#### **Cheap gas prices will kill nuclear power**

Levi 12—Ph.D. in War Studies, MA in Physics, David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change at the Council on Foreign Relations (Michael A., July/August 2012, “Splitting Rock vs. Splitting Atoms: What Shale Gas Means For Nuclear Power,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Vol. 68, no. 4, doi: 10.1177/0096340212451432, SAGE Journals, RBatra)

Projections for the cost of electricity from new nuclear power plants don’t even come close. A 2009 study by two MIT scholars, based on a survey of recent construction experience, pegged the cost of electricity from new nuclear power plants at 8.4 cents for a kilowatt-hour (Du and Parsons, 2009). (With heroic assumptions about the future availability of cheap capital, that figure dropped to 6.6 cents.) Even the Nuclear Energy Institute, the industry lobby, pegs the price of electricity from new nuclear power plants at more than 11 cents per kilowatt-hour, and expects it to remain above 7 cents through 2025 (NEI, 2011). With cheap gas, new US nuclear energy seems to be pretty much dead.

#### t/

Brook, 98 Ph.D. in Sociology, UC Davis (Daniel, “Environmental Genocide: Native Americans and Toxic Waste,” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 105-113, JSTOR, RBatra)

Deadly environmental threats also emanate from uranium and coal mining, U.S. military target practice and war games, spent ammunition shells, dis- cardedbatteries, and asbestos. Sadly, this is only a partial list. In fact, a survey of only 25 Indian reservations revealed “that 1200 hazardous waste generators or other hazardous waste activity sites were located on or near . . . [those] reservations selected for the survey” (Williams 1992, 282). The issue is serious, the scope is wide, and the results are disastrous.Native Americans have always altered their environment, as well as hav- ing it altered by others. The environment, like culture, is inherently dy- namic and dialectical. Native Americans “used song and ritual speech to modify their world, while physically transforming that landscape with ﬁre and water, brawn and brain. They did not passively adapt, but responded in diverse ways to adjust environments to meet their cultural as well as material desires” (Lewis 1994, 188). However, the introduction of toxic waste and other environmental hazards, such as military-related degrada- tion, have catastrophically affected the present and future health and cul- ture of Native Americans.

### Perm

#### A poem, Kentucky coal mine

http://alwaysexploring.hubpages.com/hub/A-poem-Kentucky-coal-mine

Among the old Kentucky pines

The old man resting quietly in his bed , thinking about the old Peabody coal mine

A place he spent his life-time, among the old Kentucky pine

Working from sunup til sundown every single day

Making a poor man's dollar, seemed the only way

Lungs full of dust, heavy tired blackened feet

Never enough money to make the dangling loose ends meet

No education past the eighth grade...

No time for school, no place to learn a decent trade

From the time you're born in these old Kentucky hills..

You know you're headed for the mine

Just to live and pay your bills

Too tired to make love, too tired to sleep

His sweetheart understood

Her pure heart was filled with love that ran deep

They'd been together, just kids running through the Kentucky pines

They'd been loving each other forever

Their souls were intertwined

He'd had no time to watch his children grow or play

But they knew he loved them

When they listened to him pray...

God bless this family, thank you for our food...

And a restful place to lay

The old man remembering while lying quietly in his bed

Past memories, the ups and downs

The rough roads he had to tread

His boy's now grown, working in the mine

His daughter's married miners

It all started over, it was just a matter of time

Generation after generation, all lived the same

Hard work, little pay

That's the poor man's game

Now his life was slowly fading away

He was looking forward to a home with God in heaven

For a new and brighter day

His one true love had already gone to her eternal home to rest

He was ready to go be with her

He knew he'd done his very best.

#### Framework – the k must prove the whole plan is a bad idea – failure to engage in political debate kills the alt – working within the government results in progressive remapping

Woods 2011 (Michael, prof geography @ Aberystwyth University, UK “Diving in again – a response to commentaries on ‘Applied policy research and critical human geography: Some reflections on swimming in murky waters” Dialogues in Human Geography 1(2) 242–245

