#### CP solves the AFF – the ultra-wealthy protest wind farms on the basis of scenic integrity and because they are seen as a blight on property values

McCaffery 11

[Maria, Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/cif-green/2011/feb/07/windfarm-nimbyism>, 7 Feb 2011 // myost]

Last week, [**Alexander Chancellor declared himself in favour of nimbyism**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/feb/04/wind-farms-nimbyism)**. In the debate on windfarms, this acronym, derived from "not in my back yard", signifies a state of mind of those who protest against windfarms in their residential area, almost entirely on aesthetic grounds. Which is the crux of the problem. An aesthetic objector will start with a sense that a windfarm will in some way devalue the landscape and his property. Sensing that this is not a sufficient reason to object against** [**renewable energy**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/renewableenergy)**, he will then drag into the debate all sorts of cod-scientific evidence on why wind turbines don't work,** often with a tilt at Brussels eurocrats and perceived environmental "political correctness". Chancellor's article follows the same pattern. The view from his 17th-century pavilions would be "blighted" by a windfarm three miles away. The turbine blades could spook the horses. There is a sense that people are afraid of criticising windfarms, although according to Chancellor, a Sunday Times article ([it was actually the Mail on Sunday](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/moslive/article-1350811/In-China-true-cost-Britains-clean-green-wind-power-experiment-Pollution-disastrous-scale.html)), says they cause more harm than good.

## CP2

#### CP: The United States federal government should ban nuclear power plants.

#### This solves their nuclear holocaust argument and environmental racism and doesn’t link to nuclear bad.

## Cap K

#### Nuclear energy is a smokescreen to continue the capitalist project of imperialism, ensure there is money to be made after oil, and the development of nuclear weapons

ICC 2011 (International Communist Current; Nuclear Energy, capitalism and communism; <http://www.dianuke.org/nuclear-energy-and-capitalism/>; kdf)

The potential to use nuclear fission or fusion to produce power has been known about for around a century but it was only after the Second World War that it was actually realised. Thus, while its general context is that outlined above, the specific context is the post-war situation dominated by the rivalry between the USA and USSR and the nuclear arms race that resulted. The development of nuclear power is thus not only inextricably linked to that of nuclear weapons but was arguably a smokescreen for the latter.¶ In the early 1950s the American government was concerned about the public’s response to the danger of the nuclear arsenal it was assembling and the strategy of first strike that was being propounded. It’s response was to organise a campaign known as Operation Candor to win the public over through adverts across the media (including comic books) and a series of speeches by President Eisenhower that culminated in the announcement at the UN General Assembly of the ‘Atoms for Peace’ programme to “encourage world-wide investigation into the most effective peacetime uses of fissionable materials.”[19] The plan included sharing information and resources, and the US and USSR jointly creating an international stockpile of fissionable material. In the years that followed the arms race went on unabated and nuclear weapons spread to other powers, often under the guise of a civilian nuclear power programme, as in Israel and India. The initial reactors produced large quantities of material for nuclear weapons and small amounts of very expensive electricity. The sharing of nuclear knowledge became part of global imperialist struggles; thus in the late 1950s Britain secretly supplied Israel with heavy water for the reactor it was building with French assistance.[20]¶ Despite talk about energy too cheap to meter, nuclear power has never fulfilled this promise and has relied on state support to cover its real cost. Even where private companies build and run plants there are usually large open or hidden subsidies. For example privatisation of the nuclear industry in Britain failed when Thatcher attempted it in the 1980s because private capital identified there were unquantifiable costs and risks. It was only in 1996, when the ageing Magnox reactors that would soon need decommissioning were excluded from the deal that private investors were prepared to buy British Energy at a knockdown price of £2bn. Six years later the company had to be bailed out with a £10bn government loan.[21]¶ While advocates of nuclear energy today argue that it is cheaper than other sources this remains a questionable assertion. In 2005 the World Nuclear Association, stated that “In most industrialized countries today, new nuclear power plants offer the most economical way to generate base-load electricity even without consideration of the geopolitical and environmental advantages that nuclear energy confers” and published a range of data to support the claim that construction, financing, operating and waste and decommissioning costs have all reduced.[22] Between 1973 and 2008 the proportion of energy from nuclear reactors grew from 0.9% of the global total to 5.8%.[23]¶ A report published in 2009, commissioned by the German Federal Government,[24] makes a far more critical evaluation of the economics of nuclear power and questions the idea that there is a nuclear renaissance underway. The report points out that the number of reactors has fallen over the last few years in contrast to the widespread forecasts of increases in both reactors and the power produced. The increase in the amount of power generated that has taken place during this period is the result of upgrading the existing reactors and extending their operational life. It goes on to argue that there is a lot of uncertainty about the reactors currently described as being ‘under construction’, with a number having been in this position for over 20 years. The number under construction has fallen from the peak of over 200 in 1980 to below 50 in 2006.¶ As regards the economics of nuclear power, the report points to the high level of uncertainty in all areas including financing, construction, operation and decommissioning. It shows that the state remains central to all nuclear projects, regardless of who they are formally owned and operated by. One aspect of this is the various forms of subsidy provided by the state to support capital costs, waste management and plant closure and price support. Another has been the necessity for the state to limit the liability of the industry in order for the private sector to accept the risks. Thus in 1957 the US government stepped in when insurance companies refused to agree insurance because they were unable to quantify the risk.[25] Today it is estimated that “In general national limits are in the order of a few hundred million Euro, less than 10% of the cost of building a plant and far less than the cost of the Chernobyl accident.”[26]¶ The dangers of nuclear energy are as fiercely debated as the costs and the scientific evidence seems to be very variable. This is particularly the case with the Chernobyl disaster where the estimates of the deaths that resulted vary widely. A World Health Organisation Report found that 47 the 134 emergency workers initially involved had died as a result of contamination by 2004[27] and estimated that there would be just under 9,000 excess deaths from cancer as a result of the disaster.[28] A report by Russian scientists published in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences estimated that from the date of the accident until 2006 some 985,000 additional deaths had resulted from the accident from cancer and a range of other diseases.[29]¶ For those without specialist medical and scientific knowledge this is difficult to unravel, but what is less questionable is the massive level of secrecy and falsification that runs from the decision by the British government to withhold publication of the report into one of the first accidents in the industry at Windscale in 1957 to Fukishima today where the true scale of the disaster only emerged slowly. Returning to Chernobyl, the Russian government did not report the accident for several days, leaving the local population to continue living and working amidst the radiation. But it was not only Russia. The French government minimised the radiation levels reaching the country[30] and told its population that the radiation cloud that spread across the whole of Europe had not passed over France![31] Meanwhile the British government reassured the country that there was no risk to health, reporting levels of radiation that were forty times lower than they actually were[32], and then quarantined hundreds of farms. As late as 2007 374 farms in Britain still remained under the special control scheme.[33]¶ Nuclear energy is being pushed by various governments as a ‘green’ solution to the problems associated with fossil fuels. This is largely a smokescreen to hide the real motives, which are concerns about the possible exhaustion of oil, the increasing price of oil and the risks associated with a dependence on energy resources outside the state’s control. This green facade is slipping as the economic crisis leads states to return to coal[34] and to push down the costs of exploiting new sources of oil, much of which is physically hard to access, or requires processes that pollute and despoil the environment, such as coal-tar sands. Energy supplies have also been a factor in the imperialist struggles over recent years and it seems likely that this may increase in the period ahead. Nuclear energy then comes back to where it started as a source of fissile material and a cover for weapons programmes.

