## 1AC

### FW

#### For too long we have been exposed to the unrelenting desire for progress. Regardless of whether it is the desire for ideological progress, emotional progress or tangible progress, progress always manifests in one desire: the desire for power. This power emerges as a way for humankind to conquer nature, conquer each other, and engage in cultural warfare; the desire to civilize others subverts the desire for harmony.

Emerson ’11, [Margaret Emerson (Margaret Emerson, MA is a writer, designer, ecopsychologist and the author of the book Contemplative Hiking Along the Colorado Front Range. She leads contemplative hikes through her MeetUp group and facilitates overnight mindfulness-in-nature retreats in the mountains of Colorado. She writes a blog at www.ContemplativeHiking.com.), Four Reasons Why “Progress” Isn’t Always Progress, No Publication, 1-27-2011, 11, https://carolynbaker.net/2011/01/27/four-reasons-why-progress-isnt-always-progress-by-margaret-emerson/, 9-4-2016. SK]

**From the time we were children, we’ve been taught that “progress”—**as defined by capitalist American culture—**is a good thing**. **Progress is manifest destiny**. **Progress is civilizing the uncivilized, elevating the inhabitants of the third world and taming the “savages” that lived off the land**. **Progress is taming nature**, not being at its mercy. **Progress means more time for leisure and the opportunity to be wealthy and comfortable**. Progress is a good thing. Or is it? Perhaps **we need to examine our unexamined assumptions**, because despite our push toward that sort of economic and social “progress”, most Americans are no more happy today than they were in the 1970s, according to a study done by University of Pennsylvania economists Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers. While there have been certain social milestones made in the last two centuries when it comes to human social progress, other forms of economic or technological progress hasn’t all been good. Certainly, we can celebrate the end of slavery, segregation, and polio. We should hail the progress that the women’s rights movement has made in the last century, and feel relieved that advances in medicine mean we can cure most cancer and help women deliver babies safely as compared to several centuries ago. We can feel grateful that progress has meant that men and women alike no longer have to toil on the land in order to survive and thrive: they can become artists and engineers and activists and leave the hard work to those who find their soul’s calling in the agricultural arts. However, **the endless quest for progress has brought us** such **environmentally destructive practices** as natural gas fracking, tar sands, and risky deep water drilling. More consumption means more pollution, more rainforests cut down to accommodate agriculture, more trees cut to manufacture paper for magazines and junk mail. **In the mainstream media today, progress is akin to a national religion**. **When the economy isn’t growing, we’re not making progress, and therefore, we need to put all our time and energy into making sure we get things back on track**. **This is the Story that our culture lives by and subscribes to, but it is this story that will foretell our demise.** Do we even stop for one minute to consider that the story we’re telling ourselves isn’t correct? That from the perspective of the planet, and thus ultimately from the human perspective, progress isn’t always progress? Here are at least four reasons why: Reason #1: **Progress has disconnected us from nature.** It’s true that in the last two centuries, there have been great strides in technology and efficiency that have enabled most people to pursue careers of a non-agrarian nature. One farmer, equipped with fuel-powered tractors and petroleum-based fertilizers and pesticides, can do the work of hundreds of farmers without such implements. Therefore, more people have been able to branch out into the arts and sciences and dream up things like machines that can travel across a city or out into space. **We no longer need to have the knowledge of how food grows or how to care for the land on which we live**: we can exchange our thinking in the form of skills and talents for food and shelter. When in the past people would know when the first frost was likely to end a growing season and what “normal” rainfall to expect year to year—because their very life depended on it—today people barely notice the weather because they spend time indoors in climate-controlled offices and houses. But **we cannot live as a species disconnected from the rest of nature**. When the sole purpose of our life becomes the acquisition of money and material goods, and we no longer care about what happens to the rivers and forests surrounding our cities, massive environmental degradation is sure to follow. When we can once again enjoy a relationship with nature—whether it’s in the form of gardening, farming or simply hiking—we can once again be physically and spiritually healthy. Reason #2: **Progress has disconnected us from each other**. People used to spend a lot more time together as a community. **Now people are too busy working in cubicles, commuting to and from work, and compulsively checking our e-mail to really get to know their neighbors**. And why should they care about knowing or befriending their neighbors when we don’t really NEED them anymore? If our car breaks down we have our choice of perhaps dozens of auto repair shops that can service our car. If we need a loaf of bread we just go and buy one from the grocery store. If we need a barn for our horses (or RVs), we hire a contractor to build one. In the old days, alienating yourself from your neighbors meant a difficult and lonely life. Today, it means that you’re just “busy” and probably have a big salary. Money has enabled us to become self-reliant and independent, and it has destroyed community. Technology has made the world a smaller place, but it has isolated us from each other. Instead of going over a friend or neighbor’s house for dinner and conversation, we eat our fast food meal alone on the couch while watching TV and checking our cellphone every five minutes to see if anyone has commented on our Facebook status. No gadget, software or website can take the place of real human companionship and interaction. We are deficient in community and we don’t even know it, because we think we are “friends” with more people than ever through the internet. But while face-to-face time satiates our craving for companionship, spending time on the computer does not. Therefore, we have become addicted to technology and the momentary euphoria of being acknowledged by words on a screen. Reason #3: Life expectancy goes up, but health goes down. Life expectancy has gone up considerably in the last two centuries because of advances in medicine. Antibiotics, chemotherapy, surgery, and many life-saving drugs have made it possible for most Americans to reach a ripe old age of 70. However, it’s the quality of health that’s gone down for many—particularly the lower-income demographic. According to the American Cancer society, an unhealthy lifestyle of poor eating habits, smoking and little exercise has increased cancer cases to 27 million and increased cancer deaths to 17 million in 2009. China, Russia and India are expected to have the highest rate of increase of cancer incidence and deaths and the overall global increase is expected to be 1% per year. Tobacco use and obesity are the leading causes of cancer in poorer countries. Children are developing Type 2 diabetes in America, something that was practically unheard of just 50 years ago. Residents living near natural gas drilling platforms are at an increased risk of developing neurological problems and disease. Allergies are epidemic, and scientists postulate that a too-sterile environment is to blame. Processed food is cheap and easy, but nutritionists and doctors now warn that a diet high in processed food can cause colon cancer and other health problems. Reason #4: Resource depletion and environmental destruction. Human activities have led to a rate of species extinction that is at least 100–1,000 times higher than the natural rate. Industrial agriculture and genetically modified crops have killed soil fertility and left what amounts to a chemically-dependent sponge upon which we grow plants and feed crop. We treat animals like products to be caged, injected with hormones and drugs, and slaughtered en-masse instead of treating them like creatures that can feel pain and despair. We dump industrial toxins into rivers and oceans and tell the world that the ocean is big and “can take it” when there’s an oil spill and we have to pour even more chemicals into it in order to cover up our negligence. **We don’t care that we’re poisoning the air or the waterways or causing the extinction of precious animals and plants, because all we seem to care about are jobs, economic growth, and how much money we’re going to have in our bank account.** What is the cost of all this insanity? **What else will we have to sacrifice or destroy in order to worship at the altar of this so-called progress**? SK.

To clarify, we critique a very specific form of progress: the progress that focuses on putting others down to pull ourselves up – progress premised on exploitation and domination. Only a pure critique aimed at challenging the system of ideological domination through progress can be a sufficient ethic from which to view the world.

#### This desire for exploitative reform and constant dominating progress has permeated into our educational spaces. It justifies a crackdown on critical thinking and dialogue in favor of indoctrinating students into a system of control ruled by fear of others.

Giroux ’13, [Henry A. Giroux | Violence, USA: The Warfare State and the Brutalizing of Everyday Life Wednesday, 02 May 2012 10:03 By Henry A. Giroux, Truthout | Op-Ed. SK]

**Even public school reform is now justified in the dehumanizing language of national security, which increasingly legitimates the trans- formation of schools into adjuncts of the surveillance and police state**. '3 **The privatization and militarization of schools mutually inform each other as students are increasingly subjected to** disciplinary apparatuses that limit their capacity for critical thinking **while molding them** into consumers, testing them into submission, **stripping them of** any sense of social responsibility, and convincing large numbers of poor minority students that they are better off under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system instead of being treated as valued members of the public schools. Schools are increasingly absorbing the culture of prisons and are aggressively being transformed into an extension of the criminal justice system. Many public schools are being militarized to resemble prisons instead of being safe places that would enable students to learn how to be critical and engaged citizens. Rather than being treated with dignity and respect, students are increasingly treated as if they were criminals, given that they are repeatedly "photographed, fingerprinted, scanned, x-rayed, sniffed and snooped on."" As I mentioned in chapter 2, the space of the school resembles a high-security prison with its metal detectors at the school entrances, drug-sniï¬‚ing dogs in school corri- dors, and surveillance cameras in the hallways and classrooms. Student behaviors that were once considered child play are now elevated to the status of a crime. Young people who violate dress codes, engage in food fights, hug each other, doodle, and shoot spit wads are no longer repri- manded by the classroom teacher or principal; instead their behavior is criminalized. Consequently, the police are called in to remove them is criminalized. Consequently, the police are called in to remove them from the classroom, handcuff them, and put them in the back of a police car to be carted off to a police station where they languish in a holding cell. There is a kind of doubling that takes place here between the culture of punishment, on the one hand, and the feeding of profits for the security-surveillance industries. What has emerged in the United States is a civil and political order structured around the problem of violent crime. This governing- through-crime model produces a highly authoritarian and mechanistic approach to addressing social problems that often focuses on low- income and poor minorities, promotes highly repressive policies, and places undue emphasis on personal security rather than considering the larger complex of social and structural forces that fuels violence in the first place. Far from promoting democratic values, a respect for others, and social responsibility, a governing-through-crime approach criminalizes a wide range of behaviors and in doing so often functions largely to humiliate, punish, and demonize. "lhe abuse and damage that criminalizes a wide range of behaviors and in doing so often functions largely to humiliate, punish, and demonize. The abuse and damage that is being imposed on young people as a result of the ongoing militariza- tion and criminalization of public schools defy the imagination. And ;';.':;~.n='.~m':' 74 AMERICA'S EDUCATION DEFICIT AND THE WAR ON the trivial nature of the behaviors that produce such egregious prac- tices is hard to believe. A few examples will suffice: In November 2011, a 14-year-old student in Brevard County, Florida, was suspended for hugging a female friend, an act which even the principal acknowledged as innocent. A 9-year-old in Charlotte, North Carolina, was suspended for sexual harassment after a substitute teacher overheard the child tell another student that the teacher was "cute." A 6-year-old in Georgia was arrested, handcuffed and suspended for the remainder of the school year after throwing a temper tantrum in class. A 6-year-old boy in San Francisco was accused of sexual assault following a game of tag on the playground. A 6-year-old in Indiana was arrested, handcuffed and charged with battery after kicking a school principal. Twelve- year-old Alexa Gonzalez was arrested and handcuffed for doodling on a desk. Another student was expelled for speaking on a cell phone with his mother, to whom he hadn't spoken in a month because she was in Iraq on a military deployment. Four high school students in Detroit were arrested and handcuffed for participating in a food fight and charged with a misdemeanor with the potential for a 90-day jail sentence and a $500 fine. A high school student in Indiana was expelled after sending a profanity-laced tweet through his Twitter account after school hours. The school had been con- ducting their own surveillance by tracking the tweeting habits of all students. These are not isolated incidents. In 2010, some 300,000 Texas schoolchildren received misdemeanor tickets from police officials. One 12-year-old Texas girl had the police called on her after she sprayed perfume on herself during class." **Public spaces that should promote dialogue, thoughtfulness, and critical exchange are** ruled by fear **and become the ideological corol- lary of a state that aligns its priorities to war** and munitions sales while declaring a state of emergency (under the aegis of a permanent war) as a major reference for shaping domestic policy. **In addition, the media and other cultural apparatuses now** produce, circulate, and **validate forms of** symbolic and real violence **that dissolve the democratic** bonds of social reciprocity. **This dystopian use of violence** as enter- tainment and spectacle **is reinforced through the media's incessant appeal to the** market-driven **egocentric interests of the autonomous individual, a fear of the Other, and a stripped-down version of secu- rity that narrowly focuses on personal safety** rather than collective security nets and social welfare. One consequence is that **those who are viewed as disposable and reduced to zones of abandonment are forced "to address the reality of extreme violence** . . . **in the very heart of their everyday life**."'Â° Violence in everyday life is matched by a surge of violence in popular culture. Violence now runs through media and popular culture like an electric current. As the New York Times reported recently, "The top-rated show on cable TV is rife with shoot- ings, stabbings, machete attacks and more shootings. The top drama at the box office fills theaters with the noise of automatic weapons fire. The top-selling video game in the country gives players the choice to kill or merely wound their quarry.""' SK

#### Thus the role of the debater as a student is to challenge the system of progress which is predicated on dominating others and stunting critical thinking.

Because the ballot has the power to endorse what is considered truthful by virtue of picking a winner, the judge must assume the role of the intellectual, whom has the primary obligation to deconstruct regimes of truth – we do not criticize to assert our own ideology as dominant and “true” but rather criticize to remove the way truth is used to conquer others. The 1AC is a method and a process of evaluating truth, not a form of truth production.

**Foucault 1984,** [Michel Foucault, “Power and Knowledge,” 1980, Print.]

It seems to me that what must now be taken into account in **[T]he intellectual is not the ‘bearer of universal values.’** **Rather**, it’s **the person** occupying a specific position – but **who**se specificity **is linked**, in a society like ours, **to** the general functioning of an apparatus of **truth**. In other words, the intellectual has a three-fold specificity: that of his class position (whether as petty-bourgeois in the service of capitalism or ‘organic’ intellectual of the proletariat); that of his conditions of life and work, linked to his condition as an intellectual (his field of research, his place in a laboratory, and political and economy demands to which he submits of against which he rebels, in the university, the hospital, etc.); lastly, the specificity of the politics of truths in our societies. And **it’s with this** last **factor that [their]** his **position can take on** a general **significance** and that his local, specific struggle can have effects and implications which are not simply professional or sectorial. The intellectual can operate and struggle at the general level of that regime of truth which is so essential to the structure and functioning of our society. **There is a battle** ‘for truth,’ or at least **‘around truth’** – it being understood once again that by truth I do not mean ‘the ensemble of truths which are to be discovered and accepted,’ but rather ‘the ensemble of rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true’, it being understood also that it’s not a matter of a battle ‘on behalf’ of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth **and the** economic and political **role it plays**. It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of ‘science’ and ‘ideology’, but in terms of ‘truth’ and ‘power’. And thus the question of the professionalization of intellectuals and the division between intellectual and manual labour can be envisaged in a new way. All this must seem very confused and uncertain. Uncertain indeed, and what I am saying here is above all to be taken as a hypothesis. In order for it to be a little less confused, however, I would like to put forward a few ‘propositions’ – not firm assertions, but simply suggestions to be further tested and explained. **‘Truth’ is** to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. ‘Truth’ is **linked** in a circular relation **with** system of **power**s **which** produces and **sustain** it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. **A regime** of truth. This regime is not merely ideological or superstructural; it was a condition of the formation and development of capitalism. And it’s this same regime **which [is], subject to** certain **modification**s, operates in the socialists countries (I leave open here the question of China, about which I know little). **The** essential political problem for the **intellectual** **is not to criticize** the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or **to ensure that his own** scientific **practice is** accompanied by a **correct** ideology, **but** **that of ascertaining the possibility of** constitution a **new** politics of **truth.** The problem is not changing people’s consciousness’s – or what’s in their heads – but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. **It’s** not **a matter** of emancipating truth from every system of power (which would be a chimera, for truth is already power) but **of detaching the power of truth from** the forms of **hegemony**, social economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time.

**Thus the standard is to break down systems of progress aimed at sustaining domination**

### Advocacy

#### Nuclear power and uranium mining embody the quest for power and are expected to grow more globally in the next 20 years than ever before.

Els ’15, [Frik Els (Frik is editor and writer for MINING.com. Frik has worked as a financial journalist for 15 years appearing in a number of business and consumer publications including British Airways in-flight magazine, Business Insider, Investment.com, Driving.ca, YCharts and Business in Vancouver. Frik was a speaker at the 2014 Global Mining Summit in Las Vegas, the Mine Lifecycle Management conference in Salt Lake City and the 2015 Canada Investment Conference in Vancouver. (DISCLAIMER: Frik Els does not own shares or hold positions in any of the equities he writes about. Nothing written should be construed as a solicitation to buy or sell any securities. Seek the advice of a broker/dealer first.)), Nuclear power to grow fastest in more than 20 years, MINING, Sep. 11, 2015, 11:21 AM, http://www.mining.com/nuclear-power-to-grow-fastest-in-more-than-20-years/, 9-4-2016. SK]

**A new report** by the World Nuclear Association **estimates global nuclear power generation capacity should grow by** more than 45% **over the next 20 years and** a new pipeline of uranium mines **will be needed after 2025**. The 40-year old association's bi-annual 2015 Nuclear Fuel report released on Thursday forecasts global nuclear capacity will grow to 552 gigawatts equivalent (GWe) by 2035 from 379 GWe or roughly 11% of world electricity supply at the moment. The report states that until the Fukushima accident in Japan, the outlook for nuclear power around the world was improving, but despite the March 2011 disaster, "many countries are putting more emphasis on satisfying environmental and security of supply objectives in their energy strategies, which should favour increased nuclear power." **The prospects for new reactor build continue to be strong in China, India and Korea as well as in a number of countries in the EU and the Middle East**, but electricity demand growth in countries where nuclear power is well-established continues to be slow. "**Nuclear electricity output is set to** increase at a faster rate **over the next five years than we have seen for more than two decades**," said Agneta Rising, director general of the association which started life in 1975 as the Uranium Institute**. To feed the rise in global capacity, the world will likely need 103,000 tonnes of elemental uranium** or tU (equal to roughly 267m pounds of U3O8) by 2035, up from 56,250 tU (146m pounds U3O8) in 2014, according to the report. Secondary supplies of uranium are gradually playing a diminishing role in the world market according to the report, but will continue to be an important source of supply as underfeeding of enrichment plants is expected to add significant quantities of uranium to the market in the period to 2025. World known resources of uranium are more than adequate to satisfy reactor requirements to well beyond 2035, but depressed uranium prices have curtailed exploration activities and the opening of new mines and some mines have stopped production. The report concludes that rapid uranium demand growth in a number of countries, particularly China, coupled with a limited contribution of secondary supplies will result in the need for additional mined uranium. Nevertheless, the market should still be adequately supplied to 2025 according to the report but only if all planned mines and those under development start up as forecast. After 2025 however a new supply pipeline will have to be developed to meet demand. SK

#### Advocacy Text: All Countries including Indigenous countries should prohibit the production of nuclear power due to the rationale of industrialism which justifies danger to the environment. To clarify, the 1AC does not concern itself primarily with whether nuclear power results in harm to the environment but rather whether the principles on which nuclear power are founded are centered around progress. I defend the government passing legal regulation as the mechanism.

Rozman, [Izzati Rozman (Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Terengganu, Malaysia, Faculty of English & Communication Department, Undergraduate), “ARGUMENTATIVE REPORT: SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT NUCLEAR POWER ENERGY BE BANNED GLOBALLY?”, Academia.edu, SK.]

**Nuclear power should be banned globally not because of the availability of extensive reasons that can always be put at dispute whenever the issue is being debated, but strictly because upon the ration[e]ality that the proliferation of nuclear power program in harboring nuclear energy for the industrialization purposes is indeed dangerous and risky by putting human being, open environment as well as civilization in a precarious state.** The threat of uranium mining, health deterioration due to radioactive exposure and high scale impact of industrial accident and catastrophe risk is all the potential colossal damaging threats that would cease the entire human civilization, putting the innocent lives at stake should be banned globally (Maclellan, 2014). The threat of uranium mining The danger of uranium mining over the years deftly covers explicit issues which remain underneath the discussion partly because of the nature of the process itself and the precarious unease it bring upon the subject. SK

#### A ban through legal regulation by countries is key to disrupting the dominant narrative under the rationale of progress that pursuing electricity production and industrialization and progress is a “superfluous reward” that outweighs any risk.

Rozman, [Izzati Rozman (Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Terengganu, Malaysia, Faculty of English & Communication Department, Undergraduate), “ARGUMENTATIVE REPORT: SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT NUCLEAR POWER ENERGY BE BANNED GLOBALLY?”, Academia.edu, SK.]

In the years following the major nuclear accidents at Three Mile Island in 1979 and Chernobyl in 1986, nuclear power fell out of favor, and some countries even applied the brakes to their emergent nuclear programs (Zerbo, 2014). The Fukushima Daiichi devastating nuclear disaster in March 2011 witnessing how the nuclear proliferation movement continually lost its momentum when a 9.0 magnitude earthquake and the massive tsunami annihilated Japan's Fukushima nuclear power plant. Three reactors were severely damaged, suffering at least partial fuel meltdowns and paralyzing the whole system at once (Collina & Kimball, 2010). Releasing radiation at a level only a few points less than Chernobyl, The Fukushima nuclear incident led to the displacement of 50,000 households that later serve as the direct cause of over 1500 deaths due to radioactive materials leakage. The worst nuclear incident in 25 years also tawdrily led to ban on some shipments of vegetables and fish in Japan causing an unspeakable economic and political ruckus worldwide. The event impulsively corrode widespread public opinion and cast doubt upon the safety of nuclear power if the movement was about to resurface. Prior to the incident, Germany immediately announced an accelerated shutdown of its nuclear reactors in all states alongside with broad public support while Japan perhaps with less conviction, made a similar declaration (Vignard, 2010). The incongruities of the circumstances however subsist, even to the point of sustaining its adverse phenomenon prior to the issue. Ironically, 60 nuclear plants are approximately under construction in recent years and in fact significantly contribute to the 15% of the world's electricity at present (International Energy Association, 2005). Over 150 nuclear-powered naval vessels have been built extensively in the past several years, and a few radioisotope rockets have been expansively produced making half the world’s populations live in countries where new nuclear power reactors are in planning or under construction. Despite of the critiques ranges from threats including health risks and environmental damage to the unsolved problem of radioactive nuclear waste, **nuclear power to some extend is globally accepted as a somewhat hazardous, potentially problematic, but** convenient alternative of generating electricity. Taken into context of global warming and population explosion, it is almost inevitable that the usage of nuclear power should be largely expanded (Lovins, 2006). 5 | Page **Access to energy would unquestionably be the fundamental requirement for economic development in any countries**. Prior to the fact, 1.5 billion people in the world nowadays nevertheless are not yet having accesses even to the basic form of energy, electricity (International Energy Association, 2005). As these countries grow massively in population as well as economic for the next several years, the critical demand for energy will continuously escalates and unless immediate solutions are sought there, then the current energy scarcity in these countries will positively turn severed. Recently, renewable energy like wind and solar and biomass becomes a promising alternatives in managing future energy economy. Under these circumstances, it may be theoretically possible to stabilize the climate without nuclear power. However, those energy sources cannot scale up fast enough to deliver cheap and reliable power at the scale the global economy requires and thus, there is no credible path to climate stabilization that does not include a substantial role for nuclear power in the real world (Rajaraman, 2010). Concerns about climate change, air pollution in addition to growing demand for electricity pressurizes many governments **to re-evaluate their aversion to nuclear power, reversing their phase-out of nuclear energy**, with few already extended the lifetimes of existing reactors, and many by now developed plans for new ones (Maclellan, 2014). Despite all the disregard on the nuclear consensus few years ago, **nuclear power is once again rise as a prominent alternative energy, touted as an environmentally beneficial solution** since it emits far fewer greenhouse gases during electricity generation than coal or other traditional power plants alongside impressive safety and reliability record to date. **The current dialogues on harboring nuclear energy and operating nuclear power reactor globally** are **now centers around weighing the** probability of intense risks against the superfluous rewards. Proponents of nuclear energy would argue that nuclear power is a sustainable energy source which reduces carbon emissions and is the answer for the global warming issue. Opponents on the other hand would argue that **nuclear power poses numerous threats** to people and the environment **and** although nuclear power produces virtually no air pollution, they strongly contend that **nuclear power is not a low-carbon electricity source that can help fighting climate change** (Middle Powers Initiative, 2011). These are just some of the issues involved. **The main question and the debate now would be gyrating on the issue [of] whether nuclear energy should** 6 | Page **be banned globally given the threats it possessed despite of the promising verification surrounding the claim that this is only the chance left for us in** combating against global warming issue and in **the** pursuit of growing energy demands. Let’s put all the pieces left together and at this juncture, here is our stand on this issue. **We** are hereby **resolutely** **oppos**ing the idea of **government** in **operating nuclear power** plants to produce nuclear energy as an alternative in fighting environmental issue thus **fasten our stand further that the** nuclear power should be banned globally. SK

#### This is always the first step to any other ideological or material change. The call to stop this unrelenting progress is a call to change the perceived rules of the game, evaluate the situation rationally and break from a system we became indoctrinated within. Alternate strategies must not seek to fully replace previous strategies, as a combination of strategies is always preferable.

