# Round 4 vs Stanford GS (Aff)

## 1AC

#### Same as other ASU Rounds.

## 2AC

### T

#### We meet: Reprocessing extracts fuel from waste.

World Nuclear Association 12 [Processing of Used Nuclear Fuel, http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf69.html]

Used nuclear fuel has long been reprocessed to extract fissile materials for recycling and to reduce the volume of high-level wastes. ¶ New reprocessing technologies are being developed to be deployed in conjunction with fast neutron reactors which will burn all long-lived actinides. ¶ A significant amount of plutonium recovered from used fuel is currently recycled into MOX fuel; a small amount of recovered uranium is recycled. ¶ A key, nearly unique, characteristic of nuclear energy is that used fuel may be reprocessed to recover fissile and fertile materials in order to provide fresh fuel for existing and future nuclear power plants. Several European countries, Russia and Japan have had a policy to reprocess used nuclear fuel, although government policies in many other countries have not yet addressed the various aspects of reprocessing.¶ Over the last 50 years the principal reason for reprocessing used fuel has been to recover unused uranium and plutonium in the used fuel elements and thereby close the fuel cycle, gaining some 25% more energy from the original uranium in the process and thus contributing to energy security. A secondary reason is to reduce the volume of material to be disposed of as high-level waste to about one fifth. In addition, the level of radioactivity in the waste from reprocessing is much smaller and after about 100 years falls much more rapidly than in used fuel itself.¶

#### Counter interpretation:

#### The aff has to affect both resource extraction and conversion into energy

Australian Government, Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency 2011 [“Energy Production and Consumption,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/national-greenhouse-energy-reporting/publications/supplementary-guidelines/energy-production-consumption.aspx]

Production of energy: in relation to a facility, means the:

1. extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility
2. manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility, or for use other than in the operation of the facility (regulation 2.23(3) NGER Regulations).

#### We meet the counter-interpretation: recycling involves both the act of reprocessing the used fuel and using it to create new nuclear energy.

#### Our interp good:

A. Predictability – Only our interpretation guarantees link arguments to both extraction and the burning of resources to produce energy. This is crucial link ground for pollution DAs and domestic/foreign energy tradeoff DAs.

B. Limits: Requiring the aff to both extract and convert the energy is necessary to eliminate affs that only extract, like capture carbon or methane or stockpile oil as a strategic military reserve with heg advantages. Also key to prevent affs that only burn fuels like Bataille-style affs that encourage rapid consumption or R&D affs that incentivize new ways to burn the same resources.

#### Competing interpretations are bad: Race to the bottom: they’re just trying to limit out one more case

#### Prefer reasonability: as long as we’re reasonably topical, there’s no reason to pull the trigger. Don’t vote on potential abuse.

### Waste

#### No prolif concerns – new tech does not separate the plutonium preventing it from theft or usability.

Lagus, 2005 WISE Intern, ‘5

[Todd, University of Minnesota, WISE, “Reprocessing of Spent Nuclear Fuel: A Policy Analysis”

<http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2005/lagus.pdf>, RSR]

In the case of the newer UREX+ technology, the long-lived fission products create more steps in weapons deployment. The new technologies for reprocessing including transmutation would not involve separating pure plutonium, but rather a plutonium/ actinide mixture that would increase the toxicity of the material and protect it from theft and handling. The International Atomic Energy Agency’s (IAEA) standard for self protection requires 1 Sievert/hr (100 rems/hr) at one meter. Five Sieverts is a median lethal dose. 45 This technology again has been demonstrated in laboratories, but a great deal of research is still underway. The actinides also contaminate the plutonium such that it would not be usable as a weapon without sophisticated chemical separation technologies, which few countries, if any, possess. 46 Some argue that there are many other weapons options which are cheaper and easier to fabricate should an enemy decide to strike. 47

### States

#### Perm do both. Solves elections, looks like deference to the states which is popular, and solves spending because states would foot the bill.

#### CP links to elections – reverse coattails in 2008 prove

Rosenberg 8 (Andy, Obama's Reverse Coattails, Huffington Post, 3 October 2008, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/andy-rosenberg/obamas-reverse-coattails\_b\_131592.html, da 10-5-12)

But an interesting thing has happened in the months since the primary. For a variety of reasons - the resurgent posture of the Democrats in Congress, a dominant fundraising performance by the DCCC and a stable of far superior congressional candidates than those proffered by the GOP - the coattails have actually reversed and it is Obama who is being helped by a strong down ticket surge in pivotal regions across the country.¶ A good example of this is the Pennsylvania 3rd Congressional District, where Republican incumbent Phil English is getting the challenge of his career from businesswoman and political neophyte Kathy Dahlkemper. A recent poll conducted for Roll Call showed Dahlkemper leading English 49 percent to 45 percent, with 6 percent undecided. English was elected to his seat in the GOP-leaning district in 1994, succeeding Republican Tom Ridge, who was elected governor that year. It was drawn to guarantee a solid Republican seat. With Dahlkemper's strength pulling support to the Democrats, however, the poll shows Republican presidential nominee John McCain leading Obama by just 48 percent to 46 percent in the district. Local pundits are observing that an unexpectedly robust Dahlkemper campaign could be generating new votes for Obama in this key region of the state where John McCain needs to dominate.¶ Another example of a strong down ticket surge in a pivotal state for Obama is the Senate campaign of former Virginia Governor Mark Warner. Currently ahead by 30 points over his hapless Republican opponent, the enormously popular Warner has the opportunity to provide coattails to Obama - carrying the Democratic nominee to near-certain victory should he help generate a win in Virginia. (Should Warner win by 30 and not bring Obama with him, however, many Democratic activists would consider it a hollow victory ... and something Warner should definitely be working hard to avoid.)¶ As the list of swing districts and states grows in which unexpectedly strong Congressional and Senatorial Democratic candidates are dominating their Republican opponents, Obama stands to benefit from a national wave of down ticket strength - a phenomenon that is reversing prior assumptions about the election, and just may be the unforeseen factor that propels Obama to a dominant outcome on election day.

#### States CP are V/I. 1.) No comparative literature compares the action of 50 states simultaneously vs. the federal government. 2.) Fiat abuse – uniformity circumvents the common disputes about state action like race to the bottom and enforcement. Kills competitive equity.