#### **The affirmative only makes energy production easier and thus cheaper, the logic of capitalism dictates that this only increases consumption resulting in extinction of the planet**

Foster et al 2010 (John Bellamy [prof of sociology @ U of Oregon], Brett Clark [Assistant prof of sociology @ NC State U] and Richard York [assoc. prof of sociology @ U of Oregon]; Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency; Nov 1; <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/capitalism-and-the-curse-of-energy-efficiency>; kdf)

The Jevons Paradox was forgotten in the heyday of the age of petroleum during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century, but reappeared in the 1970s due to increasing concerns over resource scarcity associated with the Club of Rome’s Limits to Growth analysis, heightened by the oil-energy crisis of 1973-74. As energy efficiency measures were introduced, economists became concerned with their effectiveness. This led to the resurrection, at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, of the general question posed by the Jevons Paradox, in the form of what was called the “rebound effect.” This was the fairly straightforward notion that engineering efficiency gains normally led to a decrease in the effective price of a commodity, thereby generating increased demand, so that the gains in efficiency did not produce a decrease in consumption to an equal extent. The Jevons Paradox has often been relegated to a more extreme version of the rebound effect, in which there is a backfire, or a rebound of more than 100 percent of “engineering savings,” resulting in an increase rather than decrease in the consumption of a given resource.30¶ Technological optimists have tried to argue that the rebound effect is small, and therefore environmental problems can be solved largely by technological innovation alone, with the efficiency gains translating into lower throughput of energy and materials (dematerialization). Empirical evidence of a substantial rebound effect is, however, strong. For example, technological advancements in motor vehicles, which have increased the average miles per gallon of vehicles by 30 percent in the United States since 1980, have not reduced the overall energy used by motor vehicles. Fuel consumption per vehicle stayed constant while the efficiency gains led to the augmentation, not only of the numbers of cars and trucks on the roads (and the miles driven), but also their size and “performance” (acceleration rate, cruising speed, etc.)—so that SUVs and minivans now dot U.S. highways. At the macro level, the Jevons Paradox can be seen in the fact that, even though the United States has managed to double its energy efficiency since 1975, its energy consumption has risen dramatically. Juliet Schor notes that over the last thirty-five years:¶ energy expended per dollar of GDP has been cut in half. But rather than falling, energy demand has increased, by roughly 40 percent. Moreover, demand is rising fastest in those sectors that have had the biggest efficiency gains—transport and residential energy use. Refrigerator efficiency improved by 10 percent, but the number of refrigerators in use rose by 20 percent. In aviation, fuel consumption per mile fell by more than 40 percent, but total fuel use grew by 150 percent because passenger miles rose. Vehicles are a similar story. And with soaring demand, we’ve had soaring emissions. Carbon dioxide from these two sectors has risen 40 percent, twice the rate of the larger economy.¶ Economists and environmentalists who try to measure the direct effects of efficiency on the lowering of price and the immediate rebound effect generally tend to see the rebound effect as relatively small, in the range of 10 to 30 percent in high-energy consumption areas such as home heating and cooling and cars. But once the indirect effects, apparent at the macro level, are incorporated, the Jevons Paradox remains extremely significant. It is here at the macro level that scale effects come to bear: improvements in energy efficiency can lower the effective cost of various products, propelling the overall economy and expanding overall energy use.31 Ecological economists Mario Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi argue that the Jevons Paradox can only be understood in a macro-evolutionary model, where improvements in efficiency result in changes in the matrices of the economy, such that the overall effect is to increase scale and tempo of the system as a whole.32¶ Most analyses of the Jevons Paradox remain abstract, based on isolated technological effects, and removed from the historical process. They fail to examine, as Jevons himself did, the character of industrialization. Moreover, they are still further removed from a realistic understanding of the accumulation-driven character of capitalist development. An economic system devoted to profits, accumulation, and economic expansion without end will tend to use any efficiency gains or cost reductions to expand the overall scale of production. Technological innovation will therefore be heavily geared to these same expansive ends. It is no mere coincidence that each of the epoch-making innovations (namely, the steam engine, the railroad, and the automobile) that dominated the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries were characterized by their importance in driving capital accumulation and the positive feedback they generated with respect to economic growth as a whole—so that the scale effects on the economy arising from their development necessarily overshot improvements in technological efficiency.33 Conservation in the aggregate is impossible for capitalism, however much the output/input ratio may be increased in the engineering of a given product. This is because all savings tend to spur further capital formation (provided that investment outlets are available). This is especially the case where core industrial resources—what Jevons called “central materials” or “staple products”—are concerned.¶ The Fallacy of Dematerialization¶ The Jevons Paradox is the product of a capitalist economic system that is unable to conserve on a macro scale, geared, as it is, to maximizing the throughput of energy and materials from resource tap to final waste sink. Energy savings in such a system tend to be used as a means for further development of the economic order, generating what Alfred Lotka called the “maximum energy flux,” rather than minimum energy production.34 The deemphasis on absolute (as opposed to relative) energy conservation is built into the nature and logic of capitalism as a system unreservedly devoted to the gods of production and profit. As Marx put it: “Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!”35¶ Seen in the context of a capitalist society, the Jevons Paradox therefore demonstrates the fallacy of current notions that the environmental problems facing society can be solved by purely technological means. Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist development.36 Each new steam engine, as Jevons emphasized, was more efficient than the one before. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical.”37¶ What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39¶ The result is the production of mountains upon mountains of commodities, cheapening unit costs and leading to greater squandering of material resources. Under monopoly capitalism, moreover, such commodities increasingly take the form of artificial use values, promoted by a vast marketing system and designed to instill ever more demand for commodities and the exchange values they represent—as a substitute for the fulfillment of genuine human needs. Unnecessary, wasteful goods are produced by useless toil to enhance purely economic values at the expense of the environment. Any slowdown in this process of ecological destruction, under the present system, spells economic disaster.¶ In Jevons’s eyes, the “momentous choice” raised by a continuation of business as usual was simply “between brief but true [national] greatness and longer continued mediocrity.” He opted for the former—the maximum energy flux. A century and a half later, in our much bigger, more global—but no less expansive—economy, it is no longer simply national supremacy that is at stake, but the fate of the planet itself. To be sure, there are those who maintain that we should “live high now and let the future take care of itself.” To choose this course, though, is to court planetary disaster. The only real answer for humanity (including future generations) and the earth as a whole is to alter the social relations of production, to create a system in which efficiency is no longer a curse—a higher system in which equality, human development, community, and sustainability are the explicit goals.

