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Fukushima has blinded us with the trauma of a suture in reality itself – the catastrophe is a wall for knowledge production that amounts to pan-social writers block – in reality the catastrophe was an eruption that challenges us to rethink nuclear energy and the industry – particularly in relation to the victims
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(Alain-Marc, Professor at the University of Lyon-Jean Moulin, Department of Philosophy, “Thinking After Fukushima: Epistemic Shift in Social Sciences”, 3.14.12, <http://hal-ens-lyon.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/70/17/44/PDF/Rieu_KS_after_Fukushima_14-3-12.pdf>, [CL])

A year after the catastrophe, the time has come to evaluate its historical meaning.  *Fukushima* is not a disaster like others. This is the reason why it *is becoming a turning point in world history*: relations between technology, politics, industry, society and ecology are  forever transformed. Its long-term impact and meaning are impossible to repress: wherever  they live, people will never see and understand nuclear energy and nuclear industry as they  did before, on the same pattern. Many studies, reports, debates have poured over the victims,  the dead, the missing and the displaced, on all Japanese, on the contaminated land and sea, on  institutions, politicians, journalists, professors and experts, bureaucrats, managers and  industrial companies (Japan focus 2012). At least, one thing is clear: the Fukushima  catastrophe is an appeal for new knowledge. The goal of this paper is to understand how it  changes the way we think. A paradox (a methodological challenge as well) has first to be solved: any discourse on Fukushima is an interpretation of the catastrophe. Accordingly it  would not matter to start by the interpretation and then deduct from it an explanation of the  event. But the catastrophe is a “scandal” of such magnitude and depth that it remains beyond  its interpretations, indefinitely in excess. This excess is not a call for a metaphysical  explanation but a call for new knowledge. To start by an interpretation or explanation would  be part of the scandal because it would be an attempt to fall into an endless debate and *close a  real search*. A description of the event has to come first because it drives all interpretations.  Few events in world history have this rare property: in the recent past, the First World War,  Nazism, the Holocaust, Hiroshima, the Gulag and now Fukushima. It cannot be denied that  the analysis of the event presupposes its interpretation. But the event overpowers and  overshadows established interpretations in the humanities and social sciences. This explains  why such events open a paradigm shift.

1. What really happened at Fukushima?

A French psychoanalyst, Jacques Lacan (1966), introduced in the 1950s a difference  between reality and what is real. What is commonly called “reality” covers the objects studied  and explained by science, produced by technology, bought and used by consumers, by all of  us. Reality is what makes propositions true, what common language seems to be talking  about. Reality seems glued to our uses of language, to our minds, bodies, habits and customs.  An event like Fukushima shows another side of reality, what is real. What is real is not  common reality: it is what erupts or simply happens, what punctures and deconstructs daily  routines and established knowledge. The real is what overflows our discourses and  disciplines. Fukushima is an eruption and overflow. But the real is not something hidden,  which suddenly appears or is revealed: it has always been there in the open but unseen,  unnoticed because too obvious. Lacan takes an example from a short story by Edgar Poe of an  open letter left on a mantelpiece, telling the truth, in view of everyone looking for the truth.  *The Fukushima catastrophe is showing what is real in Japan.* What really happened at  Fukushima was caused neither by the earthquake nor by the resulting tsunami: they just were  the deadly trigger of a systemic catastrophe, all at once human, social, political, technological  hal-00701744, version 1 - 26 May 2012Europe-Asia Journal 3 and industrial. According to available knowledge, the catastrophe was caused by the power  structure, which in Japan decided where to build this nuclear plant and its six reactors  (Nishioka 2011). This power structure also selected the technology; it decided the standards  for the plant’s construction, its maintenance and back up systems, for the security of nearby population and for protecting also the environment, the land and the ocean (Crowell 2011,  Koide 2011). Other nuclear plants have been built in highly seismic regions. Since March 2011, this power structure has been exhibited in great details by the media in a series of  remarkable articles and studies.

The history of Atoms for Peace situates modern nuclear power within a new string of government narratives about greening energy – but the plan is nothing but a façade to prop up imperial projects elsewhere.
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(International Communist Current, “Nuclear Energy, Capitalism and Communism”, 8.16.11, <http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear>, [Cl])

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 1980sbecause 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.