#### Doesn’t solve the aff – absent the plan, companies would be vary of going against NATIONAL policy because it could kill the industry. That’s Selyukh 10.

#### Interpretation – negative gets to either fiat state enacting of the plan or some method of federal government enaction, but not both. A.) Multi-government level fiat bad – allows them to claim net benefits like federalism by saying devolving power to the states would solve backlash B.) Not real world – this has never happened before so there’s no lit base on it. This is especially true on the energy topic which is a unique federal power. Voter for fairness and education.

#### CP can’t solve – federal investment is necessary to remove the perceptual ban on reprocessing.

Adams, ‘8

[Rod, “What Do You Do About the Waste? Recycle and Reuse”, Clean Technica, 5-29-2008,

<http://cleantechnica.com/2008/05/29/what-do-you-do-about-the-waste-recycle-and-reuse/>, RSR]

The US used to have a plan to recycle our fuel as well, but a great deal of marketing and pressure by people that do not like the idea of using plutonium as a source of commercial heat resulted in President Ford issuing a presidential order to temporarily halt nuclear fuel recycling in 1976. President Carter, a man who claimed to be a nuclear engineer, made that ban permanent in the hopes that forcing US companies to avoid fuel recycling would cause others to abandon the very logical idea. That effort did not work as planned, but the people who had invested large amounts of time and money into building three recycling plants in the US only to have them shut down with the stroke of a pen decided “once bitten, twice shy.” Though President Reagan removed the ban, President Clinton essentially reinstated it and no commercial company has been willing to build a facility and risk having it turn into a white elephant after an election.

#### Conditionality is a voting issue – being able to kick positions at will destroys argumentative responsibility, skews the 2AC, the focal point of all aff offense, because we have to spend more time answering things than they do kicking them, and justifies aff conditionality to be reciprocal.

#### Congress is necessary – overcomes regulatory process.

Fertel, Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer at the Nuclear Energy Institute, ‘5

[Marvin, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER'S PLACE IN A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,” 4/28, lexis]

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the federal government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation. Such efforts have provided a dramatic contribution to global security, as evidenced by the U.S.-Russian nonproliferation agreement to recycle weapons-grade material from Russia for use in American reactors. Currently, more than 50 percent of U.S. nuclear power plant fuel depends on converted Russian warhead material. Nowhere is continued congressional oversight more important than with DOE's program to manage the used nuclear fuel from our nuclear power plants. Continued progress toward a federal used nuclear fuel repository is necessary to support nuclear energy's vital role in a comprehensive national energy policy and to support the remediation of DOE defense sites. Since enactment of the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE's federal repository program has repeatedly overcome challenges, and challenges remain before the Yucca Mountain facility can begin operation. But as we address these issues, it is important to keep the overall progress of the program in context. There is international scientific consensus that a deep geologic repository is the best solution for long-term disposition of used military and commercial nuclear power plant fuel and high-level radioactive byproducts. The Bush administration and Congress, with bipartisan support, affirmed the suitability of Yucca Mountain for a repository in 2002. Over the past three years, the Energy Department and its contractors have made considerable progress providing yet greater confirmation that this is the correct course of action and that Yucca Mountain is an appropriate site for a national repository. --During the past year, federal courts have rejected significant legal challenges by the state of Nevada and others to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 2002 Yucca Mountain site suitability determination. These challenges questioned the constitutionality of the Yucca Mountain Development Act and DOE's repository system, which incorporates both natural and engineered barriers to contain radioactive material safely. In the coming year, Congress will play an essential role in keeping this program on schedule, by taking the steps necessary to provide increased funding for the project in fiscal 2006 and in future years. Meeting DOE's schedule for initial repository operation requires certainty in funding for the program. This is particularly critical in view of projected annual expenditures that will exceed $1 billion beginning in fiscal 2007. Meeting these budget requirements calls for a change in how Congress provides funds to the project from monies collected for the Nuclear Waste Fund. The history of Yucca Mountain funding is evidence that the current funding approach must be modified. Consumer fees (including interest) committed to the Nuclear Waste Fund since its f6rmation in 1983 total more than $24 billion. Consumers are projected to pay between $750 million to $800 million to the fund each year, based on electricity generated at the nation's 103 reactors. This is more than $2 million per day. Although about $8 billion has been used for the program, the balance in the fund is nearly $17 billion. In each of the past several years, there has been a gap between the annual fees paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants and disbursements from the fund for use by DOE at Yucca Mountain. Since the fund was first established, billions of dollars paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants to the Nuclear Waste Fund-intended solely for the federal government's used fuel program-in effect have been used to decrease budget deficits or increase surpluses. The industry believes that Congress should change the funding mechanism for Yucca Mountain so that payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund can be used only for the project and be excluded from traditional congressional budget caps. Although the program should remain subject to congressional oversight, Yucca Mountain appropriations should not compete each year for funding with unrelated programs when Congress directed a dedicated funding stream for the project. The industry also believes that it is appropriate and necessary to consider an alternative perspective on the Yucca Mountain project. This alternative would include an extended period for monitoring operation of the repository for up to 300 years after spent fuel is first placed underground. The industry believes that this approach would provide ongoing assurance and greater confidence that the repository is performing as designed, that public safety is assured, and that the environment is protected. It would also permit DOE to apply evolving innovative technologies at the repository. Through this approach, a scientific monitoring program would identify additional scientific information that can be used in repository performance models. The project then could update the models, and make modifications in design and operations as appropriate. Congressional committees like this one can help ensure that DOE does not lose sight of its responsibility for used nuclear fuel management and disposal, as stated by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The industry fully supports the fundamental need for a repository so that used nuclear fuel and the byproducts of the nation's nuclear weapons program are securely managed in an underground, specially designed facility. World-class science has demonstrated that Yucca Mountain is the best site for that facility. A public works project of this magnitude will inevitably face challenges. Yet, none is insurmountable. DOE and its contractors have made significant progress on the project and will continue to do so as the project enters the licensing phase. Congressional oversight also can play a key role in maintaining and encouraging the stability of the NRC's regulatory process. Such stability is essential for our 103 operating nuclear plants and equally critical in licensing new nuclear power plants. Congress played a key role several years ago in encouraging the NRC to move toward a new oversight process for the nation's nuclear plants, based on quantitative performance indicators and safety significance. Today's reactor oversight process is designed to focus industry and NRC resources on equipment, components and operational issues that have the greatest importance to, and impact on, safety. The NRC and the industry have worked hard to identify and implement realistic security requirements at nuclear power plants. In the three-and-a-half years since 9/11, the NRC has issued a series of requirements to increase security and enhance training for security programs. The industry complied-fully and rapidly. In the days and months following Sept. 11, quick action was required. Orders that implemented needed changes quickly were necessary. Now, we should return to the orderly process of regulating through regulations. The industry has spent more than $1 billion enhancing security since September 2001. We've identified and fixed vulnerabilities. Today, the industry is at the practical limit of what private industry can do to secure our facilities against the terrorist threat. NRC Chairman Nils Diaz and other commissioners have said that the industry has achieved just about everything that can be reasonably achieved by a civilian force. The industry now needs a transition period to stabilize the new security requirements. We need time to incorporate these dramatic changes into our operations and emergency planning programs and to train our employees to the high standards of our industry-and to the appropriately high expectations of the NRC. Both industry and the NRC need congressional oversight to support and encourage this kind of stability. CONCLUSION Electricity generated by America's nuclear power plants over the past half-century has played a key part in our nation's growth and prosperity. Nuclear power produces over 20 percent of the electricity used in the United States today without producing air pollution. As our energy demands continue to grow in years to come, nuclear power should play an even greater role in meeting our energy and environmental needs. The nuclear energy industry is operating its reactors safely and efficiently. The industry is striving to produce more electricity from existing plants. The industry is also developing more efficient, next-generation reactors and exploring ways to build them more cost-effectively. The public sector, including the oversight committees of the U.S. Congress, can help maintain the conditions that ensure Americans will continue to reap the benefits of our operating plants, and create the conditions that will spur investment in America's energy infrastructure, including new nuclear power plants. One important step is passage of comprehensive energy legislation that recognizes nuclear energy's contributions to meeting our growing energy demands, ensuring our nation's energy security and protecting our environment. Equally important, however, is the need to ensure effective and efficient implementation of existing laws, like the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and to provide federal agencies with the resources and oversight necessary to discharge their statutory responsibilities in the most efficient way possible. The commercial nuclear power sector was born in the United States, and nations around the world continue to look to this nation for leadership in this technology and in the issues associated with nuclear power. Our ability to influence critical international policies in areas like nuclear nonproliferation, for example, depends on our ability to maintain a leadership role in prudent deployment, use and regulation of nuclear energy technologies here at home, in the United States, and on our ability to manage the technological and policy challenges-like waste management-that arise with all advanced technologies.

