#### Nuclear is necessary for renewable energy production- wind and solar can’t provide baseload power. The alternative is coal- worse in every way
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The question of environmental impacts of replacement energy sources is a thorny one. A nuclear plant generally produces over 1,000 MW of [\*413] electricity and operates at about 90% capacity on about 1,000 acres of land, or two square miles. Accordingly, a NRC assessment usually reviews the energy sources needed to replace the capacity of the plant as well as the land use problems that arise when a replacement source is contemplated. As a general rule, the NRC has found that replacement of the existing nuclear facility would result in unacceptable environmental impacts. For instance, new coal-fired facilities will require large land areas, as well as railroad spurs and other infrastructure development such as transmission lines and rights-of-way. There are adverse impacts from coal mining, and from operational pollution. Construction and operation will have ecological and social impacts, and will affect water resources as well. Finally, coal waste would also pose long-term negative effects. n79 Natural gas facilities may have less impact than coal, because of the technology and fuel source, but the adverse impacts of this energy source are still greater than those from an existing nuclear power plant. Renewable energy sources are also available, but the NRC has generally found that these resources are either insufficiently developed to replace the huge capacity of the existing facility, or simply lack the replacement capacity. In such cases, the NRC usually reviews combinations of renewable energy sources. Some creative options include wind, solar, and baseload sources such as natural gas or coal-fired facilities. Where more than one reactor is on site some alternatives suggest continued operation of one unit along with wind and solar. But these combinations must also consider the impacts of the renewable source, particularly in terms of land use and availability. For example, most wind facilities operate at very low capacity; any replacement project would require a very large commitment of land and resources. Moreover, opposition to large wind farms has been strong nationwide, and NRC has doubted the likelihood of a large wind facility being constructed as a partial replacement for the lost nuclear capacity. Solar facilities are likewise intermittently useful, and are also land use intensive. [\*414]

If you think imagining the US doesn’t exist is a good idea, you should, as a writer activist vote to make the elites get rid of the US- closing the distance between elites and their power tied to the US. We should make them choose their own destruction or they can pretend someone did this to them, and that they are the victim, which reinforces their subjectivity. Erasing it doesn’t work if we don’t close the gap. They should have to end the world because they are the ones that ruined it in the first place- they are attempting to oppress/subjugate which Wilderson says.

Focusing solely on the black body and not taking an intersctional approach eliminates identity  
Lazarus ‘94
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At the outset, I must abandon "the Center." It is very hard to hold on to the Center when you have Dr. Greve on the panel because he pushes things so far over that the Center ends up being pretty far to the Left. To try, nonetheless, to bring things back to the Center, what I would like to do is take up the question that Professor Gregory raised in the first instance, and that is the challenge of the very title of this panel - "Racism or Economics" - which presents a false dichotomy.¶ It is a misguided and false dichotomy at three different levels. The factors, racism and economics, are not mutually preclusive; they are not unrelated; and the dichotomy misapprehends what environmental justice is all about. [n1](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n1)¶ First, the factors are not mutually preclusive. Why not both? Why not sometimes racism, sometimes economics, and sometimes both? Why does not the possibility of "both" mean the problem may be twice as large, rather than half as large, as one might think. Why one and not the other? I do not doubt that there are instances when it is more racism than economics, and that there are instances when it is more economics than racism. But I would like to see somebody defend the thesis that it is just economics. What would make environmental protection so special that it [\*482] would somehow be immune from the kinds of racist attitudes ranging from the most venal to the most subconscious stereotypical decisionmaking that we know otherwise influence decisionmaking on a day to day basis? [n2](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n2)¶ Why should we suppose that environmental protection law policymakers are somehow unencumbered by those same kinds of attitudes? We know that such attitudes affect who is hired, who is fired in the employment sector. We know they affect where one attends school. We know they affect the level of health care that is obtained. We know that they affect the price that one pays for a car. We know that they affect the interest rate one gets for a loan. We know that they affect the extent to which one is arrested, convicted, and the sentence that one receives, including, many believe, the death sentence. We know these attitudes affect who one dates, who one marries. (I have yet to see an interracial couple on the Love Connection). [n3](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n3)¶ What is so special about environmental pollution and law? Why would environmental pollution and environmental protection be somehow immune from all these attitudes? [n4](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n4) Why would the distribution, the benefits, and burdens associated with it, unlike all these other well-established areas, not suffer from these same well-established tendencies? [n5](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n5) I doubt it. And I think that the recent studies that suggest there is an economic dimension to who is subject to pollution and who benefits from cleanup do not question that there is simultaneously a racial dimension.¶ Second, race and economics is a false dichotomy because the two are clearly interrelated. Racism and economics are not independent variables. They are dependent variables. Economics is unrelated to race no more than politics is unrelated to race, which is another false dichotomy I have seen in this area. [\*483] ¶ There was a notable Wall Street Journal Op-Ed piece recently, which said, "it's not racism, it's just politics." [n6](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n6) Those two are no more related or unrelated than yellow is to green. There is, at bottom, a relationship between the two. Yellow is after all part of green, and race is part of the economy. Race is part of politics.¶ The fact that African-Americans and persons of color generally have less economic power, less choice, are less able to resist the risks caused by environmental degradation; is that unrelated to racism? [n7](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n7) To say that their immediate cause may, in some instances, be market forces is not to say it is unrelated to race.¶ After all, a fairly fundamental reason why persons of color have less economic power is related to decades of de jure legalized racist laws in this country and their continuing vestiges, which cause African-Americans and other persons of color to have less economic power and less political power. [n8](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623#n8) It is no more sensible to say that the distribution of such power is unrelated to race than to posit that school segregation patterns are unrelated to race, and just a matter of economics. Can one fairly posit that the reason why there are fewer persons of color in the wealthy suburban schools is merely because they just do not happen to live there, because it costs more to live there? It is therefore simply the result of economics. It is not race. I doubt it.

Severance Perms Good

1. We’re not severance- the world of the K isn’t a literally fiating away of the US, instead it is asking you to wish away the problems by pretending the US doesn’t exist. It’s a methodology K, and the methods of the alt- which is paradigmatic analysis, and the aff, which is intersectionality, can work together for maximum good.
2. Severance perms are a still a test of competitiveness and not an advocacy of the affirmative.
3. Key to aff ground – all perms other than “do both” would be severance and that’s unfair to the aff because they’re key to checking back unpredictable cp’s/k’s.
4. They’re reciprocal – neg gets to run pics, severance perms are key to checking this.
5. Err aff on theory -- neg gets the block and can control the outcome of the debate by strategically picking certain arguments.
6. Not a voter – reject the argument and not the team

No society has every changed by not making the ruling class confront their problems

Elites have never been forced (historically) to push towards the end of the world

Prerequisite to ending the world