#### Capitalism’s naturalization of the process of subjugation creates social exclusion on a global scale – the ultimate ethico-political responsibility is to challenge the foundations of this system’s organization principles. This makes reaching the Universal impossible.

Zizek and Daly 2004(Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek, 14-6)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord¬ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties con¬cerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions' and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety.

For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor¬bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary

This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral marketplace.

Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameess (viz. the patronizing reference to the 'developing world'). And Zizek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle.

Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par¬ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a 'glitch' in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### Thus the Alternative: Vote negative to do nothing

Doing nothing is not just sitting and waiting for the moment to attack—it is the only genuine political act--it is an act of abstaining from the depoliticized gameboard of capitalism by refusing to play their game—ultimately withdrawing past the point of commodification

Zizek 2008(Slavoj, [Senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology, University of Ljubljana], Violence: Big Ideas// small books. Picador, pg(s) 213-7, kdf)

Last but not least**, the lesson of the intricate rela­tionship between subjective and systemic violence is that violence is not a direct property of some acts, but is distributed between acts and their contexts, between activity and inactivity.** The same act can count as vio­lent or non-violent, depending on its context; **some­times a polite smile can be more violent than a brutal outburst.** A brief reference to quantum physics might be of some help here; one of the most unsettling no­tions in quantum physics is that of the Higgs field. Left to their own devices in an environment to which they can pass their energy, all physical systems will eventu­ally assume a state of lowest energy. To put it in another way, the more mass we take from a system, the more we lower its energy, till we reach the vacuum state at which the energy is zero. There are, however, phenomena which compel us to posit the hypothesis that there has to be something (some substance) that *we cannot take away from a given system without RAISING that sys­tem's energy—this* "something" is called the Higgs field: once this field appears in a vessel that has been pumped empty and whose temperature has been lowered as much as possible, its energy will be further lowered*.* The "something" which thus appears is a something that contains less energy than nothing. In short, sometimes **zero is not the "cheapest" state of a system, so that, paradoxically, "nothing" costs more than "something**." In a crude analogy, **the social "nothing"** (the stasis of a system, its mere reproduction without any changes**)"costs more than something"** (a change**), that is, it de­mands a lot of energy, so that the first gesture to pro­voke a change in the system is to withdraw activity, to do nothing**.

Jose Saramago's novel Seeing(the literal translation of the original title is *An Essay on Lucidity)3* can effec­tively be perceived as a mental experiment in Bartlebian politics.4 It tells the story of the strange events in the unnamed capital city of an unidentified democratic country. When the election day morning is marred by torrential rain, voter turnout is disturbingly low, but the weather breaks by mid-afternoon and the population heads en masse to their voting stations. **The govern­ment's relief is short lived, however, when vote counting reveals that over 7o per cent of the ballots cast in the capital have been left blank. Baffled by this apparent civic lapse, the government gives the citizenry a chance to make amends just one week later with another elec­tion day. The results are worse: now 83 per cent of the ballots are blank.** The two major political parties-the ruling party of the right (p.o.t.r.) and their chief adver­sary, the party of the middle (p.o.t.m.)-are in a panic, while the haplessly marginalised party of the left (p.o.t.l.) produces an analysis claiming that the blank ballots are essentially a vote for their progressive agenda.