#### US stance against reprocessing hurts relations with South Korea and results in South Korean nuclearization.

Yurman, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Dan, “Revisiting Reprocessing in South Korea”, ANS Nuclear Café, 8-2-12,

<http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/08/02/revisiting-reprocessing-in-south-korea/>, RSR]

Comes now the request by the South Korean government, first aired in October 2010, to revise the bilateral cooperation treaty with the U.S. It has been in place for more than 40 years and it is a cornerstone of U.S./South Korean diplomatic relations. Many specialists in the field of nonproliferation see a “hard and fast” policy against any expansion of uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing as a key to stopping states like North Korea from pursuing these activities. That strategy hasn’t worked and, as a result, South Korea wants relief from the restriction in the now-decades-old treaty. Negotiations over changes to the treaty have been going on since last December, but appear to be stalemated around a key set of issues. It is a delicate dance, as diplomats like to say, because if the U.S. leans too heavily on South Korea, it could sour relations between the two countries and spawn nationalist sentiment that might lead to a nuclear weapons program. Since the 1950s, South Korea has depended on the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a shield against aggression from its neighbor to the north.

#### US-SoKo relations k2 regional stability and global security

Clinton 10 [Hillary Rodham Clinton, “America’s Engagement in the Asia-Pacific”, October 28, 2010, http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/10/150141.htm]

This year also marked a milestone with another ally: the 60th anniversary of the start of the Korean War, which Secretary Gates and I commemorated in Seoul this past summer. And in two weeks, our presidents will meet in Seoul when President Obama travels there for the G-20 summit. Our two countries have stood together in the face of threats and provocative acts from North Korea, including the tragic sinking of the Cheonan by a North Korean torpedo. We will continue to coordinate closely with both Seoul and Tokyo in our efforts to make clear to North Korea there is only one path that promises the full benefits of engagement with the outside world – a full, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization.The alliance between South Korea and the United States is a lynchpin of stability and security in the region and now even far beyond. We are working together in Afghanistan, where a South Korean reconstruction team is at work in Parwan Province; in the Gulf of Aden, where Korean and U.S. forces are coordinating anti-piracy missions. And of course, beyond our military cooperation, our countries enjoy a vibrant economic relationship, which is why our two Presidents have called for resolving the outstanding issues related to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement by the time of the G-20 meeting in Seoul.

#### East Asian instability leads to World War III

Knight Ridder 2k

(Jonathon S. Landay, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts”, 3-11, L/N)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But **even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war**. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. **Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile**," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "**We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster**."

### Elections

#### Romney wins now – national polls and independents.

Geraghty, Contributor, 10-25

[Jim, “Obama ‘Wins’ Debate, But Somehow Romney Wins the Undecideds”, The National Review, 10-25-12,

<http://www.nationalreview.com/campaign-spot/331597/obama-wins-debate-somehow-romney-wins-undecideds>, RSR]

President Obama scored a modest win in the third presidential debate, according to the latest Washington Post-ABC News tracking poll, but it’s Republican Mitt Romney who moved the needle among likely voters — including independents — with his debate performances. Overall, the contest remains unchanged from Tuesday, with 49 percent of likely voters nationally backing Romney, and 48 percent supporting Obama. But as was the case after the first and second debates, more voters say they have better, not worse, opinions of the former Massachusetts governor when assessing the three debates. Most say the president’s debate performances did not change their views of him, a continuing challenge for an incumbent stuck with an approval rating in dangerous territory: 50 percent of likely voters approve of how he’s handling the job, 49 percent disapprove. Looking at handling the economy as a broad issue, Romney’s lead among independents has swelled to 56 to 39 percent in the new poll, an advantage that helps him to a sizable, 12-point lead over Obama when it comes to their voting preferences. Obama won independent and other voters by eight percentage points in 2008.

