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#### “*We knew the world would not be the same. A few people laughed, a few people cried, most people were silent… “Now, I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds*.”

#### - J. Robert Oppenheimer in 1945, after seeing the first atomic bomb test.

#### Our narrative of nuclear power picks up with a small group of European physicists in 1939 who discover the unlikely potential of fission energy within atoms, only to have their research co-opted to create the A-Bomb. This is beginning of the end, sealing nuclear power’s inevitable connection to nuclear weapons and militarism.

Jean-Claude Debeir et al, 1986

Jean Claude Debeir, Jean-Paul Deleage and Daniel Hemery, translated by John Barzman. “In the Servitude of Power: Energy and Civilization Through the Ages” pg 168-169.

From the very beginning, the nuclear energy chain has been characterized by an irresistible drift of its successive historic states towards unforeseen results (see Table 8.1). Until 1940, nuclear power was merely an audacious research topic. the idea that an unlimited source of energy could be tapped the concern of a narrow circle of physicists. the main problematic stake of theoretical physics then still predominantly practised in Europe. But in late March 1939, the team of Frederic Joliot. Hans Halban and Lew Kowarski demonstrated that it was possible to maintain a fission reaction capable of releasing enormous amounts of energy; thereafter. the great European and American laboratories focused their efforts on the means to activate a nuclear reactor and mobilize the explosive force of fission. 'The war had barely begun when the means by which it would be won were hinted at. The research led to the invention of the A-bomb technologies. The irradiation of Hiroshima on 6 August 1945. and of Nagasaki on 9 August I945 tested them experimentally. That was the first drift: as theoretical knowledge of nuclear power was finally achieved. a sudden shift took place from a project designed to liberate productive energy to the creation of a weapon of destntction considered absolute at the time. 'Everything that can be done will be done': this axiom of scientific production in its present state once again became a reality. Atomic science and industry had barely been born when they were militarized. As early as I939-42. all activity around the atom was put under military rules of operation: accelerated competition between states. imposition of almost absolute secrecy - by late i939 - on scientific knowledge. and most importantly. attempts to monopolize uranium and the content and applications of the new technology. The latter attempt was principally the doing of the United States. in 1942. US laboratories caught up with and overtook their British rivals. mining Britain's eariy pretensions to it nuclear monopoly. Thereafter. the nuclear relationship of forces shifted to the advantage of the United States. At the first nuclear summit conference held in Washington on 15 November I945. the British representative Attlee and the Canadian representative Mackenzie King reluctantly agreed to the secret atomic policy dictated to them by Truman. But US policy in this arena was a total failure. Following the world wu. the race for the military atom begun in I939 rebounded and. within fifteen years. led to the formation of an 'Atomic Archipelago.' a club of five atomic powers. the product of a fast wave of nuclear proliferation punctuated by series of atomic bomb tests carried out by each nation. Altogether L522 nuclear explosions were carried out between 1945 and i988 (including 46l in the atmosphere) with a total power equal to 40.000 Hiroshima bombs. including 29 Chinese tests and I34 French tests. The stakes in the military nuclear competition shifted to the development of nuclear-tipped missiles. The two main powers in panicular had to face a new challenge: the tendency of the nuclear weapon to proliferate 'horizontally' through the spread of civilian nuclear applications and the inseparable 'sensitive' technologies (technologies of plutonium. a byproduct of civilian reactors. enriched uranium. the fuel of the same reactors. enrichment and reprocessing of irradiated fuel). This was the second historic occasion when the atom skidded off its assigned course: the militarization of nuclear knowledge. which was intended to create a 'single' monopoly of the tool of absolute power. led in fact to a first wave of uncontrolled proliferation of the new weapon. which the United States. with more or less help from the USSR. could only attempt to slow down. In this. they met some success thanks to their monopoly over the production of enriched uranium and the development of a system of international control of civilian nuclear activities entrusted in I956 to the lntemational Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and codified in the Moscow Treaty of I963 and the Non- Proliferation Treaty of I968.

#### Following the experimental failures at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, America instituted a historical damage control in order to civilize perception of nuclear power. Under the guise of “nuclear energy”, the West proliferates nuclear capacities across the globe, sealing a Faustian bargain for all of humanity while rewriting the history of the atom.

Jean-Claude Debeir et al continues,

Jean Claude Debeir, Jean-Paul Deleage and Daniel Hemery, translated by John Barzman. “In the Servitude of Power: Energy and Civilization Through the Ages” pg 170-172.