**Is this an organised conspiracy to overthrow not just the ruling government but the entire democratic sys­tem? If so, who is behind it, and how did they manage to organise hundreds of thousands of people into such subversion without being noticed? When asked how they voted, ordinary citizens simply respond that such information is private, and besides, is not leaving the ballot blank their right**? Unsure how to respond to a benign protest but certain that an anti-democratic con­spiracy exists, the government quickly labels the move­ment "terrorism, pure and unadulterated" and declares a state of emergency, allowing the government to sus­pend all constitutional guarantees. Five hundred citizens are seized at random and dis­appear into secret interrogation sites, and their status is coded red for secrecy. Their families are informed in Orwellian style not to worry about the lack of informa­tion concerning their loved ones, since "in that very si­lence lay the key that could guarantee their personal safety." When these moves bear no fruit, the right-wing government adopts a series of increasingly drastic steps, from declaring a state of siege and concocting plots to create disorder to withdrawing the police and seat of government from the capital, sealing all the city's en­trances and exits, and finally manufacturing its own terrorist ringleader. The city continues to function near-normally throughout, the people parrying each of the government's thrusts in inexplicable unison and with a truly Gandhian level of non-violent resistance. In his perspicacious review of the novel, Michael Wood noted a Brechtian parallel:In a famous poem, written in East Germany in 1953, Brecht quotes a contemporary as saying that the people have lost the trust of the government. Would it not therefore be easier, Brecht slyly asks, to dissolve the people and have the government elect another one? Saramago's novel is a parable of what happens when neither government nor people can be dissolved. While the parallel holds, the concluding characterisa­tion seems to fall short: the unsettling message of *See­ing is* not so much the indissolubility of both people and government as the compulsive nature of democratic rit­uals of freedom. What happens is that by abstaining from voting, people effectively dissolve the government-not only in the limited sense of overthrowing the existing government, but more radically. Why is the government thrown into such a panic by the voters' abstention? It is compelled to confront the fact that it exists, that it ex­erts power, only insofar as it is accepted as such by its subjects- accepted even in the mode of rejection. The voters' abstention goes further than the intra-political negation, the vote of no confidence: it rejects the very frame of decision. In psychoanalytic terms, **the voters' abstention is something like the** psychotic *Verwerfung* **(foreclosure, rejection/repudiation), which is a more radical move than repression** *(Verdrangung).* According to Freud, **the repressed is intellectually accepted by the subject, since it is named, and at the same time is negated because the subject refuses to recognise it, refuses to rec­ognise him or herself in it. In contrast to this, foreclo­sure rejects the term from the symbolic *tout court.******To* circumscribe the contours of this radical rejection, one is tempted to evoke Badiou's provocative thesis: "It is better to do nothing than to contribute to the invention of formal ways of rendering visible that which Empire already recognizes as existent.' Better to do nothing than to engage in localised acts the ultimate function of which is to make the system run more smoothly** (acts such as providing space for the multitude of new subectivities). **The threat today is not passivity, but pseudo-activity, the urge to "be active' to "participate," to mask the nothingness of what goes on. People intervene all the time, "do something"; academics participate in meaningless debates,** and so on. **The truly difficult thing is to step back, to withdraw. Those in power often prefer even a "critical" participation, a dialogue, to silence-just to engage us in "dialogue," to make sure our ominous passivity is broken. The voters' abstention is thus a true political *act:* it forcefully confronts us with the vacuity of today's democracies.**

## Reprocessing DA

### **1NC**

#### **Peak uranium will happen by 2070, much faster if the US builds more reactors**

Burke et al 2012 (Tom; Tony Juniper; Jonathon Porritt; and Charles Secrett; Climate Change and Energy Security; Apr 27; www.jonathonporritt.com/sites/default/files/users/BRIEFING%205%20-%20Climate\_and%20energy%20security\_27\_April%202012.pdf; kdf)

However, neither the IAEA nor the OECDNEA reports address the problem of ore ¶ quality. As discussed above, reductions ¶ in ore quality have a big impact on ¶ nuclear’s ability to be a low-carbon form ¶ of generation, and it is important to ¶ understand that reductions in ore quality ¶ ultimately destroy nuclear power’s ¶ ability to yield meaningful energy at all. ¶ In the words of the ORG:¶ ‘If the world nuclear generating ¶ capacity stays at the current levels, ¶ nuclear power will fall off the ‘energy cliff’ by around 2070 – within the ¶ lifetime of new UK nuclear build. ¶ Nuclear power then consumes as much ¶ energy as it puts into the grid’.¶ 28¶ If, as expected, nuclear generation ¶ increases significantly, that threshold ¶ will come correspondingly sooner.¶ Lastly, although some of the major ¶ uranium producers can be considered ¶ politically and economically stable ¶ (for example, Australia and Canada), ¶ other key producers cannot. These ¶ include Kazakhstan, Niger, Namibia and ¶ Uzbekistan, who between them supply ¶ 40% of current global production. Since ¶ the price of commodities is set at the ¶ margins, disruption to supply from any ¶ of these countries has the potential to ¶ cause serious price fluctuations.

#### **This means a switch to more dangerous fuels and reprocessing**

WSJ 2008 (Peak Uranium: What's Goining to Fuel all those nuclear plants?; Dec 19; blogs.wsj.com/environmentalcapital/2008/12/19/peak-uranium-whats-going-to-fuel-all-those-nuclear-plants/; kdf)

How’s that? Recent years have seen an explosion in uranium exploration after two quiet decades, adding to global reserves. And higher prices just encourage even more exploration—the World Nuclear Association figures that if uranium prices double, recoverable reserves will rise ten-fold. Provided, that is, that environmental worries about uranium mining don’t kneecap new projects from Virginia to Australia.¶ What uranium-supply fears could do is stoke more interest in fuel reprocessing and alternative nuclear fuels, such as thorium, the Red Books says: “Deployment of advanced reactor and fuel cycle technologies could increase the long-term availability of nuclear energy from a century to thousands of years.”