This collusion of power-knowledge in the military-academic complex has produced a domination of strategic studies and academic circles by the expanding realm of the military – this erases accountability for violence and denies the importance of the ethical questions behind the technology we develop. This inevitably produces catastrophe and depoliticizes violence.
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(John Morrissey, Department of Geography, National University of Ireland, 2011, Architects of Empire: The Military–Strategic Studies Complex and the Scripting of US National Security Antipode Vol. 43, pp 435–470])

In the power–knowledge symmetry of the academic–military world, strategic studies discourses do vital geopolitical work: they prioritize, disguise, legitimize and characterize entire conflicts; they reduce political and cultural geographical knowledges of distant places; and they erase the signature of, and accountability for, “our” violence. In a world of euphemisms and neologisms, well paid mercenary soldiers become “contractors” or “security employees”; ungovernable spaces of abject violence andmisery become areas currently experiencing “a slight uptick in violence”; and waterboarding becomes “simulated drowning”, not actual drowning interrupted or torture. As David Bromwich (2008) succinctly puts it, the “‘global war on terrorism’ promotes a mood of comprehension in the absence of perceived particulars, and that is a mood in which euphemisms may comfortably take shelter”. He points out that critical accounts of US foreign policy and its consequences and accountability are limited to popular academic works such as Chalmers Johnson’s *Blowback*or Robert Pape’s *Dying toWin*(Johnson 2000; Pape 2005).23 The reductive “imaginative geographies” of the military–strategic studies complex not only support the operations of US geopolitical and geoeconomic calculation in the Middle East; they also contribute to a pervasive and predominant cultural discourse on the region that has all the hallmarks of Orientalism (Gregory 2004; Little 2002; Said 2003; Shapiro 1997).

Collusion between “knowledge” and “power” must be forcefully exposed, as must the purposes to which bureaucracy bends knowledge’s specialization. When institutional (academic) knowledge sets itself up above lived experience . . . **catastrophe is in the offing.**Catastrophe is indeed already upon us (Lefebvre 1991:415). Henri Lefebvre may have been writing in 1974 but his perceptive thoughts are perhaps as vital today as ever. The “specialized knowledges” of the “military–strategic studies complex” have long been patronized, prioritized and actioned by the US military. The cosy “collusion” between the Pentagon and military–strategic studies has been instrumental in the contemporary “production of military space”. Reductive scriptings of national security, abstracted geopolitical visions and dreams of empire have collectively served to occlude geographies of the “lived experience” (Chandrasekaran 2006; Packer 2005). As Bradley Klein (1994:3) reminds us,“questions of war and peace are too important to leave to students [and practitioners] of Strategic Studies”. Strategic studies knowledges have long been “above lived experience”, yet their power has been instrumental in unleashing catastrophe, terror and abject misery for the very people whose lives they are “above”. But clearly there is “catastrophe” for “us” too: the catastrophe of being overwhelmed by the collusion of power and knowledge, the catastrophe of the militant and deeply unequal world in which we live and the catastrophe of inaction—politically, discursively and otherwise. But of course there has been action, with some of the most significant resistance taking place outside the academy, such as that seen in the unprecedented global protests against the Iraq War in February and March 2003, and continued anti-war activism worldwide since then. Geographers and other academics have of course been variously actively involved. Within the academy, geographers have illuminated key aspects of the US-led war against “militant Islam”, including its place-making strategies, its territorial responses to terrorist attacks and its exceptional legal and biopolitical geographies (Coleman 2003; Elden 2007; Morrissey 2011; Reid-Henry 2007). Others have revealed the imperial historical geographies of contemporary geopolitics, and signalled its geoeconomic underpinnings (Cowen and Smith 2009; Harvey 2003;Kearns 2006; Smith 2003a). In addition, geographers have depicted the violent geographies of recentwesternmilitary interventions (Dalby 2006; Flint 2005; Graham 2005; Gregory and Pred 2007). And focus has been placed too on the state discourses of military power and broader imaginative and affective geographies legitimating that violence (Bialasiewicz et al 2007; Hannah 2006; ´O Tuathail 2003; Woodward 2005). Such counter-geographies are important, yet their disruptive power, as Matthew Sparke notes (2007:347), is perhaps ultimately “practically limited”. In spite of the above work, and after a cultural turn in the US military that has produced a “powerful rhetorical effect” that justifies “more killing to stop the killing” (Gregory 2008a:21), reductive vernaculars, reifying essentialist tropes of terror, threat, correction and security still prevail and discursively underpin the war in Iraq and broader war on terrorism. The military–strategic studies complex plays a central role in advancing such discourses, and possesses vital forums through which to enunciate their endgame: **legitimized state violence**.