**The failure of the United States to preserve its A-bomb monopoly had a lot to do with the 'civilizing' of the atom** in I953-55 **which signalled a new phase of nuclear history: nuclear electricity.** 'l11is new development of atomic activities presented itself at once as a partial reconversion and new advance of the immense scientific and industrial complexes erected to produce nuclear weapons. Until the l970s. a nearly universal consensus grew up around it thanks in great part to the efforts of scientists. For them, the transition to civilian atoms represented an indispensable social legitimation of their scientific interests. the irrefutable historic justification of the primacy of nuclear physics in the field of science and technology. In seeking to impose this new collective image of atomic energy in the 1950s. they were seeking to rehabilitate the atom: the civilian reactor and its promises would absolve nuclear science and industry of the sin of 1945 and could definitively bring to a close the painful interlude opened at Hiroshima. Advertising the peaceful applications of atomic energy became one of the main arguments for denouncing the use of atomic energy for military purposes. But this denunciation. as it unfolded in the l950s. mainly through the channels of the world campaign launched by the Peace Movement after the Appeal of Stockholm. became one of the props of the later rise of nuclear electricity. it helped to disseminate the terms of the consensus around civilian nuclear energy; the latter became one of the major stakes of the campaign. although still only virtually and implicitly. 'lhe third phase of nuclear history. the phase of nuclear energy. opened when the main industrialized countries launched their large-scale nuclear reactor programmes at various times over the period. All through this new period. the initiative for the development of nuclear power came from the US government and US industry. It was inspired by a series of scenarios established between I946 and l95O which 'demonstrated' that nuclear electricity was competitive. Titus Sam Schutr's anticipation published in I947. a pioneer of this sort of literature. gave a very optimistic evaluation of the production cost of the nuclear kilowatt-hour. somewhere between 3.5 and eight cents. that is. equal or less than the cost price of the coal kilowatt-hour. and concluded not only that nuclear electricity was competitive. but also that it was irreplaceable for the industrialization of regions lacking fossil fuels: '... the unequalled mobility of nuclear fuel makes it ideal when the point is to produce power cheaply in places far from other energy sources..." We key moment in this ï¬‚oating of the civilian nuclear project was the famous 'Atoms for Peace' speech delivered by President Eisenhower before the General Assembly of the United Nations on 8 December I953. proposing 'to organize the peaceful use of atomic energy' through the development of international co-operation and through the transfer of fissile materials to an international organization under the United Nations. On 30 August I954. the US Congress adopted the Atomic Energy Act amending the earlier MacMahon Act by authorizing the passing of infonnation and fissile uranium to other countries. provided their use of it was controlled. 'Atoms for Peace' was followed by a meeting. called by the United Nations and United States. of the Conference for the Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy in Geneva. 8 to 20 August 1955. during which L400 delegates representing 75 nations. including Best bloc countries. exchanged. for the first time, their knowledge and the results of their research and. more importantly. unified their perception of the future of nuclear energy. The secrecy of non~miIitary knowledge and techniques was lifted. 'lire Geneva assembly founded the nuclear energy project in a euphoric mood. The project was Faustian: a fantastic alchemy. but a scientific one in this case and therefore sheltered from critics. would produce unlimited energy at a low can. For two decades. everywhere. nuclear power became the new 'frontier' of the future. the necessary horizon of all human societies. This was the optimistic phase. Nuclear power was seen as a sure win. a properly Pascalian wager. as the miracle-energy. the long-terrn solution to all immediate energy problems - those. for instance. which arose at the end of I956 with the Suez crisis. the first 'oil shoclt' experienced by the West - as well as future energy problems. forebodings of which were just beginning. 'Civilizing' the atom meant. in the shon run. having an answer to the demands of the oil states which were about to fonn OPEC; it meant developing an economic deterrent r-is-d-vis the Arab states and. therefore. helping to keep the price of oil down. lt also meant. in the longer term. succeeding in switching energies and definitively solving the energy supply problems of industrialized countries. Finally. it meant opening a new market, building a new energy industry, both of which would make capital yield profits on a scale comparable to the oil industry. For the leaders of the large US and a European nuclear institutions and the big corporations who were their partners. the point was to make nuclear power stations commonplace. to turn them into factories with stable technical structures. producible serially. marketable through catalogues and turnkey contracts. The nationalist ruling classes of new Third World states had other goals in mind which could converge with the former. Decisive in the mind of Nehru and his friend. the physicist Homi Bhabba. was the conviction that nuclear power was I shortcut to industrialization that could. despite the heavy investments required. allow 'latecomer' national states to overcome their handicap and catch up with their Western elders.

#### Those who bore the brunt of nuclear power’s perverse history are those labeled “deviant”. Toxic labor, colonization of indigenous land, and racialization all in the name of National Security and Uranium operate within “zones of morbidity” that justify certain deaths as less important, profitable, and justifiable.