Noble in 95, [Noble, David F. Progress without people: New technology, unemployment, and the message of resistance. Between the Lines, 1995. SK]

**Among our inherited blinders is the identification of simple technological advance with social progress**. an idea espoused by liberals and socialists alike. Late-twentieth-century Americans need not be reminded that this belief is suspect and invites a fundamental reevaluation. Given the all-too-important social costs, military, ecological, and socioeconomic. it would be wise to call a halt to rapid. undirected technological advance, if only temporarily until we regain our bearings But **we are confronted immediately with another inherited blindspot, the conviction that technological advance cannot be stopped because "You can't stop progress"** In reality. **this is a bizarre and relatively recent western notion, invented to disarm critics of capitalism**, and is readily refuted by reference to centuries of socially interrupted techno- logical development. "Protective" regulations of one sort or another have long served to buffer society from disruptive changes; the Luddities them- selves appealed to this time-honored tradition. which assumed the suprem- acy of society over mere economic activity and technological contrivance. This consistent characteristic of human society was eradicated only within the last few centuries by the rapacious champions of laissez-faire who suc- ceeded in putting "things" in the saddle. to ride mankind. It is necessary now to remind ourselves of this lost tradition and confidently to reassert it. To the dictum. you can't stop progress, we must Ieam to respond: of course you can. **There are those who have tried to undo our modern fatalism**. with little success Norbert Wiener. the father of cybemetics. appealed in the 1940s and 1950s for some slowing down of the pace of automation and warned against an impending catastrophe for labor (he erred in his prediction, but only in terms of time: he was off by a decade or two). John Parsons. inventor of numerical control and the acknowledged (by the Society of Manufacturing Engineers) "father of the second Industrial Revolution," called also for a "moratorium on technological advance. to provide time for reflection and a search for socially responsible ways to proceed." Both protests were dis- missed without a hearing. It is now urgent to revive their efiorts and extend them IIILIII. One possible strategy might be to illustrate that, **despite our espoused deference to technological advance and economic ends, our society routinely accepts certain limits** on both. For example. we are learning to live with environmental constraints on both economic and technological activities **We** also now **would reject the reinstitutionalization of slavery even if it could be shown to enhance our international competitiveness**. Yet if undue environ- mental degradation and the institution of slavery are today unacceptable, social dislocation caused by capital ï¬‚ight and technological displacement are not. How might they become so? We have environmental impact statements, why do we not have employee impact statements? Required by all employers who wish to introduce new methods, these would demand an assessment of and solutions to likely problems before implementation. "We protect the fish." one electrical worker at G.E. Lynn observed, "why not the people?" **In** April **1983**. the United States Supreme Court ruled that states have the right to "allow the development of nuclear power to be slowed down or even stopped for economic reasons" and. in a minority opinion, **two Justices** went a step further and **argued that** "a ban on construction of nuclear power plants would be valid **even if its authors were motivated by fear of a core meltdown or other nuclear catastrophe**" (e.g.. nuclear waste hazards). Might this decision serve as a precedent for banning the use of robots pending the solution of the problem of unemployment? In recent years the California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) has sued the University of California, on behalf of farmworkers and small growers, in an attempt to prevent further publicly-funded development of agricultural mechanization that serves only agribusiness at the expense of those workers and smaller farmers. The suit, still pending. has been derided as an attempt to halt progress and the CRLA lawyers have been denounced as Luddites Ways must now be found to follow their lead**. Saying no to such technological innovation serves two purposes at once.** **First. the call to stop progress reminds us that we have been** caught up in something moving**, something we never started or ever decided to partici- pate in. On the intellectual level. then. saying no brings our collective com- pulsion to consciousness and** permits us to begin to proceed on a rational basis, with our eyes **open. Second, saying no** does not **so much** arrest human history **as [but]** call into question the current form of development **and** change the rules of the game **in the present.** in line with the smashing of mental machinery, **intellectuals must strive to overcome their own and others' undue reverence for, and deference to, physical machinery,** in order to develop criteria, defences, and devices for effective resistance to technological change. No one Is against "teclinology," despite the frequently heard charge, because technology as such does not exist. Technolo exists only in the particular, as particular pieces of equiplmeptlinl 'articular settings. E erefore, oippphsitipnhto tfechnologiicial progrenss is to be! mean ng u, os op ons are 0 ereassess n e g 0 new con ions,cr era mus be developed for selectin which technologies ought to be stopped. **Technologies might be opposed**, for example: i they degrade people and diminish their freedom and control without any apparent economic or other compensating benefit; **if their technical and economic viability is ambiguous but they pose serious social problems; or if they are clearly viable in the narrow technical or economic sense but are nevertheless** destructive for society as a whole. Similarly, a technology might be elected for opposition if management depends on it heavily. **Such opposition to technologies must be defended in the public sphere**, and intellectuals might he pfully formulate persuasive defences. These mig t inclu e a moratorium in order to buy time in which to develop socially responsible procedures for their introduction, the protection of existing organizations, the guarantee of livelihoods, or the lpreseivation of communities**. Reclaiming the present must not necessarily entail an abandonment of the future**. **It remains an essentia task to develop alternative social and political visions, rediscover roads not taken, and recast science and technology according to life-enhancing criteria**. This has always been and remains a central challenge for intellectuals. But **care must be taken to ensure that such projections never substitute for present strategies, but serve rather to** complement**, inspire, and perhaps guide them**. **The danger is not utopianism**-we still need Utopia-**but the confusion of the future with the present**. if we cannot afford to abandon the future in our preoccupation with the immediate, neither can we afford any longer to concentrate upon the future and surrender the present. The two must be joined. **One illustration of how this might be done has been offered** by Mike Cooley in England. He suggests that **the development of "human-centred systems" for roduction**, such as those projects now under way at the University of Manchester, **must be coupled with shop-floor organizin and struggle**. According to Cooley, the new technological systems are meaningful po itically on y if workers can be inspired to demand that they be substituted in the present for management-designed systems, and inspired to strike or take other direct action in su port of this demand. Without such action, research projects are doomed to academic irne evance. **if opposition to technological progress helps us overcome our infantile dreams of technological salvation, it enables us also, finally, to transcend the technological mystificatlon of power in our society**. For technology has never reall been the problem, nor will it ever be the solution. Technology does not by itself destroy emocracy, nor does it bring democracy into being. If we have become a politically regressive society, as Sheldon S. Wolin suggested in the first issue of the journal democracy, it is not because of the politics of technology but because, **"hypnotized" by** ideologies of progress**, we have substituted technology for politics**. The ultimate challenge pos by the current technological assault, therefore, is for us to learn not only to put technology in perspective but also to put it aside, to make way for politics. **The goal must be** not a human-centred technology, but **a human-centred society**. **This demands, as it always has,** a confrontation with power and domination. if the lessons of the Luddites are instructive in this regard, so too is the observation of that English radical who, in 1835, summed up the matter parsimoniously, and in a manner still appropriate today: The real grievance is neither more nor less than the subjection of the labouring to the monied classes, in conse uence of the latter having usurped the exclusive making of the laws. Rents, tit es, taxes, tolls, but above all profits. Here is our distress explained in five words, or to comprise all in one, it lies in the word Dnkknu. 'lnnmnnr lndnnd. SK

### Scenario One is Industry

#### We use too much energy in the so-called “developed world”, a world that falsely believes that “quality of life” and “standard of living” are synonymous. With more energy sources like nuclear power, we would merely perpetuate consumerism and the military industrial complex – the dominant structures that exist today.

Kearns ’07, [Josh Kearns (Bona Fide Hill-Billy Who Currently Lives In Oakland, Ca. He’S Been A Researcher In Environmental Chemistry and Ecological Economics. Currently He’S Into Techniques For High Quality Self-Reliant Living Like Organic Farming, Natural Building, Permaculture And Bluegrass Music), The Crisis Of Too Much Energy, Matador Network, 6-20-2007, 7, http://matadornetwork.com/bnt/the-crisis-of-too-much-energy/, 9-4-2016. SK]

You may have heard of the recently announced collaboration between the University of California and BP in a big-money deal to research biofuels and thus address sustainability, tackle the energy crisis, etc. BP PLC, the green-minded oil producer, in February chose the University of California at Berkeley to help lead low carbon research, starting with biofuels. BP plans to spend $500-million over a decade. This is perhaps the biggest collaboration between the corporate sector and academia in history, all in the name of developing alternative fuels to handle the growing energy shortage. Or is it? **The real energy crisis is that we have too much energy.** **The way politicians, the media, corporations, economists, make it sound you’d think we don’t have enough now, and that we’re heading for greater demand because of population growth and economic expansion**. This is a good test for my rule of thumb about reality: whatever they’re saying on the TV news – on Fox, on CNN, – is probably just about the opposite. If you watch the news and play a game of “opposite day,” like we did in third grade, then you’ll have a better idea of the truth. Uncovering The Issues So we’re supposed to get excited that BP and UC are going to spend a lot of money (mostly public subsidies) on high-tech research and development to discover or invent technologies to solve the environmental and economic problems. They will be able to (finally) apply technology to solve the problems created by technology. Talk about fighting fire with fire! What this is really meant to do is allow us to continue conducting business-as-usual. The fundamental tenets of the faith of modern economics aren’t being questioned. This UC-BP collaboration is just the latest and most ostentatious denial and refusal to address **the only two rational questions regarding the so-called energy crisis: “What are we doing with all the energy we have now?” and, “Do we really need to do those things?”** To address the first question, I’ll offer a few examples. For one, **a ton of energy goes into the military**. The military is fighting in Iraq and elsewhere to get more energy (such as oil). If we just stopped fighting so much we wouldn’t need so much energy. Fewer people would be hurt and killed and there would be less incentive for terrorism. That solves many problems at once. **But the military contractors, engineering outfits and weapons corporations don’t like this solution**. Also, a huge amount of our energy goes towards pumping water to service industrial agriculture, along with scads of energy for fertilizers, pesticides, farm machinery and food processing and transport. In general, an all-around nightmare. If we reformed our agriculture system and embraced small-scale, self-reliant permaculture and organic agriculture systems, we could use way less energy. But the big agribusiness corporations don’t like this solution either. A Dead End Where else do we use a lot of energy? **We drive a lot**. People in cities like Atlanta commute, on average, over an hour to work, one way. That’s a lot of driving time, a lot of gas burned. Some very silly people, like me, use a lot of energy flying all around the world in airplanes to learn about and work for ecological sustainability. (I plead no contest. So it goes). **And we use a lot of electricity**. **In the average American home, the TV is on almost eight hours per day**. And it’s a double wammy **since what’s on TV is advertisements that cajole people to go out** (in their car) **and shop, shop, shop**. People going out to buy tons of crap they don’t need, because commercials have made them feel inferior. You get the point. **The energy we have now is used for destructive, wasteful, and/or unnecessary purposes**. None of the stuff I listed makes our lives any better. In fact, it makes our lives worse. Three hours round-trip commuting in Atlanta traffic sucks. I don’t care if you do it in an air-conditioned Lexus SUV. The medium of television could make our lives better but it doesn’t. Most of what’s on there is garbage. The rest is advertisement – advertisement for garbage. A Single Solution? Sometimes people ask me, “Josh, what’s the one thing I can do to really make a difference in my life and the world?” First I give them a hard time for wanting the easy way out, for looking for the one thing, the conscience-cleansing “silver bullet” they can do for a better world. Once I’ve dressed them down I tell them the best thing they can do is to stop watching TV. “It’s mind poison. Literally. Stop poisoning yourself.” Once I’ve dressed them down I tell them the best thing they can do is to stop watching TV. “It’s mind poison. Literally. Stop poisoning yourself.” If I could do one massive experiment on the whole US I would take away TV for a month. Once a chunk of the population survived the mind-poison withdrawal I bet great things would start to happen. People would shop less, exercise more, talk to their neighbors, maybe even, dare I say, read a book or plant a garden. You can bet the social and political landscape of the US would look mighty different. **The status quo assumes we need a lot of energy for a good quality of life**. On the contrary, **we have too much energy now and our use of it has damaged our quality of life and the environment as well**, **which is inextricably linked with our quality of life**. Accessing new energy sources will certainly exacerbate this problem, not ameliorate it. As an example in support of my argument I offer myself – I spent the winter living fantastically abundantly with a very small Ecological Footprint **in a locally self-reliant organic farming community in northern Thailand**. I can attest that **the quality of life is very high, despite the relatively low** (material and energetic) **standard of living**. A New Paradigm **You can also see why [for] the proponents of** the **big-money**, high-tech R&D deals like the UC-BP collaboration **will never get this. Because it’s hard-wired into their paradigm that quality of life and standard of living are positively correlated**, **even that they’re synonymous**. That’s how they can be so tremendously irrational in assuming that continually pursuing more and better technology will solve the problems created by technological expansion. You try to tell them that quality of life and standard of living for many people in the developing world (and almost everyone in the West), are inversely related and see how far you get. It’s like trying to tell conventional economists that economic growth is making us worse off instead of better off. They just won’t get it, just can’t get it. **It means calling into serious question fundamental axioms of the whole modern paradigm**. If they did they’d be out of a job and replaced with people who would more assiduously keep the dogma. Over the past century, modern civilization has behaved like a ten-year-old with a fire hose when it comes to our energy use. We need to ask ourselves what really makes for quality of life. **Our rampant pursuit and use of energy for transport and to power all sorts of new techno-gizmos, not to mention the out-and-out destruction caused by militarism, economic globalization and industrial agriculture, is killing us and the ecosystems we depend on.** The win-win solution of embracing high-quality, low energy and small footprint lifestyles is there, it just requires a bit of swimming upstream in the current cultural milieu. You can start by turning off the TV. SK

#### Even tangible reasons to support nuclear power are premised on humankind’s dominance and function to civilize and promulgate a culture of corporations where humans have conquered nature – rejection is key.

Hollo ’14, [Tim Hollo(Tim Hollo is an environmentalist and musician who has recently started Green Music Australia. He was previously communications director for Australian Greens Leader Christine Milne, and has worked for organisations including 350.org, Lock the Gate and Greenpeace, on whose board he now sits. He writes in his personal capacity, not representing any of these organisations), Nuclear power keeps the corporates in charge. No wonder it's conservatives' preferred solution to climate change, Guardian, 12-1-2014, 14, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/dec/01/nuclear-power-keeps-the-corporates-in-charge-no-wonder-its-conservatives-preferred-solution-to-climate-change, 8-14-2016. SK]

The US Christian right has long promoted this line from Genesis 1:28 as a Biblical critique of environmentalism. God is telling them, they believe, that we humans are entitled to do whatever we like with the Earth and its resources. There is, of course, a very different Biblical view. Thea Ormerod of the Australian religious response to climate change, among others, talks of the concept of “stewardship”, and the responsibility to look after God’s creation. But the “dominion mandate” dovetails so neatly with **the modern industrial idea that humanity is separate from and dominant over nature that it has become a powerful aspect of the western materialist creation story**. app Download the free Guardian app Download the free Guardian app Specially crafted for Windows 10, this app gives you full access to the Guardian's award-winning content. With automatic caching, you can keep reading even when you’re offline. Click here **Nuclear power fits perfectly within a world view that sees splitting the atom as the apogee of human dominance over nature.** Given its enormous and persistent waste problem, **nuclear power is only acceptable if you believe that it is our right to pollute as we please.** Abbott has explicitly referred to the dominion mandate, most notably in a speech about forestry early this year. Clearly, this theology influences his views on nuclear power. The second tenet is not canonical, unless you believe Jesus was making an ironic statement when he threw the money-lenders out of the temple. But the increasingly blind faith Abbott and his ilk invest in **corporate capitalism has developed a distinctly theological aura**. While it is reasonable to reject climate science, and acceptable to deny declining reef health, it is heresy to question whether handing ever more power to corporate interests will benefit the rest of us. **The privatisation of profit and socialisation of risk inherent in nuclear power only makes economic sense if you believe in the divine right of corporations**. **With multi-billion dollar cost blowouts in construction and decommissioning, the refusal of private insurance companies to cover risk, and a waste stream that will need to be managed for many times longer than our civilisation has so far existed, it’s basically a complex wealth transfer from citizens to corporations**. Advertisement **Nuclear power**’s great attraction for those who subscribe to this particular faith is that it **would maintain the corporate grip on energy infrastructure at a time when diversified and distributed renewable energy systems threaten to democratise energy supply.** Energy regulators the world over are facing increasingly panicked demands from beleaguered fossil fuel companies to staunch the loss of market share as more and more people realise that solar power makes sense. In parts of the USA, there are even proposals to make going off the grid illegal. In this context, nuclear power is a godsend. The final tenet is the central one of conservative faith - that change is difficult, dangerous and unnecessary. This, as Naomi Klein’s latest book, This Changes Everything, points out is what makes climate change so threatening for the right. The clear message of accelerating global warming caused by the fuels that have allowed industrial consumerist capitalism to develop is that we have to change direction. **If you want to deal with climate change – but your world view won’t let you contemplate changing the way we use energy, the way we consume, the way our society is structured – nuclear power provides a neat solution**. **It suggests that we can tackle climate change without really changing anything**. A pity it’s not true. Not even the International Energy Agency believes it. But then neither, frankly, do many of its advocates. Spruiking **nuclear power**, for many on the right, is not about actually promoting its use. **It’s far more important as a weapon in the culture war, promoting an idea** which buttresses their three key articles of faith: **that “man” has dominion over nature; that corporate might makes right; and that change must be avoided.** Opposition to nuclear power is**, I would emphasise, a rational position**. The evidence is stacked against it. A suite of renewable energy options can be rolled out faster and cheaper and more safely, and they can supply our energy needs - so long as we also change our profligate lifestyles. **But it is also an ethical position, based on a particular world-view; a view that we humans need to stop living as if there is no tomorrow, or there will be no tomorrow; a view that we can and should live as though all of us on this planet, human and non-human, now and in the future, matter**. Support for nuclear power is based on a world-view, but it doesn’t have the benefit of also being backed by rational arguments. It is simply a fantasy of the right, a convenient prop they occasionally produce to pretend we can address climate change while changing nothing, and a weapon in their culture war. SK

### Scenario Two is Fear

#### The very existence of nuclear power production creates radiophobia - a fear of radiation – which causes psychological damage and real tangible harm to people.

Falkner ’15, [Scott Falkner(), Nuclear Power — Study Says Fear Of Energy Source Is Much Worse Than Any Possible Radiation Effects, Inquisitr News, 8-2-2015, 15, http://www.inquisitr.com/2301716/nuclear-power-study-says-fear-of-energy-source-is-much-worse-than-any-possible-radiation-effects/, 8-15-2016. SK]

In a series of studies on nuclear power published in the Lancet, **researchers have discovered that the fear of a nuclear reactor or power plant malfunctioning or overheating causes many, many more health problems than the actual, physical effects of an actual malfunction or meltdown**. **There are currently over 437 nuclear power plants currently in operation the world over.** However, nuclear power plant accidents are extremely uncommon. The most recent nuclear power plant malfunction happened in 2011, in Japan at the Fukushima Daiichi power plant. Before that, there have been four other severe nuclear power plant accidents in human history, including Chernobyl, Russia, in 1986, Three Mile Island in the United States in 1979, Windscale Piles in England in 1957, and Kyshtym in Russia, also in 1957. A “severe” nuclear power plant accident is classified as a “level 5” — an accident with “wider consequences,” such as a massive release of radiation. Dr. Koichi Tanigawa from the Fukushima Medical University in Japan spoke about the relatively low amount of physical health effects linked to the Fukushima power plant versus the widespread psychological effects. “Although the radiation dose to the public from Fukushima was relatively low, and no discernible physical health effects are expected, psychological and social problems, largely stemming from the differences in risk perceptions, have had a devastating impact on people’s lives.” The Three Mile Island nuclear power plant accident also resulted in very low physical health problems in 1979. As a result of the incident, health providers stated that most individuals in the path of the radiation “cloud” received a dose of radiation similar to that of getting a chest x-ray. Though in 1986, the physical effects of the Chernobyl nuclear power accident were much worse on nearby residents, a 2006 study performed by the United Nations on the worldwide effects of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant determined that the accident’s “most serious public health issue” was adverse effects on the mental health of the public. The United Nations report said that poor communication about the health risks “associated with radiation levels made the problem worse.” Additionally, **post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and general depression remained at much higher than normal levels 20 years after the accident in the surrounding area**. Now, according to the Lancet Papers, **Fukushima is experiencing the same sort of adverse mental health effects in its nearby population following its power plant accident.** The Fukishima Health Management Survey indicates that **segments of the population that were involved in evacuation procedures following the nuclear power plant accident were five times more likely to experience ongoing psychological distress versus the rest of the population**. SK

#### The fact that nuclear power doesn’t cause radiation doesn’t respond – my argument is about public perception of nuclear power.

#### And, calls for facts over fear that claim that we are too ignorant are the same form of dominance the 1AC criticizes that forces us to submit ourselves mindlessly to experts who are part and parcel of the hegemonic political system*.*

MacLean ‘87, [MacLean, Douglas (Research Associate at the Center for Philosophy and Public Policy). "Understanding the nuclear power controversy." HT Engelhardt & AL Caplan (Hg.): Scientific controversies: case studies in the resolution and closure of disputes in science and technology. Cambridge, UK (1987): 567-582. SK]

**Defenders of nuclear power** sometimes **charge that people are afraid because they are hopelessly ignorant about the facts** of nuclear technologies, and led astray by an almost equally ignorant and often irresponsible press. **This account presupposes that the** -.; I I public **opposition is** basically technical, but **misinformed**. **It may be**, however, **that** the **contending parties have different** political **agendas** in the dispute that centers on this technology. The nuclear power controversy is a political war, and the participants on both sides may be pursuing other goals on the battleground over health risks and safety standards, if this is where they think they can most easily achieve them. The perception of health and safety risks, by both experts and non-experts, is strongly colored by these other factors. **Someone who thinks that nuclear technologies have bad political implications will tend to see the health risks as worse** than others see them. And someone who is acutely aware of the economic costs of safety equipment might tend to see the risks as lower than others see them. **The experts are** not without their own political axes to grind**, and objective assessments are hard to identify**. Furthermore, **any "expert" who wants to render some general judgment about nuclear power must address subjects beyond his or her area of special competence. The issues involved require a greater understanding of physics, engineering, medicine, epidemiology, geology, economics, systems analysis, psychology, management techniques**, and so on, **than any individual can muster**. So, in a sense, there are no experts, no individuals who have special insight into all the technical areas, let alone the non-technical ones. R eport from the Center for Finally, **rather than relying on experts to assess nuclear technology, people increasingly want a technology for which such** blind reliance is unnecessary. **One technology may be preferred to another because it allows those served by it to make their own autonomous decisions about its risks and costs**. **If nuclear power** requires a surrender to the authority of experts, this may itself constitute a reason to reject that technology. SK

#### The 1AC does not take a stance on whether the fear *itself* is grounded or ungrounded, but rather addresses the material implications that this fear has on the populous, the fact that hegemony proliferates.

Implications:

**A.** Nuclear Power requires us to submit to the same form of authority that we criticize as bent on ideological and material progress by conquering and civilizing the “ignorant”

**B.** Fear is a political project, and nuclear weapons are the tool – getting rid of the tool heightens the chances that we break down this political project seeking to dominate individuals.

**C.** Fear *of nuclear reactors specifically* creates psychological and mental distress which destroys value to life.

**D.** A destruction of perceived self-efficacy denies possibilities for future change through innovation.

Bandura ’09, [Bandura, Albert. "Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness." Handbook of principles of organization behavior 2 (2009): 179-200. SK]

Rational models of motivation and decision making that exclude perceived self - effi cacy sacrifi ce explanatory and predictive power. **Perceived self - effi cacy** not only **sets the slate of options for consideration**, but also **[and] regulates their implementation**. Having decided on a course of action, one cannot sit back and wait for the performances to appear. **Making a decision does not ensure that individuals will mobilize the effort** to execute the decided course of action successfully and stick to it in the face of diffi culties. **A psychology of decision making requires a psychology of action grounded in enabling and sustaining effi cacy beliefs**. One must add a performatory self to the decisional self, otherwise the decider is left stranded in thought. **Beliefs of personal effi cacy shape whether people attend to the opportunities or to the impediments that their life circumstances present and how formidable the obstacles appear.** **People of high effi cacy focus on the opportunities worth pursuing and view diffi cult obstacles as surmountable**. (Krueger and Dickson, 1993 , 1994 ). **Through ingenuity and perseverance they fi gure out ways of exercising some measure of control even in environments of limited opportunities and many constraints.** **Those beset with self - doubts** dwell on impediments which they view as obstacles over which they can exert little control. They **easily convince themselves of the futility of effort** so they achieve limited success even in environments that provide many opportunities. SK\

#### And, this politics of fear is proliferated by government inertia. Countries’ refusal to prohibit nuclear power serves their own agenda of industrialism as the populous is too divided because of fear to respond to actual political threats.

Robin ’11, [COREY ROBIN (Corey Robin (born 1967) is an American political theorist, journalist, and professor[1] of Political Science at Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He has devoted his scholarly attention to the study of the contemporary forms of American conservatism and neoconservatism, as well as of the difficulties of both liberals and the New Left in dealing with American supremacy after the end of the Cold War.[citation needed] In 1999, Robin received his Ph.D. from Yale University.[2] He is the author of the books Fear: The History of a Political Idea and The Reactionary Mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin. Robin’s articles have appeared in many reviews and newspapers, including: American Political Science Review, Social Research, Theory and Event, The New York Times, The Washington Post, The London Review of Books, The Nation, Jacobin and Dissent. As interim director at the Graduate Center for Worker Education at Brooklyn College in 2013 Robin was part of the decision-making process to restructure the program. In a Portside essay Robin urged readers to ignore a petition protesting the elimination of funding.[3] On August 1, 2013 Portside published a statement by Immanuel Ness, editor of WorkingUSA: The Journal of Labor and Society, also of Brooklyn College, countering Robin and urging that the petition be signed.[4] Robin responded to these criticisms, providing a litany of details regarding his opinions about mismanagement and questionable use of the facility.[5] From Wikepedia), “The Politics of Fear”, SYMPOSIUM | A DECADE SQUANDERED, FALL 2011, Issue NO. 22, SK.]

Yet, as others in this symposium have noted, **the political infrastructure of fear**—the bureaucracies and institutions created in the wake of 9/11, the profiling and practices of surveillance, the laws and enforcement agencies—**survives**. We still have a Department of Homeland Security and a Patriot Act, Guantánamo is open for service, and what my colleague Jeanne Theoharis calls “Guantánamo at home”—the draconian policies and procedures, directed primarily at Muslims and Arabs, in the federal prison system—has not been scrutinized or even discussed. And all this, it hardly needs be said, nearly three years into the Obama Administration. From these polar realities—a thinning atmosphere of political fear, an expanding infrastructure of political fear—I draw two conclusions. First, the politics of fear is far less dependent upon the actual psychic experience of the public than analysts would have us think. While many believe that the individual emotions of the citizenry propel the policies the government pursues, I see little evidence of that. Even if we assume that each and every member of the public is experiencing fear, that experience still doesn’t explain the policies. **A frightened population could just as easily inspire the government to pursue policies that would dampen rather than arouse fear.** **It is** politics that produces policies**, not fear.** In any event, the public’s putative experience of fear cannot explain the persistence, indeed the enhancement, of the kind of government policies and practices we’ve seen in the last five years or so. **A combination of** bureaucratic inertia **and partisan interests**, in which neither party has much incentive to do anything on behalf of a persecuted minority—the sorry stuff, in other words, of old-fashioned political science—**explains far more** than do speculation and experiments in social or cognitive psychology. Second, journalists and scholars too often assume that the public is united in its fear because the objects of fear—terrorism, radical Islam, and so on—are equally threatening to each and every member of the public. But as Hobbes understood so well, men and women do argue about political threats—whether they exist, whom they threaten, whence they come, how to respond to them. They argue about political threats for the same reason they argue about other political matters: **Perceptions of harm are dependent upon beliefs about good and evil, justice and injustice, and experiences of harm are mediated by material factors** such as one’s standing in the world. Indeed, it was this profoundly human penchant to argue about threats that drove Hobbes to insist it was among the sovereign’s most important duties to simply decide, to declare by fiat, whether a nation was threatened or not—and that it was among the subject’s most important duties to allow the sovereign to make that decision. Far from assuming that this right of the sovereign to identify public threats would be easily accepted, however, Hobbes understood that it had to be defended through a comprehensive effort of popular instruction—a project, judging by the debates over national security that have punctuated American history from its inception (remember the Hartford Convention?), in which few governments have ever succeeded. **That sovereigns have to assert that they are the deciders of our fears testifies to the fact that national security is no more a source of unity than Social Security**. As we’ve seen over the last decade, citizens still disagree about threats and how to respond to them, and they experience political fear in different ways. A Muslim or Arab citizen of the United States might well be more afraid of government surveillance than of a terrorist attack. An unemployed middle-aged woman may be more concerned about economic insecurity or poverty than Al Qaeda. And even threats that do temporarily command the public’s attention seldom yield united responses beyond the very short term**.** A unity of fear, then, is not an artifact of mass psychology; it is a political project, crafted through leadership, ideology, and collective action. Like many political projects, it often fails, or at least does not fully succeed. And **when it fails**—dissenters question whether we need be afraid, citizens cease to pay attention to “orange” and “red” alerts, parties focus on other items of public concern—**governments either try to** enlarge the infrastructure **by insulating it against the vagaries of public opinion**, **or** dampen the dissent. Again, old-fashioned politics. SK

## 1AC – Short

### FW

#### For too long we have been exposed to the unrelenting desire for progress. Regardless of whether it is the desire for ideological progress, emotional progress or tangible progress, progress always manifests in one desire: the desire for power. This power emerges as a way for humankind to conquer nature, conquer each other, and engage in cultural warfare; the desire to civilize others subverts the desire for harmony.