#### Reprocessing causes prolif

Union of Concerned Scientists 2011 (Nuclear Reprocessing: Dangerous, Dirty, and Expensive; www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_risk/nuclear\_proliferation\_and\_terrorism/nuclear-reprocessing.html; kdf)

Reprocessing would increase the ease of nuclear proliferation.

U.S. reprocessing would undermine the U.S. goal of halting the spread of fuel cycle technologies that are permitted under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty but can be used to make nuclear weapons materials. The United States cannot credibly persuade other countries to forgo a technology it has newly embraced for its own use. Although some reprocessing advocates claim that new reprocessing technologies under development will be "proliferation resistant," they would actually be more difficult for international inspectors to safeguard because it would be harder to make precise measurements of the weapon-usable materials during and after processing. Moreover, all reprocessing technologies are far more proliferation-prone than direct disposal.

#### Nuclear proliferation risks extinction

**Krieger, 2009** Pres. Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and Councilor – World Future Council, (David, “Still Loving the Bomb After All These Years”, 9-4, https://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2009/09/04\_krieger\_newsweek\_response.php?krieger)//AA

Jonathan Tepperman’s article in the September 7, 2009 issue of Newsweek, “Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb,” provides a novel but frivolous argument that nuclear weapons “may not, in fact, make the world more dangerous….” Rather, in Tepperman’s world, “The bomb may actually make us safer.” Tepperman shares this world with Kenneth Waltz, a University of California professor emeritus of political science, who Tepperman describes as “the leading ‘nuclear optimist.’” Waltz expresses his optimism in this way: “We’ve now had 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It’s striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states.” Actually, there were a number of proxy wars between nuclear weapons states, such as those in Korea, Vietnam and Afghanistan, and some near disasters, the most notable being the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Waltz’s logic is akin to observing a man falling from a high rise building, and noting that he had already fallen for 64 floors without anything bad happening to him, and concluding that so far it looked so good that others should try it. Dangerous logic! Tepperman builds upon Waltz’s logic, and concludes “that all states are rational,” even though their leaders may have a lot of bad qualities, including being “stupid, petty, venal, even evil….” He asks us to trust that rationality will always prevail when there is a risk of nuclear retaliation, because these weapons make “the costs of war obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable.” Actually, he is asking us to do more than trust in the rationality of leaders; he is asking us to gamble the future on this proposition. “The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling,” Tepperman argues, “it’s led to what’s known as the nuclear peace….” But if this is a peace worthy of the name, which it isn’t, it certainly is not one on which to risk the future of civilization. One irrational leader with control over a nuclear arsenal could start a nuclear conflagration, resulting in a global Hiroshima. Tepperman celebrates “the iron logic of deterrence,” but deterrence is a theory that is far from rooted in “iron logic.” It is a theory based upon threats that must be effectively communicated and believed. Leaders of Country A with nuclear weapons must communicate to other countries (B, C, etc.) the conditions under which A will retaliate with nuclear weapons. The leaders of the other countries must understand and believe the threat from Country A will, in fact, be carried out. The longer that nuclear weapons are not used, the more other countries may come to believe that they can challenge Country A with impunity from nuclear retaliation. The more that Country A bullies other countries, the greater the incentive for these countries to develop their own nuclear arsenals. Deterrence is unstable and therefore precarious. Most of the countries in the world reject the argument, made most prominently by Kenneth Waltz, that the spread of nuclear weapons makes the world safer. These countries joined together in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, but they never agreed to maintain indefinitely a system of nuclear apartheid in which some states possess nuclear weapons and others are prohibited from doing so. The principal bargain of the NPT requires the five NPT nuclear weapons states (US, Russia, UK, France and China) to engage in good faith negotiations for nuclear disarmament, and the International Court of Justice interpreted this to mean complete nuclear disarmament in all its aspects. Tepperman seems to be arguing that seeking to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons is bad policy, and that nuclear weapons, because of their threat, make efforts at non-proliferation unnecessary and even unwise. If some additional states, including Iran, developed nuclear arsenals, he concludes that wouldn’t be so bad “given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.” Those who oppose Tepperman’s favorable disposition toward the bomb, he refers to as “nuclear pessimists.” These would be the people, and I would certainly be one of them, who see nuclear weapons as presenting an urgent danger to our security, our species and our future. Tepperman finds that when viewed from his “nuclear optimist” perspective, “nuclear weapons start to seem a lot less frightening.” “Nuclear peace,” he tells us, “rests on a scary bargain: you accept a small chance that something extremely bad will happen in exchange for a much bigger chance that something very bad – conventional war – won’t happen.” But the “extremely bad” thing he asks us to accept is the end of the human species. Yes, that would be serious. He also doesn’t make the case that in a world without nuclear weapons, the prospects of conventional war would increase dramatically. After all, it is only an unproven supposition that nuclear weapons have prevented wars, or would do so in the future. We have certainly come far too close to the precipice of catastrophic nuclear war. As an ultimate celebration of the faulty logic of deterrence, Tepperman calls for providing any nuclear weapons state with a “survivable second strike option.” Thus, he not only favors nuclear weapons, but finds the security of these weapons to trump human security. Presumably he would have President Obama providing new and secure nuclear weapons to North Korea, Pakistan and any other nuclear weapons states that come along so that they will feel secure enough not to use their weapons in a first-strike attack. Do we really want to bet the human future that Kim Jong-Il and his successors are more rational than Mr. Tepperman?