Jamie Skye Bianco, 2004

Bianco is a Clinical Assistant Professor of Media, Culture, and Communication; “Zones of Morbidity”; Issue 8 – Spring 2004; Rhizomes; <http://www.rhizomes.net/issue8/bianco.htm> [Brackets in original]

If the heart of global U.S. militarist imperialism and its dependencies on nuclear weapons and energy production is located at the sites of ongoing internal colonization and indigenous genocide, then this seems a space ready and replete for progressive political action, and Silko's Almanac is a techno-nativist cultural guide and one strain in the tech-neo insurgency. What constitutes a tech-neo-imperialism of these lands and peoples occurs after the onset of World War II and the uranium findings in Monument Valley. The second discovery of uranium was on Pueblo land in the area of the sacred snake at Mt. Taylor, west of Albuquerque. Intensive research into nuclear power and atomic weapons followed and is another well-documented history, with the profound omissions of the colonized and imperialized land, toxic labor, and debilitated lives co-habiting this now nuclear and irradiated territory with Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories, among others. At its Cold War peak, 90% of southwest and South Dakotan indigenous lands were voluntarily (if voluntarism can be located on the axes of abject poverty of the poorest, most dispossessed and disenfranchised people in the U.S.) and non-voluntarily leased by the federal government and assigned to federal laboratories and transnational energy corporations for the purposes of uranium mining, above and below ground nuclear production and testing. The famous, first nuclear test site 'Trinity' occurred on Mescalero Apache land, south of the Pueblos and Albuquerque. Silko's Almanac marks this moment and traces uranium mining: He had not understood before why the old people had cried when the U.S. government had opened the [open-pit uranium] mine. Sterling was reminded of the stub left after amputation when he looked at the shattered, scarred sandstone that remained; the mine had devoured entire mesas. "Leave our Mother Earth alone," the old folks had tried to warn, "otherwise terrible things will happen to us all." Before the end of the war, the old folks had seen the first atomic explosion — the flash brighter than any sun — followed weeks later by the bombs that had burned up half a million Japanese. "What goes around, comes around." (Almanac 759, my bold and italics) It is the entire technoscientific, commercial and militarized, federally-funded complex of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, nuclear testing and nuclear waste disposal (or lack thereof) that constitutes tech-neo-imperialism of these lands, which are no longer, micro-physically, the same lands, air and water. In fact, Silko's reference here takes place across the entire Laguna Pueblo village of Paguate, 45 miles west of Albuquerque. This Pueblo village sits at the center of the first open-pit uranium mine, the Jackpile-Paguate in the Grants Uranium Belt, dug by "Anaconda Copper Company, a subsidiary of the Atlantic Richfield Company" (Kuletz 24). And though ownership has been acquired by the tribal council subject to B.I.A. oversight, Jackpile-Paguate and approximately 2000 other open-pit uranium mines are still un-reclaimed, meaning they sit open and radioactive for the sake of future mining and national energy and security demands [20]. But tech-neo-imperialism does not begin and end with nuclear landscaping. It at once includes a range of technologies and know-how that include a range of necropolitics, dispossessions and forms of primitive accumulation: nuclearism, smart weapons, viral and bacterial engineering and testing, eugenic piracy, bio-materials marketing and organ theft, immaterial labor practices, the 'desert-as-toxic-dump' and intra-national and transnational market leveraging of the poorest people in this country. The revolutionary Angelita La Escapia, a Mexican revolutionary leader in Silko's Almanac provides critical analysis of the political economy of the genocide of the Americas: [Marx and Engels] had been on the right track with their readings on Native American communal economies and cultures. For Europeans, they had been far ahead of their time; they had been close but they still hadn't got it quite right. They had not understood that the earth was mother to all beings, and they had not understood anything about the spirit beings. But at least Engels and Marx had understood the earth belongs to no one. No human, individuals or corporations, no cartel of nations, could "own" the earth; it was the earth who possessed the humans and it was the earth who disposed of them. Now it was up to the poorest tribal people and survivors of European genocide to show the remaining humans how all could share and live together on earth. (Almanac 749, my italics) The question of mobilization and resistance, raised by Sandoval's earlier analysis, now must be answered within zones of morbidity where dying and toxicity are profitable and productive of U.S. imperial "national security." How is it possible to leverage political action over the survival of "the poorest tribal people and survivors of [U.S.-] European genocide?" These politically "authentic" bodies are summoned over and against the call from above for a politics of "grass-roots" resistance "on the ground." Whose ethical position warrants taking on the debt and risk of necropolitical abandonment or targeting? To this, Mbembé's Foucauldian response is clear, "In the economy of biopower, the function of racism is to regulate the distribution of death and to make possible the murderous functions of the state" ("Necropolitics" 17). These racialized bodies, the poor, "the grassroots" are simultaneously constructed as a new political class by virtue of their proximity to death and morbidity AND at the same time as cultivated bio-material fodder. This is not irony; this is necropolitics. Resistance is deadly and profitable. Complicating the horribly complex ethics of political action is the melting terrain of civil society in the U.S. Civil society and progressive politics, particularly when intensely located in post-industrial labor activisms, are slipping or "withering" (Hardt) with moments of stabilization. And the shock to privileged liberals and progressives alike is that as the citizenry becomes the civilianry, we are undergoing a radical and reterritorializing "democratization of oppressions." Silko underscores differences between the racist U.S. state and the racialized American nation: The U.S. Treasury might be nearly empty, and the United States might be caught in civil unrest and strikes — but the white men would spend their last dime to stop the people from the South. The U.S. government might have no money for the starving, but there was always government money for weapons and death…. The people themselves might be finished with wars, but their generals and business tycoons were not. (Almanac 711) Perhaps, we might concede that U.S. tech-neo-imperialism includes and exceeds Marxist-Leninist and centrist territorial and colonial imperialisms as well as those of leveraged finance capital, hedge funds, and currency trading. Perhaps, this imperialism has added to its arsenal the movement and the logistics of the U.S. as high-speed, deterritorializing, cultural-material, bio-political, technological imperialism as articulated by Foucault, Deleuze, and Hardt and Negri. Bio-politics are both at work and involuted, operating through and against what Mbembé describes in Palestine, Israel, and Central Africa as "necropolitics," what Joao Biehl details in brazil as "vita or life in zones of social abandonment," the "mattering" of bodily tissues that Pheng Cheah articulates in Southeast Asia, and Benjamin and Agamben's "sacred life" over and against "bare life" in Europe and the North.