This community is itself composed of a military-strategic studies complex that overwrites history and actively participates in fueling a banal geopolitics of militarist violence that acts as architecture for Empire, while simultaneously acting as apologists for its consequences. We must foreground the history and material experiences of the victims of US Empire and theorize anti-imperialism
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(John Morrissey, Department of Geography, National University of Ireland, 2011, Architects of Empire: The Military–Strategic Studies Complex and the Scripting of US National Security Antipode Vol. 43, pp 435–470])

I want to conclude more positively, however, by suggesting ways to effectively oppose them. As an academic working in political geography, *a key starting point of resistance* for me is the careful detailing of the largely unseen inner workings of empire in our contemporary world, ultimately in order to be better able to resist it (which is what this paper has been about). That resistance can manifest itself in counter-scriptings in a variety of contexts, from lecture halls to town halls, from academic journals to online blogs. And in a variety of *public forums*, many geographers have played, and continue to play, important roles in critiquing the war on terror and advancing more nuanced, reasoned and humane geographies and histories of Islam and the Middle East (Gregory 2005). Such academic and public intellectual work can also crucially liaise with, learn from, and be transformed by grassroots activists in peace and social justice movements throughout the world.44 And linking to their work in our teaching especially has more power than perhaps we sometimes realise; especially given the multimedia teaching and learning tools available today.45 A recent *Antipode*special issue saw a number of insightful reflections on the possibilities of “practising public scholarship” [volume 40(3), 2008]. The contributors outline various ways in which critical geographies can support and enable political and social activism. In addition, Don Mitchell makes an important point in reminding us thatacademic “intellectual” and “bureaucratic” work are also “vital parts of any activism” (Mitchell 2008:448). Disrupting and countering the abstracted geopolitical scriptings of strategic studies can take on a variety of forms. But both inside and outside the academy, a*key intellectual task*, I think, *is theorizing anti-imperialism*— both historically and in our contemporary moment. Effective counterdiscourses for our time must surely incorporate the lessons learned from the anti-imperial/anti-colonial struggles of history—from Ireland to India, from Algeria to Vietnam. Appellations like “insurgents” do the same discursive work today as the historical preference “rebels” did in reductively demonizing whole populations and delegitimizing their right to resistance. But more importantly, perhaps, they serve too to disengage us from unpacking the discourses and practices of contemporary anti-imperialism. Yet *historical contexts of resistance* have much to offer if our endgame is articulating critical and humane geographies of our contemporary world. And this is a crucial challenge, given the sheer pervasiveness of strategic geopolitical discourses that negate human geographical realities. Such scriptings are not only intellectually unconvincing; they are dangerous and hugely consequential. In seeking to avoid dangerously reductive accounts of the world, geography for me has always had a particular responsibility and strength. In understanding conflict, past and present, discourse has perpetually played a troubled role. In reading the current proliferation of “geopolitical discourse”, it is useful to bear in mind history’smultiple reminders of the impossibilities of “colonial discourse” (Morrissey 2010). There is a need to spatialize and locate the material and corporeal geographies of war; not just its imaginative geographies. The spaces and agency of resistance or so-called “insurgency” in the war on terror, for example, are little theorized and frequently not even recognized; reflecting a power relations of knowledge familiar to any student of colonial history. This remains a key challenge for critical accounts of our contemporary geopolitical world. That said, however, *connecting* what James Sidaway calls the “banal geopolitics” of *militarism to its brutal consequences* will always be an urgent task too (Sidaway 2001, 2008). And the dots can be joined. The military–strategic studies complex in contemporary America is a powerful producer of banal geopolitics, patronized and prioritized geographical knowledge and ultimately actionable geostrategic intelligence*. Its experts and advocates are both architects of empire and apologists for its consequences.* Their dominant national security discourse is about positing legitimized, aggressive US military action against the threat of irrational terrorism emanating from the Middle East; it is about presenting the USA as the guardian of global economic health; and it is about imperial ambition too. This paper has sought to expose the military–strategic studies complex as playing *a central role* in support of that imperial ambition and in the advancement of its aggressive geopolitics. I hope it has signalled too the imperative of resistance. In the face of ubiquitous scriptings of insecurity, war and geopolitics in our contemporary world, the task of both exposing the geoeconomic stakes and insisting on real places with real people, with bodies and rights just like us, is as urgent as ever.