Emerson ’11, [Margaret Emerson (Margaret Emerson, MA is a writer, designer, ecopsychologist and the author of the book Contemplative Hiking Along the Colorado Front Range. She leads contemplative hikes through her MeetUp group and facilitates overnight mindfulness-in-nature retreats in the mountains of Colorado. She writes a blog at www.ContemplativeHiking.com.), Four Reasons Why “Progress” Isn’t Always Progress, No Publication, 1-27-2011, 11, https://carolynbaker.net/2011/01/27/four-reasons-why-progress-isnt-always-progress-by-margaret-emerson/, 9-4-2016. SK]

**From the time we were children, we’ve been taught that “progress”—**as defined by capitalist American culture—**is a good thing**. **Progress is manifest destiny**. **Progress is civilizing the uncivilized, elevating the inhabitants of the third world and taming the “savages” that lived off the land**. **Progress is taming nature**, not being at its mercy. **Progress means more time for leisure and the opportunity to be wealthy and comfortable**. Progress is a good thing. Or is it? Perhaps **we need to examine our unexamined assumptions**, because despite our push toward that sort of economic and social “progress”, most Americans are no more happy today than they were in the 1970s, according to a study done by University of Pennsylvania economists Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers. While there have been certain social milestones made in the last two centuries when it comes to human social progress, other forms of economic or technological progress hasn’t all been good. Certainly, we can celebrate the end of slavery, segregation, and polio. We should hail the progress that the women’s rights movement has made in the last century, and feel relieved that advances in medicine mean we can cure most cancer and help women deliver babies safely as compared to several centuries ago. We can feel grateful that progress has meant that men and women alike no longer have to toil on the land in order to survive and thrive: they can become artists and engineers and activists and leave the hard work to those who find their soul’s calling in the agricultural arts. However, **the endless quest for progress has brought us** such **environmentally destructive practices** as natural gas fracking, tar sands, and risky deep water drilling. More consumption means more pollution, more rainforests cut down to accommodate agriculture, more trees cut to manufacture paper for magazines and junk mail. **In the mainstream media today, progress is akin to a national religion**. **When the economy isn’t growing, we’re not making progress, and therefore, we need to put all our time and energy into making sure we get things back on track**. **This is the Story that our culture lives by and subscribes to, but it is this story that will foretell our demise.** Do we even stop for one minute to consider that the story we’re telling ourselves isn’t correct? That from the perspective of the planet, and thus ultimately from the human perspective, progress isn’t always progress? Here are at least four reasons why: Reason #1: **Progress has disconnected us from nature.** It’s true that in the last two centuries, there have been great strides in technology and efficiency that have enabled most people to pursue careers of a non-agrarian nature. One farmer, equipped with fuel-powered tractors and petroleum-based fertilizers and pesticides, can do the work of hundreds of farmers without such implements. Therefore, more people have been able to branch out into the arts and sciences and dream up things like machines that can travel across a city or out into space. **We no longer need to have the knowledge of how food grows or how to care for the land on which we live**: we can exchange our thinking in the form of skills and talents for food and shelter. When in the past people would know when the first frost was likely to end a growing season and what “normal” rainfall to expect year to year—because their very life depended on it—today people barely notice the weather because they spend time indoors in climate-controlled offices and houses. But **we cannot live as a species disconnected from the rest of nature**. When the sole purpose of our life becomes the acquisition of money and material goods, and we no longer care about what happens to the rivers and forests surrounding our cities, massive environmental degradation is sure to follow. When we can once again enjoy a relationship with nature—whether it’s in the form of gardening, farming or simply hiking—we can once again be physically and spiritually healthy. Reason #2: **Progress has disconnected us from each other**. People used to spend a lot more time together as a community. **Now people are too busy working in cubicles, commuting to and from work, and compulsively checking our e-mail to really get to know their neighbors**. And why should they care about knowing or befriending their neighbors when we don’t really NEED them anymore? If our car breaks down we have our choice of perhaps dozens of auto repair shops that can service our car. If we need a loaf of bread we just go and buy one from the grocery store. If we need a barn for our horses (or RVs), we hire a contractor to build one. In the old days, alienating yourself from your neighbors meant a difficult and lonely life. Today, it means that you’re just “busy” and probably have a big salary. Money has enabled us to become self-reliant and independent, and it has destroyed community. Technology has made the world a smaller place, but it has isolated us from each other. Instead of going over a friend or neighbor’s house for dinner and conversation, we eat our fast food meal alone on the couch while watching TV and checking our cellphone every five minutes to see if anyone has commented on our Facebook status. No gadget, software or website can take the place of real human companionship and interaction. We are deficient in community and we don’t even know it, because we think we are “friends” with more people than ever through the internet. But while face-to-face time satiates our craving for companionship, spending time on the computer does not. Therefore, we have become addicted to technology and the momentary euphoria of being acknowledged by words on a screen. Reason #3: Life expectancy goes up, but health goes down. Life expectancy has gone up considerably in the last two centuries because of advances in medicine. Antibiotics, chemotherapy, surgery, and many life-saving drugs have made it possible for most Americans to reach a ripe old age of 70. However, it’s the quality of health that’s gone down for many—particularly the lower-income demographic. According to the American Cancer society, an unhealthy lifestyle of poor eating habits, smoking and little exercise has increased cancer cases to 27 million and increased cancer deaths to 17 million in 2009. China, Russia and India are expected to have the highest rate of increase of cancer incidence and deaths and the overall global increase is expected to be 1% per year. Tobacco use and obesity are the leading causes of cancer in poorer countries. Children are developing Type 2 diabetes in America, something that was practically unheard of just 50 years ago. Residents living near natural gas drilling platforms are at an increased risk of developing neurological problems and disease. Allergies are epidemic, and scientists postulate that a too-sterile environment is to blame. Processed food is cheap and easy, but nutritionists and doctors now warn that a diet high in processed food can cause colon cancer and other health problems. Reason #4: Resource depletion and environmental destruction. Human activities have led to a rate of species extinction that is at least 100–1,000 times higher than the natural rate. Industrial agriculture and genetically modified crops have killed soil fertility and left what amounts to a chemically-dependent sponge upon which we grow plants and feed crop. We treat animals like products to be caged, injected with hormones and drugs, and slaughtered en-masse instead of treating them like creatures that can feel pain and despair. We dump industrial toxins into rivers and oceans and tell the world that the ocean is big and “can take it” when there’s an oil spill and we have to pour even more chemicals into it in order to cover up our negligence. **We don’t care that we’re poisoning the air or the waterways or causing the extinction of precious animals and plants, because all we seem to care about are jobs, economic growth, and how much money we’re going to have in our bank account.** What is the cost of all this insanity? **What else will we have to sacrifice or destroy in order to worship at the altar of this so-called progress**? SK.

To clarify, we critique a very specific form of progress: the progress that focuses on putting others down to pull ourselves up – progress premised on exploitation and domination. Only a pure critique aimed at challenging the system of ideological domination through progress can be a sufficient ethic from which to view the world.

#### This desire for exploitative reform and constant dominating progress has permeated into our educational spaces. It justifies a crackdown on critical thinking and dialogue in favor of indoctrinating students into a system of control ruled by fear of others.

Giroux ’13, [Henry A. Giroux | Violence, USA: The Warfare State and the Brutalizing of Everyday Life Wednesday, 02 May 2012 10:03 By Henry A. Giroux, Truthout | Op-Ed. SK]

**Even public school reform is now justified in the dehumanizing language of national security, which increasingly legitimates the trans- formation of schools into adjuncts of the surveillance and police state**. '3 **The privatization and militarization of schools mutually inform each other as students are increasingly subjected to** disciplinary apparatuses that limit their capacity for critical thinking **while molding them** into consumers, testing them into submission, **stripping them of** any sense of social responsibility, and convincing large numbers of poor minority students that they are better off under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system instead of being treated as valued members of the public schools. Schools are increasingly absorbing the culture of prisons and are aggressively being transformed into an extension of the criminal justice system. Many public schools are being militarized to resemble prisons instead of being safe places that would enable students to learn how to be critical and engaged citizens. Rather than being treated with dignity and respect, students are increasingly treated as if they were criminals, given that they are repeatedly "photographed, fingerprinted, scanned, x-rayed, sniffed and snooped on."" As I mentioned in chapter 2, the space of the school resembles a high-security prison with its metal detectors at the school entrances, drug-sniï¬‚ing dogs in school corri- dors, and surveillance cameras in the hallways and classrooms. Student behaviors that were once considered child play are now elevated to the status of a crime. Young people who violate dress codes, engage in food fights, hug each other, doodle, and shoot spit wads are no longer repri- manded by the classroom teacher or principal; instead their behavior is criminalized. Consequently, the police are called in to remove them is criminalized. Consequently, the police are called in to remove them from the classroom, handcuff them, and put them in the back of a police car to be carted off to a police station where they languish in a holding cell. There is a kind of doubling that takes place here between the culture of punishment, on the one hand, and the feeding of profits for the security-surveillance industries. What has emerged in the United States is a civil and political order structured around the problem of violent crime. This governing- through-crime model produces a highly authoritarian and mechanistic approach to addressing social problems that often focuses on low- income and poor minorities, promotes highly repressive policies, and places undue emphasis on personal security rather than considering the larger complex of social and structural forces that fuels violence in the first place. Far from promoting democratic values, a respect for others, and social responsibility, a governing-through-crime approach criminalizes a wide range of behaviors and in doing so often functions largely to humiliate, punish, and demonize. "lhe abuse and damage that criminalizes a wide range of behaviors and in doing so often functions largely to humiliate, punish, and demonize. The abuse and damage that is being imposed on young people as a result of the ongoing militariza- tion and criminalization of public schools defy the imagination. And ;';.':;~.n='.~m':' 74 AMERICA'S EDUCATION DEFICIT AND THE WAR ON the trivial nature of the behaviors that produce such egregious prac- tices is hard to believe. A few examples will suffice: In November 2011, a 14-year-old student in Brevard County, Florida, was suspended for hugging a female friend, an act which even the principal acknowledged as innocent. A 9-year-old in Charlotte, North Carolina, was suspended for sexual harassment after a substitute teacher overheard the child tell another student that the teacher was "cute." A 6-year-old in Georgia was arrested, handcuffed and suspended for the remainder of the school year after throwing a temper tantrum in class. A 6-year-old boy in San Francisco was accused of sexual assault following a game of tag on the playground. A 6-year-old in Indiana was arrested, handcuffed and charged with battery after kicking a school principal. Twelve- year-old Alexa Gonzalez was arrested and handcuffed for doodling on a desk. Another student was expelled for speaking on a cell phone with his mother, to whom he hadn't spoken in a month because she was in Iraq on a military deployment. Four high school students in Detroit were arrested and handcuffed for participating in a food fight and charged with a misdemeanor with the potential for a 90-day jail sentence and a $500 fine. A high school student in Indiana was expelled after sending a profanity-laced tweet through his Twitter account after school hours. The school had been con- ducting their own surveillance by tracking the tweeting habits of all students. These are not isolated incidents. In 2010, some 300,000 Texas schoolchildren received misdemeanor tickets from police officials. One 12-year-old Texas girl had the police called on her after she sprayed perfume on herself during class." **Public spaces that should promote dialogue, thoughtfulness, and critical exchange are** ruled by fear **and become the ideological corol- lary of a state that aligns its priorities to war** and munitions sales while declaring a state of emergency (under the aegis of a permanent war) as a major reference for shaping domestic policy. **In addition, the media and other cultural apparatuses now** produce, circulate, and **validate forms of** symbolic and real violence **that dissolve the democratic** bonds of social reciprocity. **This dystopian use of violence** as enter- tainment and spectacle **is reinforced through the media's incessant appeal to the** market-driven **egocentric interests of the autonomous8 individual, a fear of the Other, and a stripped-down version of secu- rity that narrowly focuses on personal safety** rather than collective security nets and social welfare. One consequence is that **those who are viewed as disposable and reduced to zones of abandonment are forced "to address the reality of extreme violence** . . . **in the very heart of their everyday life**."'Â° Violence in everyday life is matched by a surge of violence in popular culture. Violence now runs through media and popular culture like an electric current. As the New York Times reported recently, "The top-rated show on cable TV is rife with shoot- ings, stabbings, machete attacks and more shootings. The top drama at the box office fills theaters with the noise of automatic weapons fire. The top-selling video game in the country gives players the choice to kill or merely wound their quarry.""' SK

#### Thus the role of the debater as a student is to challenge the system of progress which is predicated on dominating others and stunting critical thinking.

Because the ballot has the power to endorse what is considered truthful by virtue of picking a winner, the judge must assume the role of the intellectual, whom has the primary obligation to deconstruct regimes of truth – we do not criticize to assert our own ideology as dominant and “true” but rather criticize to remove the way truth is used to conquer others. The 1AC is a method and a process of evaluating truth, not a form of truth production.

**Foucault 1984,** [Michel Foucault, “Power and Knowledge,” 1980, Print.]

It seems to me that what must now be taken into account in **[T]he intellectual is not the ‘bearer of universal values.’** **Rather**, it’s **the person** occupying a specific position – but **who**se specificity **is linked**, in a society like ours, **to** the general functioning of an apparatus of **truth**. In other words, the intellectual has a three-fold specificity: that of his class position (whether as petty-bourgeois in the service of capitalism or ‘organic’ intellectual of the proletariat); that of his conditions of life and work, linked to his condition as an intellectual (his field of research, his place in a laboratory, and political and economy demands to which he submits of against which he rebels, in the university, the hospital, etc.); lastly, the specificity of the politics of truths in our societies. And **it’s with this** last **factor that [their]** his **position can take on** a general **significance** and that his local, specific struggle can have effects and implications which are not simply professional or sectorial. The intellectual can operate and struggle at the general level of that regime of truth which is so essential to the structure and functioning of our society. **There is a battle** ‘for truth,’ or at least **‘around truth’** – it being understood once again that by truth I do not mean ‘the ensemble of truths which are to be discovered and accepted,’ but rather ‘the ensemble of rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true’, it being understood also that it’s not a matter of a battle ‘on behalf’ of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth **and the** economic and political **role it plays**. It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of ‘science’ and ‘ideology’, but in terms of ‘truth’ and ‘power’. And thus the question of the professionalization of intellectuals and the division between intellectual and manual labour can be envisaged in a new way. All this must seem very confused and uncertain. Uncertain indeed, and what I am saying here is above all to be taken as a hypothesis. In order for it to be a little less confused, however, I would like to put forward a few ‘propositions’ – not firm assertions, but simply suggestions to be further tested and explained. **‘Truth’ is** to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. ‘Truth’ is **linked** in a circular relation **with** system of **power**s **which** produces and **sustain** it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. **A regime** of truth. This regime is not merely ideological or superstructural; it was a condition of the formation and development of capitalism. And it’s this same regime **which [is], subject to** certain **modification**s, operates in the socialists countries (I leave open here the question of China, about which I know little). **The** essential political problem for the **intellectual** **is not to criticize** the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or **to ensure that his own** scientific **practice is** accompanied by a **correct** ideology, **but** **that of ascertaining the possibility of** constitution a **new** politics of **truth.** The problem is not changing people’s consciousness’s – or what’s in their heads – but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. **It’s** not **a matter** of emancipating truth from every system of power (which would be a chimera, for truth is already power) but **of detaching the power of truth from** the forms of **hegemony**, social economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time.

**Thus the standard is to break down systems of progress aimed at sustaining domination**

### Advocacy

#### Nuclear power and uranium mining embody the quest for power and are expected to grow more globally in the next 20 years than ever before.

Els ’15, [Frik Els (Frik is editor and writer for MINING.com. Frik has worked as a financial journalist for 15 years appearing in a number of business and consumer publications including British Airways in-flight magazine, Business Insider, Investment.com, Driving.ca, YCharts and Business in Vancouver. Frik was a speaker at the 2014 Global Mining Summit in Las Vegas, the Mine Lifecycle Management conference in Salt Lake City and the 2015 Canada Investment Conference in Vancouver. (DISCLAIMER: Frik Els does not own shares or hold positions in any of the equities he writes about. Nothing written should be construed as a solicitation to buy or sell any securities. Seek the advice of a broker/dealer first.)), Nuclear power to grow fastest in more than 20 years, MINING, Sep. 11, 2015, 11:21 AM, http://www.mining.com/nuclear-power-to-grow-fastest-in-more-than-20-years/, 9-4-2016. SK]

**A new report** by the World Nuclear Association **estimates global nuclear power generation capacity should grow by** more than 45% **over the next 20 years and** a new pipeline of uranium mines **will be needed after 2025**. The 40-year old association's bi-annual 2015 Nuclear Fuel report released on Thursday forecasts global nuclear capacity will grow to 552 gigawatts equivalent (GWe) by 2035 from 379 GWe or roughly 11% of world electricity supply at the moment. The report states that until the Fukushima accident in Japan, the outlook for nuclear power around the world was improving, but despite the March 2011 disaster, "many countries are putting more emphasis on satisfying environmental and security of supply objectives in their energy strategies, which should favour increased nuclear power." **The prospects for new reactor build continue to be strong in China, India and Korea as well as in a number of countries in the EU and the Middle East**, but electricity demand growth in countries where nuclear power is well-established continues to be slow. "**Nuclear electricity output is set to** increase at a faster rate **over the next five years than we have seen for more than two decades**," said Agneta Rising, director general of the association which started life in 1975 as the Uranium Institute**. To feed the rise in global capacity, the world will likely need 103,000 tonnes of elemental uranium** or tU (equal to roughly 267m pounds of U3O8) by 2035, up from 56,250 tU (146m pounds U3O8) in 2014, according to the report. Secondary supplies of uranium are gradually playing a diminishing role in the world market according to the report, but will continue to be an important source of supply as underfeeding of enrichment plants is expected to add significant quantities of uranium to the market in the period to 2025. World known resources of uranium are more than adequate to satisfy reactor requirements to well beyond 2035, but depressed uranium prices have curtailed exploration activities and the opening of new mines and some mines have stopped production. The report concludes that rapid uranium demand growth in a number of countries, particularly China, coupled with a limited contribution of secondary supplies will result in the need for additional mined uranium. Nevertheless, the market should still be adequately supplied to 2025 according to the report but only if all planned mines and those under development start up as forecast. After 2025 however a new supply pipeline will have to be developed to meet demand. SK

#### Advocacy Text: All Countries including Indigenous countries should prohibit nuclear power due to the rationale of industrialism which justifies danger to the environment. To clarify, the 1AC does not concern itself primarily with whether nuclear power results in harm to the environment but rather whether the principles on which nuclear power are founded are centered around progress.

Rozman, [Izzati Rozman (Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Terengganu, Malaysia, Faculty of English & Communication Department, Undergraduate), “ARGUMENTATIVE REPORT: SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT NUCLEAR POWER ENERGY BE BANNED GLOBALLY?”, Academia.edu, SK.]

**Nuclear power should be banned globally not because of the availability of extensive reasons that can always be put at dispute whenever the issue is being debated, but strictly because upon the ration[e]ality that the proliferation of nuclear power program in harboring nuclear energy for the industrialization purposes is indeed dangerous and risky by putting human being, open environment as well as civilization in a precarious state.** The threat of uranium mining, health deterioration due to radioactive exposure and high scale impact of industrial accident and catastrophe risk is all the potential colossal damaging threats that would cease the entire human civilization, putting the innocent lives at stake should be banned globally (Maclellan, 2014). The threat of uranium mining The danger of uranium mining over the years deftly covers explicit issues which remain underneath the discussion partly because of the nature of the process itself and the precarious unease it bring upon the subject. SK

#### A ban through legal regulation by countries is key to disrupting the dominant narrative under the rationale of progress that pursuing electricity production and industrialization and progress is a “superfluous reward” that outweighs any risk.

Rozman, [Izzati Rozman (Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Terengganu, Malaysia, Faculty of English & Communication Department, Undergraduate), “ARGUMENTATIVE REPORT: SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT NUCLEAR POWER ENERGY BE BANNED GLOBALLY?”, Academia.edu, SK.]

In the years following the major nuclear accidents at Three Mile Island in 1979 and Chernobyl in 1986, nuclear power fell out of favor, and some countries even applied the brakes to their emergent nuclear programs (Zerbo, 2014). The Fukushima Daiichi devastating nuclear disaster in March 2011 witnessing how the nuclear proliferation movement continually lost its momentum when a 9.0 magnitude earthquake and the massive tsunami annihilated Japan's Fukushima nuclear power plant. Three reactors were severely damaged, suffering at least partial fuel meltdowns and paralyzing the whole system at once (Collina & Kimball, 2010). Releasing radiation at a level only a few points less than Chernobyl, The Fukushima nuclear incident led to the displacement of 50,000 households that later serve as the direct cause of over 1500 deaths due to radioactive materials leakage. The worst nuclear incident in 25 years also tawdrily led to ban on some shipments of vegetables and fish in Japan causing an unspeakable economic and political ruckus worldwide. The event impulsively corrode widespread public opinion and cast doubt upon the safety of nuclear power if the movement was about to resurface. Prior to the incident, Germany immediately announced an accelerated shutdown of its nuclear reactors in all states alongside with broad public support while Japan perhaps with less conviction, made a similar declaration (Vignard, 2010). The incongruities of the circumstances however subsist, even to the point of sustaining its adverse phenomenon prior to the issue. Ironically, 60 nuclear plants are approximately under construction in recent years and in fact significantly contribute to the 15% of the world's electricity at present (International Energy Association, 2005). Over 150 nuclear-powered naval vessels have been built extensively in the past several years, and a few radioisotope rockets have been expansively produced making half the world’s populations live in countries where new nuclear power reactors are in planning or under construction. Despite of the critiques ranges from threats including health risks and environmental damage to the unsolved problem of radioactive nuclear waste, **nuclear power to some extend is globally accepted as a somewhat hazardous, potentially problematic, but** convenient alternative of generating electricity. Taken into context of global warming and population explosion, it is almost inevitable that the usage of nuclear power should be largely expanded (Lovins, 2006). 5 | Page **Access to energy would unquestionably be the fundamental requirement for economic development in any countries**. Prior to the fact, 1.5 billion people in the world nowadays nevertheless are not yet having accesses even to the basic form of energy, electricity (International Energy Association, 2005). As these countries grow massively in population as well as economic for the next several years, the critical demand for energy will continuously escalates and unless immediate solutions are sought there, then the current energy scarcity in these countries will positively turn severed. Recently, renewable energy like wind and solar and biomass becomes a promising alternatives in managing future energy economy. Under these circumstances, it may be theoretically possible to stabilize the climate without nuclear power. However, those energy sources cannot scale up fast enough to deliver cheap and reliable power at the scale the global economy requires and thus, there is no credible path to climate stabilization that does not include a substantial role for nuclear power in the real world (Rajaraman, 2010). Concerns about climate change, air pollution in addition to growing demand for electricity pressurizes many governments **to re-evaluate their aversion to nuclear power, reversing their phase-out of nuclear energy**, with few already extended the lifetimes of existing reactors, and many by now developed plans for new ones (Maclellan, 2014). Despite all the disregard on the nuclear consensus few years ago, **nuclear power is once again rise as a prominent alternative energy, touted as an environmentally beneficial solution** since it emits far fewer greenhouse gases during electricity generation than coal or other traditional power plants alongside impressive safety and reliability record to date. **The current dialogues on harboring nuclear energy and operating nuclear power reactor globally** are **now centers around weighing the** probability of intense risks against the superfluous rewards. Proponents of nuclear energy would argue that nuclear power is a sustainable energy source which reduces carbon emissions and is the answer for the global warming issue. Opponents on the other hand would argue that **nuclear power poses numerous threats** to people and the environment **and** although nuclear power produces virtually no air pollution, they strongly contend that **nuclear power is not a low-carbon electricity source that can help fighting climate change** (Middle Powers Initiative, 2011). These are just some of the issues involved. **The main question and the debate now would be gyrating on the issue [of] whether nuclear energy should** 6 | Page **be banned globally given the threats it possessed despite of the promising verification surrounding the claim that this is only the chance left for us in** combating against global warming issue and in **the** pursuit of growing energy demands. Let’s put all the pieces left together and at this juncture, here is our stand on this issue. **We** are hereby **resolutely** **oppos**ing the idea of **government** in **operating nuclear power** plants to produce nuclear energy as an alternative in fighting environmental issue thus **fasten our stand further that the** nuclear power should be banned globally. SK

#### This is always the first step to any other ideological or material change. The call to stop this unrelenting progress is a call to change the perceived rules of the game, evaluate the situation rationally and break from a system we became indoctrinated within. Alternate strategies must not seek to fully replace previous strategies, as a combination of strategies is always preferable.