#### Therefore, I affirm Resolved: Countries ought to prohibit the production of nuclear power.

#### Our method of enacting the prohibition of nuclear power production is one of genealogy – a critical interrogation of its historical underpinnings. Rather than reading history through objectivity, constantly interrogates the structures that enable certain histories to become dominate truisms. Such a process enables the removal of the reference points of power by placing a continuously shifting view of events that fragments coherence and allows resubjectivization while producing modes of resistance.

Michael Clifford, 2001

Clifford is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at the Institute for the Humanities and the Department of Philosophy and Religion at Mississippi State University. “Political Genealogy After Foucault,” Routledge London, pg 134-137.

Foucault’s counter-memory is very close to the Nietzschean idea of “active forgetfulness” (aktive Vergesslichkeit).21 Counter-memory consists of essentially forgetting who we are. It is a forgetfulness of essence, of necessity, of the moral and ontological obligations that bind us to an identity. There is freedom in forgetfulness. Counter-memory holds us at a remove, a distance, from ourselves; not in the traditional sense of self reflection, but of wrenching the self—this identity—apart, through an incision, a cutting that makes the self stand naked and strange before us across an unbridgeable divide, a gap of difference. Counter-memory dislodges the propriety of our-selves. The self, as a coherent identity, becomes foreign through counter-memory. We cannot remember what it was that compelled us to act, believe, be a given way. Counter-memory dissolves this compulsion, this determination, this subjection. The power of identity is suspended through a forgetfulness of its necessity—a freedom is opened within the space of a difference that no identity can constrain. This difference always plays outside the limits, outside any delimitation of being. Counter-memory thrusts us into this uncharted world, where a memory makes no sense, where play is the order of the day, where lightening and chance disintegrate the heavy and solid, the identical. Counter-memory bears directly on processes of subjectivation, on the techniques of the self through which we constitute for ourselves an identity. “Counter-discourses” anticipate a subjectival freedom of open possibilities by opposing themselves to the discourses of truth through which we recognize ourselves as subjects.22 These counter-discourses, the discourses of genealogy, lift the burdensome obligations imposed on us by such a recognition. As a forgetfulness of these obligations, counter-memory always takes the form of a transgression. It invites condemnation even as it refuses to be held accountable. Yet there is freedom in this refusal, in this transgression—for those who have the stomach for it.23 There is always an essential risk involved in refusing, in forgetting, one’s identity.24 Counter-memory is not a form of consciousness. It is nothing, really, except the effect of a certain kind of description of ourselves, a description of the historical ontology of ourselves as subjects. This description has been closed off and denied by power/knowledge relations, excluded and made peripheral by certain dominant discourses and entrenched scientific-philosophical enterprises that bind us to a conception of what we are in truth. Counter-memory counters, or suspends, the power of identity through genealogical accounts of its constitution. Genealogy effects “the systematic dissociation of identity” by revealing its radical contingency, its historicality and utter lack of essentiality. The purpose of genealogy, says Foucault, “is not to discover the roots of our identity, but to commit itself to its dissipation.”25 Genealogical critique is an exposition of our history as subjects that has the effect of disposing subjectival constraints by exposing the contingency of their imposition. Genealogy turns the firm posture of the self-identical subject into the mere posing of a pretentious display. Genealogy proceeds through “dissension” and “disparity.” Wherever “the self fabricates a coherent identity,” genealogy puts into play a subversive counter-analysis that “permits the dissociation of the self, its recognition and displacement as an empty synthesis.”26 Genealogy disturbs, fragments, displaces the unity of subjectivity. It cuts through the oppressive, assimilating density of Truth and discovers in this beguiling haze that subjectivity is nothing more than a colorful mask. Who we are, what we are, is a mask displayed for public viewing and examination, for person-al subjection and ethical subjugation. Genealogy cuts through this mask, only to make another discovery. Behind it there is no essential identity, no unified spirit or will, no naked subject stripped of its colorful dress. Rather, there is only a matrix of intersecting lines and heterogenous congruities, an arbitrary