**Do not evaluate this like any other debate argument.  We are asking you an ethical question: What do you want your community to look like?**

**Rejecting the affirmative’s production of knowledge in THIS academic space is key to inculcate a language of critique that reclaims public spaces from the militarization of knowledge – this is not about offense and defense or weighing the case – this is a pass/fail gateway issue. If the 1AC has produced bad scholarship, you vote negative to send them home to write a better 1AC.**

**Giroux 12**

(Henry, Global TV Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at [McMaster University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McMaster_University) in [Hamilton, Ontario](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamilton,_Ontario), “Against the Militarized Academy”, 7.4.12,<http://nnomy.org/index.php?option=com_flexicontent&view=items&cid=290%3Amilitarism-a-war&id=545%3Aagainst-the-militarized-academy&Itemid=821&lang=en>, [CL])

While there is an ongoing discussion about what shape the military-industrial complex will take under an Obama presidency, what is often left out of this analysis is the intrusion of the military into higher education. One example of the increasingly intensified and expansive symbiosis between the military-industrial complex and academia was on full display when Robert Gates, the secretary of defense, announced the creation of what he calls a new "Minerva Consortium," ironically named after the goddess of wisdom, whose purpose is to fund various universities to "carry out social-sciences research relevant to national security."([1](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#1)) Gates's desire to turn universities into militarized knowledge factories producing knowledge, research and personnel in the interest of the Homeland (In)Security State should be of special concern for intellectuals, artists, academics and others who believe that the university should oppose such interests and alignments. At the very least, the emergence of the Minerva Consortium raises a larger set of concerns about the ongoing militarization of higher education in the United States. In a post-9/11 world, with its all-embracing war on terror and a culture of fear, the increasing spread of the discourse and values of militarization throughout the social order is intensifying the shift from the promise of a liberal democracy to the reality of a militarized society. Militarization suggests more than simply a militaristic ideal - with its celebration of war as the truest measure of the health of the nation and the soldier-warrior as the most noble expression of the merging of masculinity and unquestioning patriotism - but an intensification and expansion of the underlying values, practices, ideologies, social relations and cultural representations associated with military culture. What appears new about the amplified militarization of the post-9/11 world is that it has become normalized, serving as a powerful educational force that shapes our lives, memories and daily experiences. As an educational force, military power produces identities, goods, institutions, knowledge, modes of communication and affective investments - in short, it now bears down on all aspects of social life and the social order. As Michael Geyer points out, what is distinctive about the militarization of the social order is that civil society not only "organizes itself for the production of violence,"([2](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#2)) but increasingly spurs a gradual erosion of civil liberties. *Military power and policies are expanded* to address not only matters of defense and security, but also problems associated with the entire health and social life of the nation, which are now measured by military spending, discipline and loyalty, as well as hierarchical modes of authority. As citizens increasingly assume the roles of informer, soldier and consumer willing to enlist in or be conscripted by the totalizing war on terror, we see the very idea of the university as a site of critical thinking, public service and socially responsible research being usurped by a manic jingoism and a market-driven fundamentalism that enshrine the entrepreneurial spirit and military aggression as means to dominate and control society. This should not surprise us, since, as William G. Martin, a professor of sociology at Binghamton University, indicates, "universities, colleges and schools have been targeted precisely because they are charged with both socializing youth and producing knowledge of peoples and cultures beyond the borders of Anglo-America."([3](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#3)) But rather than be lulled into complacency by the insidious spread of corporate and military power, we need to be prepared to reclaim institutions such as the university that have historically served as *vital democratic spheres*protecting and serving the interests of social justice and equality. What I want to suggest is that such a struggle is not only political, but also pedagogical in nature. Over 17 million students pass through the hallowed halls of academe, and it is crucial that they be educated in ways that enable them to recognize creeping militarization and its effects throughout American society, particularly in terms of how these effects threaten "democratic government at home just as they menace the independence and sovereignty of other countries."([4](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#4)) But students must also recognize how such anti-democratic forces work in attempting to dismantle the university itself as a place to learn how to think critically and participate in public debate and civic engagement.([5](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#5)) In part, this means giving them the tools to fight for the *demilitarization of knowledge on college campuses* - to resist complicity with the production of knowledge, information and technologies in classrooms and research labs that contribute to militarized goals and violence. Even so, there is more at stake than simply educating students to be alert to the dangers of militarization and the way in which it is redefining the very mission of higher education. Chalmers Johnson, in his continuing critique of the threat that the politics of empire presents to democracy at home and abroad, argues that if the United States is not to degenerate into a military dictatorship, in spite of Obama's election, a grass-roots movement will have to occupy center stage in opposing militarization, government secrecy and imperial power, while reclaiming the basic principles of democracy.([6](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#6)) Such a task may seem daunting, but there is a crucial need for faculty, students, administrators and concerned citizens to develop alliances for long-term organizations and social movements to resist the growing ties among higher education, on the one hand, and the armed forces, intelligence agencies and war industries on the other - ties that play a crucial role in reproducing militarized knowledge. Opposing militarization as part of a broader pedagogical strategy in and out of the classroom also raises the question of what kinds of competencies, skills and knowledge might be crucial to such a task. One possibility is to develop critical educational theories and practices that define the space of learning not only through the critical consumption of knowledge but also through its production for peaceful and socially just ends. In the fight against militarization and "armed intellectuals," educators need *a language of critique*, but they also need a language that embraces a sense of hope and collective struggle.This means elaborating the meaning of politics through a concerted effort to expand the space of politics by *reclaiming "the public character of spaces*, relations, and institutions regarded as private" on the other.([7](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#7)) We live at a time when matters of life and death are central to political governance.While registering the shift in power toward the large-scale production of death, disposability and exclusion, a new understanding of the meaning and purpose of higher education must also point to notions of agency, power and responsibility that operate in the service of life, democratic struggles and the expansion of human rights. Finally, if higher education is to come to grips with the multilayered pathologies produced by militarization, it will have to rethink not merely the space of the university as a democratic public sphere, but also the global space in which intellectuals, educators, students, artists, labor unions and other social actors and movements can form transnational alliances to oppose the death-dealing ideology of militarization and its effects on the world - including violence, pollution, massive poverty, racism, the arms trade, growth of privatized armies, civil conflict, child slavery and the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. As the Bush regime comes to an end, it is time for educators and students to take a stand and develop global organizations that can be mobilized in the effort to supplant a culture of war with a culture of peace, whose elemental principles must be grounded in relations of economic, political, cultural and social democracy and the desire to sustain human life.