Noble in 95, [Noble, David F. Progress without people: New technology, unemployment, and the message of resistance. Between the Lines, 1995. SK]

**Among our inherited blinders is the identification of simple technological advance with social progress**. an idea espoused by liberals and socialists alike. Late-twentieth-century Americans need not be reminded that this belief is suspect and invites a fundamental reevaluation. Given the all-too-important social costs, military, ecological, and socioeconomic. it would be wise to call a halt to rapid. undirected technological advance, if only temporarily until we regain our bearings But **we are confronted immediately with another inherited blindspot, the conviction that technological advance cannot be stopped because "You can't stop progress"** In reality. **this is a bizarre and relatively recent western notion, invented to disarm critics of capitalism**, and is readily refuted by reference to centuries of socially interrupted techno- logical development. "Protective" regulations of one sort or another have long served to buffer society from disruptive changes; the Luddities them- selves appealed to this time-honored tradition. which assumed the suprem- acy of society over mere economic activity and technological contrivance. This consistent characteristic of human society was eradicated only within the last few centuries by the rapacious champions of laissez-faire who suc- ceeded in putting "things" in the saddle. to ride mankind. It is necessary now to remind ourselves of this lost tradition and confidently to reassert it. To the dictum. you can't stop progress, we must Ieam to respond: of course you can. **There are those who have tried to undo our modern fatalism**. with little success Norbert Wiener. the father of cybemetics. appealed in the 1940s and 1950s for some slowing down of the pace of automation and warned against an impending catastrophe for labor (he erred in his prediction, but only in terms of time: he was off by a decade or two). John Parsons. inventor of numerical control and the acknowledged (by the Society of Manufacturing Engineers) "father of the second Industrial Revolution," called also for a "moratorium on technological advance. to provide time for reflection and a search for socially responsible ways to proceed." Both protests were dis- missed without a hearing. It is now urgent to revive their efiorts and extend them IIILIII. One possible strategy might be to illustrate that, **despite our espoused deference to technological advance and economic ends, our society routinely accepts certain limits** on both. For example. we are learning to live with environmental constraints on both economic and technological activities **We** also now **would reject the reinstitutionalization of slavery even if it could be shown to enhance our international competitiveness**. Yet if undue environ- mental degradation and the institution of slavery are today unacceptable, social dislocation caused by capital ï¬‚ight and technological displacement are not. How might they become so? We have environmental impact statements, why do we not have employee impact statements? Required by all employers who wish to introduce new methods, these would demand an assessment of and solutions to likely problems before implementation. "We protect the fish." one electrical worker at G.E. Lynn observed, "why not the people?" **In** April **1983**. the United States Supreme Court ruled that states have the right to "allow the development of nuclear power to be slowed down or even stopped for economic reasons" and. in a minority opinion, **two Justices** went a step further and **argued that** "a ban on construction of nuclear power plants would be valid **even if its authors were motivated by fear of a core meltdown or other nuclear catastrophe**" (e.g.. nuclear waste hazards). Might this decision serve as a precedent for banning the use of robots pending the solution of the problem of unemployment? In recent years the California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) has sued the University of California, on behalf of farmworkers and small growers, in an attempt to prevent further publicly-funded development of agricultural mechanization that serves only agribusiness at the expense of those workers and smaller farmers. The suit, still pending. has been derided as an attempt to halt progress and the CRLA lawyers have been denounced as Luddites Ways must now be found to follow their lead**. Saying no to such technological innovation serves two purposes at once.** **First. the call to stop progress reminds us that we have been** caught up in something moving**, something we never started or ever decided to partici- pate in. On the intellectual level. then. saying no brings our collective com- pulsion to consciousness and** permits us to begin to proceed on a rational basis, with our eyes **open. Second, saying no** does not **so much** arrest human history **as [but]** call into question the current form of development **and** change the rules of the game **in the present.** in line with the smashing of mental machinery, **intellectuals must strive to overcome their own and others' undue reverence for, and deference to, physical machinery,** in order to develop criteria, defences, and devices for effective resistance to technological change. No one Is against "teclinology," despite the frequently heard charge, because technology as such does not exist. Technolo exists only in the particular, as particular pieces of equiplmeptlinl 'articular settings. E erefore, oippphsitipnhto tfechnologiicial progrenss is to be! mean ng u, os op ons are 0 ereassess n e g 0 new con ions,cr era mus be developed for selectin which technologies ought to be stopped. **Technologies might be opposed**, for example: i they degrade people and diminish their freedom and control without any apparent economic or other compensating benefit; **if their technical and economic viability is ambiguous but they pose serious social problems; or if they are clearly viable in the narrow technical or economic sense but are nevertheless** destructive for society as a whole. Similarly, a technology might be elected for opposition if management depends on it heavily. **Such opposition to technologies must be defended in the public sphere**, and intellectuals might he pfully formulate persuasive defences. These mig t inclu e a moratorium in order to buy time in which to develop socially responsible procedures for their introduction, the protection of existing organizations, the guarantee of livelihoods, or the lpreseivation of communities**. Reclaiming the present must not necessarily entail an abandonment of the future**. **It remains an essentia task to develop alternative social and political visions, rediscover roads not taken, and recast science and technology according to life-enhancing criteria**. This has always been and remains a central challenge for intellectuals. But **care must be taken to ensure that such projections never substitute for present strategies, but serve rather to** complement**, inspire, and perhaps guide them**. **The danger is not utopianism**-we still need Utopia-**but the confusion of the future with the present**. if we cannot afford to abandon the future in our preoccupation with the immediate, neither can we afford any longer to concentrate upon the future and surrender the present. The two must be joined. **One illustration of how this might be done has been offered** by Mike Cooley in England. He suggests that **the development of "human-centred systems" for roduction**, such as those projects now under way at the University of Manchester, **must be coupled with shop-floor organizin and struggle**. According to Cooley, the new technological systems are meaningful po itically on y if workers can be inspired to demand that they be substituted in the present for management-designed systems, and inspired to strike or take other direct action in su port of this demand. Without such action, research projects are doomed to academic irne evance. **if opposition to technological progress helps us overcome our infantile dreams of technological salvation, it enables us also, finally, to transcend the technological mystificatlon of power in our society**. For technology has never reall been the problem, nor will it ever be the solution. Technology does not by itself destroy emocracy, nor does it bring democracy into being. If we have become a politically regressive society, as Sheldon S. Wolin suggested in the first issue of the journal democracy, it is not because of the politics of technology but because, **"hypnotized" by** ideologies of progress**, we have substituted technology for politics**. The ultimate challenge pos by the current technological assault, therefore, is for us to learn not only to put technology in perspective but also to put it aside, to make way for politics. **The goal must be** not a human-centred technology, but **a human-centred society**. **This demands, as it always has,** a confrontation with power and domination. if the lessons of the Luddites are instructive in this regard, so too is the observation of that English radical who, in 1835, summed up the matter parsimoniously, and in a manner still appropriate today: The real grievance is neither more nor less than the subjection of the labouring to the monied classes, in conse uence of the latter having usurped the exclusive making of the laws. Rents, tit es, taxes, tolls, but above all profits. Here is our distress explained in five words, or to comprise all in one, it lies in the word Dnkknu. 'lnnmnnr lndnnd. SK

### Contention

#### We use too much energy in the so-called “developed world”, a world that falsely believes that “quality of life” and “standard of living” are synonymous. With more energy sources like nuclear power, we would merely perpetuate consumerism and the military industrial complex – the dominant structures that exist today.

Kearns ’07, [Josh Kearns (Bona Fide Hill-Billy Who Currently Lives In Oakland, Ca. He’S Been A Researcher In Environmental Chemistry and Ecological Economics. Currently He’S Into Techniques For High Quality Self-Reliant Living Like Organic Farming, Natural Building, Permaculture And Bluegrass Music), The Crisis Of Too Much Energy, Matador Network, 6-20-2007, 7, http://matadornetwork.com/bnt/the-crisis-of-too-much-energy/, 9-4-2016. SK]

You may have heard of the recently announced collaboration between the University of California and BP in a big-money deal to research biofuels and thus address sustainability, tackle the energy crisis, etc. BP PLC, the green-minded oil producer, in February chose the University of California at Berkeley to help lead low carbon research, starting with biofuels. BP plans to spend $500-million over a decade. This is perhaps the biggest collaboration between the corporate sector and academia in history, all in the name of developing alternative fuels to handle the growing energy shortage. Or is it? **The real energy crisis is that we have too much energy.** **The way politicians, the media, corporations, economists, make it sound you’d think we don’t have enough now, and that we’re heading for greater demand because of population growth and economic expansion**. This is a good test for my rule of thumb about reality: whatever they’re saying on the TV news – on Fox, on CNN, – is probably just about the opposite. If you watch the news and play a game of “opposite day,” like we did in third grade, then you’ll have a better idea of the truth. Uncovering The Issues So we’re supposed to get excited that BP and UC are going to spend a lot of money (mostly public subsidies) on high-tech research and development to discover or invent technologies to solve the environmental and economic problems. They will be able to (finally) apply technology to solve the problems created by technology. Talk about fighting fire with fire! What this is really meant to do is allow us to continue conducting business-as-usual. The fundamental tenets of the faith of modern economics aren’t being questioned. This UC-BP collaboration is just the latest and most ostentatious denial and refusal to address **the only two rational questions regarding the so-called energy crisis: “What are we doing with all the energy we have now?” and, “Do we really need to do those things?”** To address the first question, I’ll offer a few examples. For one, **a ton of energy goes into the military**. The military is fighting in Iraq and elsewhere to get more energy (such as oil). If we just stopped fighting so much we wouldn’t need so much energy. Fewer people would be hurt and killed and there would be less incentive for terrorism. That solves many problems at once. **But the military contractors, engineering outfits and weapons corporations don’t like this solution**. Also, a huge amount of our energy goes towards pumping water to service industrial agriculture, along with scads of energy for fertilizers, pesticides, farm machinery and food processing and transport. In general, an all-around nightmare. If we reformed our agriculture system and embraced small-scale, self-reliant permaculture and organic agriculture systems, we could use way less energy. But the big agribusiness corporations don’t like this solution either. A Dead End Where else do we use a lot of energy? **We drive a lot**. People in cities like Atlanta commute, on average, over an hour to work, one way. That’s a lot of driving time, a lot of gas burned. Some very silly people, like me, use a lot of energy flying all around the world in airplanes to learn about and work for ecological sustainability. (I plead no contest. So it goes). **And we use a lot of electricity**. **In the average American home, the TV is on almost eight hours per day**. And it’s a double wammy **since what’s on TV is advertisements that cajole people to go out** (in their car) **and shop, shop, shop**. People going out to buy tons of crap they don’t need, because commercials have made them feel inferior. You get the point. **The energy we have now is used for destructive, wasteful, and/or unnecessary purposes**. None of the stuff I listed makes our lives any better. In fact, it makes our lives worse. Three hours round-trip commuting in Atlanta traffic sucks. I don’t care if you do it in an air-conditioned Lexus SUV. The medium of television could make our lives better but it doesn’t. Most of what’s on there is garbage. The rest is advertisement – advertisement for garbage. A Single Solution? Sometimes people ask me, “Josh, what’s the one thing I can do to really make a difference in my life and the world?” First I give them a hard time for wanting the easy way out, for looking for the one thing, the conscience-cleansing “silver bullet” they can do for a better world. Once I’ve dressed them down I tell them the best thing they can do is to stop watching TV. “It’s mind poison. Literally. Stop poisoning yourself.” Once I’ve dressed them down I tell them the best thing they can do is to stop watching TV. “It’s mind poison. Literally. Stop poisoning yourself.” If I could do one massive experiment on the whole US I would take away TV for a month. Once a chunk of the population survived the mind-poison withdrawal I bet great things would start to happen. People would shop less, exercise more, talk to their neighbors, maybe even, dare I say, read a book or plant a garden. You can bet the social and political landscape of the US would look mighty different. **The status quo assumes we need a lot of energy for a good quality of life**. On the contrary, **we have too much energy now and our use of it has damaged our quality of life and the environment as well**, **which is inextricably linked with our quality of life**. Accessing new energy sources will certainly exacerbate this problem, not ameliorate it. As an example in support of my argument I offer myself – I spent the winter living fantastically abundantly with a very small Ecological Footprint **in a locally self-reliant organic farming community in northern Thailand**. I can attest that **the quality of life is very high, despite the relatively low** (material and energetic) **standard of living**. A New Paradigm **You can also see why [for] the proponents of** the **big-money**, high-tech R&D deals like the UC-BP collaboration **will never get this. Because it’s hard-wired into their paradigm that quality of life and standard of living are positively correlated**, **even that they’re synonymous**. That’s how they can be so tremendously irrational in assuming that continually pursuing more and better technology will solve the problems created by technological expansion. You try to tell them that quality of life and standard of living for many people in the developing world (and almost everyone in the West), are inversely related and see how far you get. It’s like trying to tell conventional economists that economic growth is making us worse off instead of better off. They just won’t get it, just can’t get it. **It means calling into serious question fundamental axioms of the whole modern paradigm**. If they did they’d be out of a job and replaced with people who would more assiduously keep the dogma. Over the past century, modern civilization has behaved like a ten-year-old with a fire hose when it comes to our energy use. We need to ask ourselves what really makes for quality of life. **Our rampant pursuit and use of energy for transport and to power all sorts of new techno-gizmos, not to mention the out-and-out destruction caused by militarism, economic globalization and industrial agriculture, is killing us and the ecosystems we depend on.** The win-win solution of embracing high-quality, low energy and small footprint lifestyles is there, it just requires a bit of swimming upstream in the current cultural milieu. You can start by turning off the TV. SK

#### Even tangible reasons to support nuclear power are premised on humankind’s dominance and function to civilize and promulgate a culture of corporations where humans have conquered nature – rejection is key.

Hollo ’14, [Tim Hollo(Tim Hollo is an environmentalist and musician who has recently started Green Music Australia. He was previously communications director for Australian Greens Leader Christine Milne, and has worked for organisations including 350.org, Lock the Gate and Greenpeace, on whose board he now sits. He writes in his personal capacity, not representing any of these organisations), Nuclear power keeps the corporates in charge. No wonder it's conservatives' preferred solution to climate change, Guardian, 12-1-2014, 14, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/dec/01/nuclear-power-keeps-the-corporates-in-charge-no-wonder-its-conservatives-preferred-solution-to-climate-change, 8-14-2016. SK]

The US Christian right has long promoted this line from Genesis 1:28 as a Biblical critique of environmentalism. God is telling them, they believe, that we humans are entitled to do whatever we like with the Earth and its resources. There is, of course, a very different Biblical view. Thea Ormerod of the Australian religious response to climate change, among others, talks of the concept of “stewardship”, and the responsibility to look after God’s creation. But the “dominion mandate” dovetails so neatly with **the modern industrial idea that humanity is separate from and dominant over nature that it has become a powerful aspect of the western materialist creation story**. app Download the free Guardian app Download the free Guardian app Specially crafted for Windows 10, this app gives you full access to the Guardian's award-winning content. With automatic caching, you can keep reading even when you’re offline. Click here **Nuclear power fits perfectly within a world view that sees splitting the atom as the apogee of human dominance over nature.** Given its enormous and persistent waste problem, **nuclear power is only acceptable if you believe that it is our right to pollute as we please.** Abbott has explicitly referred to the dominion mandate, most notably in a speech about forestry early this year. Clearly, this theology influences his views on nuclear power. The second tenet is not canonical, unless you believe Jesus was making an ironic statement when he threw the money-lenders out of the temple. But the increasingly blind faith Abbott and his ilk invest in **corporate capitalism has developed a distinctly theological aura**. While it is reasonable to reject climate science, and acceptable to deny declining reef health, it is heresy to question whether handing ever more power to corporate interests will benefit the rest of us. **The privatisation of profit and socialisation of risk inherent in nuclear power only makes economic sense if you believe in the divine right of corporations**. **With multi-billion dollar cost blowouts in construction and decommissioning, the refusal of private insurance companies to cover risk, and a waste stream that will need to be managed for many times longer than our civilisation has so far existed, it’s basically a complex wealth transfer from citizens to corporations**. Advertisement **Nuclear power**’s great attraction for those who subscribe to this particular faith is that it **would maintain the corporate grip on energy infrastructure at a time when diversified and distributed renewable energy systems threaten to democratise energy supply.** Energy regulators the world over are facing increasingly panicked demands from beleaguered fossil fuel companies to staunch the loss of market share as more and more people realise that solar power makes sense. In parts of the USA, there are even proposals to make going off the grid illegal. In this context, nuclear power is a godsend. The final tenet is the central one of conservative faith - that change is difficult, dangerous and unnecessary. This, as Naomi Klein’s latest book, This Changes Everything, points out is what makes climate change so threatening for the right. The clear message of accelerating global warming caused by the fuels that have allowed industrial consumerist capitalism to develop is that we have to change direction. **If you want to deal with climate change – but your world view won’t let you contemplate changing the way we use energy, the way we consume, the way our society is structured – nuclear power provides a neat solution**. **It suggests that we can tackle climate change without really changing anything**. A pity it’s not true. Not even the International Energy Agency believes it. But then neither, frankly, do many of its advocates. Spruiking **nuclear power**, for many on the right, is not about actually promoting its use. **It’s far more important as a weapon in the culture war, promoting an idea** which buttresses their three key articles of faith: **that “man” has dominion over nature; that corporate might makes right; and that change must be avoided.** Opposition to nuclear power is**, I would emphasise, a rational position**. The evidence is stacked against it. A suite of renewable energy options can be rolled out faster and cheaper and more safely, and they can supply our energy needs - so long as we also change our profligate lifestyles. **But it is also an ethical position, based on a particular world-view; a view that we humans need to stop living as if there is no tomorrow, or there will be no tomorrow; a view that we can and should live as though all of us on this planet, human and non-human, now and in the future, matter**. Support for nuclear power is based on a world-view, but it doesn’t have the benefit of also being backed by rational arguments. It is simply a fantasy of the right, a convenient prop they occasionally produce to pretend we can address climate change while changing nothing, and a weapon in their culture war. SK

#### And, calls for facts over fear that claim that we are too ignorant are the same form of dominance the 1AC criticizes that forces us to submit ourselves mindlessly to experts who are part and parcel of the hegemonic political system*.*

MacLean ‘87, [MacLean, Douglas (Research Associate at the Center for Philosophy and Public Policy). "Understanding the nuclear power controversy." HT Engelhardt & AL Caplan (Hg.): Scientific controversies: case studies in the resolution and closure of disputes in science and technology. Cambridge, UK (1987): 567-582. SK]

**Defenders of nuclear power** sometimes charge that people are afraid **because they are hopelessly ignorant about the facts** of nuclear technologies, and led astray by an almost equally ignorant and often irresponsible press. **This account presupposes that the** -.; I I public **opposition is** basically technical, but **misinformed**. **It may be**, however, **that** the **contending parties have different** political **agendas** in the dispute that centers on this technology. The nuclear power controversy is a political war, and the participants on both sides may be pursuing other goals on the battleground over health risks and safety standards, if this is where they think they can most easily achieve them. The perception of health and safety risks, by both experts and non-experts, is strongly colored by these other factors. **Someone who thinks that nuclear technologies have bad political implications will tend to see the health risks as worse** than others see them. And someone who is acutely aware of the economic costs of safety equipment might tend to see the risks as lower than others see them. **The experts are** not without their own political axes to grind**, and objective assessments are hard to identify**. Furthermore, **any "expert" who wants to render some general judgment about nuclear power must address subjects beyond his or her area of special competence. The issues involved require a greater understanding of physics, engineering, medicine, epidemiology, geology, economics, systems analysis, psychology, management techniques**, and so on, **than any individual can muster**. So, in a sense, there are no experts, no individuals who have special insight into all the technical areas, let alone the non-technical ones. R eport from the Center for Finally, **rather than relying on experts to assess nuclear technology, people increasingly want a technology for which such** blind reliance is unnecessary. **One technology may be preferred to another because it allows those served by it to make their own autonomous decisions about its risks and costs**. **If nuclear power** requires a surrender to the authority of experts, this may itself constitute a reason to reject that technology. SK

Implications:

**A.** Nuclear Power requires us to submit to the same form of authority that we criticize as bent on ideological and material progress by conquering and civilizing the “ignorant”

**B.** Fear is a political project, and nuclear weapons are the tool – getting rid of the tool heightens the chances that we break down this political project seeking to dominate individuals.

**C.** A destruction of perceived self-efficacy denies possibilities for future change through innovation.

Bandura ’09, [Bandura, Albert. "Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness." Handbook of principles of organization behavior 2 (2009): 179-200. SK]

Rational models of motivation and decision making that exclude perceived self - effi cacy sacrifi ce explanatory and predictive power. **Perceived self - effi cacy** not only **sets the slate of options for consideration**, but also **[and] regulates their implementation**. Having decided on a course of action, one cannot sit back and wait for the performances to appear. **Making a decision does not ensure that individuals will mobilize the effort** to execute the decided course of action successfully and stick to it in the face of diffi culties. **A psychology of decision making requires a psychology of action grounded in enabling and sustaining effi cacy beliefs**. One must add a performatory self to the decisional self, otherwise the decider is left stranded in thought. **Beliefs of personal effi cacy shape whether people attend to the opportunities or to the impediments that their life circumstances present and how formidable the obstacles appear.** **People of high effi cacy focus on the opportunities worth pursuing and view diffi cult obstacles as surmountable**. (Krueger and Dickson, 1993 , 1994 ). **Through ingenuity and perseverance they fi gure out ways of exercising some measure of control even in environments of limited opportunities and many constraints.** **Those beset with self - doubts** dwell on impediments which they view as obstacles over which they can exert little control. They **easily convince themselves of the futility of effort** so they achieve limited success even in environments that provide many opportunities. SK

## 1AR Overviews

### Overview (0:48)

#### The framework is the biggest voting issue in this round. If I win that we should stop forms of progress that create domination, if I win any advantage to the aff, then, regardless of whether you prove that nuclear power solves for some forms of domination, if I prove that the process of nuclear power is premised on domination, that is sufficient for an aff ballot.

#### Remember, this debate is not a question of ends or means, but rather a question of motivation, which controls those impacts, as if both our end result and the way we do things are constrained by a motivation for domination, the terminal impact of those will always cyclically create more domination as truth becomes ascribed to those methods –that’s Foucault and Emerson.

#### Extend the Rozman evidence – the 1AC solvency advocate is amazing – it proves that we ban nuclear power based on the *rationale of industrialism* which justifies progress, and the Els ’15 uniqueness evidence that proves that nuclear power is only growing now.

#### Extend Kearns ’07– the call for more energy is co-opted by the government as extra energy is funneled into dominant structures such as corporations – Hollo ’14 proves this internal link and proves that nuclear power symbolically represents humankinds domination over nature by controlling the atom itself.

#### And, experts do not exist on nuclear power, so all of your empirics are tainted by hegemonic political structures, so prefer logic over empirics – you have conceded this warrant from MacLean ’87,

#### This also means that a ban on nuclear power is key to take a step back and evaluate the situation rationally without being caught up in progress and trusting power structures extend Noble ’95 – the two net benefits here are that (a) it is a prerequisite to rational evaluation of any other alternative as we are caught up in progress right now – that’s inherency - and the aff is a rejection of progress and (b) it calls into question the current form of development and thus we have the strongest internal link into Foucault in deconstructing truth.

There are so many power structures surrounding nuclear power that we can’t evaluate whether its good or bad so we affirm to break that apart.

### Overview (General)

The 1AC has the burden of proving that nuclear power production is a form of progress that works to sustain and reaffirm systems of domination, i.e. systems that push other people down to pull oneself up. The Emerson evidence in the framework proves that these systems of progress are bad because (a) they destroy societal connections but also (b) that this desire for exploitative reform stunts critical thinking in the debate round for students which is necessary for us to debate productively in the first place – that’s Giroux.

The 1AC meets this burden – extend the Nobel ’95 evidence that indicates that we should ban forms of energy progress such as nuclear power as it allows us to extract ourselves from an ideological system we never chose to be a part of and rationally evaluate the situation, which outweighs as it allows for better solutions to quality of life – that’s also the Kearns ’07 evidence that indicates that we have too much energy right now and that more forms of energy production such as nuclear power will only legitimize consumerist and militarist systems of domination.

Extend the Hollo ’14 evidence – corporations use the nuclear power industry to legitimize dominance *and* nuclear power is a symbol that demonstrates the apogee of human dominion over nature through the splitting of the atom and legitimization of waste dumping

Extend Falkner ’15 – the fear ptsd impact outweighs because

### OV – Internal Link Turn (0:19)

#### The 1NC claims that we need more energy in the future and this is key to some impact – this is answered by both the Noble and Kearns evidence. Multiple implications:

#### Defense - we have too much energy now it’s just distributed poorly

#### Link Turn - the call for using progress to improve this “standard of living” is a bad means– our framework criticizes the process of progress because the ultimate impact will always legitimize more exploitation and dominant structures.

#### the type of growth we sustain only leads to more consumerism and militarism and the other harms we criticize.

#### Even if we concede that your internal link is true, the link does not trigger the impact as the energy will not be funneled into (x), but rather the energy will go into the military industrial complex and dominant structures which operate under the desire for power that the 1AC dismantles, which also means that the 1AC has the greatest probability of solving for your impact as we get rid of the excess of energy which drives this obsession with progress in the first place.

### OV – One form of Oppression

#### The 1NC attempts to (link into the affirmative framework/garner offense) by focusing on one “group” that is oppressed and asserting that that form of oppression is more important. That is the exact form of ideological progress that we criticize in Emerson that prioritizes productivity and dominance over equality and acceptance.

## 1AR Extensions

### XT – Framework

#### Extend Emerson – the call for progress underpins our current epistemology which legitimizes any structural violence in favor of that progress which creates dominant power structures.

#### Extend that the “progress” we criticize in the 1AC only refers to progress premised on exploitation and putting others down to progress ourselves – we criticize the means which constrains all other impacts because even the ends are good if the action was done with domination it legitimizes a structure which cyclically sustains itself.

#### Extend the Giroux and Foucault evidence – dominant structures of progress are bad for debate

#### (a) they legitimize oppressive structures which create cyclical violence

#### (b) they stunt student creativity by making us scared of speaking out which is an *in round impact* and *outweighs* on solvency because it destroys the ability to create better solutions to problems

#### (c) they corrupt our understanding of truth which kills judge decision making as they make a decision on the truth or falsity of a position.

#### Thus, the role of us as debaters is to speak out and find ways of stunting the dominant narrative of progress

#### The role of the judge is to act to empower students by deconstructing the regime of the truth of progress which aligns itself to dominant structures to evade capture.

## 1AR v Theory

### 1AR v Theory (General)

Overview – there are two dropped implications out of the 1AC which both take out theory and link into the judges role in the round as contextualized by the 1AC. This necessitates that **(a)** the 1AC framework comes first as we must evaluate it before deliberating on accepting your starting point of theory and **(b)** the two kritiks function as offense on the prefiat layer demonstrating that the act of reading theory is proactively bad.

#### Extend Giroux ’13 – here’s the first link – theory drives the fear of punishment for insubordination or going outside the boundaries of what is deemed appropriate for kritikal engagement. This is exactly what drives the logic of someone else taking away the rights of students *and* is a form of metaphysical violence against students by cutting off their avenues for participation. Multiple impacts.

A. This validates the destruction of social reciprocity as people become focused on themselves rather than others which link turns your fairness voter as there will never be equal access in society which also outweighs on real world applicability.

B. The fear of punishment facilitates dominant power structures which legitimize themselves by threatening others to force them to conform. This means your voter proliferates fear which justifies dominance.

#### The second link is that theory creates rules or norms and is a disciplinary force which attempts to limit what is possible within the educational space which limits the capacity for critical thinking. Two impacts:

A. Destroys the ability for social activism which outweighs in the long term – even if you claim some impossibility to engage within this round, your norm of setting boundaries destroys critical thinking in the long run, which is key to solving real world issues.

B. Violates the 1AC Framework – you support the normalization of students into violent structures by denying them the way to break out.

#### These arguments also function as permutations on theory – we define what it means to be the better debater so only after destroying the fear of normalization can we evaluate your theoretical considerations.

#### And – these warrants about rules and norms and disciplinary forces being bad are conceded out of the 1AC – no new responses in the 2 NR. Implicit clash is not sufficient – my opponent actually has to answer the most important framing piece of evidence coming out of the 1AC.

### 1AR v Substantive Engagement

#### A. Your focus on your own ability to substantively engage bites into Giroux who criticizes focus on the self through personal safety which is exactly what you are doing by protecting yourself from losing the round by calling me unfair –this destroys social reciprocity which link turns your fairness voter as there will never be equal access in society which also outweighs on real world applicability – that’s Giroux ’13.