#### Romney wins now – best polls and swing states.

Chambers 10-24 (Dean, Arlington Conservative, “Mitt Romney 54 percent 359 electoral votes projected at UnSkewed Polls site”, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-54-percent-359-electoral-votes-projected-at-unskewed-polls-site)

While the Gallup tracking poll released today shows Romney leading the race 50 percent to 46 percent, other major polls and projections are also suggesting Mitt Romney will be the next president of the United States. Calling it the “Unskewed Projection” of the 2012 presidential race, QStarNews has released today via UnSkewedPolls.com a detail prediction of the race by popular vote in all states and nationally as well as a projection by electoral votes. The report projects Mitt Romney will defeat President Obama by a 54 percent to 46 percent by national popular vote and 359 electoral votes for Romney to 179 electoral votes for Obama. The projection includes a chart predicting the popular vote and vote percentages for all the states as well as vote data from all states from the last four presidential elections. The QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com projection of the race is based on analyzing and predicting the popular vote in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia by assessing the votes in the last four elections, the political profile, demographic changes, current and recent polls including the QStarNews polls as well information regarding the targeting of those states by the Obama and Romney campaigns this year. The QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com predicts that overall turnout nationally will be about 105 percent of what it was in 2008 and the electorate will be made up of 34.8 percent Republicans, 35.2 percent Democrats and 30.0 percent independents. The reports projects that a total of 130,955,000 voters will vote in the election this year. Romney is shown winning all 11 of the key swing states, as also projected in the latest QStarNews poll of swing states, in the QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com projection. Those states include Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. Most observers of this election and their projections consider Michigan and Pennsylvania to be more likely to be won in November by President Obama. The map above shows the electoral college projection from this QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com report. Mitt Romney is projected to win 359 electoral votes while President Obama is expected to win the remaining 179 electoral votes. While many will be surprised to see Romney winning Oregon, Minnesota, Michigan and Pennsylvania, the other surprises are how close states like Connecticut, New Jersey and Maine end up in popular since those states have been fairly safely in the Obama column in most projections and polls up to now. QStarNews reports this “definitive projection” will be highly accurate because of the methodology used to produce the numbers on which it is based. QStarNews was quite accurate in projecting the 2010 elections for Congress, senators and governors.

#### Romney’s winning Nevada now, and it’s key to the election.

Myers, Las Vegas Review Journal reporter, 10-22 (Laura; Las Vegas Journal Review; Heavy early voting favors Democrats on eve of Romney, Obama Nevada visits; 22 October 2012; http://www.lvrj.com/news/heavy-early-voting-favors-democrats-on-eve-of-romney-obama-nevada-visits-175333751.html, da 10-23-12)

Obama's and Romney's focus on the Silver State in the final two weeks before Nov. 6 shows how important Nevada is to both of their strategies to gain the 270 Electoral College votes needed to win. Nevada delivers only six of those votes but could make the difference if the race comes down to the wire.¶ The stakes high, early voting got off to a booster-rocket start, setting records Saturday and Sunday in both Clark and Washoe counties.¶ Statewide, about 81,130 people voted early, and more than 24,640 absentee ballots were counted, for a total weekend turnout of nearly 106,000, or 8 percent of the electorate, the secretary of state's office reported.¶ By party, Democrats racked up more than 51,120 voters statewide compared with more than 37,800 for Republicans - an advantage of about 13,320, according to figures posted Monday. More than 16,840 cast ballots as third party or non partisan voters. They could play a decisive role in the close election.¶ In Clark County, Registrar of Voters Larry Lomax said record early voting happened Saturday and Sunday across the Las Vegas Valley for a total of 59,190 ballots cast, including about 31,400 Democrats and 18,100 Republicans . Four years ago, more than 45,000 first-weekend ballots were cast in Clark.¶ "After the first two or three days, we're on track to surpass early voting" for 2008, Lomax said Monday afternoon. By then, another 17,000 Nevadans had cast ballots. In 2008, more than two-thirds of voters in Clark County and statewide cast ballots early, Lomax said.¶ In Washoe County, a record 14,475 ballots were cast over the weekend, compared with 9,036 four years ago.¶ At the start of early voting, the Democrats had a big voter registration advantage over the Republicans of about 90,000 voters statewide and 127,000 in Clark County, where 70 percent of the population lives.¶ That compares with four years ago, when the Democrats enjoyed a 100,000 voter registration advantage in Nevada and Obama won by 12 percentage points - or about the same early voting advantage he had back then.¶ Although Republicans are running behind again this year, a GOP strategist noted Monday that the party is doing far better than in 2008. The strategist also said Republicans have historically tightened the gap each day of the two-week early voting period, which ends Nov. 2.¶ For example, in 2008 Republicans were more than 16,000 voters behind Democrats after the first weekend of early voting, said Darren Littell, communications director for the GOP's Team Nevada. By the last day of early voting, Republicans nearly matched Democrats' daily tally, election records show.¶ "The big picture is, we cut into their lead," he said. "We did better the first day this year than we did on our first day in '08. And we did better the second day. And as the days go on we'll do even better."¶ Littell said Republicans are focused now on turning out "low propensity" voters while Democrats are looking to bank "high propensity" voters ahead of Election Day, or those who would vote no matter when.¶ On Election Day, Littell said Republicans will have a higher turnout than Democrats, as they historically do, and the GOP will need to spend less energy getting out voters who might not normally go to the polls.¶ "I don't think anybody ever disputed in either campaign that this was going to be a close, hard-fought battle," Littell said. "But I think they've underestimated our ground game."