### 1NC

#### **France proves—the aff crowds out renewables**

Dvorak 2010 (Paul [experienced mechanical engineer]; French "nuclear miracle" crowds our renewables; Sep 22; www.windpowerengineering.com/policy/french-“nuclear-miracle”-plagued-by-fast-rising-costs-crowds-out-renewables/; kdf)

Recent analysis shows French approach touted by some for a U.S. reactor build-up is a failed model. U.S. wind and solar industries would suffer under “French nuclear socialism.” The so-called “French nuclear miracle” embraced by some U.S. policymakers as a model for this nation is a misconception masking a pattern of fast-rising nuclear reactor construction costs and a “crowding out” of investments in renewable energy, such as wind, solar and hydro-electric power, according to a new study by Vermont Law School’s Institute for Energy and the Environment.¶ “The problems in the French nuclear industry are similar to the problems that have long afflicted the U.S. industry, so there it no reason to believe things will change if the U.S. follows the French path,” says study author Mark Cooper, the VLS Institute’s senior research fellow for economic analysis. “If the U.S. nuclear industry is relaunched with massive subsidies, this analysis shows the greatest danger is not that the U.S. will import French technology, but that it will replicate the French model of nuclear socialism. Nuclear power will remain a ward of the state, as has been true throughout its history in France. It is a great burden on ratepayers, as has been the case throughout its history in both France and the U.S., and it will retard the development of lower-cost renewables alternatives, as it has done in France and portions of the U.S.”

#### Renewables solve warming

Renewable Energy World 2007 (ASES Report: Renewable Energy Can Curb Global Warming by 2030; <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2007/02/ases-report-renewable-energy-can-curb-global-warming-by-2030-47351>; kdf)

American Solar Energy Society (ASES) unveiled its 200-page landmark report, "Tackling Climate Change in the U.S.: Potential Carbon Emissions Reductions from Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by 2030." The report illustrates how concentrating solar power (CSP), photovoltaics (PV), wind power, biomass, biofuels, and geothermal power, combined with energy efficiency measures, can displace approximately 1.2 billion tons of carbon emissions annually by the year 2030 -- the magnitude of reduction that scientists believe is necessary to prevent the most dangerous consequences of climate change. In the Executive Summary, editor Charles F. Kutscher, Ph.D, P.E. wrote: The results of these studies show that renewable energy has the potential to provide approximately 40% of the U.S. electric energy need projected for 2030 by the Energy Information Administration (EIA). After we reduce the EIA electricity projection by taking advantage of energy efficiency measures, renewables could provide about 50% of the remaining 2030 U.S. electric need.

#### Extinction

Tickell 8 [Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Guardian, 8-11, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange]

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

## Case

#### Nuclear waste is dumped on communities of color and the poor – turns the AFF because it just means they re-entrench domination

#### Bullard No Date

[Robert D., PhD, “POVERTY, POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM: STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES,” <http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html>]

**Hazardous waste generation and international movement of hazardous waste still pose some important health, environmental, legal, and ethical dilemmas. The "unwritten" policy of targeting Third World nations for waste t**rade received international media attention in 1991. Lawrence Summers, at the time he was chief economist of the World Bank, shocked the world and touched off an international firestorm when his confidential memorandum on waste trade was leaked. Summers writes: "'Dirty' Industries: Just between you and me, shouldn't the World Bank be encouraging MORE migration of the dirty industries to the LDCs?" [[16](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#16end)] Between 1989 and 1994, an estimated 2,611 metric tons of hazardous waste was exported from Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries to non-OECD countries. [[17](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#17end)] Transboundary Waste Trade Conventions. In a response to the growing exportation of hazardous wastes into their borders, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the G-77 nations mobilized to pass two important international agreements. [[18](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#18end)] On January 30, 1991, the Pan-African Conference on Environment and Sustainable Development in Bamako, Mali adopted the Bamako Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous wastes within Africa or the Bamako Convention. [[19](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#19end)] The G-77 nations were instrumental in amending the Basel Convention to include Decision II/12, despite opposition from the United States. On September 1995, **the third Conference of Parties to the Basel Convention (COP III) approved an amendment that would ban the export of hazardous wastes from highly industrialized countries** (specifically OECD countries and Lichtenstein) **to all other countries**. [[20](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#20end)] While Bamako and Basel may have made certain dumping formally illegal, in practice **they have not prevented the transboundary movement of hazardous waste to developing countries.** **Loopholes still allow hazardous wastes to enter countries that do not have the resources or infrastructure to handle the wastes**. For example, Karliner reports that "products such as pesticides and other chemicals banned or severely restricted by the United States, Western Europe and Japan because of their acute toxicity, environmental persistence or carcinogenic qualities are still regularly sent to the Third World." [[21](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#21end)] Having laws or treaties on the books and enforcing them are two different things. **Whether at home or abroad, environmental racism disadvantages people of color while providing advantages and privileges for whites. A form of illegal "exaction" forces people of color to pay costs of environmental benefits for the public at large**. The question of who pays and who benefits from the current industrial and development policies is central to any analysis of environmental racism.

#### Independently, waste dumping takes place on Indian lands, exposing them to deadly cancers, reproducing colonialism

#### Bullard No Date

[Robert D., PhD, “POVERTY, POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM: STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES,” <http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html>]