**Reliance on nuclear scientific knowledge replicates the divide between the haves and the have nots – makes non scientific evaluation impossible – the boundary between expert knowledge and expert opinion is non-existent – they have replaced scientific fact with an arbitrary process of assumption**

**Welsh** Lecturer in the School of Social Sciences at Cardiff **2000** Ian Mobilizing Modernity: The Nuclear Moment p 18-19

The inclusion of scientists within the dominant political elites of the UK produced some significant tensions and departures from previous practices. The scientist or boffin was a mysterious figure combining both the promise of great advance and the risk of uncomfortable discovery. In either mode scientific discourse was arcane to politicians and civil servants with a classical education. In terms of the UK nuclear project one of the farthest reaching, though unintended, consequences for science and technology policy derived from the class divide both within the nuclear project and between it and the wider scientific research and development community. The differing cultural capital of various groups within the nuclear enterprise also played a major role in shaping public responses. The effortless upper-class superiority of the highest echelons of nuclear science, centred on Oxford and Cambridge, accentuated the gulf between public and expert already entrenched by scientific discourse. In an attempt to give expression to this social and technical alienation I used the term 'social distance' in earlier work (Welsh 1988). Social distance was first used within the British sociology of 'race' to denote the impact of insertion into an 'alien' culture (Patterson 1965:20). In the sense developed here the notion of alien culture has a double meaning. It applies to scientists encountering the alien culture of public demands for accountability and acceptability and it also applies to sections of the public confronted by the alien assumption of their dependence upon experts (see Chs. 3 and 7). Social distance is thus an affective term for the social and political relations between specifically constituted publics and bodies of scientific expertise. The term is particularly useful in drawing attention to the way in which assumed social superiority structures relations between science and public and relations between sciences over several decades.  9 The struggle for dominance between sciences and between political ideologies which reached its peak in the post-war years effectively shaped the knowledge base of high or late modernity. This is a complex claim which becomes clearer when it is thought of in terms of the institutional distribution and orientation of scientific research and development pursued with significant state assistance. Concerns which became embedded within the prevailing institutional effort and ethos of peak modernity became part of a prevailing programme. The social assumptions underlying this programme were dominated by faith in rational science, expertise and technical progress. In turn the distribution of both research and development and regulatory efforts reflects a combination of extant knowledge and socially and culturally negotiated objectives. The resulting institutional structures both *codify and sediment these concerns by enmeshing them within bureaucracies*. Two main consequences follow from this. First, the prevailing distribution of regulatory effort inevitably produces lacunae into which ambiguous risk categories fall. Second,*risks* which are not acknowledged anywhere within the prevailing regulatory structure *are simply not considered.*