#### B. Your implication for the shell of (drop the argument/drop the debater) is definitely not consistent with your idea of substantive engagement. If I am really denying your ability to substantively engage then you should read whatever better (topical/theoretically viable) version of the aff as a counterplan instead of saying that I should be punished – this sort of punishment is what leads to the disposability of positions and ideas and people which doesn’t advance the end goal of the aff of finding a solution to obsession with progress that maintains dominance.

#### C. 1AC comes prior – the existence of dominant structures and the fear of backlash is what destroys your ability to engage in the first place – you are too afraid of exploring new areas of literature that will give you access to answer the aff because they are considered “too radical” or “not good” – the whole point of the 1AC is that we destroy the binding world view of dominating progress which means I have long term solvency – if the aff happens then people will be able to engage and think of new ways of engaging creatively in the future.

### 1AR v Competing Interps

Overview: The 1NC’s claim to competing interps is the exact form of obsession with progress that we criticize – competing interps motivates people to craft better interps just to

## 1AR (general)

### 1AR v Extinction

#### Extinction inevitable due to fear – two impacts: either (a) it makes no difference if we do the aff or the NC or (b) the 1AC’s rejection of fear is the only internal link into solvency.

Burrowes ’14, [Robert J (Apart from three decades of involvement in nonviolent action campaigns, therefore, I have been engaged in an ongoing research effort since 1966 to find answers to these two questions. The most important documents that have arisen from this research and nonviolent activism are as follows. Together they constitute an integrated and comprehensive strategy to end human violence and prevent human extinction: The People’s Charter to Create a Nonviolent World The Nonviolence Charter was launched simultaneously around the world on 11 November 2011; it invites all people to join a worldwide movement to end violence in all of its forms. Why Violence? This document offers a comprehensive explanation of why human beings are violent. The Flame Tree Project to Save Life on Earth This document outlines a comprehensive strategy to end human violence (including environmental destruction) and prevent human extinction. It was written in conjunction with Anita. The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense: A Gandhian Approach This book explains how to resist and defeat any form of military violence by using a strategy of nonviolent defence. I have presented the essence of this strategic thinking on the Nonviolent Defense/Liberation Strategy website. You can learn how to plan and implement a nonviolent defense or liberation strategy from this website. Nonviolent Campaign Strategy This website describes how to plan and implement a nonviolent strategy to achieve a peace, environmental or social justice outcome. The Political Objective and Strategic Goal of Nonviolent Actions This article explains the vital distinction, which is virtually never understood, between the political objective and the strategic goal of all nonviolent actions. It was originally published in Nonviolence Today 48, January-February 1996. pp. 6-7 but was republished in 2014. It will give you a taste of the strategic thinking mentioned above. Nonviolent Action: Minimizing the Risk of Violent Repression This article explains 20 things that nonviolent activists can do to minimise the risk of military, police and provocateur violence at nonviolent actions. It was originally published under the title Minimising the Risk of Police Violence in Nonviolence Today 40, September-October 1994. pp. 17-18 but was revised for republication in 2014. Nonviolent Intervention in Interpersonal Conflict This article explains how to safely and nonviolently intervene in violent conflicts between other individuals/groups. It was published in Nonviolence Today 44, May-June 1995. pp. 4-6. You can see a more complete list of my publications by clicking on ‘Publications’ in the sidebar. I spent five years working (full-time) as Honorary State Secretary of The Royal Life Saving Society – Australia, Victoria Branch from 1975-1981, during which I developed the philosophy and core content of what became known, in 1982, as the ‘Swim and Survive’ learner swimmer scheme. This scheme has substantially reduced the drowning toll in Australia. One of the many instructive experiences of my life was the time I spent working in the Shagarab East 2 Refugee Camp in eastern Sudan in 1985. This camp held 20,000 Tigrayan refugees who had just fled the Ethiopian war and famine. I was part of a Community Aid Abroad (Oxfam in Australia) refugee health team. Despite our best efforts, 5 people died in our camp every day. On one occasion, I was urgently summoned to perform cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (at which I had been expertly trained during my years as a lifesaver) on an emaciated three month old baby while her distraught parents looked on. I could not save her. Since 1981, I have been involved in many nonviolent action campaigns in relation to peace, environmental and social justice issues. These include refusing to vote (since 1981), the Franklin River Blockade (1982-1983), the campaign to end nuclear warship visits to Australian ports (1987-1988), the campaign to remove US military bases from Australian soil (1989), campaigns to halt the destruction of old-growth forests in south-eastern Australia (1989-1990) and the campaign to end duck shooting (1989-1990). My involvement in these and other campaigns has led to my arrest on about 25 occasions and to brief terms of imprisonment on about 15, including one in which I was imprisoned in a psychiatric ward and forcibly injected with ‘anti-psychotic’ drugs. During each of these terms of imprisonment, I have fasted until it was time for my release or I was given the organically/biodynamically grown, vegetarian wholefood that I had requested. There have been many other outcomes from my involvement in these campaigns, including the learning I did which enabled me to write and publish strategic analyses of many of them: see relevant articles in the list of publications. Apart from the campaigns just mentioned, however, the three campaigns in which I have been most heavily involved are as follows: War Tax Resistance: I have been a conscientious war tax resister since 1983. Among many outcomes, this has led to the seizure of my bank account in 1984, my bankruptcy in 1991, my conviction for contempt of court (because of my conscientious refusal to cooperate with the bankruptcy trustee) in 1992, and the seizure of my passport in 1993. You can read my defence presentation to the Federal Court of Australia during my bankruptcy trial by clicking on ‘Court Defence’ in the sidebar. Melbourne Rainforest Action Group: I was heavily involved in the nonviolent action campaign of the Melbourne Rainforest Action Group in 1988-1990. This campaign was extremely effective, substantially reducing Australia’s imports of rainforest timber from South East Asia, thus slowing rainforest destruction in that region. There is a video of this campaign, which includes graphic footage of nonviolent actions and a brief explanation of the group’s nonviolent strategy by me: Gulf Peace Team: I was a member of the international Gulf Peace Team – the 73 people from 16 countries who camped on the border between Iraq and Saudi Arabia in an attempt to prevent the Gulf War in January 1991. I wrote a strategic analysis of this experience in ‘The Persian Gulf War and the Gulf Peace Team’ in Yeshua Moser-Puangsuwan and Thomas Weber (eds.) Nonviolent Intervention Across Borders: A Recurrent Vision (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i, 2000). I also wrote the typology of nonviolent intervention on which this book is based: ‘Cross-border Nonviolent Intervention: A Typology’. I did a television interview about the Gulf Peace Team on 1 February 1991, just hours after we arrived in Amman from Baghdad: Apart from the websites mentioned above, I maintain the Global Nonviolence Network (GNN) website. The GNN lists nonviolence organisations by region and country around the world: GNN.), Why is Near Term Human Extinction Inevitable?, Columbus Freepress, 12-18-2014, 14, http://freepress.org/article/why-near-term-human-extinction-inevitable, 9-16-2016. SK]

December 17, 2014 "ICH" - If you hadn't previously heard the expression 'near term human extinction', you have now. And you will get used to hearing it soon unless you insulate yourself from reality with greater effectiveness than you are doing by reading this article. The expression 'near term human extinction' is relatively new in the scientific literature but, unlike other truths that have been successfully suppressed by national elites and their corporate media, this one will keep filtering out until you start to hear the expression routinely. Why? Because this truth is simply too big to suppress permanently and the planetary environment delivers its feedback directly to us in the form of catastrophic environmental events, climatic and otherwise, whether or not these are reported by the corporate media. It is now widely accepted that we are living through the sixth mass extinction in planetary history. The last one occurred 65 million years ago, when the dinosaurs vanished. We are now losing biodiversity at a rate similar to that time. But this mass extinction is driven by us. And we will be one of the casualties. The only real debate is when. And this debate is predicated on the unstated and highly problematic assumption that we can continue to avoid nuclear war. So what does the expression **'near term human extinction'** mean? In essence, according to those scientists who use the term, it **means that human beings will be extinct by about 2030**. For a summary of the evidence of this, with many references, listen to the lecture by Professor Guy McPherson on 'Climate Collapse and Near Term Human Extinction' Why 2030? Because, according to McPherson, the 'perfect storm' of environmental assaults that we are now inflicting on the Earth, including the 28 self-reinforcing climate feedback loops that have already been triggered, is so far beyond the Earth's capacity to absorb, that there will be an ongoing succession of terminal breakdowns of key ecological systems and processes – that is, habitat loss – over the next decade that it will precipitate the demise of homo sapiens. Now, it should be pointed out, many scientists disagree with this timeframe. For example, science journalist Scott K. Johnson endeavours to explain 'How Guy McPherson gets it wrong'. And, just recently, Dr Piers J Sellers, acting director of earth science at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, stated that 'It is almost certain that we will see a rise of two degrees Celsius before 2100, and a three-degree rise or higher is a possibility. The impacts over such a short period would be huge. The longer we put off corrective action, the more disruptive the outcome is likely to be.' See 'Wobbling on Climate Change' But even if Johnson and Sellers are right, and McPherson is wrong about the timeframe, there are still many scientists who are keen to point out that we are ongoingly breaching 'tipping points' that make human survival increasingly problematic. In 2009, for example, Johan Rockström, James Hansen and colleagues explained that three of nine interlinked planetary boundaries – in relation to climate, biodiversity loss and biogeochemical cycles – had already been overstepped. See 'A safe operating space for humanity' And, in 2012, Prof Kevin Anderson, Deputy Director of the UK's premier climate modelling institution, the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, warned that emissions are now out of control and we are heading for a world that is 6 degrees hotter; he pointed out that even the International Energy Agency, and conservative organisations like it, are warning that we are on track for a 4 degree increase (on the pre-industrial level) by 2040. He also accused too many climate scientists of keeping quiet about the unrealistic assessments put out by governments. See 'What They Won't Tell You About Climate Catastrophe' And what these assessments do not necessarily take into account is the synergistic impact of our combined assaults on the environment including those unrelated to the climate. These include the devastating assaults on the environment through military violence (often leaving vast areas uninhabitable), rainforest destruction, industrial farming, mining, commercial fishing and the spreading radioactive contamination from Fukushima. We are also systematically destroying the limited supply of fresh water on the planet which means that water scarcity is becoming a frequent reality for many people and the collapse of hydrological systems is now expected by 2020. Human activity drives 200 species of life (birds, animals, fish, insects) to extinction each day and 80% of the world's forests and over 90% of the large fish in the ocean are already gone. Despite this readily available information, governments continue to prioritise spending $US2,000,000,000 each day on military violence, the sole purpose of which is to terrorise and kill fellow human beings. The point is simply this: you are welcome to analyse the scientific evidence for yourself and make your own assessment of the timeframe and the degree of severity of the threat. Perhaps human extinction will not occur until next century. But whether we define 'near term' as 2030, 2040 or even next century, human extinction is now a distinct possibility. And after 200,000 years of our species, calling this 'near term' seems reasonable. So is near term human extinction inevitable? In my view, **human extinction is the most likely outcome**. But not simply because we are inflicting too many insults on the planetary environment. **Extinction is inevitable because of human fear and, specifically, unconscious fear: The fear in ourselves and others that is not experienced consciously but which often drives three capacities that are vitally important in any context**: **the focus of our attention, our capacity to adequately analyse the evidence** (if we get our attention focused on it) **and our behaviour in response to this analysis.** For example, if you do not know that your fear is making you screen out unpalatable information, then you won't even notice that you have turned your attention elsewhere and have now forgotten what you just read. Or your fear might prevent you adequately analysing the evidence and/or responding intelligently to it. See 'Why Violence?' and 'Fearless Psychology and Fearful Psychology: Principles and Practice' So, if you are one of the people still reading this article, you are probably less frightened than most people. The others gave up before they got to this paragraph. So let me now tell you the primary problem with the **fear**. It **distorts the mental focus, capacity for analysis and the behaviour of national elites**, that is, corporate owners and their political, military, media, bureaucratic, academic and judicial lackeys. In essence, corporate profits cannot be maximised in a world where environmental constraints are taken into account, either through sensible consideration or legal requirement, so fear will drive dysfunctional corporate activity irrespective of its environmental cost. And corporate executives will ensure that their political and other lackeys do not get in their way because the fear that drives profit maximizing behaviour is deep-seated and far outweighs any fears in relation to the environment. For a fuller explanation of this point, see 'Love Denied: The Psychology of Materialism, Violence and War' This is why lobbying elites to change their behaviour in the direction of environmental sustainability (or peace and justice, for that matter) is a complete waste of time. It is their fear that locks them into what they focus on, what they are 'thinking' and what they are doing, and arguments, no matter how sensible or evidential, cannot work. In essence then, it is fear that drives dysfunctional environmental behaviours. And, history tells us, **fear will prevent us taking sufficient action in time.**

#### Humans will be extinct because of environmental concerns anyway – the squo/CP does not solve, so the impact is nonunique. [Even then, the situation is irreversible, so it doesn’t matter if you solve]

Edwards ‘10

(PhysOrg.com) -- Eminent Australian scientist Professor Frank Fenner, who helped to wipe out smallpox, predicts **humans will probably be extinct within 100 years, because of overpopulation, environmental destruction and climate change**. Fenner, who is emeritus professor of microbiology at the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra, said **homo sapiens will not be able to survive the population explosion and “unbridled consumption,” and will become extinct, perhaps within a century, along with many other species**. United Nations official figures from last year estimate the human population is 6.8 billion, and is predicted to pass seven billion next year. Fenner told The Australian he tries not to express his pessimism because people are trying to do something, but keep putting it off. He said he believes **the situation is irreversible, and it is too late because the effects we have had on Earth since industrialization** (a period now known to scientists unofficially as the Anthropocene) **rivals any effects of ice ages or comet impacts.** World population growth chart World population growth chart. Fenner said that climate change is only at its beginning, but is likely to be the cause of our extinction. “We’ll undergo the same fate as the people on Easter Island,” he said. More people means fewer resources, and Fenner predicts “there will be a lot more wars over food.” Easter Island is famous for its massive stone statues. Polynesian people settled there, in what was then a pristine tropical island, around the middle of the first millennium AD. The population grew slowly at first and then exploded. As the population grew the forests were wiped out and all the tree animals became extinct, both with devastating consequences. After about 1600 the civilization began to collapse, and had virtually disappeared by the mid-19th century. Evolutionary biologist Jared Diamond said the parallels between what happened on Easter Island and what is occurring today on the planet as a whole are “chillingly obvious.” SK

### 1AR v Solvency

#### Global unconditional ban solves all solvency deficits – its enforced and there is a shift to renewables due to the ideology behind the ban.

Taylor ’96, [Nuclear Power and Nuclear Weapons Published by Theodore B. Taylor at July 12, 1996. SK]

Consider **the benefits of a rapid worldwide shift from dependence on fossil fuels and nuclear power** to vigorous pursuit of opportunities for using energy much more efficiently and providing that energy from renewable sources. **If nuclear power is phased out completely, it will become possible to outlaw internationally the possession of any key nuclear weapon materials,** such as plutonium or highly enriched uranium that can sustain a fast neutron chain reaction, along with any facilities that could be used for producing them. This would not require a global ban on basic research in nuclear physics nor the use of selected, internationally controlled accelerators for production of radionuclides for medical and industrial applications. A global ban on materials capable of sustaining nuclear explosive chain reactions would make it unnecessary to distinguish between alleged peaceful uses of these materials and uses that could be threatening. **It would greatly increase the likelihood that violations of a ban** on all nuclear weapons **would be detected technically** and by people who can report violations of the ban, without having to determine the intended uses of the materials and production facilities. **A complete phaseout of nuclear power would help focus the world’s attention on safeguarding nuclear materials** and safe, permanent disposal of all the nuclear wastes and spent nuclear fuel, separated plutonium, or other stockpiles of nuclear weapon materials that had been produced before nuclear power is completely phased out. All such materials could be internationally secured in a relatively small number of facilities while awaiting ultimate safe disposal. Although the quantities of these materials are already very large, applying the needed safeguards to them would be much easier than in a world in which nuclear power continues to flourish worldwide. **The job would be finite**, rather than open-ended. The costs of safe, environmentally acceptable, permanent disposal of nuclear weapon materials and nuclear wastes-costs that are now unknown, but are very large-would be bounded. **Concerns about safety and vulnerability** of nuclear power plants and their supporting facilities to military action or acts of terrorism **would disappear**. **In anticipation of a phaseout of nuclear power** **and sharp curtailment of combustion of fossil fuels, research, development, and commercialization of renewable energy sources could be greatly accelerated by a shift of national and international resources toward them and away from dependence on nuclear power** and fossil fuel systems that are inherent threats to human security and our global habitat. SK

### 1AR v Don’t solve root cause

#### Each act of pressure against nuclear power matters – we are at the very worst an essential step in the process.

Bowling et al ’86, [Strategy against nuclear power Friends of the Earth (Canberra) Published by Friends of the Earth (Canberra) in January 1984, ISBN 0 909313 27 X (pdf of original). A condensed version was published in Social Alternatives, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1986, pp. 9-16. This article has been written collectively by members of Friends of the Earth (Canberra). The main authors are Jill Bowling, Brian Martin, Val Plumwood and Ian Watson, with important contributions from Ray Kent, Basil Schur and Rosemary Walters. In addition, valuable comments were received from Alex Anderson, Mark Diesendorf, Russell Fisher, Barbara Hammonds, Sue McGrath, Therese Quinn, Ariel Salleh, Cynthia Shannon, Gill Shaw, Bill Standish and Ann Thomson.. SK]

While it is important to bring direct pressure to bear against institutions with pro-nuclear policies and practices, it is also necessary at the same time to provide alternatives to replace these institutions. Building these alternative institutions can take place at all levels of society, from small groups to large organisations. Local groups. **The obvious place to begin constructing a politics which is decentralised, participative and self-reliant is in small local groups**, such as anti-uranium groups themselves. **Instead of replicating the hierarchy, dominance relations and sexism found in state bureaucracies and corporations, small local groups can organise themselves in a non-hierarchical, participatory fashion**. For example, it is important to give everyone a chance to contribute, to encourage the sharing of skills, and to ensure full participation in both the boring tasks and the exciting opportunities. This helps make each person's contribution important. Activist groups constantly face problems arising from the intellectual division of labour. Different levels of expertise within a group can lead to 'power games' as different people cash in on the status which attaches to greater knowledge. Often strategies may be fragmented when irritation arises between those who want to 'talk about' issues and those who want to 'do things'. When an activist group deals with government bureaucracies, it faces officials who habitually use a monopoly on expertise or information to evade their accountability to the community. Patriarchal structures usually reinforce the intellectual division of labour. For example, masculine rationality is often used by bureaucrats to discredit humanitarian considerations by defining them as 'idealistic' and not in touch with 'practical realities'. Similarly, bureaucrats may refuse to deal with egalitarian organisational frameworks and insist on dealing with hierarchical office bearers because of the 'need' for 'administrative efficiency'. Activist groups can consciously undermine both the intellectual division of labour and patriarchal structures in their daily practices. For example, in organising community education projects (such as speaking engagements and workshops) activists can simultaneously engage in self-education. People with more expertise in the group can form partnerships with those who have less expertise and together engage in letter-writing, leaflet production, speaking engagements and so forth. In spreading the expertise around like this, activist groups are not only fostering egalitarian practices and harmonious group dynamics, but they also are constantly challenging the legitimacy of the intellectual division of labour. Similarly, activists need to continually challenge masculine rationality. In submissions to inquiries and in simple day-to-day dealings with government bureaucracies, activist groups should question narrow terms of reference and narrow criteria of efficiency and economy. Activists should pose the issues of long term outcomes and the desirability of the social goals which bureaucracies implicitly aim for. Many of the methods used in nonviolent action training can be used to foster egalitarianism in social action groups. One model is the affinity group, in which personal support within the group plays an equal role with achievement of tasks. Affinity groups have played a big role in civil disobedience actions against nuclear power in many countries since the mid-1970s. Participatory, non-hierarchical local groups provide an alternative to the institutions promoting nuclear power. By promoting local initiative and nonviolent direct action, local groups provide an alternative to the state where power is based on centralised administration and on violence. By consciously confronting interpersonal dominance relations, local groups can empower women and help to undermine patriarchy. Local communities. Local groups, however democratic and participatory, do not by themselves challenge large-scale patterns of social organisation or energy use. The next level beyond local groups is local communities: neighbourhoods, councils, towns or other groupings of people with shared physical surroundings and social interactions. Local communities are a logical place to promote energy efficiency, planning to reduce energy use and intermediate-scale renewable energy technologies. Possibilities include planning to reduce dependence on cars by fostering walking and bicycling, local production of food, solar hot water heating for groups of houses and intermediate-scale wind generators. Some of the rural communes and 'alternative lifestyle' communities, such as Nimbin and some religious retreats, have begun taking steps in these directions. When assessing the role of such groups, it is important to distinguish between alternative and oppositional. There is an important political difference between someone who simply finds a different way of life and wishes to be left alone with it, and someone who finds a different way to live and wants to change the society in its light. For example, rural communes which aim at self-sufficiency as an end in itself do not fundamentally challenge the structures which trap most people into alienating and destructive lifestyles. However, things like food co-ops, learning networks and, more specifically, projects like the proposed development of community-controlled, intermediate-scale wind power in northwest Tasmania are oppositional actions. In challenging supermarkets, schools and the Tasmanian Hydroelectric Commission, these actions hold out the promise of intervening in the lives of many more people in the community than simply those involved in the action. They can be part of a restructuring of lifestyles in general. Just as important as the alternative planning and technologies is the social organisation and decision-making processes which go along with them. Participation could be encouraged by general meetings, or by meetings of representatives of street committees. One way to encourage participation but avoid the creation of a new elite of planners would be to choose community-level coordinators by lot. People each year could be chosen randomly, as they are for a jury, to fill perhaps one quarter of the positions on a community-level planning committee. As each person would serve four years, this would ensure continuity of participants while involving a cross-section of people with no special vested interest. Bureaucracies. One of the obstacles faced by environmentalists is bureaucracy, which is a form of organisation built around hierarchy and the division of labour. Alternatives to bureaucracy exist, such as autonomous work groups and coordination by committees of representatives chosen by work groups or by lot. Large powerful bureaucracies will not wither away on their own. To democratise them will require lots of patient effort to foster the alternatives by activists inside and outside established bureaucracies. Environmentalists have usually tried to work through bureaucracies by lobbying in the right places or working on the inside. There is a need to also democratise bureaucratic structures: state bureaucracies, corporate bureaucracies, and political party and trade union bureaucracies. There are several ways to go about democratising bureaucracy. Spreading information. Since bureaucracies are based are monopolising key information at the top, democratising knowledge is an important tool in challenging bureaucracies and building alternatives. The efforts by the antinuclear movement to spread knowledge about nuclear power and to expose the values underlying nuclear expertise have played a large role in reducing the public legitimacy of the state bureaucracies promoting nuclear power. Working with activists inside bureaucracies. Inside critics have played a crucial role in campaigns against nuclear power by providing information about political developments and occasionally speaking out in public against them. Insiders will also play a vital role in efforts to democratise bureaucratic structures. Pushing for freedom of information and other constraints on bureaucratic autonomy. Secrecy and centralised control of information have been important tools in the promotion of nuclear weapons and nuclear power by states. Any means for breaking information monopolies will be helpful to the opposition. Pushing for changes in bureaucratic structure. Rather than just pushing for equal opportunity for women and other groups within the existing structures, these struggles can be linked with pressure to redefine the direction and organisation of bureaucracies, for example by reducing the number of levels in the hierarchy, sharing of tasks and allowing freedom for groups to organise their work collectively. Efforts to democratise bureaucracies can be linked with more overtly environmental goals. For example, pushing for more community participation in energy planning can be linked with arguments for allowing government bureaucrats more freedom and initiative. Campaigns for trade union action on environmental issues can be linked with campaigns for more rank and file participation in formulation of trade union policies. One of the most effective combinations of environmentalists, local communities and trade unions was the Builders' Labourers Green Bans campaigns of the early 1970s. It was responsible for rescuing many of the older residential areas of Sydney and Melbourne from high-rise office development. This campaign was most effective when it involved grassroots community activists linking up with rank and file unionists, and it was at its weakest when governmental bureaucrats and management or union officials moved in. Indeed, the campaign was eventually sabotaged when the Federal executive of the union staged a 'coup' against the radical NSW branch. A more democratic union structure, one which would have allowed the rank and file to retain control, would clearly have strengthened the environmental-community-union alliance. Since the state is bureaucratic in form, efforts to democratise bureaucracies help to weaken and provide an alternative to state power. Bureaucracies also thrive on and foster inequalities in knowledge, and foster typically masculine values such as the separation of intellect and emotion. Building alternatives to bureaucracy thus strikes at the roots of the institutions underlying nuclear technology. **It sounds like just about every major institution in society must first be challenged and replaced before nuclear power can be stopped. It's not quite like that**. **Opposing nuclear power can be done at different levels: education, community activities, rallies and civil disobedience to apply pressure within existing institutions**, **and at the same time efforts for long-term institutional change towards equality, participation and democracy**. These efforts reinforce each other. Direct pressure to stop nuclear power helps restrain the expansion of the power of the state, technocracy and other institutions behind nuclear power. And long-term programmes to build alternatives help lay the basis for future anti-nuclear campaigns. SK

### 1AR

The framework sets up how forms of progress that sustain domination is bad, the advocacy sets up how we aim to stop nuclear power *strictly* on the premise that the form of industrialization nuclear power supports is the same form of obsession with constant growth regardless of the consequences that we criticize. The two contentions lay out why nuclear power is a form of progress that aims to sustain domination 🡪 the first contention speaks to material domination be it by corporations or industry or the military, and the second contention speaks to how nuclear power is a form of progress that emphasizes fear over harmony and allows for governmental domination of people.