#### Plan gives Obama Nevada - massively supported by Nevada voters

Whaley ’12

(Sean Whaley, “Gov. Sandoval Says Nevada Does Not Want Nuclear Waste, But New Poll Shows Support For Research Facility”, Nevada News Bureau, 3-12-2012, <http://www.nevadanewsbureau.com/2012/03/12/gov-sandoval-says-nevada-does-not-want-nuclear-waste-but-new-poll-shows-support-for-research-facility/>)

Sandoval’s letter comes just as a new poll commissioned by Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy shows support for Yucca Mountain as a research park for the study of reprocessing nuclear spent fuel. The poll of 500 likely Nevada voters, taken in late February by Public Opinion Strategies, showed 62 percent in support of the research park versus 34 percent who said Yucca Mountain should be closed entirely. The question posed was whether respondents would prefer to: “Open Yucca Mountain for the study and potential reprocessing of nuclear waste into usable energy because of the jobs and money such a project would bring to the state . . .” Or: “Close Yucca Mountain altogether to help protect Nevada’s environment.” “UNR, UNLV, and many national labs around the country are conducting research on how to utilize innovative technologies now available to reprocess spent fuel, so bringing them all together to develop the best technology for commercial reprocessing makes sense,” said Gene Humphrey, the head of Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy (NV4CFE), a non-profit organization that supports building the research park. “Since several national laboratories are already doing work at the Nevada Test Site, it seems like the logical location to continue the legacy of nuclear exploration. But this project could generate a new form of clean energy, establish new export industries and create thousands of jobs for Nevadans.”

#### No link – no reason plan is associated with Obama

#### **Plan key to Florida which is key to the election – addresses voter concerns regarding energy and the economy.**

Whitman and Avilla, ‘12

[Christine and Karen, “Nuclear energy = green jobs, economic growth in Fla., beyond”, The Orlando Sentinel, 6-22-12,

http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621\_1\_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community, RSR]

We all know how critical Florida is to the outcome of this year's election. This week, as Orlando hosts the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, all eyes are on the presidential candidates as they speak to Hispanic elected officials — and by extension, to their constituents — about the issues that are top of mind for voters. Notably, the conference addresses two issues also of paramount concern to all Floridians: energy and the economy. From our perspective, these issues are deeply intertwined — and one way that Floridians and the state's thriving Hispanic community can advocate for economic growth through renewed investment in clean energy is by supporting nuclear energy. We need to let the candidates know that Americans are relying on the next president for clean, sustainable energy policies that benefit us all. As we look toward diversifying America's energy portfolio and building out the energy generated by renewables, candidates should look to nuclear energy as one proven way to effectively meet growing demand. In doing so, they are registering their support for well-paying jobs, sustained economic growth and clean, affordable energy options.

#### Funding now. Worthington ev. says subsidies now. Even if no new reactors, there’s already the perception of Obama pushing.

#### **Their ev says public already angry about deficit spending.**

#### **Turn:** The public loves nuclear—newest polling and be skeptical of their link authors

Westenhaus 9-30

[Brian, editor of the popular energy technology site New Energy and Fuel, “Confidence in Nuclear Power is on the Rise Again,” <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Confidence-in-Nuclear-Power-is-on-the-Rise-Again.html>, AM]

The Nuclear Energy Institute announced a September telephone survey in a press release suggesting almost two thirds of U.S. adults favor the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the United States. This latest survey found that Americans strongly favoring nuclear energy outnumber those strongly opposed by a two-to-one ratio, 29% versus 14%. The new numbers improve on a poll conducted in September 2011, six months after the Fukushima accident, when 62% of American favored nuclear energy, with 35% opposed. The new survey shows confidence is improving. Just over three quarters of respondents agree that nuclear energy facilities operating in the United States are ‘safe and secure,’ while only 19% think they are not. Eighty percent of Americans opposed to 16% believe “we should learn the lessons from the Japanese accident and continue to develop advanced nuclear energy plants to meet America’s growing electricity demand.” In a shock to the political system and the anti nuclear crowd a large majority (81%) of those surveyed favor the renewal of operating licenses of facilities that continue to meet federal safety standards, while 74% believe electric utilities should prepare now so they will be ready to build new nuclear power plants in the next decade if needed.

#### Turn: The plan will be spun as job creation.

Ling, NYT Staff Writer, ‘9

[Katherine, New York Times, 5-19-2009, “Is the solution to the U.S. nuclear waste problem in France?”,

<http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/05/18/18climatewire-is-the-solution-to-the-us-nuclear-waste-prob-12208.html?pagewanted=all> Published, RCM]

The outgoing Bush administration tested the political reaction to reprocessing in 2006 and found 11 communities that showed interest in having a reprocessing facility. The approach promised high-paying jobs for hosting a regional intermediate highly radioactive nuclear waste site, a sort of "energy park."

#### Fiat should be determined by the least restrictive means – – currently congress is holding ‘pro forma’ sessions until after the election – no legislative business can occur

### Race K

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus a competitive policy option.

#### This is key to ground and predictability – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Failure to engage in political solutions to the problem of racism allow the right to reappropriate racist rhetoric into new policies of racial exclusion. Their denunciation of racism and insistence on the priority of race over politics guarantees continued racism.

Winant 2006

(Howard, Temple University, "Race and Racism: Towards a Global Future." Ethnic and Racial Studies. Vol. 29, no. 5 (September 2006), pp. 986-1003. http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/routledge/01419870.html)

These contradictions are indications of the uncertainties of the current moment in racial politics. The necessarily brief review presented here suggests that a new racial hegemony has by no means been secured. There are fundamental instabilities in the ideologies of colourblindness, racial ‘differentialism’, and ‘nonracialism’. Racial biologism is prospering; is it still a ‘backdoor to eugenics’ (Duster 2003 [1990])? Race/gender/class ‘intersectionality’ denotes the instability in practice both at ‘micro-social’ and at ‘macro-social’ levels not only of race and racism, but also of other axes of oppression. The link between racism and empire was wrongly considered terminated; instead it has been reinvented, principally through US neoconservatism. In fact none of the ‘posts-‘ post-civil rights, post-apartheid, post-coloniality is sufficiently ‘post’; none denotes a full break with the conditions their very names contain; all necessitate uneasy and continuous adjustments, both on the level of policy and politics, and on that of personal experience and identity, to the ongoing operation of racial conflicts. So what is the meaning of these racial contradictions for the future? What do they suggest about the development of a new racial justice agenda, both globally and locally? Although the intellectual endeavour required to rethink global racial conditions is rather daunting, the political and personal commitments we ‘movement scholars’ have undertaken do not permit us to desist from trying to make sense of the current world racial situation and of our role within it. Neither do they allow us to ‘stop thinking about tomorrow’, as the popular song would have it. Simply reasserting the continuing significance of race, while not mistaken, nevertheless has serious limits. Such an approach is insufficiently pragmatist, as well as deficient in its democratic commitments. As we learn from racial formation theory and critical race theory, race is a flexible concept that is constantly being reshaped in practical political activity. That the civil rights movement and the racial nationalisms of the 1960s were absorbed and rearticulated in a new racial hegemony was not only a contradictory outcome, one that combined some real achievements with some painful defeats; it was also a valuable lesson about racial politics.