Radioactive Colonialism and Threatened Native Lands. There is a direct correlation between exploitation of land and exploitation of people. It should not be a surprise to anyone to discover that Native Americans have to contend with some of the worst pollution in the United States. [[24](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#24end)] Native American nations have become prime targets for waste trading. [[25](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#25end)] The vast majority of these waste proposals have been defeated by grassroots groups on the reservations. However, "radioactive colonialism" is alive and well. Winona LaDuke sums up this "toxic invasion" of Native lands as follows: While Native peoples have been massacred and fought, cheated, and robbed of their historical lands, today their lands are subject to some of most invasive industrial interventions imaginable. According to the Worldwatch Institute, 317 reservations in the United States are threatened by environmental hazards, ranging from toxic wastes to clearcuts. Reservations have been targeted as sites for 16 proposed nuclear waste dumps. Over 100 proposals have been floated in recent years to dump toxic waste in Indian communities. Seventy-seven sacred sites have been disturbed or desecrated through resource extraction and development activities. The federal government is proposing to use Yucca Mountain, sacred to the Shone, a dumpsite for the nation's high-level nuclear waste. [[26](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#26end)] Radioactive colonialism operates in energy production (mining of uranium) and disposal of wastes on Indian lands. The legacy of institutional racism has left many sovereign Indian nations without an economic infrastructure to address poverty, unemployment, inadequate education and health care, and a host of other social problems. In 1999, Eastern Navajo reservation residents filed suit with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to block a permit for uranium mining in Church Rock and Crown Point, New Mexico. The Mohave tribe in California, Skull Valley Goshutes in Idaho, and Western Shoshone in Yucca Mountain, Nevada are fighting the construction of a radioactive waste dumps on their tribal lands. The threats to indigenous peoples are not solely confined to the United States. Native and indigenous people all cross the globe are threatened with extinction due to the greed of mining and oil companies and "development genocide." Sociologist Al Gedicks' 2001 book Resource Rebels: Native Challenges to Mining and Oil Corporations traces the development of grassroots multiracial transnational movement that is countering this form of environmental racism. [[27](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#27end)] Over 5,000 members of the U'Wa tribe of Colombia have organized to prevent Occidental from drilling on sacred U'Wa land.

#### Only shifting the framework to questions of decolonization can we solve- only unconditional acceptance of a decolonizing framework can empower indigenous peoples to break out of colonial oppression

McCaslin and Breton 08 Wanda D. Law Foundation of Saskatchewan Research Officer with the Native Law Centre of Canada, Denise C. founder and executive director of Living Justice Press, “Justice as healing: Going outside the colonizer’s cage,” ,” Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies, pp 528-529

Suffice it to say, for the purposes of this chapter, we cannot map a step-by-step administrative, legal, theoretical, or any other specific path of decolonization. This is not a job for two people but for entire nations and peoples, and many paths are needed. What we do suggest -and it is by no means news for the colonized-is that any step of change, however well intentioned, will fall prey to the default framework of perpetuating colonial oppression if those involved do not consciously and intentionally make a paradigm shift and claim a framework of decolonization. If we are serious about justice, healing, transformation, and systemic change, then we must doggedly use decolonization as the standard for evaluating whatever is being proposed or implemented: Does it move us closer or farther from our decolonization? Put positively, does it flow from the framework of who we are as peoples and hence engage us in transformation? Certainly this shift begins with naming colonialism as the root harm that needs to be healed. We must assert the reality-shocking and ungrateful as it may seem to many colonizers that the colonial system is not the savior of Indigenous people but our oppressor, the systemic cause of our suffering. Certainly the shift of framework empowers Indigenous peoples to use our own Indigenous means to respond to harms among our people. Indigenous perspectives must be listened to and heard outside the assumption of colonial rule, and Indigenous autonomy and competence in handling our own affairs through our own ways must be unconditionally respected. And certainly the shift of framework involves the serious, genuine, and difficult nation-to-nation work of rectifying the immense crimes against humanity that we have suffered and that have brought us to where we are now as peoples. We do not need more studies or well-meaning programs to "solve our problems" by colonizer governments. We call for nation-to-nation relationships, land return, reparations, restitution, return of resources or payment for their exploitation with interest, adherence to treaties, and hence the return of our sovereign jurisdiction over our homelands and ancestral land bases. Decolonizing is not just a big word; it is the core of healing justice for Indigenous peoples. It signifies a scope of transformation the likes of which we have not yet seen. And, like the fall season, it must come, because the costs of avoiding it are too great for everyone. In short, the vision of the future is not to leave the colonizer's house for a better colonizer's house or to construct a better, more Indigenous friendly cage for our oppression. The aim is remove the cage altogether and instead to rebuild our tipis-or long houses, hogans, iglus, pueblos, wikiups, earth lodges, wigwams, plank houses, grass houses, or chickees. As we move in a decolonizing direction, we will move closer to practicing justice as a way of life-a way that holds the promise of being transformative for all those involved and hence profoundly healing for both the colonized and the colonizers. May the vision of this koucheehiwayhk inspire and sustain us through the rough waters we inevitably face as we move in this turbulent but fundamentally healing direction.

**The quest for nuclear power leads to a world where Indians are the expendables in the way of development, death and disease happen because corporations and the state no noone will report this tragedy, omission is no longer acceptable**

**Gedicks in 93 (**Al professor of sociology, longtime environmental and Native rights activist. Served as the director for the Center for Alternative Mining development page 43-44)

**In addition to the economic and political dimensions of internal colonialism**, **there is also an important**, but frequently overlooked, **environmental dimension**. Jerry Mander has observed that **most Indian struggles take placefar away from mass media**, "in the central Arizona desert, in the rugged Black Hills, the mountains of the Northwest, or else on tiny Pacific islands, orin the icy vastness of the far north of Alaska. **The New York Times has no bureau in those places; neither does CBS...As a result, some of the most terrible assaults upon native peoples today never get reported."**26¶ The Church Rock Tailings Dam accident on the Navajo reser­ vation is a good example of a major environmental catastrophe that received very little media attention. **In July 1979, 100 million gallons of radioactive sludge spilled into the Rio Puerco River from United Nuclear Corporation's uranium tailings pond when its dam broke. Those hardest hit by the spill were the approximately 1,700 residents of the Rio Puerco Valley, mostly Navajo Indians.** The Navajos used the river water for their livestock, grazed their cattle and sheep in the river bed, and drank from nearby wells. **While the spill remains the largest one-time release of radioactive wastes ever in the United States, it received hardly any media attention at the time.** The New York Times mentioned the spill in a short news story 12 days after it happened. The Los Angeles Times gave slightly more coverage, largely because California officials were concerned that the contam­ ination could reach the southern California water supply coming from Lake Mead, Arizona.¶ An engineering report on **the cause of the dam break attributed it to the shifting and settling of the soil underneath the dam and United Nuclear's failure to perform routine maintenance of the dam¶** **The company had known about serious problems with the site two years before the accident." The ultimate costs of the spill to the Navajo may never be calculated.** The final report of the federal Centers for Disease Control argued that epidemiological studies of mortality and morbidity rates in Church Rock should not be under­ taken due to the difficulty in detecting risks associated with radiation exposure in a small population. **In other words, the Navajo were expendable.**