From the nuclear moment on the concentration on goal orientated science produced a distribution of both basic and applied knowledge acquisition with a very particular anatomy. The political and scientific emphasis on control and domination within discrete spheres of activity resulted in the neglect of synergistic effects, an area where Beck is particularly convincing. As scientific and technical development led into domains where empirical methods could not be applied, such as in the assessment of nuclear reactor safety, reliance on computer modelling and systems analysis increased. As risk assessments became based on computer models the output became more and more dependent upon the robustness of the input assumptions. In place of absolute measures came scenario modelling where a range of consequences reflecting a range of assumptions provided the basis of policy choices. The presentation of such outputs as knowledge by practitioners and the subsequent failure of models to approximate to events has played an important part in the erosion of public and political trust in experts and expert systems. As is well known, the boundary between expert knowledge and expert opinion became increasingly permeable, even indistinguishable.

**Game over – we have evidence written about your solvency advocate AND about the PRISM reactor that says the DoE can only attract investment by contracting through private *military* connections – the implementation of the plan happens through Lockheed-Martin – the plan would be motivate by racing China and Russia**

Yurman 2009

(Dan, Reporter for Fuel Cycle Week, a nuclear industry trade newsletter, he has industry recognition and has led important seminars with the NRC on reactor safety, this is his blog, 6.28.2009, “GE-Hitachi briefs Congress on PRISM Reactor”, <http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2009/06/ge-hitachi-briefs-congress-on-prism.html>, [CL])

This article [published online](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-kirsch/climate-bill-ignores-our_b_221796.html) at the Huffington Post is a long read, but it is well worth your time if you want to know the science history of the IFR. It includes interviews with some of the principal scientists and agency officials who worked on the technology before it was cancelled in the mid-1990s. There are plenty of links to source materials. Access is free but you must register to post comments. *Kirsch* (right) is an unusual author for this topic because he is a successful venture capitalist, entrepreneur, and businessman who *has no background in nuclear energy*. His article has somewhat of a “booster” flavor to it because he has little patience with government bureaucracy. One of the people Kirsch interviews is [Ray Hunter](http://www.skirsch.com/politics/ifr/RayHunterResume.htm), a former high level official at the Department of Energy. Now retired, Hunter offers a frank assessment of why reactor technologies with promising futures, like the IFR, get shuffled aside in the agency. In the mid-1990s I was a project manager at the Idaho National Laboratory working on development of new programs for the lab. Hunter was hired by the lab as a consultant to develop these ideas both in terms of market research and for use in a business plan. I worked with Hunter and found him to be a straight shooter who had a unqiue outlook on the art of the possible in government energy programs. Here’s what he wrote about that experience. “The main reason that nuclear energy development is so screwed up in DOE is that *critical elements e.g. nonproliferation, waste, and nuclear R&D*are in separate organizations all reporting to the Secretary. It requires real head knocking to integrate the pieces to have a rational program and there is no one in DOE sufficiently interested in nuclear to perform this task.”

“The *Lockheed-Martin* Idaho Technology Company (LMITCO) *contracted with me to prepare a projection on the future of nuclear energy and technology* and a possible role for the INEEL in this future. Following interviews with LMITCO employees and contacts with DOE program offices, *universities,* industrial organizations, and foreign entities; a report was provided that identifies potential nuclear energy opportunities for INEEL. These opportunities are germane today.” What he’s talking about is the IFR reactor design. Kirsch writes that although *the IFR* was cancelled in 1994, it *has popped up repeatedly in evaluations of future reactor R&D* by DOE’s Generation IV R&D program *and both the Russians and Chinese are intensely interested in the technology.*

### 2NC – Spanos

The disinterested mode of debate promoted by the affirmative, wherein all arguments are presumed legitimate competitors in a marketplace of truth, is part and parcel of system of knowledge/power that produces the most violent injustices in the world.  Do not play neutral regarding the content of their argument – their mode of debate is rigged in a way that discounts ethical consideration for subaltern identities and produces a political class indifferent to the plight of the oppressed.