Second, different attitudes towards policy research can reflect political differences. Gleeson remarks that ‘critical geography itself is a sea of ‘‘murky waters’’’, and the stew of political perspectives that critical geography encompasses means that generalizing about critical geographers engaging with policy research is problematic. There are honourable traditions of anarchism and Marxism within critical geography that would reject outright the accommodation with the state required by government contract research, as articulated by Chris Allen. Yet there are also many critical geographers who subscribe to a social democratic ideology in which the state can be seen as a potential force for good. From this perspective, **working with government** through contract research to help develop policies to tackle disadvantage and inequality **is a progressive action**, not collusion with the dark side, or ‘getting our hands dirty’. Both viewpoints are legitimate and while individual researchers should not be intimidated into doing policy research, neither should researchers be intimidated from doing policy research by either political pressure or intellectual snobbery. Allen, in his commentary, poses the questions of ‘who defines whether or not [change] is progressive?’ and ‘who defines whether it is worth getting our hands dirty in order to achieve such change?’ – which he identifies our article as failing to address. My response to this criticism is to reiterate that we deliberately sought in the paper to move beyond debating the pros and cons of policy research to discussing the practicalities, and to reflect on these questions here. In contrast to Allen’s prescriptive conclusion that ‘we must reject the idea that in principle we can make a decision as academic geographers to go ‘with the grain of policy research’ in the hope that we can secure progressive outcomes from it while maintaining our own academic integrity’, I would argue that different critical geographers will necessarily answer Allen’s questions differently. We will each hold different views about what precisely counts as ‘progressive’, and we will need to make individual decisions about whether or not getting involved with a particular research contract will help to achieve progressive outcomes. This position allows ‘some geographers to continue to stand in a hostile relationship to everything that surrounds them’, as Allen says, but it also hints at a need for more political honesty within critical geography. Given the depth of political awareness inherent to contemporary human geography it is remarkable how infrequently one encounters genuine political debate at geography conferences, or even in geography common rooms. Maybe all human geographers, or at least all critical geographers, do share a cheery centre-left consensus, but I suspect that the appearance of consensus may in part reflect the marginalization of policy research and the separation of conceptual critique and policy application in geographical research. Indeed, I dispute the inference that critique cannot be reconciled with policy research. As a political geographer, one of the intellectual rewards that I have gained through working on government contracts is a quasi-ethnographic insight into the workings of the state, which in turn has informed my academic critique of the state. **Policy research**, I suggest, **has a role in informing political debate** and critique in human geography, and more open political debate will help geographers engage more critically and constructively in policy research. and enables the necessary biopolitical modalities of power and management on the ground for any future interventionary action.

#### Institutional factors are more important than discourses in the context of geographical reasoning --- they fetishize the importance of discourse at the expense of material action.

Gearoid O Tuathail, 1996. Department of Geography, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. “The patterned mess of history and the writing of critical geopolitics: a reply to Dalby,” Political Geography 15.6-7.

Dalby’s third point builds upon what he suggests earlier about discourses of IR as a powerful part of the Cold War, an argument he inflates even further in pointing to their importance in ‘policing the global order and maintaining injustice, poverty and violence’. The crucial point that I apparently miss is ‘the function of the discipline’s knowledges as practices of hegemony’. There are two points to be made in response to these exceedingly general claims. First, I would argue that evocations of ‘hegemony’ and ‘power’ often function in decontextualizing ways in some poststructuralist writing. Pronouncing something as hegemonic does not tell us very much about the nature and mechanisms of hegemony; in fact, it seems to substitute for the necessity of documenting the precise nature of hegemony in many instances. I recognize that this is not always possible but, in this case at least, the claim is so broad as to be meaningless. Certainly, the concept of hegemony needs to be carefully considered within critical geopolitics. Second, if we get more precise and examine the specific case of IR, there is an argument to be made that this subfield was actually not as powerful a discursive support for Cold War policies as Dalby claims. The number of top-level US foreign-policy decision-makers with PhDs in international relations is actually quite tiny. Most have backgrounds in industry, finance, law, diplomatic service and the military. The disciplining significance of IR and of academia in general is overestimated by Dalby. While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign-policy decisionmakers are quite different, so different that they constitute a distinctive problem solving, theory-averse, policy-making subculture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. **Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action** and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and poststructuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly selfinterested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. **Critical geopolitics**, in other words, **should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies poststructuralism** nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

People who fought for legislation that would make collective bargaining legal – prior to the 1880’s collective bargaining was illegal – the Sherman Anti – Trust act – the impetus might be revolutionary action. The initial revolutionary part that is west Georgia and the doing something in the wake of that which is Michigan

In 1888 there was a gigantic riot in coal mining towns in west Virginia – coal mining ground to a halt because of the lack of collective bargaining – coal companies gave in. When people got collective bargaining a codified law they could go on strike regularly.

Tenement rights – used to be that you were at the whims of the people who owned your building – when you were a tenement worker, or someone was disenfranchised you lift in a tiny fucking ass apartment with 10 to 15 other people – no bathroom and no running water – 100 people would live on every floor, overcrowding and diseases were rampant – when people started advocating the city government then people who owned the buildings had to change how they were rented out.

CX question –

Highway 94 – 2005 proposal to expand it through Detroit into areas that are only abandoned - they didn’t have the funding approved until this year – in the 7 years in between stuff has happened like the construction of schools that are performing really well – they are predominantly black schools – expansion allows those schools to be demolished so that white people have a 5 minute faster commute. Engaging with the political process allows us to stop it. Refusing to engage with it means that bad shit just continues to happen. Jives very well with our negative action arguments. Doing stuff like meeting with the city government.