and historically contingent complex of discursive and nondiscursive practices. Asserts Foucault, “If the genealogist refuses to extend his faith in metaphysics, if he listens to history, he finds that there is ‘something altogether different’ behind things; not a timeless and essential secret, but the secret that they have no essence or that their essence was fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms.”27 Contrary to what René Descartes or John Locke would contend, unity (whether of consciousness proper or the continuity of personal experience) is not the essence of subjectivity. Unity is a mask for an interplay of anonymous forces and historical accidents that permits us to identify subjects, to identify ourselves, as specific human beings. Unity—identity—is imposed on subjects as the mask of their fabrication. Subjectivity is the carceral and incarcerating expression of this imposition, of the limitations drawn around us by discourses of truth and practices of individualization; but seen through the “differential knowledge” of genealogy, the identity of subjectivity collapses. Counter-memory through genealogical critique is a transgression of limits. As such, it opens onto a possibility of freedom. Genealogy permits us “to separate out, from the contingency that has made us what we are, the possibility of no longer being, doing, thinking what we are, do, or think.” In this sense, genealogy gives “new impetus, as far and wide as possible, to the undefined work of freedom.”28 The freedom offered by counter-memory is a kind of parodic reversal of negative freedom: it is not a freedom from interference, but for it—for disruption, for displacement, for violating those inviolable spheres of liberty that serve as the limits of our subjection. It is not a freedom for individuality, but from it—a freedom from individualization, from the practices and discourses which bind us to our own identity as individuals. It is not a freedom against the office of government, but against governmentality—against a rationality that imprisons us in the cellular space of our own self-government. At the same time, the freedom of/through counter-memory is a form of mimetic play with the notion of positive freedom whereby citizenship is unwrapped like a cloak from the politicized body. In simple terms, it can be said that genealogy “enables one to get free of oneself.”29 That is, by exposing the nonessentiality of the limits imposed on us through the constitution of a self, it opens the possibility of going beyond those limits.30 This opening is a kind of fracture, at once an open space and a breaking free of the constraining power inherent in identity and identification. In this sense, genealogy opens up “a space of concrete freedom, i.e., of possible transformation.”31 This notion of fracture allows us to define freedom more precisely, to gauge whether or not a genuine space of freedom has been opened for us. Freedom, concrete freedom, is a space of possible transformation. Unless we are free to transform ourselves, to be other than the identity dictated for us by some extraneous rationality, we have no freedom. Even the most violent forms of resistance against subjection accomplish nothing if they do not gain this freedom, do not open a space of possible transformation—which means nothing more, and nothing less, than the possibility of being otherwise. Something very like this point is made by Dennis Altman with regard to the Stonewall riots of 1969 and the militant Gay Liberation Front that emerged from them in the early 1970s. In one of the seminal texts of what would later become known as Queer Theory, Altman rails against the limited vision of a political movement that sought for gay and lesbian people little more than an expansion of rights and the “liberal tolerance” of the homophile community: “Homosexuals can win acceptance as distinct from tolerance only by a transformation of society, one that is based on a ‘new human’ who is able to accept the multifaceted and varied nature of his or her sexual identity. That such a society can be founded is the gamble upon which gay and women’s liberation are based; like all radical movements they hold to an optimistic view of human nature, above all to its mutability.”32 This requirement that we are only genuinely free if we able to transform ourselves is recalcitrant.33 It is crucial to understand, however, that what is being required here is not a freedom to transform ourselves in accordance with some global or teleological model of a more “genuine” form of subjectivity. This freedom does not consist (as it does in On Liberty) in replacing one form of subjectivity for another that is supposedly “truer” or more fulfilling to human nature. Not only is this illusory and unobtainable, it would also amount to a cancellation of freedom, a reimposition of subjectival limitations and expectations. Rather, the freedom opened by counter-memory is a freedom of permanent transformation, of always being able to become other than what we are.