### 1AR UQ Wall

Conca ’16,

In the wake of the COP21 climate meeting in Paris, which subtly endorsed nuclear power, and the aggressive move by China to build a nuclear plant a month, the supplies of uranium are once again in the spotlight. The price of uranium for fuel in nuclear reactors has had a complicated history over the last forty years (see figure below). After the 2011 Tohoku tsunami and Fukushima reactor accidents, uranium prices dropped about 60%, bottoming out near $30/lb in mid-2014. By late 2013, all of Japan’s nuclear facilities were completely shut down. Other countries also closed nuclear power plants, including Germany and Switzerland. However, reliance on brown coal, and large-scale wind and solar systems, have neither met the climate needs of Germany, nor provided reasonable and stable electricity costs in Japan. Uranium Spot prices are driven by either production (which is driven by demand) or by inventory (excess amounts of uranium from weapons stockpiles that were blended down for fuel). The Fukushima disaster dropped prices again by significantly reducing demand since Japan was the third-largest producer of nuclear energy at that time, behind the United States and France. Source: Cameco, MarketWatch and AAPG EMD 2015 report Uranium Spot prices are driven by either production (which is driven by demand) or by inventory (excess amounts of uranium from weapons stockpiles that were blended down for fuel). The Fukushima disaster dropped prices again by significantly reducing demand since Japan was the third-largest producer of nuclear energy at that time, behind the United States and France. Source: Cameco, MarketWatch and AAPG EMD 2015 report ADVERTISING But uranium prices are recovering and the outlook for the uranium market has brightened for several reasons: - Japan restarted nuclear reactors at the Sendai power plant a few months ago, and about 40 of Japan’s 54 nuclear plants will likely be restarted. - China’s current and planned construction of nuclear power plants is a good indicator of future uranium demand. Mainland China has 26 nuclear power reactors in operation and 25 under construction, according to the World Nuclear Association, with almost 100 more planned by 2030. Recommended by Forbes Asian Appetite For Nuclear Power Bullish For Uranium And Miners Fossil Fuels Still Rule But Don't Worry -- We Have Plenty Of Uranium CargillVoice: How McDonald's Leveraged A Key Partnership To Verify Sustainable Beef SAPVoice: Energizing Investments And The Future Of Uranium Iran - The Deal Is Done MOST POPULAR Photos: The Richest Person In Every State TRENDING ON FACEBOOK Why Are So Many Millennials Opting For Pets, Not Parenthood? MOST POPULAR Photos: The Most Expensive Home Listing in Every State 2016 MOST POPULAR The Empty FedEx Flight That Costs $30K - India is also in the midst of a major expansion of nuclear-power generation. The country’s installed capacity is now at 5.7 GW, but that is set to grow to 10 GW in just the next four years, which puts pressure on global uranium demand. - In the United States, about 90% of our existing reactors will soon be relicensed for another 20 years, many for another 40 years, keeping the United States the biggest producer of nuclear power for at least ten more years until China completes their 100 new units. However, idling Japan’s reactors for a few years caused Japanese utilities to accumulate about 120 million pounds of uranium since they still had to honor their existing supply contracts. This is enough to fuel its restarting fleet for the next decade. In fact, according to Jim Ostroff, senior editor of Platts Nuclear Publications, “Japan is swimming – some would say drowning – in uranium.” And this is probably why uranium prices have stayed under $40 a pound. But while other energy commodity prices, particularly oil, have drastically fallen lately, uranium prices have stabilized. Uranium spot prices are usually driven by production (which is guided by demand) or by inventory (especially excess amounts of uranium from weapons stockpiles that can be blended down for fuel). As shown in the above figure, for the 20 years following 1980, abundant stockpiles of weapons-grade uranium in the Soviet Union and the United States were blended down for reactor fuel as part of treaties aimed at reducing the number of nuclear weapons. This kept uranium prices, and uranium mining production, low. When those stockpiles were mostly used up, prices became more volatile. The Fukushima disaster dropped prices again by significantly reducing demand since Japan was the third-largest producer of nuclear energy at that time, behind the United States and France. However, the price of uranium has little effect on the price of nuclear power since the fuel is such a small part of the total cost and the cost of fuel itself is dominated by the fabrication costs, not the cost of uranium. Decisions to build nuclear power plants do not hinge on uranium supplies. And there are sufficient uranium deposits in the world to provide nuclear energy at any level for many thousands of years. Eighty-nine percent of the fuel requirements of the current fleet of nuclear reactors worldwide, totaling some 377 million pounds U3O8 (yellowcake), will be met in 2016 by Canada, Australia, and Kazakhstan, with only smaller supplies from other sources. In contrast, the U.S. will consume more uranium than anyone else in the world, about 50 million pounds of U3O8 in 2016. Yet, we produce less than 5 million pounds domestically. As uranium prices rise, however, more in-situ uranium mines in the U.S. should come on-line. Thirteen states contain known deposits and new discoveries, with Virginia most notable because of a large, recently discovered deposit in that state. Although China produces only 4 million pounds of U3O8 annually, the country consumes 19 million pounds per year. China’s planned increase in nuclear energy will raise that amount to over 70 million pounds by 2030. Looking at the uranium picture in total, uranium commodity prices most likely will rise, driving stock prices up, driving new exploration and processing plant construction, and causing new rounds of mergers and acquisitions of uranium properties and their companies. This was foreshadowed last April during the first India-Canada head-of-state visit in 42 years. In Ottowa, Prime Minister Narendra Modi of India signed a five-year deal to buy 3,000,000 lbs of U3O8 for his country’s reactors, an agreement worth almost $300 million, or about $40/lb U3O8. Oddly enough, this was also the first nuclear contract between these two nations. So an increase in global nuclear power, led by China, should stabilize uranium prices at somewhere between $40 and $60 per pound in the coming decade. Just in time for a new expansion of nuclear energy and its role in addressing global warming. For more information on this subject see the I2M Web Portal which monitors the global activities of the uranium, thorium, and rare earth exploration and mining industry. The Portal contains about 5,000 entries drawn from reports, media articles and other sources available on the Internet for use by geoscientists and the general public, and for use during assessment of activities for the independent AAPG Energy Minerals Division’s Uranium Committee on Nuclear and Rare Earth Minerals for the committee’s Annual and Mid-Year reports to the EMD (full disclosure – I am a member of that committee).

### 1AR Advocacy

#### The aff is key to derailing the syste

Rozman,

The main issue being argued in this paper is whether the nuclear power should or should not be banned globally. Several claims are supported by the related premises to illustrate the danger and damaging threats of nuclear power. The first premises is the threat of uranium mining, second premise is health deterioration due to radioactive exposure and third premise is the high scale impact of industrial accident and catastrophe risk. To summarize the arguments made on the issue, the threat of uranium mining destroy the livelihood of indigenous people, depleting precious potable water resources and bring hazardous effect towards human and environment. Talking about the issue of health problem, the radioactive exposure significantly contributes to high risk of cancers occurrences among the children, infiltration of radioactive waste inside the individual DNA and exposure to the radiation among unskilled labor. To explain the high scale impact of industrial accident and catastrophe risk in managing the nuclear power, three major underlying grounds includes the impact of ageing risk issue, the prospect off the earthquakes hazards and power failure caused by the thunderstorm effect. In opposing the proponent’s idea on banning the nuclear power’s globally, the ratio nales made by the opponents are: First, nuclear power energy is sustainable and renewable. Second, nuclear power is economical and cost effective. Third, nuclear waste can be dealt with effectively. Regarding the claim that nuclear energy is sustainable and renewable, among those premises are uranium is abundance and will last for hundreds of years, nuclear energy is highly efficient and there are many novel source of uranium apart of the conventional one. In elucidating the claim that nuclear energy is far more economical and less effective, the premises are based on the grounds that building nuclear plants require minimal capital and relatively small area compared to dam, concentration of power in nuclear energy is far more economical and finally nuclear energy economies of scale are improving securing safer operation. The last claim 20 | Page reside around the idea that the nuclear waste can be dealt adequately given the premises to support the claim argued that nuclear energy waste can be recycled, nuclear waste is minimal, solid and manageable and lastly technologies for breaking-down radioactive waste are currently being developed. In rebutting the counter argument provided by the opponent on this issue, several claims are made. First, nuclear energy is not sustainable in long term and not renewable. Second, nuclear energy is never economical. Third, nuclear energy cannot be dealt with adequately. **Nuclear energy is not sustainable in long term and renewable in the future, because uranium for nuclear energy is not a renewable resource, massive demand for the water supply and thorium is not the answer for the uranium shortage.** Nuclear is never economical because first, nuclear energy is too costly to be competitive, secondly nuclear plant construction runs over time and budget and third, centralized nuclear energy production is unproductive. The third point regarding nuclear energy cannot be dealt with adequately are supported by three main premises. Firstly, transporting highly radioactive nuclear waste is public safety concern. Secondly, reprocessing nuclear waste is not a viable environmental solution and thirdly, there are no really effective ways to store the waste. As a conclusion, we as the proponent on this issue are steadfast in our decision to propose that **nuclear power should be banned globally** **because** upon the rationality that the proliferation of nuclear power program in **harboring nuclear energy for** the **industrialization purposes is** indeed **dangerous** and risky by putting human being, open environment as well as civilization in a precarious state. The threat of uranium mining, health deterioration due to radioactive exposure and high scale impact of industrial accident and catastrophe risk is all the potential colossal damaging threats that would cease the entire human civilization, putting the innocent lives at stake should be banned globally.

### 1AR industry

Aung ’15,

Modern human cannot survive without energy. We need energy for cooking meals (Sar Yae), producing clothes (Wut Yae) , for building and decorating homes (Nay Yae). It is known and well accepted by everybody and doesn’t need to elaborate. Apart from 3 basic human needs, energy and electrical power play crucial role in development, social sector, education, health, transportation and industrialization for a nation. We get energy and electric power from various sources; namely (a) from coal (b) fossil fuel and natural gases (c) hydro-power (d) solar-power (e) wind-power (f) geo-thermal-power (g) ocean wave and tidal-power (h) single use & rechargeable batteries (i) fuel cell and (j) nuclear power. Some are clean and absolutely renewable such as solar, hydro power, wind, ocean wave and tidal power. Some are renewable but no so clean such as geo-thermal, rechargeable batteries, and fuel cell. Most powerful yet dangerous to develop, operate and dispose of the waste is power production using atomic reactors. For comfortable environment lighting of homes, offices and factories is essential. We need to cool down in homes and working places in tropical countries, where the weather is warm in many months of the year. On the other hand, heating of homes and work places are essential for inhabitants to be comfortable and productive in their work in temperate countries. All in all, constant supply of electricity is needed for different type of industries, where goods, appliances, tools, instruments, machines, modern communication equipments and gadgets, vehicles, aircrafts, ships are manufactured. For instance, steel mills consume huge amount of power to convert pig iron blocks to liquefied iron, mix with ingredients such as carbon, alloys & chemicals to change into different type of steel, alloy, bars, rods, H beams, sheet metals etc. In mining industry, changing the mineral deposit and ores from the mines to concentrate metal blocks also require huge amount of power. Hospitals need uninterrupted electricity supply 24 hours a day, for many health care functions and operation of patients. Many leading industrialized countries have developed big power sources to feed and satisfy the ever increasing demands for power in many industries and factories. Coal burning produces heat, which in turn boil the water into steam inside a boiler. Steam runs a steam-turbine to generate electricity. Gravity flow of water from a water fall or elevated surface of a dam feeds into a water turbine at a lower point which generates hydro-electricity. Then power from fossil fuel and gases entered into the power generation industry. Other renewable powers such as solar power, wind power, geo-thermal power, tidal power are supplementing the ever increasing power demand. In the mid-1940s country like United States developed nuclear power and they were able to make nuclear bomb. In addition nuclear power was also used for peaceful purposes such as supplying electric power to the manufacturing industries. As a result consumer goods, machineries, equipment and tools from advanced countries in North America and Europe had flooded into the global consumer markets. Although defeated in the second world war, Japan and West Germany emerged as leading export countries of consumer products including but not limited to industrial equipment, vehicles and modern appliances. Then nuclear energy was entering to the power sector with huge impact. Many nations have opted to develop nuclear power for peaceful purposes. Currently if one looks at the top 20 economically successful and industrialized countries in the world, there are no countries without nuclear power plant providing power to their advanced industries. On the other hand, there are so-called nuclear free zones in our world. It is nevertheless true that countries with nuclear power plants [for peaceful purposes] are more advantageous in competing economy since they can supply adequate power to their advanced industries. But so-called emerging economies and developing countries leg behind in fulfilling essential power to the industries, economic and social development. Can we ever become industrialized without adequate power supplies? We in Myanmar have abundant rivers to tap hydro-electricity. Gasified turbines can produce power too. On one hand power usage is ever increasing by flourishing industrial estates and ever increasing public utility with abundant end electrical appliances, which are inevitable for a society aspiring for better living standards. In not so distant future, we will definitely have to use electric trains both in the cities as well as inter-city train transportation. On the other hand the Government has been striving to generate & supply more power, using several power generation technologies, into the national grid. But it is worth looking into alternative power source such as nuclear power, some technocrats argue. Understandably, some areas might criticize and disagree with the idea for soliciting to look into the peaceful utilization of nuclear power. If so please see the list of current top 20 industrialized countries in the world which have successfully utilized the nuclear power for peaceful purposes so as to make their countries industrialized. We might become “peaceful, modern and developed nation” if we opt, after reviewing all pros & cons, for the above mentioned alternative and supplementary power generation for our light, medium and heavy industries, manufacturing, food processing and public utilities for future generations.

### 1AR args

* Foucault and Emerson imply that attempting to assert some truth merely transfers power which means that kritiks cannot link into the affirmative framework unless if they are a criticism of epistemology?
* Asserting one form of oppression as bad is exactly the form of truth production that Emerson and Foucault criticize – attempting to civilize a misguided form of thought by asserting one group as worse off than another.
* Kearns link turns any argument that says that we need more energy to sustain growth because (a) more growth and progress that puts people down are bad and (b) the type of growth we sustain only leads to more consumerism and militarism and the other harms we criticize.
* Even if the 1NC impact is extinction, we criticize the concept that because extinction will occur due to a lack of growth we should privilege growth because there are unintended consequences that we gloss over.
* Nobel justifies permutation and sequencing – we must break from our intellectual mindset of progress in order to find other solutions to problems.
* You have to justify why technological progress is good for society as a whole – improving systems because of some risk of harm is not a reason to negate
* CPs don’t solve the aff – we don’t say radiation and the like is bad but rather that industrial progress is bad

Go for kearns and go for contention 2

A sacrifice of

2002 – study by Vandura – militarism in Iraq – endorse governmental action for invading country

## 1AR v Kritiks

### AT: One form of oppression

#### We criticize your epistemological focus as well – we say that the analyzation of the structures precludes

### AT: Wilderson

The negative completely misunderstands the 1AC. They concede that the thesis of my advocacy is to break down the domination of what we would deem to be ‘the other.’ This makes the 1AC at worst a hard no link to the Kritism. However, I argue that when the thesis of my AC in conceded I am in internal link turn to solving the impacts they claim in the 1NC.

Frist, Extend my Emerson 11 Evidence from FW. This calls out the type of domination that the negative claims. Our construction of dominating nature is the same way we dominate people we deem to be ‘the other.’ I tell you out of the 1AC that our exploitation of others will lead to our destruction. Meaning No link.

Second, Extend my Giroux 13 Evidence that calls out the domination in this space. My opponent’s narrow focus on the affirmative advocacy ignores the domination that I attempt to break down in this space. This is damning for the neg because Giroux would indicate that this narrow focus causes the same type of domination to be replicated; meaning by their own logic they should be dropped for their insistence on ignoring educational domination to advance their own fetishized liberal progress. This is both a voter and a turn to the K.

Third, Contention 2 becomes the tie breaker. They concede that radiophobia is a unique form of psychological harm. Additionally, extend the Bandura 09 evidence. This is key because when we sacrifice our autonomy in order to securitize ourselves we justify any form on violence or impact. This becomes a disad to the alternative. In a world where radiophobia still exists the destruction of ‘the other’ becomes inevitable.

The perm debate is the easiest way to vote in the round.

First, Perm do both: When they concede that im breaking down our ideological construction of domination the plan is a literal action of the alternative.

Second, Perm do the plan while embracing the alternative: Cross apply the no links and my articulation from the previous perm. They don’t give you a warrant of why post alternative the state will magically be gone. This means the incramentalist approach of the 1AC can strategically be a liberatory politic.

Third, Perm do the plan and then the alternative: Either the alt can overcome the one instance of the plan or it was always going to fail. In a world where they have no case specific links prefer the aff evidence to the implications of the advocacy.

### 1AR v Black Nihilism (2:18)

**The negative completely misunderstands the 1AC. They concede that the thesis of my advocacy is to break down the domination of what we would deem to be ‘the other.’ This makes the 1AC at worst a hard no link to the Kritism. However, I argue that when the thesis of my AC in conceded I am in internal link turn to solving the impacts they claim in the 1NC.**

#### First, Extend my Emerson 11 Evidence from FW. This calls out the type of domination that the negative claims. Our construction of dominating through progress is the same way we dominate people we deem to be ‘the other.’ I tell you out of the 1AC that our exploitation of others will lead to our destruction. Meaning No link.

#### Second, Extend my Giroux 13 Evidence that calls out the domination in this space. My opponent’s narrow focus on the affirmative advocacy ignores the domination that I attempt to break down in this space. This is damning for the neg because Giroux would indicate that this narrow focus causes the same type of domination to be replicated; meaning by their own logic they should be dropped for their insistence on ignoring educational domination to advance their own fetishized liberal progress. This is both a voter and a turn to the K.

#### Third, The 1NC falls to the fatality induced by the logic of progress – we believe nothing can be done because society is not focused on the harms that we care about. However, the disruption of the logic that we can’t do anything because the system is larger than is crucial to solving the harms of the link, and precludes the alternative. This is a sequencing permutation – the affirmative must come first.

Evans ‘14, [Mahseaevans(), Hope Matters: Black Nihilism in the Post-Ferguson Moment, Reflect Black: African American Cultural Criticism, xx-xx-xxxx, xx, https://reflectblack.wordpress.com/2014/12/07/hope-matters-black-nihilism-in-the-post-ferguson-moment/, 10-9-2016. SK]

Cornel West is a larger than life character; an impressive man paradoxically enrobed in the simplicity of his all black three piece suits. He is a whirlwind of wisdom whipping through vectors of verbosity leaving listeners both charmed and challenged by the appearance of his wide smile, and wild hair. Admittedly, I find his presentation of prophetic earnestness in the Obama era a “little much” at times. He aspires to be that lone wolf archetype; righteously crying out in midst of a meadow of the fawning uncritical masses. Still, despite my reservations on his present public persona, there is not much I can argue with substantively and his brilliance is undeniable.Cornel West With that, I did not know what to expect when reading his book, Race Matters. Surprisingly, the short essay format and his elegant yet accessible language made the text very approachable and his concepts clear. Though written decades ago, it still seems particularly relevant for today. West argues that the usual approaches to confront the issues of racism from traditionally liberal or conservative perspectives are not enough. These paradigms of action inevitably fail because they do not adequately address the “murky waters of despair” that lead to nihilism. West defines nihilism as the “profound sense of psychological depression, personal worthlessness and social despair so widespread in black America.” He also associates it with the “lived experience of coping with a life of horrifying meaninglessness, hopelessness, and (most important) lovelessness.” Paul Goodnight Paul Goodnight This destructive feeling is baked into the makeup of a white supremacist society that originally regarded black bodies not as humans, but as commodities to be exploited and later as masses to be regulated or incarcerated. However, West points out that throughout history, blacks combated racist systems by implementing multiple modes of resistance including the creative and cultural ways that sought to protect the spirit of the people; a project of soul survival. Today, **there remains an insistent need to sustain and create new “powerful buffers” that counter the racist cultural narratives of black worthlessness** in order to affirm that black lives do in fact matter. Events like the unrest in Ferguson and the non-indictment of the police officer who killed Eric Garner in Staten Island can lead one to become seduced by a insidious cynicism; a disposition of the soul that causes one to give up and give in to despair. **Hopelessness is equivalent to a type of death, therefore life-affirming efforts to combat nihilism is vital**. Scriptures says that “**where there is no vision, the people perish**.” In like manner, **where there is no hope, there is no sense of meaning or motivation to continue the struggle for a more just world**. Author and cultural critic **Ta-Nehisi Coates talks about the existential threat of nihilism especially within the Ferguson moment.** **He discusses the** presence of **fatalism and** the **rage that can** sometimes **stem from the feelings of hopelessness and helplessness**. The thrust of his argument is that, **despite its justification, “fatalism is not an option” because it saps the energy to fight on to make life better for future generations**. He argues that **our own presence today is the evidencing or manifestation of the hope of our ancestors**. As such, we are obligated to struggle on and resist the urge to give up. Coates discussed these ideas while being interviewed by Chris Hayes on MSNBC. The whole segment is worth the watch! West ends his first chapter by exploring an idea which he terms a “politics of conversion.” It is an approach to making change rooted self love and in restoring a “hope for the future and a meaning to struggle.” Maybe the task for today’s leaders, and especially spiritual leaders within the black community, is to not only support political efforts to effect change, but to creatively re-imagine new ways to equip our communities against the existential and spiritual threat of nihilism. I wonder what **new creative expressions and methods could emerge if we allow our spiritual imaginations to be unfettered and free**? Still, no matter what strategies of resistance and self-affirmation develop as we navigate through this Ferguson moment, one thing that will always remain true is that hope matters. I conclude with a song by Mos Def, as he reminds us that “there is always a way, no matter what they say.” SK

#### Third, Contention 2 becomes the tie breaker. They concede that radiophobia is a unique form of psychological harm. Additionally, extend the Bandura 09 evidence. This is key because when we sacrifice our autonomy in order to securitize ourselves we justify any form on violence or impact. This becomes a disad to the alternative. In a world where radiophobia still exists the destruction of ‘the other’ becomes inevitable.

The perm debate is the easiest way to vote in the round.

First, Perm do both: When they concede that im breaking down our ideological construction of domination the plan is a literal action of the alternative.

Second, Perm do the plan while embracing the alternative: Cross apply the no links and my articulation from the previous perm. They don’t give you a warrant of why post alternative the state will magically be gone. This means the incramentalist approach of the 1AC can strategically be a liberatory politic.

Third, Perm do the plan and then the alternative: Either the alt can overcome the one instance of the plan or it was always going to fail. In a world where they have no case specific links prefer the aff evidence to the implications of the advocacy.

#### Now on the Line by Line

1. No link – we do not embrace the state but rather use it as a heuristic to our own ends – means the state is a means to an end which devalues it

2. No link – crosapply the advocacy text that the 1AC is not concerned with ends so we are NOT SAYING that we aim to magically fix things but rather say that critiquing the motivation behind action is the first step.

3. We break down the state – the MacLean Kearns and Noble ’14 evidence are good on this question as we say that we need to take a step back and destroy the underpinnings of what sustains the state

4. Energy sustains militarism and violence by the state – that’s Kearns – means that 1AC is comparatively better because we gut the ability for the state to exercise dominance

5. We outweigh on real world – you are an ideological critique, but when people die because of militarism and the violent structures imposed by white privilege every single day you have to prioritize their lives over a fancy critique that says that we break from the state

6. No alt solvency – Warren might be a good author but you have not utilized the evidence well – nihilism cannot solve the hope that you criticize because it too attempts to “Make the world better” through ideology

7. No alt solvency – you magically fiat that we remove ourselves from the state but that links in harder because it is the type of parasitic whiteness that IGNORES STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS to say that BLACK PROBLEMS CAN BE SOLVED.

8. If anything the 1NC alternative IS THE AFF – we say that systems of progress that sustain domination are bad and that we should break down progress

9. Perm do both – recognize the state as a system of progress that sustains domination which means our epistemological position resolves the harms of the alt and the contention is a net benefit

## 1AR Contention

### 1AR v Biodiversity

#### Brook and Bradshaw’s article fails – multiple methodological problems

Henle ’16, [Henle, Klaus, et al. "Promoting nuclear energy to sustain biodiversity conservation in the face of climate change: response to Brook and Bradshaw 2015." Conservation Biology 30.3 (2016): 663-665. SK]

We agree with **Brook and Bradshaw** (2015) that pragmatic decisions on future energy mixes should be made without prejudice. They assessed different techniques for electricity generation based on a selected number of criteria. Using a multicriteria decision analysis (MCDA), they concluded that nuclear energy ranked particularly well relative to costs for biodiversity in terms of land consumption and human safety risks. **There are several problems with their assessments**. They equated the application of MCDA with objective evidence (Supporting Information), provided incomplete cost data, and treated different types of human safety risks for the different energy sources as identical. **Their data are**, in part, **questionable, they ignored criteria important for human safety risks and biodiversity effects**, **and** they **considered technological innovations only for nuclear energy.** Each of our four primary points of contention (outlined under the next four headings) is detailed in a separate online appendix (Supporting Information). Costs and Dispatchability As far as costs are concerned, **it is important to consider the total costs**, as opposed to looking solely at the financial costs for consumers, as Brook and Bradshaw did. Consumer costs distort the real costs because significant financial costs are transferred to public budgets. For example, in Germany, nuclear power has at all times been supported by public money (€219 billion from 1970 to 2014 [Küchler & Wronski 2015]). Brook and Bradshaw compared costs for energy sources for 2018. Farther in the future, the costs of renewable energy sources will fall more quickly than nuclear energy costs. Even now, the cost of nuclear power is barely competitive with renewable energy sources, and the cost of nuclear power plant construction (at least in the European Union) is not competitive with the construction of renewable energy infrastructure (Gawel & Strunz 2014). Brook and Bradshaw declare that their cost data include long-term waste management and plant decommissioning, but their reference does not provide information on this. Radioactive waste handling has to cover thousands of years. Thus, estimates of costs for waste management are highly sensitive to assumptions about discount rates; therefore, their overall costs of nuclear energy are very uncertain. Even if nuclear power were largely independent of natural conditions in terms of dispatchability, plant-cooling technologies would require different, but in each case, large volumes of water. Often, nuclear power plants are situated along rivers and may be shut down during heat waves, as has occurred in France. Human Safety Risks Brook and Bradshaw used deaths from accidents as an indicator of human safety. **Using data from Wang** (2008), **they concluded that nuclear energy has the lowest human safety risk of all energy options. The data this contention is based on are not comparable.** For example, their value of 0.04 deaths/TWh of nuclear energy applies to occupational fatalities, whereas for hydropower the value includes public fatalities. There are other problems with their estimates of human risk. Wang (2008) provided an explanation about how he calculated deaths resulting from the Chernobyl accident. He used a web-based press release (WHO et al. 2005) that reported substantially fewer fatalities than the original estimate (Cardis et al. 1996) to which the press release can be traced. Using the midpoint of estimates of thyroid cancer deaths in Europe (EC 2011) and accounting for the increase in stillbirths (Scherb & Voigt 2010), we calculated 42.5 fatalities/TWh due to the Chernobyl accident, which is 1150 times higher than the fatality rate Brook and Bradshaw reported. This risk is substantially higher than for any other energy source, except for coal. Our risk estimate is very conservative because it does not include other causes of deaths, genetic damage, or other nuclear-plant accidents and ignores safety concerns related to normal operations of nuclear power generation. Even if one were to disagree with our arguments in regard to safety, to provide an objective evaluation, Brook and Bradshaw should have cited studies that did not support their beliefs and then provided reasons for their objections to that research. Impacts on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services We agree with Brook and Bradshaw that habitat loss, pollution, and climate change are major drivers of biodiversity decline. They accounted for habitat loss through land appropriation for fuel mining and energy generation, and justified excluding mining of uranium by assuming that fourth-generation nuclear power plants will make further mining obsolete (see Technological Innovations below). **They did not account for biodiversity impacts of pollution from energy generation**. This is appropriate for energy sources whose main impacts are related to climate change and land appropriation. These are not primary concerns with nuclear energy; rather, impacts from radioactivity are paramount. Dramatic impacts are well documented. Radioactive contamination from Chernobyl spread over 40% of Europe and territories in Asia, northern Africa, and North America (Yablokov et al. 2009). Biodiversity impacts were substantial across vast areas and included morphological, physiological, and genetic disorders in every plant and animal species studied from within the highly contaminated fallout area (Yablokov et al. 2009). **All major taxonomic groups investigated displayed reduced population sizes and species richness in highly radioactive areas of the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone** (Mousseau & Møller 2014). Similar impacts were reported after Fukushima (Mousseau & Møller 2014). Early aging and genetic disorders occurred in moor frogs (Rana arvalis) 40 years after the Mayak accident (Pyastolova et al. 1996), and the accident in Seversk created an intense malformation hotspot for amphibians (Kuranova 2003). Hesse-Honegger and Wallimann (2008) found increased rates of eye, head, wing, and leg anomalies in insects in the vicinity of power plants. Ecosystem services were also lost due to the Chernobyl accident. More than 18,000 km2 of farmland in Belarus was heavily contaminated and the 1300 km2 Polessk state radioactive reserve is excluded from any economic activity in perpetuity (Yablokov et al. 2009). **Major impacts of nuclear power generation on biodiversity and ecosystem services have occurred over an area orders of magnitude larger than calculated by Brook and Bradshaw for any other energy source evaluated by them, and they treated carbon emissions as a separate problem**. **One would only be able to ignore this fact and make a just comparison of biodiversity impacts among energy sources, if impacts were minor or if such accidents could be completely ruled out in the future**. We agree with Brook and Bradshaw that demanding zero risk is asking for the impossible. Technological Innovations Brook and Bradshaw considered technological innovations only for nuclear energy, which creates biases. They argue that environmentalists’ concerns do not apply to fourth-generation nuclear power plants and contend that the solution to radioactive waste is to consume all previously generated nuclear waste as fuel. However, fourth-generation nuclear power technologies still need substantial research and development (IAEA 2013). So far, biodiversity impacts of uranium mining remain a problem, as does waste storage. Before the 1980s, several countries dumped nuclear waste in cheap drums in the sea to save money, and those drums have already corroded (Clark 1986). The ASSE II, a German interim underground storage facility, which has been misused as a final storage facility, is in danger of collapsing due to insufficient stability of structures and uncontrolled incursion of salty water and it is unknown what and how much materials, including plutonium, are stored there. Cleanup of this waste remains challenging (BfS 2010). These challenges do not lend much credibility to the promises of fourth-generation power plants to resolve the radioactive waste problem. Conclusions We agree with Brook and Bradshaw that all low-carbon options should be free to compete on a fair basis. The prerequisite should be that different types of risks are not treated as if they were the same. Brook and Bradshaw fail in this respect with their assessments of costs, human safety risks, biodiversity impacts, and technological innovations. They ignore the impacts of nuclear energy production that they account for with other energy options. For example, they ignore the problems of major concern solely or primarily for nuclear energy, such as any transgenerational effects. They based some of their crucial arguments about nuclear energy upon information on websites and ignored easily accessible published reviews (e.g., Yablokov et al. 2009; EC 2011; Mousseau & Møller 2014). It is not surprising that nuclear energy performed better than alternative energy options under such selective use of information. Brook and Bradshaw purport to provide an objective assessment and an evidence-based conclusion, but they fail to realize that their personal preference (which we infer from their article) for nuclear power may have biased their results and that other MCDA calculations might lead to the opposite conclusion. The optimal energy mix cannot be calculated and is ultimately subject to a societal balancing of all factors, including (to a great extent) intangible costs and uncertain future developments. Our criticisms should not be misinterpreted as blindness to the biodiversity effects of renewable energy sources, as Brook and Bradshaw impute to proponents of renewable energy. We are fully aware of such effects and that we must look for ways to reduce them. We believe that a reduction of energy demand and higher energy efficiency are the only solutions with minimal human safety and biodiversity risks. Conservation professionals should promote these pathways, rather than promoting an energy option with extraordinarily high safety risks. If nuclear energy goes wrong—as it has repeatedly in the past—it will affect the life of tens of thousands, if not millions of people, and have impacts on biodiversity from the genetic to the ecosystem level across areas spanning vast portions of entire continents. SK