Spanos 11

(William Spanos, World War II Veteran, POW at Dresden, distinguished professor of English and Comparative Literature at the SUNY Binghamton, 2011. Interview with Spurlock.[http://www.kdebate.com/spanos.html](http://www.kdebate.com/spanos.html" \t "_blank))

The reason I asked you that question is because I've always thought that the debate system is a rigged process, by which I mean, in your terms, it's framed to exclude anything that the frame can't contain and domesticate. To frame also means to "prearrange" so that a particular outcome is assured," which also means the what's outside of the frame doesn't stand a chance: it is "framed" from the beginning. It was, above all, the great neo-Marxist Louis Althusser's analysis of the "problematic" - the perspective or frame of reference fundamental to knowledge production in democratic-capitalist societies -- that enabled me to see what the so calleddistinterestness of empirical inquiry is blind to or, more accurately **willfully represses** in its Panglossian pursuit of the truth.  Althusser's analysis of the "problematic" is too complicated to be explained in a few words. (Anyone interested will find his extended explanation in his introduction --"From Capital\* to Marx's Philosophy" -- to his and Etienne Balibar's book \*Reading Capital\*. It will suffice here to say that we in the modern West have been \*inscribed\* by our culture --"ideological state apparatuses (educational institutions, media, and so on)-- by a system of knowledge production that goes by the name of "disinterested inquiry," but in reality the "truth" at which it arrives is a construct, a fiction, and thus ideological. And this is precisely because, in distancing itself from earthly being --the transience of time --this system of knowledge production privileges the panoptic eye in the pursuit of knowledge. This is what Althusser means by the "problematic": a frame that allows the perceiver to see only what it wants to see. Everything that is outside the frame doesn't exist to the perceiver. He /she is blind to it. It's nothing or, at the site of humanity, it's nobody. Put alternatively, the problematic -- this frame, as the very word itself suggests, \*spatializes\* or \*reifies\* time -- reduces what is a living, problematic force and not a thing into a picture or thing so that it can be comprehended (taken hold of, managed), appropriated, administered, and exploited by the disinterested inquirer.  All that I've just said should suggest what I meant when, long ago, in response to someone in the debate world who seemed puzzled by the strong reservations I expressed on being informed that the debate community in the U.S. was appropriating my work on Heidegger, higher education, and American imperialism. I said then -- and I repeat here to you -- that the traditional form of the debate, that is, the hegemonic frame that rigidly determines its protocols-- isunworldly in an ideological way. It willfully separates the debaters from the world as it actually is-- by which I mean as it has been produced by the dominant democratic/capitalist culture --and it displaces them to a free-floating zone, a no place, as it were, where all things, nor matter how different the authority they command in the real world, are equal. But in \*this\* real world produced by the combination of Protestant Christianity and democratic capitalism,things -- and therefore their value --are never equal. They are framed into a system of binaries-Identity/ difference, Civilization/barbarism I Men/woman, Whites/blacks, Sedentary/ nomadic, Occidental/ oriental, Chosen I preterit (passed over), Self-reliance I dependent (communal), Democracy I communism, Protestant Christian I Muslim, and so on -- in which the first term is not only privileged over the second term, but, in thus being privileged, is also empowered to demonize the second. Insofar as the debate world frames argument as if every position has equal authority (the debater can take either side) **it obscures and eventually effaces awareness of the degrading imbalance of power in the real world and the terrible injustices it perpetrates**. Thus framed, debate gives the false impression that it is a truly democratic institution, whereas in reality it is **complicitous with the dehumanized and dehumanizing system of power that produced it**.It is no accident, in my mind, that this fraudulent form of debate goes back to the founding of the U.S. as a capitalist republic and that it has produced what I call the "political class" to indicate not only the basic sameness between the Democratic and Republican parties but also its **fundamental indifference to the plight of those who don't count** in a system where what counts is determined by those who are the heirs of this quantitative system of binaries.