**Nuclear wastes sites are tools of oppression for the USFG and corporations to place near minorities**

**Smith in 05** (Professor of Native American Studies at the U. of Michigan and co founder of INCITE! Women of color against violence. She has a phd from the University of California Santa Cruz in History Of Consciousness. Conquest, pg 57-58)

Unfortunately for the colonizers, **nature is not so easy to subdue and control. As we find ourselves in the midst of environmental disaster, it is clear that no one can escape the repercussions of environmental damage. Yet colonizers attempt to deny this reality by forcing those people who have already been rendered dirty, impure, and hence expendable to face the most immediate consequences of environmental destruction**.¶ **Marginalized communities suffer the primary brunt of environmental destruction so that other communities can remain in denial a bout the effects of environmental degradation.** The United Church of Christ's landmark study on environmental racism,¶ *Toxic Wastes and Race found* that **race is consistently the most statistically significant variable in the location of commercial hazardous waste facilities**. **'I** hiee out of every have African Americans and Latino North Americans live in communities with toxic waste sites. **Half of all Asians, Pacific Islanders, and American Indians live in communities with uncontrolled toxic waste sites¶ People of color are also disproportionately affected by workplace hazards.** For instance, pesticide exposure among primarily Latino farmworkers causes more than 300,000 pesticide-related illnesses each year.¶ **American Indian lands are a particular focal point in the struggle for environmental justice. It is not an accident that virtually all uranium production place on or near Indian land.13¶ Nor is it a coincidence that to date, more than 50 reservations have¶ been targeted for waste dumps**. Military and nuclear testing also takes place almost exclusively on Native lands. For instance, there have been at least 928 nuclear explosions on Western Shoshone land at the Nevada test site. Fifty percent of these underground tests have leaked radiation into the atmosphere.1 **Native peoples**, the expendable ones, **are situated to suffer the brunt of environ­ mental destruction so that colonizers can continue to in denial about the fact that they will also eventually be affected**.¶

'

**When it comes to Nuclear Waste no action is safe for Native peoples, organizations that the USFG formed to protect them are corrupted by other forms of bureaucracy so that individuals are kept from making decisions**

**La Duke in 99**(Native American environmental activist and formal vice presidential running mate of Ralph Nadar, written several briefs for governmental organizations cataloguing the destruction of lands via energy development. *All Our Relations Native Struggles for land and life pg 100-101)*

**In addition to the problem of already extant nuclear waste contamination, many of today's American reactors have almost run out of space for their used fuel rods and their on-site waste**. In the next decade most of the nation's reactors will experience a shortfall in their space**. This space "crisis" has pushed the discussion around handling nuclear wastes forward.¶ The growing environmental justice movement, coupled with the sovereign status of Indian lands and their frequent lack of infrastructure, mean that the nuclear industry has increasingly targeted Native lands for dumps**. Besides that, by the 1990s**, it had become "conveniently politically incorrect" to argue against a tribe's autonomous decision making**, says Winnebago attorney Jean Belile of the Rocky Mountain Land and Water Institute.n¶ **During the early and mid-1990s, the federal government and the nuclear industry offered seemingly lucrative deals to Native communities willing to ac­ cept nuclear waste dumps on their lands**. A few big Native American organiza­ tions took the bait and worked on or at least provided the forum to discuss the¶ dumping.¶ The federal Adminislration for Native Americans (ANA) and **the Depart­ ment of Commerce funded Indian consulting firms to promote the waste indus try in Indian country**. A big chunk of their money went to the Council on Energy Resource Tribes (CERT), an organization of 50 member tribes founded in 1975 to assert control over the development of Native mineral resources. In¶ 1987, CERT received $2.5 million, over half of their total income, from federal nuclear waste conlracts.¶ During the late 1980s, the **National Congress of American Indians** (NCAI) joined in nuclear waste research. Founded in 1944 to "work toward the promotion of the common welfare" of Native Americans, NCAI **cooperated with the Department of Energy to ensure participation of Indian tribal govern­ ments in the siting and transportation of high-level nuclear waste.** 12 **Between¶ 1986 and 1990, NCAI received nearly $1 million, over one-fourth of their total¶ income, from Department of Energy nuclear waste grants.** In 1992, the DOE¶ and NCAI signed a five-year cooperative agreement for $1.8 million. The¶ ¶ Nuclear Waste I 0 I¶ NCAI's nuclear waste program, initiated largely with federal funds, provided tribes with a steady stream of information on radioactive wastes.13¶ At a 1991 meeting of the NCAI, the Mescalero Apache Chairman ex­ plained **that it was easy to get $100,000 by signing up for a grant for no-strings-attached research into the feasibility of siting a Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) facility for nuclear waste on tribal lands**. In 1992, the Mescalero Apache Tribe and CERT publicly advocated that Native communities host nu­ clear waste dump sites on their lands. Fourteen tribal councils, along with pro-nuclear government representatives and nuclear industry salespeople, at­ tended the meeting.¶ That influential meeting was essentially about the philosophical underpin­ nings of hosting nuclear waste sites on Indian lands. David Leroy, DOE's nu­ clear waste negotiator, aggressively courted tribes with nuclear waste proposals. According to Nilak Butler, a former Indigenous Environmental Network council member, Leroy and **the DOE argued that Native responsibility to hold nuclear waste emanates from the "superior Native understanding of the natural world" and the fact that we are "our brother's keeper."**14¶