#### These perverse narratives of nuclear power are self-sustaining, critique is off limits because of the omnipresent image of the all-knowing Scientist. The historical webs cast by this “despotism of science” is innocent in neither intent nor consequence, ensuring a militaristic tie between science and warfare and corrupting critical questioning of potential risk-factors within vulnerable populations in favor of statist drives for power and domination. Our genealogical reading of the resolution enables a counter-historical narrative to oppose and break down the Western framing of nuclear power.

Jean-Claude Debeir et al, 1986

Jean Claude Debeir, Jean-Paul Deleage and Daniel Hemery, translated by John Barzman. “In the Servitude of Power: Energy and Civilization Through the Ages”.

To operate, the nuclear industry requires a minimum act of faith. It establishes the 'despotism of science' (Marx) over production and proclaims itself the equal and necessary partner of the state in the determination of economic and strategic choices. Henceforth. decisions transcend the competence of technicians and scientists. as well as politicians. The political and economic weight of the elite of scientists and of the great research institutions therefore becomes decisive. Coal and oil had fostered the historical promotion of chemistry and thermodynamics: the nuclear industry generated the lasting pre-eminence of physics. the modern form of the 'domination of brains' analysed by Louis Puiseux." A new generation of scientists. the physicists. and no longer the engineers. as in the past. would take the leadership of the international energy establishment and bring to bear their own considerations and interests in defining choices. In a way, World War II had been a war of physicists. As witnessed by the entire history of the atomic bomb from 1940 to I945. science enlisted blindly in the service of the new rising statism; everywhere. it was scientists who 'shook up' their government. This blindness was characteristic of a certain historical state of scientific conscience. 'Among the hundreds of thousands of documents written by scientists and engineers of the whole world in the first five years of the study of fission. **not a single work. not a single letter was found that tried to analyse the consequences of the development of reactors for society in depth. Even the general impact of nuclear bombs was never discussed attentively until they were actually exploded over cities.**"' As Louis Puiseux said: 'What is at stake here is not the individual good faith or civic conscience of the experts: their professional membership in large technical organizations suffices to orient their collective preferences. it is enough to invoke the "tendency of the being to persevere in the being" established by Spinoza: happiness for a researcher in a laboratory is pursuing his research; for a producer of electricity. increasing his output.'" **Whether for military or civilian purposes. the nuclear industry everywhere served to promote the new scientific elite of physicists into the inner structures of the state.** In France, the role played by Jean Penin and the Curies in the creation of the National Fund for Scientific Research in I935. the access of nuclear physics to governmental power with LÃ©on Blum's establishment of an Under-Secretary of State for Scientific Research and his appointment of Irene Joliot-Curie. then Jean Perrin. to that post. the setting up of the National Centre for Applied Scientific Research (CNRSA) by the Popular Front in I938 with committees bringing together scientists. industrialists and politicians. and the subsequent creation of the CNRS in i939. and its reorganization into a centralized and planned structure by Frederic Joliot in l944. and finally the foundation under his sponsorship of the High Commission for Atomic Energy. were the first steps of this ascension. **All in all. the nuclear industry represents a space 'beyond'. half-way between industrial production and the production of scientific knowledge. incorporating one of the latter's main characteristics: its aleatory dimension. Of course. it would be wrong to claim that a nuclear power station can be transformed into an atom bomb. But it has not really succeeded in operating as a classical plant. that is a production unit guided by a fixed. repetitive and more or less automatic division of labour.** In the United States. I3 of the 72 reactors existing in l98l had to be shut down for long periods. eight for one year or more." **The first industry to operate in 'a hostile environment created by humans" - the radioactive field - it remains in the universe of chance. within reach of the infinitely improbable: its production standards are set imperatively by the 'major risk'. the fatal 'excursion'. because of the apocalyptic irnmenslty of their virtual impact** - over ten million Americans live less than l5 kilometres from a nuclear power station." True. the nuclear industry did not invent industrial risks. but it brought them to the level of excess and incalculability. **Incidents cannot be prevented in the radioactive environment of the nuclear industry. or only at the cost of infinite precautions.** prolonged interruptions of the facilities and impressive cost ovemtns. When a leak appeared in September I978 at the Japanese Tokai Mura reprocessing plant, people expected a stoppage of merely three months; in fact. the facilities could be started up again only over one year later. To build an 900 MW: PWR reactor core, approximately 800,000 data inputs must be recorded to put together the 'identification files' of the fuel assemblies. that is over 50.000 items (blueprints. schemas. specifications) to be kept up to date." Two challenges must be faced on a permanent basis: the multiplicity and unpredictability of breakdowns. 1he accident at the 'Three Mile island reactor, knocked out of line on 28 March I979 as a result of a fault in the operation ofa single valve. one in many thousands. was not the most typical accident although it triggered a major psychological earthquake which mined the credibility of nuclear power for years. In India. one of the main nuclear powers today. the record of nuclear power stations is far more representative of the average accident. Their national programme (l0.000 MWe planned for the year 2000. l.I00 already on line) is already ten years behind schedule in spite of the quality of Indian nuclear science. In nine years of activity. reactor number one of the Kora nuclear power station. a Candu reactor built in I973 but currently off line. experienced 25l breakdowns of one kind or another. Number two. completed in I980. had already registered 24 incidents in its second year on line."