#### You do not mention poverty reduction – unless if specifically mentioned biodiversity conservation fails without it –

Adams et al ’04, [Adams, William M., et al. "Biodiversity conservation and the eradication of poverty." Science 306.5699 (2004): 1146-1149. SK]

The problem with this strategy is that its **impacts on poverty are often negative**. **The creation of protected areas causes the foreclosure of future land use options**, **with** **potentially significant economic opportunity costs** (9). The creation of protected areas can have substantial negative impacts on local people. The eviction of former occupiers or right holders in land or resources can cause the exacerbation of poverty, as well as contravention of legal or human rights (10–14). Globally, it is recognized that **the costs of biodiversity conservation are not distributed in proportion to their benefits** (15). Typically, many of the costs of protected areas in poor biodiverse countries are paid by local people (16). The 7th CBD COP called for an assessment of Bthe economic and sociocultural costs of protected areas (including the cost of livelihood opportunities foregone), and policies to ensure that they are equitably compensated[ (8). By the start of the 21st century, a remarkable international agreement on the urgency of global poverty elimination had made the relation between biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction an important element of debate about conservation policy (1, 13). The meaning of poverty may be intuitively obvious, but its measurement is complex. Common definitions are based on monetary (such as per-capita income) or nonmonetary (such as health or mortality) criteria, although broader approaches have been suggested (17, 18). In 1999, 1.2 billion people worldwide had consumption levels below $1 a day and 2.8 billion lived on less than $2 a day (17). Poverty is not a static condition, but it is estimated that between 300 and 420 million people live in a state of chronic poverty (always or usually poor) (19). The first of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), agreed on in 2000, was to halve, between 1990 and 2015, both the proportion of people whose income is less than $1 a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger (20). **National poverty reduction** strategies are central to attempts to achieve poverty elimination (21, 22). There is a clear **need** for these **to be integrated with national sustainable development strategies** (1, 23). The UN MDGs are premised on such integration, with the area of land protected to maintain biological diversity being an indicator of performance against MDG Goal 7 (Bto ensure environmental sustainability[). However, the co-listing of poverty elimination and environmental goals does not mean that integrated solutions are possible or that protected areas can contribute to growth and poverty reduction in poor countries. Indeed, the separation by the MDGs of environmental sustainability issues from development goals alarms some observers (24). It has even been suggested that the urgent global push for poverty reduction has subsumed or supplanted conservation goals (1). Combining Conservation and Development Goals The combination of poverty elimination and biodiversity conservation goals has been approached in various ways. The specific problem of the social impacts of protected areas has been recognized by conservation planners for two decades. The principle that the needs of local people should be systematically integrated into protected-area planning was agreed to at the third World Parks Congress in Bali in 1982 (25). In 1992, the president of IUCN–The World Conservation Union argued that ‘‘if local people do not support protected areas, then protected areas cannot last’’ (26). IUCN’s director general now suggests that protected areas should be seen as ‘‘islands of biodiversity in an ocean of sustainable human development,’’ with their benefits extending far beyond their boundaries (27), but this is still an aspiration. Delegates from the human rights and minority peoples’ movements prominently voiced concern at the persistence of such impacts at the fifth World Parks Congress in September 2003 (28). There are coherent calls for better understanding of the social impacts of protected areas (29, 30). Beyond protected areas, the question of whether it is possible to combine poverty elimination and biodiversity conservation relates to the more general debate, familiar REVIEW 1 Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 3EN, UK. 2 Fauna & Flora International, Great Eastern House, Tenison Road, Cambridge, CB1 2RS, UK. 3 School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford, Mansfield Road, Oxford, OX1 3TB, UK. 4 Resource Africa, Post Office Box 198, Cambridge, CB3 0TF, UK. 5 Department for International Development, 1 Palace Street, London SW1E 5HE, UK. 6 International Institute for Environment and Development, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, UK. 7 Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Falmer, Sussex, BN1 9RE, UK. 1146 12 NOVEMBER 2004 VOL 306 SCIENCE www.sciencemag.org on September 12, 2012 www.sciencemag.org Downloaded from to conservation scientists, about the environmental dimensions of development. In the 20th century, the dominant approach was to push for economic growth first and assume that environmental problems (and indeed improved social welfare) could be sorted out later. Economists argue that as economies grow, they can invest in cleaner technologies and less resource-depleting processes: Arguably, an ‘‘environmental Kuznets curve’’ can be observed in industrialized and newly industrialized countries, with improvements in factors such as air pollution (31). In the 1950s and 1960s, development planners paid scant attention to environmental impacts, whether focusing on poverty elimination, the creation of high-productivity agriculture, or physical infrastructure such as dams or industrialization and the associated problems of pollution (32, 33). Critics of this technocratic top-down development focused on its environmental and social failures (33, 34). The need to improve the environmental record of development gave rise to the second approach to the environmental aspects of development, in the concept of sustainable development, which underpinned the 1980 World Conservation Strategy document (33). As developed since, notably at the World Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, the concept of sustainable development was extended to make explicit reference to justice, equity, and the elimination of poverty. World leaders agreed that biodiversity and resource conservation must be fully integrated into strategies for economic development and are essential elements of sustainable livelihoods at local scales (35). It is widely argued that biodiversity underpins the livelihood strategies of the rural poor (16). These political and policy insights have been accompanied by the emergence of new academic subfields that offer integrative transdisciplinary insights into social-ecological systems (36). Sceptics point to the large element of wish fulfillment in arguments about the possibility of win-win solutions in sustainable development (1, 33, 37, 38). A strong body of opinion, however, maintains that poverty elimination and conservation can happen together. The term ‘‘pro-poor conservation’’ has been used to identify conservation strategies that are designed to deliver both poverty reduction and biodiversity protection (39, 40). But is this confidence in win-win solutions justified? Lasting positive outcomes of conservation-with-development projects are elusive (41, 42). Projects that seek to integrate conservation and development have tended to be overambitious and underachieving (41–44). Although it is desirable to satisfy the goals of biodiversity and poverty reduction simultaneously, it may only be possible under specific institutional, ecological, and developmental conditions [such as in long-lasting field projects in small human communities in fragile ecosystems (1)]. The links between biodiversity and livelihoods, and between conservation and poverty reduction, are dynamic and locally specific (34, 45). In most cases, hard choices will be necessary between goals, with significant costs to one goal or the other. The acceptability of these costs will vary for different organizations and actors. Diverse Relations Between Conservation and Poverty Reduction Clarity over the choices between biodiversity conservation and poverty elimination goals is essential. The desire to package projects as delivering win-win solutions plays down the incompatibilities between goals. Equally, exclusive conservation or development goals can be blind to alliances that favor both (1). We therefore offer a conceptual typology of the relationships between poverty reduction and conservation in order to promote a clearer understanding of them. The typology presents four different ways of looking at the connections and disconnections between poverty reduction and conservation, reflecting positions in the current debate. It includes both the moral and pragmatic dimensions of arguments for the conservation of biodiversity and the reduction of poverty. Disentangling these makes for clarity. 1) Poverty and conservation are separate policy realms. This position sees poverty elimination and conservation as quite different problems comprising distinct sectors of policy concern. Thus, conservation is a legitimate objective that can be pursued independently of any benefits in poverty reduction (and vice versa). Under this position, conservation strategies would focus on the establishment of protected areas or approaches such as direct payments (46). If poverty is recognized as an important cause of conservation failure, the response is the designation of further critical biodiverse habitat and the stronger defense of protected areas, rather than the dissipation of scarce conservation resources to maintain diversity across landscapes or in poverty alleviation activities (37, 38). This position sees conservation benefiting poverty reduction indirectly where it secures ecosystem services that yield economic benefits to society, such as enhanced water yields from forested catchments (47, 48). There may also be local opportunities for win-win strategies that combine biodiversity and poverty reduction [such as protected-area tourism arrangements (49)]. However, this position holds that trying to combine conservation with poverty reduction everywhere risks misallocating limited conservation resources and compromising biodiversity preservation (37, 38). The key to the success of conservation is the establishment and effective management of a complete global network of protected areas selected because of scientific criteria and owned or legally established by the state or legitimate private owners. Success is measured in terms of biodiversity criteria, not of measures of social development (6). 2) Poverty is a critical constraint on conservation. This position makes the empirical, pragmatic argument that poverty limits conservation success to a sufficient degree that biodiversity conservation will fail if it does not successfully address poverty elimination. Such a position might be expected in a scenario where poor people were overharvesting wild species, poaching critical species, or colonizing and cultivating biodiverse land, and if the political or economic costs of stopping them (such as by a conventional strict protected-area strategy) were prohibitive. Poverty reduction would be undertaken in this instance simply as a means to achieve more effective conservation. This position holds that to achieve its goal, conservation must provide (and be seen to provide) effective contributions to poverty reduction, including both net benefits to the poor and the avoidance of significant local costs to any social group. Conservation organizations will invest in addressing the poverty of critical protected-area neighbors and actors with the power to disrupt conservation programs. Examples of policy action include classic park outreach strategies (such as service provision to neighboring villages, employment for local people, and participation in park planning processes) and incomegenerating projects (such as sharing revenue from wildlife tourism in protected areas, integrated conservation-development projects, or the provision of locally acceptable alternatives to lost resources) (41, 43). 3) **Conservation should not compromise poverty reduction.** This position recognizes that conservation agencies have conservation as their primary goal, but it holds that in pursuing that goal they should, at a minimum, not increase poverty or undermine the livelihoods of the poor. This position was adopted at the Fifth World Parks Congress in 2003, but has its critics (27). Examples of strategies resulting from this position might include codes of conduct for conservation organizations, social impact assessment of protected areas (29, 30), and the payment of the full local opportunity costs of conservation in protected areas (50). Conservation strategies might also seek to generate positive economic benefits for local communities within constraints of biodiversity conservation targets, for example through nonextractive use [such as ecotourism (49)] or R EVIEW www.sciencemag.org SCIENCE VOL 306 12 NOVEMBER 2004 1147 on September 12, 2012 www.sciencemag.org Downloaded from harvesting within sustainable limits [such as safari hunting, medicinal products, or biomass products (51, 52)]. **This position** differs from the empirical claim in position 2 that poor people, if ignored, will undermine conservation. Rather it **reflects independent moral and political obligations on conservation agencies to take account of human poverty**. It is a claim that recognizes that conservation action can be sustained despite negative social impacts (53). It applies even where it is possible to do conservation effectively without benefiting poor people. 4) Poverty reduction depends on living resource conservation. This position rests on the empirical claim that financially poor and socially and politically marginalized people depend on living species in biodiverse ecosystems for livelihoods and ecosystem services, and that their livelihoods can be improved through appropriate conservation activities (33). Conservation is therefore a tool for achieving poverty reduction, with the sustainable use of natural resources being a foundation of strategies for achieving poverty reduction and social justice. Biodiversity benefits not immediately necessary to this goal are a secondary gain. This position might lead to the rejection of a protected-area strategy because, except under special circumstances (for example, where shares of ecotourism revenues exceeded all other forms of land use), protected areas were unlikely to achieve poverty reduction goals. Alternative approaches would include the sustainable use of living resources to optimize economic return and/or positive impacts on the rural or urban poor (54). Examples of policy include conservation programs outside protected areas; for example, to promote the local management of common-pool resources within the constraints of ecological sustainability such as fisheries, wildlife, grazing, or forestry that are targeted at improving the livelihoods of the poor (54–56). Conservation in response to this position tends toward the maintenance of yields of harvestable species and ecosystems rather than the preservation of biodiversity. Outcomes may deviate to a greater or lesser degree from biodiversity conservation targets. This principle is reflected in the ‘‘ecosystem approach’’ adopted by the CBD in 2000 (57). Conclusion No position outlined here suggests that either the conservation of biodiversity or the elimination of poverty are improper goals. All positions are consistent with the call for conservation organizations to identify and monitor the social impacts of their work, and to take corporate responsibility for operating in a socially accountable manner (29). They are also all consistent with the need for poverty alleviation efforts, and wider projects for the development of humankind, to have regard to their demands, or footprint, on the biosphere (3, 58, 59). Different agencies (and different individuals) are likely to wish to adopt different positions. For example, differences in thinking about the balance to be struck between poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation underlie different positions in the ‘‘parks versus sustainable use’’ debate (37, 38, 54, 60). Those advocating strictly enforced protected areas in poor developing countries to guarantee the maintenance of populations of vulnerable species (such as forest primates) are adopting position 1, treating the problems of extinction and poverty as separate. Those advocating programs to tackle the poverty of people living around such parks in order to persuade them not to trespass or hunt are adopting position 2, seeing poverty as a critical constraint on conservation. Those who would seek to increase the flow of revenues from such parks to a level that would fully compensate all stakeholders for associated opportunity costs of the park are adopting position 3, attempting to ensure that conservation does not increase poverty in any way. Those who propose conservation strategies building on the needs of local communities for sustainable harvests of wild species resources, and not necessarily a formally declared protected area at all, are adopting position 4, seeing conservation strategies based on sustainable use primarily as a means to reduce poverty. **Policy that fails to take account of the diverse relationships between conservation needs and the demands of poverty reduction**, and the related consumptive demands of the growing world economy, **risks failure** (1). **Organizations committed to the preservation of species** and those committed to sustainable rural livelihoods based on natural resource use **are likely to engage with issues of poverty and biodiversity in very different ways.** Their interactions will be facilitated if they can understand their mutual positions. **The recognition of different starting points** in the way in which biodiversity conservation and poverty elimination goals are prioritized **is essential if there is to be success** in identifying common ground and differences between biodiversity and development organizations. Such recognition will facilitate the task of those who believe that the goals must be achieved together. It is premature to abandon attempts to combine conservation and development. The elimination of poverty and the preservation of biodiversity are two distinct objectives. Each may be driven by different moral agendas, but there is considerable overlap in practice. At the local scale, the policy need is to reconcile the interests of different stakeholders in the management of the natural resources of biodiverse ecosystems (45). The larger challenge is to allow human society to meet its potential and share the fruits of economic growth while sustaining a biosphere that not only sustains full ecological functions but retains its living diversity (3, 34). SK

### 1AR v Desal (0:40)

#### Desal fails – feasibility concerns means it can’t solve your impacts and destroys water sources

Hiltzik ’15, [Michael Hiltzik (Michael A. Hiltzik (born November 9, 1952) is an American columnist and reporter who has written extensively for the Los Angeles Times. In 1999, he won a beat reporting Pulitzer Prize for co-writing an article about corruption in the music industry. In 2004, he won a Gerald Loeb Award for Distinguished Business and Financial Journalism.[1] ), Desalination plants aren't a good solution for California drought, latimes, 4-24-2015, 15, http://www.latimes.com/business/hiltzik/la-fi-hiltzik-20150426-column.html, 9-17-2016. SK]

As surely as the hot, dry Santa Ana winds bring blue skies to the coast and wildfires to the hills, severe California droughts bring calls to build desalination plants up and down the seashore. All that ocean water, begging to be converted to fresh and pumped into our pipelines, would solve our water supply problems instantly and permanently, boosters say. In the coming months, the drumbeat will only get louder. That's not only because the current drought is the longest and most severe in memory, but because a $1-billion desalination project scheduled to start operating in Carlsbad this fall will be attracting lots of attention. The plant, the largest of its kind in the U.S., is designed to provide San Diego County with about 50 million desalinated gallons a day, about 7% of its water needs. "A lot of people are watching what's going to happen in Carlsbad," says Peter MacLaggan, the executive overseeing the project for its developer, privately held Poseidon Water. "They're going to base their future decisions on the success of this project." That could be a mistake. MacLaggan himself doesn't expect desalination to be "a major component in our lifetime" of the state's overall water supply, although Poseidon has proposed to build a second desalination plant, in Huntington Beach. That plant is still awaiting approval from the California Coastal Commission. **Enthusiasm for desalination tends to overlook its high costs**, **which stem in part from its enormous energy demand and weighty environmental footprint.** The **modern process, known as reverse osmosis, involves forcing seawater at high pressure through a membrane that screens out the salt, leaving behind a heavily brackish residue**. In Southern California, which has become more dependent on fossil-fueled electric generation since the shutdown of the San Onofre nuclear power plant, Carlsbad arguably will be moderating the effects of climate change on the region while also contributing to the greenhouse gas emissions that help cause it. (MacLaggan says Poseidon will buy carbon credits and restore local wetlands to offset the plant's environmental impact.) "There are definite advantages to seawater desalination," says Heather Cooley, water program director at the Oakland-based environmental think tank Pacific Institute. "It's a reliable supply, independent of weather conditions like drought. But it's still among the most expensive water supply options." Let's take a look at the hard realities. As big industrial facilities, **desalination plants can't be plunked down just anywhere on the coast without destroying the qualities that attract people to the shoreline**. Yet the plants need to be close to customers, with room for pumps, pipelines, inflows and outfalls. **Poseidon rejected three locations before settling** on the Carlsbad site, which is next to NRG Energy's Encina Power Station. That allowed the new plant to share the seawater-cooled power station's water lines, which reduced its cost and its impact on marine life. Even so, according to a 2012 state appeals court ruling, the plant had to install extra equipment to reduce its marine impact in periods when Encina isn't running; if the power plant shuts down permanently, the desalination plant may have to submit a new environmental impact report. The San Diego County Water Authority has committed to purchasing the plant's entire output for 30 years — a deal that was crucial for Poseidon's financing — for about $2,100 to $2,300 per acre-foot, plus inflation. An acre-foot is 325,851 gallons, or about a year's usage for one or two five-member families. The county agency, therefore, will be paying at least $110 million a year, whether it needs the plant's water or not. San Diego water bills are projected to rise by an average of $5 to $7 a month to cover the cost. The county judged that it might pay about that much in the future for other imported water, which makes the commitment look like a long-term hedge against a continuing water crisis. But desalinated water is far more expensive than other existing sources. San Diego currently pays $923 per acre-foot for treated water from the Metropolitan Water District. The Pacific Institute reported in 2012 that San Diego could obtain recycled water for as little as $1,200 per acre-foot, and that the marginal cost of water obtained through conservation and efficiency measures was as little as $150. San Diego is making a risky bet that may be ill-advised in a crisis. "**Investing in desalination is not a good way to address a drought**," says Henry J. Vaux Jr., an emeritus water economist at UC Berkeley, "because **by the time you finish it the drought is over**." That's what happened to Santa Barbara, which began building a $34-million desalination plant during the drought-stricken 1980s. By the time it was completed in 1992, the rains had returned; the facility went through a few weeks of pilot testing, then was mothballed and partially dismantled. The city is now contemplating restarting it at a cost of $40 million, plus $5 million a year in operating costs. That would place the cost of desalinated water at about $3,000 an acre-foot and drive up average monthly household water bills to $108 from $78 today. Santa Barbara's experience has been replicated on a much larger scale by Australia, which after 2006 invested more than $12 billion in six desalination plants — the largest of them twice the capacity of Carlsbad's — only to mothball four in 2012, after returning rains overfilled the country's reservoirs. The least visible cost, of course, is environmental damage. Ocean inflows suck up and kill larval marine organisms. At the other end of the desalination cycle, **the salt extracted from seawater produces a heavy brine to be pumped back into the ocean, potentially destabilizing the ecology around the outflows**. "Dumping water that is saltier than seawater into the ocean isn't harmless," says Vaux, who contributed to a 2008 blue-ribbon study of desalination for the National Research Council. "Some organisms can't survive, others move in — the ocean isn't a great big garbage can." Few studies have tracked the environmental impact of dumping on Carlsbad's scale for a long period. It may be premature, at best, for MacLaggan to say that it "truly is a benign impact" compared with that of diverting water from waterways in Northern California to send south. San Diego, which is more dependent on outside water than most populous California communities, may be the best location in the state for a big desalination project. Other jurisdictions, including Santa Cruz and five Northern California water districts, have taken a look at the technology and backed off because of its expense and environmental implications. Assertions that desalination is an easy answer to California's water crisis should be taken with more than a grain of, well, salt. SK

#### Nuke power doesn’t solve costs – price of water is a major factor

Lallanilla ’14, [Marc Lallanilla, Assistant Editor(), Getting Soaked? Desalination Plants Face Scrutiny, Live Science, 2-20-2014, 14, http://www.livescience.com/43531-carlsbad-desalination-plant-scrutiny.html, 9-17-2016. SK]

The Carlsbad Desalination Project will use reverse osmosis, a reliable technology that uses fine-pored, cylindrical membranes to filter salt, other minerals and impurities out of seawater. Reverse osmosis has become more practical, as recent advances in membrane technology have made the technique more cost-effective. Nonetheless, it still takes about 2 gallons (8 liters) of seawater to make 1 gallon (4 liters) of freshwater, according to a 2013 report from the Pacific Institute, a nonprofit environmental and economic research group. And **despite advances in energy** recovery, **separating salt from saltwater remains a very energy-intensive enterprise**. As a result, many desalination facilities are cogeneration plants, which use the heat generated from another process to convert salt or brackish water into freshwater. **Nuclear power plants**, for example, **create intense heat and require water to cool their reactors** and generate steam. **That same heat can be used to distill freshwater from seawater.** Energy costs debated **It's the energy costs associated with desalination that make the technique** — once the stuff of engineers' pipe dreams — **such a pricey endeavor**. The San Diego County Water Authority has agreed to purchase the water from Poseidon Water, the Carlsbad plant's operator, for about $2,000 an acre-foot for 30 years after the plant goes online. (An acre-foot is the volume of water that would cover an acre with one foot of water — about 326,000 gallons, or 1,234 cubic meters.) The trouble is, that **cost is almost double what the agency now pays for water, and will** raise ratepayers' bills **by about 10 percent**, according to NBC News. That rate hike has some critics of the Carlsbad desalination project crying foul. "**The only way to make desal[ination] work is if there's some guarantees that the** price of water **can be lowered**," Leila Monroe, an attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council, told CNBC. It's not just ratepayers who are taking a dim view of the economics behind desalination: In 2013, financial and investment analysts at Fitch Ratings gave the Carlsbad project's bond issue a BBB- rating, the lowest rating possible for investment-grade debt, the Times reported. Proponents of desalination projects like the one at Carlsbad, however, have one irrefutable argument: California needs the water, and all of the obvious sources have been tapped out, making water an increasingly rare commodity that will become more costly every year. [10 Ways to Green Your Home] "Even though there is a significant [cost] difference right now, those costs will converge in the future, [and] that convergence could happen as soon as the early 2020s," Bob Yamada, planning manager with the San Diego County Water Authority, told NBC. SK

#### Also means that corporations co-opt your impact – Hollo ’14 justifies corporation control of the nuclear power industry means that economic costs will be a major factor for them.