#### Case outweighs: by failing to solve the impending waste crisis, they allow waste on-site and Yucca Mountain to eventually blow up, leading to extinction and the destruction of the entire environment. No reason why reorienting ourselves to the world would resolve the waste crisis.

#### Perm do both: Embrace their criticism through our policy making framework. A policy focus is key to challenge structures of white supremacy.

Themba-Nixon 00, Executive Director of The Praxis Project, a nonprofit organization helping communities use media and policy advocacy

Makani, July 31, Colorlines, Changing the Rules: What Public Policy Means for Organizing, Vol 3.2)

“This is all about policy," a woman complained to me in a recent conversation. "I'm an organizer." The flourish and passion with which she made the distinction said everything. **Policy is for** wonks, sell-out politicians, and **ivory-tower eggheads**. **Organizing is what real**, grassroots **people do**. Common as it may be, **this distinction doesn't bear out in the real world**. Policy is more than law. It is any written agreement (formal or informal) that specifies how an institution, governing body, or community will address shared problems or attain shared goals. It spells out the terms and the consequences of these agreements and is the codification of the body's values-as represented by those present in the policymaking process. **Given who's usually present**, **most policies reflect the political agenda of powerful elites**. Yet, policy can be a force for change-especially when we bring our base and community organizing into the process. In essence, **policies are the codification of power relationships** and resource allocation. Policies are the rules of the world we live in. Changing the world means changing the rules. So, **if organizing is about changing the rules and building power**, **how can organizing be separated from policies**? **Can we** really speak truth to power, fight the right, stop corporate abuses, or **win racial justice without contesting** the rules and the rulers, **the policies and the policymakers**? **The answer is no**-and double no **for people of color**. Today, **racism subtly dominates** nearly every aspect of **policymaking**. From ballot propositions to city funding priorities, policy is increasingly about the control, de-funding, and disfranchisement of communities of color. Take the public conversation about welfare reform, for example. Most of us know it isn't really about putting people to work. The right's message was framed around racial stereotypes of lazy, cheating "welfare queens" whose poverty was "cultural." But the new welfare policy was about moving billions of dollars in individual cash payments and direct services from welfare recipients to other, more powerful, social actors. Many of us were too busy to tune into the welfare policy drama in Washington, only to find it washed up right on our doorsteps. Our members are suffering from workfare policies, new regulations, and cutoffs. Families who were barely getting by under the old rules are being pushed over the edge by the new policies. Policy doesn't get more relevant than this. And so we got involved in policy-as defense. Yet we have to do more than block their punches. We have to start the fight with initiatives of our own. Those who do are finding offense a bit more fun than defense alone. Living wage ordinances, youth development initiatives, even gun control and alcohol and tobacco policies are finding their way onto the public agenda, thanks to focused community organizing that leverages power for community-driven initiatives. - Over 600 local policies have been passed to regulate the tobacco industry. Local coalitions have taken the lead by writing ordinances that address local problems and organizing broad support for them. - Nearly 100 gun control and violence prevention policies have been enacted since 1991. - Milwaukee, Boston, and Oakland are among the cities that have passed living wage ordinances: local laws that guarantee higher than minimum wages for workers, usually set as the minimum needed to keep a family of four above poverty. These are just a few of the examples that demonstrate how organizing for local policy advocacy has made inroads in areas where positive national policy had been stalled by conservatives. Increasingly, the local policy arena is where the action is and where activists are finding success. Of course, corporate interests-which are usually the target of these policies-are gearing up in defense. Tactics include front groups, economic pressure, and the tried and true: cold, hard cash. Despite these barriers, grassroots organizing can be very effective at the smaller scale of local politics. At the local level, we have greater access to elected officials and officials have a greater reliance on their constituents for reelection. For example, getting 400 people to show up at city hall in just about any city in the U.S. is quite impressive. On the other hand, 400 people at the state house or the Congress would have a less significant impact. Add to that the fact that all 400 people at city hall are usually constituents, and the impact is even greater. Recent trends in government underscore the importance of local policy. Congress has enacted a series of measures devolving significant power to state and local government. Welfare, health care, and the regulation of food and drinking water safety are among the areas where states and localities now have greater rule. Devolution has some negative consequences to be sure. History has taught us that, for social services and civil rights in particular, the **lack of clear federal standards and mechanisms for accountability lead to** uneven enforcement and even **discriminatory implementation of policies**. Still, there are real opportunities for advancing **progressive initiatives** in this more localized environment. Greater local control can mean greater community power to shape and implement important social policies that were heretofore out of reach. To do so will **require careful attention to the mechanics of** local **policymaking** and a clear blueprint of what we stand for. Much of the work of framing what we stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. **By getting into the policy arena** in a proactive manner, **we can take our demands to the next level**. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decisionmaker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, **this work requires** a certain amount of **interaction with** "the suits," as well as struggles with **the bureaucracy**, **the technical language**, and the all-too-common resistance by decisionmakers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, **policy work is** just one tool in our box.

#### Status quo waste siting is a form of radioactive colonialism. Native Americans have to contend with the worst waste, which saps them of an infrastructure to address dire problems.