#### The role of the judge is to be an intellectual engaged in processes of uncovering and representing knowledge suppressed by systems of power.

#### Systems of power are tools that can either be used for good or manipulated for exploitation, as power is not absolute but rather fluid in its nature. Intellectuals have a particularly crucial role to play in terms of the restricting of criticism and history given their position within society. Acting alongside rather than evaluating transcendentally is crucial to critical praxis that can produce effective resistance.

Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, 2004

Foucault was a historian, Deleuze was a philosopher. They didn’t really do much. “Desert Island and Other Texts: 1953-1974” (Desert Islands is a collection of unpublished interviews and texts by Deleuze, the collection was published in 2004, but the work within was written between 1953-1974) p206-209

Michel Foucault: A Maoist told me: "I can see why Sartre is on our side, for what and why he is involved in politics; and you, I can even see why you do it, since you've always considered imprisonment a problem. But Deleuze, really, I don't see it." His question took me totally by surprise, because it's crystal clear to me. Gilles Deleuze: Maybe it's because for us the relationships between theory and praxis are being lived in a new way. On the one hand, praxis used to be conceived as an application of theory, as a consequence; on the other hand, and inversely, praxis was supposed to inspire theory, it was supposed to create a new form of theory. In any case, their relationship took the form of a process of totalization, in one shape or another. Maybe we're asking the question in a new way. For us the relationships between theory and praxis are much more fragmentary and partial. In the first place, a theory is always local, related to a limited domain, though it can be applied in another domain that is more or less distant. The rule of application is never one of resemblance. In the second place, as soon as a theory takes hold in its own domain, it encounters obstacles, walls, collisions, and these impediments create a need for the theory to be relayed by another kind of discourse (it is this other discourse which eventually causes the theory to migrate from one domain to another). Praxis is a network of relays from one theoretical point to another, and theory relays one praxis to another. A theory cannot be developed without encountering a wall, and a praxis is needed to break through. Take yourself, for example, you begin by theoretically analyzing a milieu of imprisonment like the psychiatric asylum of nineteenth-century capitalist society. Then **you discover how necessary it is precisely for those who are imprisoned to speak on their own behalf, for them to become a relay** (or perhaps you were already a relay for them), but these people are prisoners, they're in prison. This was the logic behind your creating the GIP (Group for Information on Prisons): to promote the conditions in which the prisoners themselves could speak.2 It would be totally misguided to say, as the Maoist seemed to be saying, that you were making a move toward praxis by applying your theories. **In your case we find** neither an application, nor a reform program, nor an investigation in the traditional sense. It is something else entirely: **a system of relays in an assemblage, in a multiplicity of bits and pieces both theoretical and practical.** **For us, the intellectual and theorist have ceased to be a subject, a consciousness, that represents or is representative.** And **those involved in political struggle have ceased to be represented**, whether by a party or a union that would in turn claim for itself the right to be their conscience. **Who speaks and who acts? It's always a multiplicity, even in the person that speaks or acts.** We are all groupuscles. **There is no more representation. There is only action, the action of theory, the action of praxis, in the relations of relays and networks.** Michel Foucault: It seems to me that traditionally, an intellectual's political status resulted from two things: 1) the position as an intellectual in bourgeois society, in the system of capitalist production, in the ideology which that system produces or imposes (being exploited, reduced to poverty, being rejected or "cursed," being accused of subversion or immorality, etc.), and 2) intellectual discourse itself, in as much as it revealed a particular truth, uncovering political relationships where none were before perceived. These two forms of becoming politicized were not strangers to one another, but they didn't necessarily coincide either. You had the "cursed" intellectual, and you had the "socialist" intellectual. In certain moments of violent reaction, the powers that be willingly confused these two politicizations with one another—after 1848, after the Commune, after 1940: the intellectual was rejected, persecuted at the very moment when "things" began to appear in their naked "truth," when you were not supposed to discuss the king's new clothes. Since the latest resurgence, however, **intellectuals realize that the masses can do without them and still be knowledgeable: the masses** know perfectly well what's going on, it is perfectly clear to them, they **even know better than the intellectuals do, and they say so convincingly enough. But a system of power exists to bar, prohibit, invalidate their discourse and their knowledge**—a power located not only in the upper echelons of censorship, but which deeply and subtly permeates the whole network of society. **The intellectuals are themselves part of this system of power**, as is the idea that intellectuals are the agents of "consciousness" and discourse. **The role of the intellectual is no longer to situate himself "slightly ahead"** or "slightly to one side" **so he may speak the silent truth of each and all; it is rather to struggle against those forms of power** where he is both instrument and object: in the order of "knowledge," "truth," "consciousness," and "discourse." So it is that theory does not express, translate, or apply a praxis; it is a praxis— but local and regional, as you say: non-totalizing. **A struggle against power, a struggle to bring power to light and open it up wherever it is most invisible and insidious.** Not a struggle for some "insight" or "realization" (for a long time now consciousness as knowledge has been acquired by the masses, and consciousness as subjectivity has been taken, occupied by the bourgeoisie)—but **a struggle to undermine and take power side by side with those who are fighting, and not off to the side trying to enlighten them**. A "theory" is the regional system of this struggle.