### 1AR v Space Col (0:22)

**1. Space col is progress – you literally are conquering space which is a colonization disadvantage to your position**

**2. Case outweighs – harm of progress constrains our impacts so continuing a civilization premised on progress in space will lead to cyclical harms**

**3. Cross apply Kearns and Hollo – even if nuke power is key to space col, it will be diverted away into military industrial complex and other oppressive structures.**

#### 4. Nonunique and turn - Geothermal is key not nuclear power which is more cumbersome in space

Dorminey ’16, [Bruce Dorminey (American science journalist and author who primarily covers aerospace, astronomy and astrophysics. He is a regular contributor to Astronomy magazine. Since March 2012, he has written a regular tech column for Forbes.com. [1] He is also a correspondent for Renewable Energy World.), Why Geothermal Energy Will Be Key To Mars Colonization, Forbes, xx-xx-xxxx, xx, http://www.forbes.com/sites/brucedorminey/2016/09/30/why-geothermal-energy-will-be-key-to-mars-colonization/#28bee4fe1b31, 10-13-2016. SK]

Artificial life support is a complex and energy-intensive process, as Martyn Fogg noted in a 1996 Martian geothermal energy paper published in The Journal of the British Interplanetary Society. In his paper, Fogg noted that each resident of Mars would probably require anywhere between 1 to 100 kilowatts of electric capacity each. The prime real estate for a Martian colony will be right next to such a geothermal power source. “There are [likely] places on Mars where the water table is much closer to the surface than a kilometer,” said Zubrin **Why not** solar, **nuclear**, wind or radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs)? At Mars’ distance from the Sun and with today’s limited photovoltaic robotic technology, solar power generation on Mars would be tenuous at best. RTGs are fine for generating tens of watts but are not suitable for powering Martian villages with hundreds of residents, much less cities with thousands of residents that Musk envisions there. Wind energy on Mars is negligible. With an atmosphere that is only 2% that of Earth’s, as previously noted here, a 100 mph wind would feel like being struck by a feather. **Large-scale nuclear power production will be a long-term option** when Mars has a robust infrastructure. **Nuclear power requires an elaborate infrastructure in place**, Fogg writes. **Fuels must be prospected, mined, purified and then consumed in reactors that are themselves the products of sophisticated manufacturing, he writes**. Their spent nuclear fuel must be disposed of properly and reprocessed. **In contrast, geothermal energy**, in the form of geothermal heat or either electricity generated via steam turbines from potentially hot geothermal reservoirs **is the most viable option for near term Martian colonization**. Zubrin points out in his book that in some places a liquid water table probably exists within a kilometer of the surface. “I have to think there’s some geothermal power potential maybe 100 miles from NASA’s Curiosity rover and Gale Crater,” said Zubrin. That’s because these methane puffs that it’s detecting are intermittent, he says. On the other hand, if the methane detected by the Curiosity were a global source it would have long been diffused. Zubrin writes in his book that the planet’s low gravity, a third that of Earth, should make it much easier to drill on Mars. That’s because the planet’s lower gravity will compact the soil less forcefully. And then once hot water is brought to the surface, he notes it would be flashed to steam and used to power a turbine to generate electric power. Zubrin also says that the planet’s low atmospheric pressure will also allow steam to be much more fully expanded before it is condensed. SK

## 1AR v Counterplan

### 1AR v TWR

#### 1. TWR is also a form of progress which dominates by aligning itself to corporations

#### 2. This is a colonizing tool – Bill Gates is pushing it into China to increase US dominance

#### 3. If I win an advantage I win a disad to nuclear power and thus to TWR

#### 4. Even if you mitigate harms the harms still exist and are solved by the aff

#### 5. Perm – TWR doesn’t happen for at least a decade so do the aff and if the aff fails to reorient do the cp

Ervin ‘15, [Dan Ervin (Dan Ervin (DMERVIN@salisbury.edu) is a professor of finance at the Perdue School of Business at Salisbury University. This commentary does not represent the official position or views of Salisbury University.), Nuclear wave of the future, baltimoresun, 11-29-2015, 15, http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-wave-reactor-20151129-story.html, 8-9-2016. SK]

Anyone concerned about climate change should support efforts to build a new generation of advanced nuclear reactors. These new reactor designs can deliver clean, reliable electricity and support our carbon-reduction goals. Nuclear power is the only current technology able to generate the amount of electricity required to support our standard of living without emitting carbon dioxide and nitrogen compounds. Our nation's, and indeed **the world's, future well-being depends on innovative technologies like the traveling wave reactor**. Therefore, it is surprising that little attention was given to a recent announcement. **The** China National Nuclear Corporation (**CNNP**) along **with TerraPower** — a Seattle-based start-up financed in large part by Microsoft founder Bill Gates and his longtime associate, Nathan Myhrvold — **announced a plan to build a traveling wave prototype.** This reactor can use a variety of materials for fuel, however, an exciting option is the use of depleted uranium. This is the by-product of the uranium enrichment process with significant volumes stored in secured locations. We have sufficient quantities of depleted uranium to generate electricity for centuries. Also, this reactor can use "spent" fuel from our existing reactors. ADVERTISING The core in a traveling-wave reactor gradually converts fertile material into the fuel it needs. Cooled by liquid sodium instead of water, the reactor is designed to be safer than conventional light-water plants. Research is ongoing to address challenges using liquid sodium as the reactor coolant. In some respects, its waste is much easier to handle and is only radioactive for a few hundred years — not thousands. The prototype, to be built in China, will be a mid-sized 600-megawatt reactor that will be ready for start-up by 2020. It will be followed by development of a 1,150-megawatt reactor for commercial use, with Asia as the principal market. It is no surprise this reactor will be built in China. It is a long, arduous and very expensive process to license new reactor designs in the United States. Many energy experts believe the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is resource constrained. Additional funding would allow the NRC to hire engineers and scientists and hopefully reduce the licensing period. This is important because each new reactor design for the domestic market must be approved by the NRC, and this approval is considered the "Gold Standard" by many potential international customers. Shorter licensing time frames would have a positive impact on domestic employment. However, current efforts to increase funding have encountered resistance in Congress. **It can take a decade or more**, and hundreds of millions of dollars, **to license a prototype reactor** with the NRC. While **this situation does not sit well with nuclear entrepreneurs,** some **policymakers prefer the licensing process essentially as is.** Allison Macfarlane, who was NRC chairman from 2012 until earlier this year and is now the director of the Center for International Science and Technology Policy at George Washington University, opposes efforts to expedite reactor licensing. It is her view the current regulatory process best serves the public interest. Hence, TerraPower has opted to build its prototype in China. Other U.S.-based nuclear startups have indicated their intention to find other countries in which to prove their technologies. Even the Department of Energy, working through the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, is collaborating with the Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics to build a prototype molten salt reactor in China. It would be unfortunate if the U. S. lost its leadership in nuclear power technology as a result of suboptimal energy policy and regulation.SK

#### 6. Laundry list of disads to TWR which makes it worse than the aff.

Makhijani ’13, Sodium-cooled Gold at the End of a Nuclear Rainbow? Traveling Wave Reactors: By Arjun Makhijani, Ph.D. September 2013 I

The TWR is different in some specific respects from other sodium-cooled breeders. The most important difference is that in the TWR the breeding would be done in the core; by design the newly created plutonium would be burned without having to be separated first. In a conventional breeder, the plutonium breeding is done in a “blanket” outside the core; the plutonium would then be separated and fabricated into fuel in a reprocessing plant (onsite or offsite). The initial TWR design proposed was that of a reactor in which the chain reaction front would proceed like a slow wave across the core much like a cigarette burning from tip to butt, with the ashes remaining (inside, in the case of the reactor) as waste. TerraPower has a video illustration of this concept; it can be seen on a YouTube video simulation (TerraPower 2013c). There would be little or no unused fissile or fertile material. An essentially 100 percent use of the uranium resource was implied. More detailed design work has apparently led to a change in this conceptual design in favor of a core that is more like a traditional sodium-cooled breeder, except that the fuel would be “shuffled” periodically, enable better breed of fuel in the core and long periods between refueling (Ellis et al. 2010, and Garwin 2010). Contrary to early implications, illustrated in the TerraPower video mentioned above, the first generation of the TWR would achieve a burnup of just 15 percent (Ellis et al. 2010).1 1 Design details of the present (2013) configuration are not publicly available. 5 Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) Further, the design cannot burn the plutonium and uranium in present-day spent fuel inventory from today’s light water reactors without reprocessing – a costly enterprise that would increase proliferation risks. Figure 2 (see next page) shows a diagram of the latest TWR public design. Reprocessing (called “repurposing” by proponents – Ellis et al. 2010) spent fuel could substantially increase the fraction of the uranium resource that is used upward from 15 percent to over 50 percent, but at the cost of increased proliferation risk. **Proponents claim that “repurposing” the fuel can be done “without the proliferation risk of fissile material separations**” (Ellis et al. 2010). **This claim does not stand scrutiny**. Ellis et al. propose the same process as the one being developed for Experimental Fast Breeder II fuel. Figure 3 (see page 7) shows a pilot electrorefiner, at the Idaho National Laboratory, where the first sodium-cooled reactor, called Experimental Breeder Reactor I, was built in 1951. This technology, also known as “pyroprocessing” and “electrometallurgical processing,” was developed for dealing with sodium-bonded metal fuel used in sodium-cooled breeder reactors (Benedict et al. 2007). A 2009 study by U.S. national laboratory experts concluded that the various reprocessing technologies, including the electrorefining process discussed in Ellis et al. 2010, would provide little additional proliferation resistance, so far as proliferant states were concerned, compared to the present-day PUREX process that has been a source of great concern (Bari et al. 2009). It is not a matter of what present-day nuclear weapon states would do with the technology, but what potential proliferant states could do with it. Even with very high use of the uranium resource and repeated reprocessing, a deep geologic repository would be needed in any case. This is a central reason that the Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future recommended that a repository program should proceed independent of the nuclear power and reprocessing path chosen by the United States (BRC 2012, p. 27). A once-through open cycle TWR would have an advantage over conventional breeders in that no reprocessing would be needed to achieve much greater use of the uranium resource relative to today’s light water reactors. Direct disposal of spent fuel would reduce proliferation risk relative to conventional breeders, but this it would pose considerable difficulties. Specifically, the sodium used as a thermal bond in the fuel would have to be removed first. Present-day reactor spent fuel requires no comparable step and can be put into disposal containers without such intermediate steps, risks, and costs. By the same token, **the disposal of TWR spent fuel would create its own problems. The spent fuel would contain residual uranium and unburned transuranic radionuclides including plutonium-239.** It would also contain the usual variety of short- and long-lived fission products, except that a much larger amount would be contained per unit volume due to the much higher burnup. 6 Traveling Wave Reactors: Sodium-cooled Gold at the End of a Nuclear Rainbow? FIGURE 2 Figure 2: Traveling wave reactor. The core is at the bottom center. (Source: TerraPower. TWR-P Reactor, at http://terrapower.com/uploads/multimedia/TWR-P.jpg) 7 Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) FIGURE 3 Figure 3: Pilot “Electrorefiner” for Experimental Breeder Reactor II at Idaho National Laboratory. Reprocessing for the TWR would presumably use a similar reprocessing technology. (Source: Wikimedia Commons, author: Argonne National Laboratory, at http:// commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:EBRElectrorefiner.jpg) 8 Traveling Wave Reactors: Sodium-cooled Gold at the End of a Nuclear Rainbow? As a consequence, **the local thermal loads created by TWR spent fuel in a repository would be** much higher than **with** today’s **spent fuel. This may make the site selection and repository design more difficult than it already is.** For instance, **it may increase the risk of local fissures in the vicinity of the disposal locations; such fissures could open up more pathways for radioactive materials to reach the human environment** **relative to present-day spent** fuel. We have not come across any serious analysis of waste disposal and repository issues from proponents of TWRs that would be created by direct disposal of very high burnup TWR spent fuel. The TWR would use uranium fuel enriched to a much higher degree than present light water reactors — 15 percent, instead of 4 to 5 percent. It is a relatively short step from 15 percent enriched uranium to 90 percent enriched weapons grade uranium. One extravagant claim is that the TWR would only need “one uranium enrichment plant per planet” (Wald 2009), the reality would likely be quite different. Without reprocessing, each first generation TWR would require about 1 metric ton of 15 percent enriched uranium per year (Garwin 2010).2 While this reduces the separative work required by about a factor of five relative to light water reactors, **widespread adoption of TWRs could require large numbers of enrichment plants configured to produce uranium enriched to a degree that is** much closer to weapons grade than present-day **reactors**. If reconfigured, an enrichment plant that produces 1 ton of 15 percent enriched uranium would produce about 146 kg of 90 percent HEU, or nearly 6 bombs worth. At a typical size of 3 million kilograms of separative work per year, a single enrichment plant would fuel about 90 TWRs. In bomb-enrichment configuration, each such plant could produce well over 500 bombs worth of enriched uranium. Proponents have suggested that the world could adopt this as its main power source to provide electricity at the current U.S. level worldwide for a global population of 10 billion (Ellis et al. 2010). SK

#### 7. Traveling Wave Reactors harms outweigh,

**Makhijani writes,**

**One of the most difficult engineering problems with sodium-cooled reactors has to do with the fact that sodium burns on contact with air and explodes on contact with water.** Further, some of the non-radioactive sodium nuclei of the coolant absorb a neutron and are thereby converted to intensely radioactive sodium-24. **Leaks create difficult clean-up and maintenance and repair problems.** This is especially so for primary leaks, but also true for secondary loop sodium leaks where no radioactivity releases are involved – as was the case with the 1995 Monju fire. **Leaks are often followed by weeks, months, or even years of repair, cleanup, testing and inspection before the reactor can be restarted. Further, leaks have been a common problem in sodium-cooled breeder programs, including in France, the UK, India, Russia, and Japan** (IPFM 2010, various chapters). Core meltdown accidents can also occur: **two of the U.S. sodium-cooled breeders have had partial core meltdowns** (IPFM 2010, pp. 92, 95). Sodium-cooled reactors have some safety advantages relative to presentday light water reactors, such as operation at low pressure, in contrast to light water reactors. But they also have safety disadvantages, including the potential for the reactor to continue to sustain a chain reaction in the event of coolant loss (IPFM

#### 8. Traveling Wave Reactors cost significantly higher and are not worth the immense raise in cost,

**Makhijani 2 writes,**

Even apart from the poor reliability in many cases, **sodium-cooled breeder reactor capital costs** have been very variable and **have not decreased over time**. Fermi I, built in the 1960s, cost about $4,000 per kilowatt, while the Fast Flux Test Facility, operational in 1980, cost over $10,000 per kilowatt. Superphénix cost, commissioned in 1986, about $4,800 per kilowatt, but Monju, commissioned nearly a decade later, cost over $20,000 per kilowatt (all in 1996 dollars – Makhijani 2010, Table 3). Overall, **it is expected that costs of sodium-cooled breeders will be significantly higher than current reactors** (IPFM 2010, p. 7), **despite the fact that about $100 billion have been spent worldwide (2007 dollars) on the attempt to commercialize sodium-cooled breeder reactors, so far without success**

#### 9. No solvency for sodium coolant problems

**Makhijani 3 writes,**

The ups and downs of the successes and **failures of sodium-cooled reactors, including the commercial failure of the most recent ones,** indicate that **there has been no demonstrable learning curve.** Proponents of sodium-cooled reactors, including **traveling wave reactors, tend not to focus on how they plan to overcome the problematic parts of the sodium-cooled design history**, centered in large part on sodium-related problems, **but rather tend to focus on the vast available raw material to produce a large amount of power for the indefinite future.**

#### 10. The reprocessing they cherish increases prolif risk

**Makhijani 4 writes,**

**Further, the design cannot burn the plutonium and uranium in present-day spent fuel inventory from today’s light water reactors without reprocessing – a costly enterprise that would increase proliferation risks.** Figure 2 (see next page) shows a diagram of the latest TWR public design. Reprocessing (called “repurposing” by proponents – Ellis et al. 2010) **spent fuel could substantially increase the fraction of the uranium resource that is used upward from 15 percent to over 50 percent, but at the cost of increased proliferation risk.** Proponents claim that “repurposing” the fuel can be done “without the proliferation risk of fissile material separations” (Ellis et al. 2010). This claim does not stand scrutiny. Ellis et al. propose the same process as the one being developed for Experimental Fast Breeder II fuel. Figure 3 (see page 7) shows a pilot electrorefiner, at the Idaho National Laboratory, where the first sodium-cooled reactor, called Experimental Breeder Reactor I, was built in 1951. This technology, also known as “pyroprocessing” and “electrometallurgical processing,” was developed for dealing with sodium-bonded metal fuel used in sodium-cooled breeder reactors (Benedict et al. 2007). A 2009 study by U.S. national laboratory experts concluded that the various reprocessing technologies, including the electrorefining process discussed in Ellis et al. 2010, would provide little additional proliferation resistance, so far as proliferant states were concerned, compared to the present-day PUREX process that has been a source of great concern (Bari et al. 2009). It is not a matter of what present-day nuclear weapon states would do with the technology, but what potential proliferant states could do with it.

### 1AR vs MSR

#### 1. Sodium coolant harms outweigh,

**Makhijani writes,**

**One of the most difficult engineering problems with sodium-cooled reactors has to do with the fact that sodium burns on contact with air and explodes on contact with water.** Further, some of the non-radioactive sodium nuclei of the coolant absorb a neutron and are thereby converted to intensely radioactive sodium-24. **Leaks create difficult clean-up and maintenance and repair problems.** This is especially so for primary leaks, but also true for secondary loop sodium leaks where no radioactivity releases are involved – as was the case with the 1995 Monju fire. **Leaks are often followed by weeks, months, or even years of repair, cleanup, testing and inspection before the reactor can be restarted. Further, leaks have been a common problem in sodium-cooled breeder programs, including in France, the UK, India, Russia, and Japan** (IPFM 2010, various chapters). Core meltdown accidents can also occur: **two of the U.S. sodium-cooled breeders have had partial core meltdowns** (IPFM 2010, pp. 92, 95). Sodium-cooled reactors have some safety advantages relative to presentday light water reactors, such as operation at low pressure, in contrast to light water reactors. But they also have safety disadvantages, including the potential for the reactor to continue to sustain a chain reaction in the event of coolant loss (IPFM

#### 2. MSRs cost significantly higher and are not worth the immense raise in cost,

**Makhijani 2 writes,**

Even apart from the poor reliability in many cases, **sodium-cooled breeder reactor capital costs** have been very variable and **have not decreased over time**. Fermi I, built in the 1960s, cost about $4,000 per kilowatt, while the Fast Flux Test Facility, operational in 1980, cost over $10,000 per kilowatt. Superphénix cost, commissioned in 1986, about $4,800 per kilowatt, but Monju, commissioned nearly a decade later, cost over $20,000 per kilowatt (all in 1996 dollars – Makhijani 2010, Table 3). Overall, **it is expected that costs of sodium-cooled breeders will be significantly higher than current reactors** (IPFM 2010, p. 7), **despite the fact that about $100 billion have been spent worldwide (2007 dollars) on the attempt to commercialize sodium-cooled breeder reactors, so far without success**

#### 3. No solvency for sodium coolant problems

**Makhijani 3 writes,**

The ups and downs of the successes and **failures of sodium-cooled reactors, including the commercial failure of the most recent ones,** indicate that **there has been no demonstrable learning curve.** Proponents of sodium-cooled reactors, including **traveling wave reactors, tend not to focus on how they plan to overcome the problematic parts of the sodium-cooled design history**, centered in large part on sodium-related problems, **but rather tend to focus on the vast available raw material to produce a large amount of power for the indefinite future.**

## F/L

### F/L – FW

Caradonna ’14, [Jeremy Caradonna(), Is 'Progress' Good for Humanity?, Atlantic, xx-xx-xxxx, xx, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/09/the-industrial-revolution-and-its-discontents/379781/, 9-4-2016. SK]

**The stock narrative of the Industrial Revolution is one of moral and economic progress**. Indeed, **economic progress is cast as moral progress.** The story tends to go something like this: Inventors, economists, and statesmen in Western Europe dreamed up a new industrialized world. Fueled by the optimism and scientific know-how of the Enlightenment, a series of heroic men—James Watt, Adam Smith, William Huskisson, and so on—fought back against the stultifying effects of regulated economies, irrational laws and customs, and a traditional guild structure that quashed innovation. By the mid-19th century, they had managed to implement a laissez-faire (“free”) economy that ran on new machines and was centered around modern factories and an urban working class. It was a long and difficult process, but this revolution eventually brought Europeans to a new plateau of civilization. In the end, Europeans lived in a new world based on wage labor, easy mobility, and the consumption of sparkling products. Europe had rescued itself from the pre-industrial misery that had hampered humankind since the dawn of time. Cheap and abundant fossil fuel powered the trains and other steam engines that drove humankind into this brave new future. Later, around the time that Europeans decided that colonial slavery wasn’t such a good idea, they exported this revolution to other parts of the world, so that everyone could participate in freedom and industrialized modernity. They did this, in part, by “opening up markets” in primitive agrarian societies. The net result has been increased human happiness, wealth, and productivity—the attainment of our true potential as a species. Sadly, **this saccharine story** still sweetens our societal self-image. Indeed, it **is deeply ingrained in the collective identity of the industrialized world**. The narrative has gotten more complex but remains à la base a triumphalist story. Consider, for instance, the closing lines of Joel Mokyr’s 2009 The Enlightened Economy: An Economic History of Britain, 1700–1850: “Material life in Britain and in the industrialized world that followed it is far better today than could have been imagined by the most wild-eyed optimistic 18th-century philosophe—and whereas this outcome may have been an unforeseen consequence, most economists, at least, would regard it as an undivided blessing." The idea that the Industrial Revolution has made us not only more technologically advanced and materially furnished but also better for it is a powerful narrative and one that’s hard to shake. It makes it difficult to dissent from the idea that new technologies, economic growth, and a consumer society are absolutely necessary. To criticize industrial modernity is somehow to criticize the moral advancement of humankind, since a central theme in this narrative is the idea that industrialization revolutionized our humanity, too. **Those who criticize industrial society are often met with** defensive snarkiness: “So you’d like us to go back to living in caves, would ya?” or “**you can’t stop progress**!” What if we adopt a more critical and skeptical attitude toward the values we’ve inherited from the past? Narratives are inevitably moralistic; they are never created spontaneously from “the facts” but are rather stories imposed upon a range of phenomena that always include implicit ideas about what’s right and what’s wrong. **The proponents of the Industrial Revolution** inherited from the philosophers of the Enlightenment the narrative of human (read: European) progress over time but **placed technological advancement and economic liberalization at the center of their conception of progress**. **This narrative remains today an ingrained operating principle that propels us in a seemingly unstoppable way toward more growth** and more technology, **because the assumption is that these things are ultimately beneficial** for humanity. **Advocates of sustainability** are not opposed to industrialization per se, and don’t seek a return to the Stone Age. But what they do **oppose** is **the dubious narrative of progress** caricatured above. Along with Jean-Jacques Rousseau, they acknowledge the objective advancement of technology, but they don’t necessarily think that it has made us more virtuous, and they don’t assume that the key values of the Industrial Revolution are beyond reproach: social inequality for the sake of private wealth; economic growth at the expense of everything, including the integrity of the environment; and the assumption that mechanized newness is always a positive thing. Above all, sustainability-minded thinkers question whether the Industrial Revolution has jeopardized humankind’s ability to live happily and sustainably upon the Earth. Have the fossil-fueled good times put future generations at risk of returning to the same misery that industrialists were in such a rush to leave behind? But what if **we rethink the narrative of progress**? What if we believe that the inventions in and after the Industrial Revolution have made some things better and some things worse? What if we adopt a more critical and skeptical attitude toward the values we’ve inherited from the past? Moreover, what if we write environmental factors back in to the story of progress? Suddenly, things begin to seem less rosy. Indeed, in many ways, **the ecological crisis of the present day has roots in the Industrial Revolution**. For instance, consider the growth of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere since 1750. Every respectable body that studies climate science, including NASA, the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration, and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), has been able to correlate GHG concentrations with the pollutants that machines have been spewing into the atmosphere since the late-18th century. These scientific bodies also correlate GHGs with other human activities, such as the clearing of forests (which releases a lot of carbon dioxide and removes a crucial carbon sink from the planet), and the breeding of methane-farting cows. But fossil fuels are the main culprit (coal, gas, and oil) and account for much of the increase in the parts per million of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The main GHGs, to be sure, are carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), and a few others, many of which can be charted over time by analyzing the chemistry of long-frozen ice cores. More recent GHG levels are identified from direct atmospheric measurements. What we learn from these scientific analyses is that the Industrial Revolution ushered in a veritable Age of Pollution, which has resulted in filthy cities, toxic industrial sites (and human bodies), contaminated soils, polluted and acidified oceans, and a “blanket” of air pollution that traps heat in the Earth’s atmosphere, which then destabilizes climate systems and ultimately heats the overall surface temperature of the planet. The EPA is quite blunt about it: “Increases in concentrations of these gases since 1750 are due to human activities in the industrial era.” It’s worth noting, too, that the population of the world only began to take off during the Industrial Revolution. For millennia, the population of homo sapiens was well below the 1 billion mark, until that number was surpassed around 1800. The world now has 7 billion people and counting. That’s a lot of people who require food, energy, and housing and who place great strains upon global ecosystems. Consider the following figures: Carbon dioxide (PPM), methane (PPB), and nitrous oxide (PPM) in the atmosphere since 1750. Before the Industrial Revolution, CO2 levels had long been stable at about 280 PPM. Now they’re above 400 PPM. CO2 levels have not been this high for at least 2 million years. (USGCRP 2009) Carbon dioxide and methane levels in the atmosphere since 1750. (NASA, based on data from the NOAA Paleoclimatology and Earth System Research Laboratory) World Population Population levels in developing and industrialized countries over time, with future projections. (Philippe Rekacewicz, UNEP/GRID-Arendal) When we take these trajectories into consideration, the Industrial Revolution starts to look like something less than an “undivided blessing.” It begins to look like, at best, a mixed blessing—one that resulted in technologies that have allowed many people to live longer, safer lives, but that has, simultaneously, destroyed global ecosystems, caused the extinction of many living species, facilitated rampant population growth, and wreaked havoc on climate systems, the effects of which will be an increase in droughts, floods, storms, and erratic weather patterns that threaten most global societies. All of this is to say that **the simple-minded narrative of progress needs to be rethought**. This is not a new idea: In fact, critics of industrialization lived throughout the Industrial Revolution, even if their message was often drowned out by the clanking sounds of primitive engines. In their own particular ways, thinkers and activists as diverse as Thomas Malthus, Friedrich Engels, the Luddites, John Stuart Mill, Henry David Thoreau, William Wordsworth, and John Muir criticized some or all aspects of the Industrial Revolution. The narrative of industrial-growth-as-progress that became the story of the period occurred despite their varied protestations. The Luddites questioned the necessity of machines that put so many people out of work. Engels questioned the horrendous living and working conditions experienced by the working classes and drew links between economic changes, social inequality, and environmental destruction. Thoreau questioned the need for modern luxuries. Mill questioned the logic of an economic system that spurred endless growth. Muir revalorized the natural world, which had been seen as little more than a hindrance to wealth creation and the spread of European settler societies around the globe. These figures have provided wisdom and intellectual inspiration to the sustainability movement. John Stuart Mill and John Muir, for instance, have each been “rediscovered” in recent decades, respectively, by ecological economists and environmentalists in search of a historical lineage. For the **sustainability-minded thinkers** of the present day, it was these figures, and others like them, who **were the true visionaries of the age**. SK