Bullard and Johnson, Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center and Assistant Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, ‘9

(Robert D. and Glenn S., “Environmental Justice: Grassroots Activism and Its Impact on Public Policy Decision Making,” *Environmental Sociology: from Analysis to Action*, Second Edition, p.62-63, accessed 7-10-09, AJP)

There is a direct correlation between exploitation of land and exploitation of people. It should not be a surprise to anyone to discover that Native Americans have to contend with some of the worst pollution in the United States (Beasley, 1990b;Kay,1991;Taliman,1992;Tomsho,1990).Native American nations have become prime targets for waste trading (Angel,1992;Geddicks,1993).More than three dozen Indian reservations have been targeted for landfills, incinerators, and other waste facilities (Kay,1991).The vast majority of these waste proposals have been defeated by grassroots groups on the reservations. However, “radioactive colonialism” is alive and well (Churchill & LaDuke,1983). Radioactive colonialism operates in energy production (mining of uranium) and disposal of wastes on Indian lands. The legacy of institutional racism has left many sovereign Indian nations without an economic infrastructure to address poverty, unemployment, inadequate education and health care, and a host of other social problems. Some industry and governmental agencies have exploited the economic vulnerability of Indian nations. For example, of the 21 applicants for the DOE’s monitored retrievable storage (MRS) grants,16 were Indian tribes (Taliman,1992a). The 16 tribes lined up for $100,000 grants from the DOE to study the prospect of “temporarily” storing nuclear waste for a half century under its MRS program. It is the Native American tribes’ sovereign right to bid for the MRS proposals and other industries. However, there are clear ethical issues involved when the U.S. government contracts with Indian nations that lack the infrastructure to handle dangerous wastes in a safe and environmentally sound manner. Delegates at the Third Annual Indigenous Environmental Council Network Gathering (held in Cello Village, Oregon, on June 6,1992) adopted a resolution of “No nuclear waste on Indian lands.”

#### This discursive erasure of cultural and spiritual values attached to Yucca creates a nuclear sacrifice zone, exterminating Native lands and peoples

Kuletz, Prof. of American Studies @ U of Canterbury, 98

[Valerie, The Tainted Desert: Environmental Ruin in the American West, pg. 12-13, RSR]

In this Indian country two landscapes – Indian and nuclear – meet at nearly every point of the nuclear cycle, from uranium mining to weapons testing to the disposal of nuclear waste. For example: Nuclearism in this large region began in the early 1940s with the mining and milling of uranium ore largely on Navajo, Hopi, Pueblo and Ute Mountain Ute land in the Navajoan desert. This uranium fueled the atomic bomb developed at Los Alamos, located adjacent and near traditional Pueblo lands on the Pajarito Plateau of New Mexico. In 1945, the first testing of the atomic bomb occurred at Alamagordo (now White Sands), New Mexico, near the Mescalero Apache reservation. In the 1950s, ancestral lands of the Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute at the intersection of the Great Basin and Mojave deserts were seized by the federal government, in violation of the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley, for use as the nation’s testing fields for nuclear weapons (the Nevada Test Site) – an area where more nuclear bombs have been detonated than on any other single, similar size region on the globe. Today, the only above-ground, temporary nuclear waste storage facilities under consideration have been on the Nevada Test Site and the Mescalero Apache, Skull Valley Goshute, and Fort Mcdermitt Paiute-Shoshone reservations. The nation’s moderate-level nuclear waste storage, called WIPP (for Waste Isolation Pilot Project), is in the same general region as the Mescalero Apache reservation in the Chihuahuan desert. Radioactive waste from research at Los Alamos National Laboratory is now stored at “Area G”, which borders the San Ildefonso Pueblo and is near the Santa Clara Pueblo’s lands. Low-level nuclear waste is targeted for disposal in the Mojave Desert’s Ward Valley, home of the Fort Mojave Indians and the Chemehuevi of the Colorado River Indian tribes. Finally, the proposed premiere site for the nation’s high-level nuclear waste repository is Yucca Mountain – “holy land” to the Western Shoshone, Southern Paiute, and Owens Valley Paiute. The discursive map demonstrates how the development, testing, and waste storage of nuclear materials in the highly militarized landscapes of the western United States might be understood as a form of environmental racism. At the very least, it sets the stage for asking how land use, racism, power and internal colonialism intersect in this region. This mapping not only makes visible the millions of acres that were removed from access for weapons testing and development in the postwar years, it also reveals the peoples affected and displaced by these activities. Once revealed, the nuclear landscape can be perceived and experienced differently; it can be seen as one landscape superimposed upon another: a landscape of national sacrifice, an expendable landscape, over what many North American Indians understand as a geography of the sacred, a geography where spiritual and cultural life are woven directly into the landscape itself.

#### Reject identity politics – recreates its own harms.

Minow, Professor of Law @ Harvard, 1997

[Martha, Not Only For Myself: Identity, Politics, and the Law, p. 22-23]

This book explores issues of identity politics not as questions of tactics but instead as clues to collective social experiences in the United States as the twentieth century closes. Amid assertions and rejections of group membership and struggles for both liberty and equality, some people worry about a fragmenting, disuniting America while others urge a more finely categorized collection of subgroups.65 Both approaches imply that some notion of identity—whether broad like "American" or narrower like "bisexual biracial"—can do important work in addressing issues of politics, justice, and orderly social change. I will suggest instead that preoccupations with identity replicate, rather than resolve, conflicting conceptions of individual freedom and social meaning, self-creation and patterns beyond personal control. For none of us have individual identities except by reference to collective social experiences, and yet all of us retain some degrees of freedom for self-invention out of the found materials of biographical and social life. The questions worth attention, I suggest, do not concern fixing or selecting the right identities for use in politics and law but § Marked 18:45 § instead ask how to strike a productive stance toward the paradoxes of individual and social meaning.66 Practice with paradox can decrease a tendency to seize one or another side, only to be hit by the other side in arguments with others, or with ourselves.67 Noticing and thinking about paradoxes of identity can reduce the likelihood of polarized discussions while also reorienting attention from desires to fix or solve issues of identity toward attending to the circumstances that make identities seem so salient.

## 1AR

### Race K

#### The discourse surrounding Yucca siting is racist as it valued technical arguments for storage over cultural arguments

Endres, Associate Professor of Communications at the University of Utah, ‘12

[Danielle, “Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process”, Process, Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, 6:3, 328-345, RSR]