#### Traditional ethical analysis is always drawn along lines of disposability – positing deviant bodies as less important and in need of input within calculations – a focus on the way streams of power operate on bodies is crucial in decision-making.

Elizabeth A. Povinelli, 2013

Povinelli is Franz Boas Professor of Anthropology and Gender Studies, Director of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender and the Co-Director of the Centre for the Study of Law and Culture at Columbia University. “Necropolitics”; The Anthropology of Biopolitics; February 23, 2013; <https://anthrobiopolitics.wordpress.com/2013/02/23/necropolitics/>”

In what might be seen as biopolitical ‘social disposability’ rather than ‘social death’, the work of critical educational theorist Henry Giroux, in “Reading Hurricane Katrina” (2006), makes an assumption about biopower similar to Mbembe’s regarding the late-modern era of perpetual terror and insecurity. However, in focusing on the United States, he is drawn more to what he sees as the ‘politics of disposability’ as the particular form of necropower, rather than emphasizing the power of death in relation to projects of sovereignty. For Giroux, the hyper-neoliberal racial state, since Reagan, has silently governed in the interests of Corporate America at the expense of human lives, by utilizing the repressive power of color-blind ideology to implement policy reforms which increasingly silently neglect disadvantaged populations further into the margins, thereby permitting their disposability (letting them die). To demonstrate that the governmentality of the racial state has changed in form from prior eras, Giroux compares the 1955 murder of Emmett Till (which helped spark civil rights movement activity) with the deaths of over one thousand racial minorities caused (superficially, he would argue) by hurricane Katrina in 2005, to show the difference in what these cases revealed about the racial state: “Till’s body allowed the racism that destroyed it to be made visible, to speak to the systemic character of American racial injustice. The bodies of the Katrina victims could not speak with the same directness to the state of American racist violence but they did reveal and shatter the conservative fiction of living in a color-blind society” (p.174). Of course, I have to wonder whether Giroux would still maintain his belief expressed here, that Katrina shattered the imaginary reality of U.S. color-blindness- to which an abundance of evidence to support this ideology’s heightening continuation today continues to surface at an ongoing rate. Nevertheless, the importance of the Katrina example, for Giroux, is to highlight how the informed decision-making of the Bush administration’s actions leading up to and after Katrina hit reveal the racial state’s knowing involvement in an anti-democratic project of sustaining insecurity in a particular fashion. That is, by knowingly rendering already-marginalized groups vulnerable to natural disasters like Katrina, which were expected to hit and devastate the gulf region of the U.S., the neoliberal state proved its complicity in the biopolitical project of not only letting die, but of actively disposing what it had redlined as value-less portions of the U.S. population. In effect, by implementing a politics of disposability in the era of neoliberal insecurity, the U.S. government was reducing its populace to a politics of “bare life”.
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