Turns the Russia advantage – their externalization of ethical responsibility to institutional structures like the government precludes ever imagining a Russia that has a true “face” to it – only the alt produces an ethical relationship of responsibility to the Other that precludes depoliticized violence

Rozo 4

**The nuclear fuel cycle releases large amounts of greenhouse gas**

Lendman MARCH 13, 2011 Stephen Lendman  BA from Harvard University. Two years of US Army service followed, then an MBA from the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan” <http://sjlendman.blogspot.com/2011/03/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan.html>

Nuclear Power: A Technology from Hell ¶ Nuclear expert Helen Caldicott agrees, telling this writer by phone that a potential regional catastrophe is unfolding. Over 30 years ago, she warned of its inevitability. Her 2006 book titled, "Nuclear Power is Not the Answer" explained that contrary to government and industry propaganda, even during normal operations, nuclear power generation causes*significant discharges of greenhouse gas emissions*, as well as hundreds of thousands of curies of deadly radioactive gases and other radioactive elements into the environment every year. ¶ Moreover, nuclear plants are atom bomb factories. A 1000 megawatt reactor produces 500 pounds of plutonium annually. Only 10 are needed for a bomb able to devastate a large city, besides causing permanent radiation contamination.¶ *Nuclear Power not Cleaner and Greener¶ Just the opposite*, in fact. Although a nuclear power plant releases no carbon dioxide (CO2), the primary greenhouse gas, a vast infrastructure is required. Called the nuclear fuel cycle, it uses large amounts of fossil fuels. ¶ Each cycle stage exacerbates the problem, starting with the enormous cost of mining and milling uranium, needing fossil fuel to do it. How then to dispose of mill tailings, produced in the extraction process. It requires great amounts of greenhouse emitting fuels to remediate. ¶ Moreover, other nuclear cycle steps also use fossil fuels, including converting uranium to hexafluoride gas prior to enrichment, the enrichment process itself, and conversion of enriched uranium hexafluoride gas to fuel pellets. In addition, nuclear power plant construction, dismantling and cleanup at the end of their useful life require large amounts of energy. ¶ There's more, including contaminated cooling water, nuclear waste, its handling, transportation and disposal/storage, problems so far unresolved. Moreover, nuclear power costs and risks are so enormous that the industry couldn't exist without billions of government subsidized funding annually.

**Any environmental gains from your technological quick-fix will be overwhelmed by growth in consumption.  Reject green consumerism.**

Rees 10 William Rees School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia “Whats blocking sustainability? Human nature, cognition, and denial” Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy Articles - 2010 | volume 6 | issue 2<http://sspp.proquest.com/archives/vol6iss2/1001-012.rees.html>

Just what is going on here? Humans are the self-proclaimed “best evidence for intelligent life on Earth.” Yet when the world’s top physicists, ecologists, and climatologists warn repeatedly that current development strategies are undermining global life support systems and risking catastrophe for billions, the responses range from negligible to ineffective. True, “triple bottom-line” corporate planning is now fairly commonplace; various protocols for “green-building” compete to influence building codes; “new urbanism,” “smart growth,” and the ecocities movement are gaining ground everywhere; hybrid and electric vehicles are increasing their market share; and green consumerism is becoming mainstream in many developed countries—*but none of this activity has made much difference* (apart from fostering the illusion of progress) (Rees, 2009a). Almost all mainstream sustainability measuresimplicitly assume that the problem can be solved through greater material and economic efficiency and *technological “fixes,”*ignoring the evidence that, to date, *such strategies have actually increased the human ecofootprint.*1 Few challenge thefundamental beliefs, values, and assumptions underpinning market-based consumer societies or examine the hidden motivators of human individual or group behavior. On the contrary, all major governments and international development agencies are committed to maintaining the growth in per capita income that has characterized industrial countries for more than a century and to extending consumer culture to the three-quarters of the world’s people who have yet to join the party (see Stutz, 2010 in this issue).2Efficiency gains are thus overwhelmed by a combination of material growth and the rebound effect in even the world’s most efficient economies (Layke et al. 2000). With no government or mainstream international agency willing openly to contemplate, let alone articulate in public, the revolutionary policy responses evoked by our best science, the modern world remains mired in a swamp ofcognitive dissonance and collective denial (Pratarelli, 2008; Pratarelli & Aragon, 2008; Rees, 2009a). Meanwhile, the loss of ecosystem integrity accelerates around the world.