Despite this progress, flaws remain in many currently used processes of participation (Depoe & Delicath, 2004). Although decision makers have adopted more dialogic participatory models of participation in some settings (e.g., Dietz & Stern, 2008), the NWPA participation process followed for Yucca Mountain remains an essentially technocratic Decide-Announce-Defend (DAD) model in which decisions are made by scientific and policy experts and then presented to the public for approval. Most DAD participation processes value scientific and technical arguments over social-, cultural-, and value-based arguments (e.g., Depoe & Delicath, 2004; Farrell & Goodnight, 1981; Fiorino, 1990; Katz & Miller, 1996; Toker, 2002; Waddell, 1990, 1996). Expanding upon these critiques of DAD models, I specifically examine the role for values in these models. Although scientific, cultural, and social dimensions of decision making are all influenced by values, technocratic decision makers often assume that scientific and technical arguments are value free, thus relegating values to the realm of the social and cultural dimensions that are already marginalized. Therefore, technocratic decision making automatically assumes one set of implicit values while excluding other competing values under the false assumption that science is value free. These flaws in DAD participation processes also apply in the more specific realm of decision making over nuclear technologies. The public sphere surrounding nuclear technologies is ‘‘constricted and degraded by technocratic domination’’ (Taylor, Kinsella, Depoe, & Metzler, 2007, p. 381). Stakeholder participation in nuclear issues is particularly problematic because of secrecy, discursive containment, and the perception that the highly technical nature of nuclear technologies is best handled by experts (e.g., Kinsella, 2001, 2005; Taylor, 1998; Taylor et al., 2007). Scientific and technical knowledge dictate the process with little attention paid to other relevant forms of expertise. In the case of Yucca Mountain, participation in the Yucca Mountain siting decision occurred in the form of comment periods held during both the EIS process (1996 2004) and site authorization decision (2001 2002). While the EIS comment period valued scientific and technical arguments over social and cultural arguments (Ratliff, 1997), the site authorization comment period explicitly called for only scientific and technical arguments (Endres, 2009a). The DOE explicitly framed the site authorization comment period as: (1) an opportunity for the DOE to educate ‘the public’ and (2) for ‘the public’ to comment on the scientific and technical arguments produced by Yucca Mountain Project scientists (DOE, 2002b, 2002c). The participation process created neither a role for non-technical arguments nor a role for the values underlying both technical and non-technical arguments. Yet, opponents and proponents still made value-based claims, which formed a significant stasis point in the controversy.

#### Discourse doesn’t shape reality, and a focus on discourse risks perpetuating violence.

Mearsheimer 95 (John, Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, “The False Promise of International Institutions,” International Security, 19(3), AD: 7-11-9) BL

It would be understandable if realists made such arguments, since they believe there is an objective reality that largely determines which discourse will be dominant.Critical theorists, however,emphasize that the world is socially constructed, and not shaped in fundamental ways by objective factors. Anarchy, after all, is what we make of it. Yet when critical theorists attempt to explain why realism may be losing its hegemonic position, they too point to objective factors as the ultimate cause of change. Discourse, so it appears, turns out not to be determinative, but mainly a reflection of developments in the objective world. In short, it seems that when critical theorists who study international politics offer glimpses of their thinking about the causes of change in the real world, they make arguments that directly contradict their own theory, but which appear to be compatible with the theory they are challenging. (159) There is another problem with the application of critical theory to international relations. Although critical theorists hope to replace realism with a discourse that emphasizes harmony and peace, critical theory per se emphasizes that it is impossible to know the future**.** Critical theory according to its own logic, can be used to undermine realism and produce change, butit cannot serve as the basis for predicting which discourse will replace realism,because the theory says little about the direction change takes. In fact, Cox argues that although "utopian expectations may be an element in stimulating people to act...such expectations are almost never realized in practice." (160) Thus, in a sense, the communitarian discourse championed by critical theorists is wishful thinking, not an outcome linked to the theory itself. Indeed, critical theory cannot guarantee that the new discourse will not be more malignant than the discourse it replaces. Nothing in the theory guarantees, for example, that a fascist discourse far more violent than realism will not emerge as the new hegemonic discourse.

#### Perm do both: Discourse must be combined with interventions at the policy level to change the knowledge economy of terrorism

Graham et. al. 4 (Phillip W., Sen. Public Health Researcher @ RTI International, Discourse and Society, 2004, 15(2-3). pp. 199-221., Muse) JPG

Martin and Rose (2003) suggest that the challenge for discourse analysis is to show how emancipation, as well as domination, is achieved through discourse; that an analytical focus on ‘hegemony’ must be balanced with a focus on discourses of empowerment—discourses designed to ‘make peace, not war’, that successfully ‘redistribute power without necessarily struggling against it’ (2003: 264; cf Martin, 1999); and that analysis needs to move away from ‘demonology’ and ‘deconstruction’ towards the design of ‘constructive’ discourse (Martin, in press). These are certainly important considerations for the theory and practice of discourse analysis. At least as important to our mind are clear understandings of macro-social, -cultural, and -economic changes, all of which can be seen quite clearly from a discourse-historical perspective—in a process of historical *reconstruction*—to grasp human history as a seamless, unbroken whole. It has become clear that in what is called “a global knowledge economy”, meanings and their mediations perform increasingly important and overt political-economic functions (cf. Graham, 2002; Fairclough and Graham, 2002). The sole social function of academics is, and always has been, ‘to influence discourse’ (David Rooney, personal correspondence)—that is all we can do as academics, whether through teaching, writing, or through the manifold arts of activism. Feudalism was tied to land and militarism; mercantilism was tied to gold and mercenary armies; capitalism was tied to ownership of productive apparatus and imperialism; corporatism is tied to the ownership of legal fictions—money, corporations, and intellectual property—and ‘information warfare’, all of which are products of discourse (Graham, 2002). Each of these developments—each stage in the ‘phylogenesis’ of western economic systems (Martin, 2003: 266)—has tended towards an increasing reliance on abstract- discursive rather than brute-physical coercion in the maintenance of inequalities.The current political economic system, as transitional as it may be, is undoubtedly the most discourse- and media-reliant system in history, precisely because of its size and the high levels of abstraction that both support it and constitute the bulk of its commodities (Graham, 2000). Understanding this means understanding the importance and potential of discursive interventions. The Pentagon’s ‘Total Information Awareness’ program fully recognises this (DARPA, 2003). Similarly, whichever group perpetrated the attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon also fully recognised it: the attacks were directed at symbolic centres of a globally hegemonic system and were designed specifically for their mass media impact. Merely exposing facts and breaking silences (as per Chomsky and Pilger) is not enough either; the current malaise is primarily axiological (values-based). Discursive interventions at the axiological level are necessary in the policy field, in the multiple fields of mass media, and in every local field. Ours is a discourse-based global society, a discourse-based global economy, and a discourse-based global culture. Consequently, humanity has never been so close to realising our ‘species-being’ (Marx, 1844/1975: ch 4)—our universal humanity—whilst simultaneously being so close to achieving self-annihilation. Discursive interventions will necessarily be decisive in the outcome between these two paths