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## 1AC

### Plan

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should provide a twenty-percent investment tax credit for the deployment of domestic nuclear fuel recycling.

### Warming

#### Observation One: Warming

#### Warming is real and anthropogenic – carbon dioxide increase, polar ice records, melting glaciers, sea level rise all prove.

Prothero, ’12 (Donald, Lecturer in Geobiology at Cal Tech and Professor of Geology at Occidental College, 3-1-12, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused," Skeptic, vol 17 no 2, EBSCO)

Converging Lines of Evidence¶ How do we know that global warming is real and primarily human caused? There are numerous lines of evidence that converge toward this conclusion.¶ 1. Carbon Dioxide Increase.¶ Carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased at an unprecedented rate in the past 200 years. Not one data set collected over a long enough span of time shows otherwise. Mann et al. (1999) compiled the past 900 years' worth of temperature data from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and direct measurements in the past few centuries, and the sudden increase of temperature of the past century stands out like a sore thumb. This famous graph is now known as the "hockey stick" because it is long and straight through most of its length, then bends sharply upward at the end like the blade of a hockey stick. Other graphs show that climate was very stable within a narrow range of variation through the past 1000, 2000, or even 10,000 years since the end of the last Ice Age. There were minor warming events during the Climatic Optimum about 7000 years ago, the Medieval Warm Period, and the slight cooling of the Little Ice Age in die 1700s and 1800s. But the magnitude and rapidity of the warming represented by the last 200 years is simply unmatched in all of human history. More revealing, die timing of this warming coincides with the Industrial Revolution, when humans first began massive deforestation and released carbon dioxide into the atmosphere by burning an unprecedented amount of coal, gas, and oil.¶ 2. Melting Polar Ice Caps.¶ The polar icecaps are thinning and breaking up at an alarming rate. In 2000, my former graduate advisor Malcolm McKenna was one of the first humans to fly over the North Pole in summer time and see no ice, just open water. The Arctic ice cap has been frozen solid for at least the past 3 million years (and maybe longer),4 but now the entire ice sheet is breaking up so fast that by 2030 (and possibly sooner) less than half of the Arctic will be ice covered in the summer.5 As one can see from watching the news, this is an ecological disaster for everything that lives up there, from the polar bears to the seals and walruses to the animals they feed upon, to the 4 million people whose world is melting beneath their feet. The Antarctic is thawing even faster. In February-March 2002, the Larsen B ice shelf - over 3000 square km (the size of Rhode Island) and 220 m (700 feet) thick- broke up in just a few months, a story typical of nearly all the ice shelves in Antarctica. The Larsen B shelf had survived all the previous ice ages and interglacial warming episodes over the past 3 million years, and even the warmest periods of the last 10,000 years- yet it and nearly all the other thick ice sheets on the Arctic, Greenland, and Antarctic are vanishing at a rate never before seen in geologic history.¶ 3. Melting Glaciers.¶ Glaciers are all retreating at the highest rates ever documented. Many of those glaciers, along with snow melt, especially in the Himalayas, Andes, Alps, and Sierras, provide most of the freshwater that the populations below the mountains depend upon - yet this fresh water supply is vanishing. Just think about the percentage of world's population in southern Asia (especially India) that depend on Himalayan snowmelt for their fresh water. The implications are staggering. The permafrost that once remained solidly frozen even in the summer has now Üiawed, damaging the Inuit villages on the Arctic coast and threatening all our pipelines to die North Slope of Alaska. This is catastrophic not only for life on the permafrost, but as it thaws, the permafrost releases huge amounts of greenhouse gases which are one of the major contributors to global warming. Not only is the ice vanishing, but we have seen record heat waves over and over again, killing thousands of people, as each year joins the list of the hottest years on record. (2010 just topped that list as the hottest year, surpassing the previous record in 2009, and we shall know about 2011 soon enough). Natural animal and plant populations are being devastated all over the globe as their environments change.6 Many animals respond by moving their ranges to formerly cold climates, so now places that once did not have to worry about disease-bearing mosquitoes are infested as the climate warms and allows them to breed further north.¶ 4. Sea Level Rise.¶ All that melted ice eventually ends up in the ocean, causing sea levels to rise, as it has many times in the geologic past. At present, the sea level is rising about 3-4 mm per year, more than ten times the rate of 0.10.2 mm/year that has occurred over the past 3000 years. Geological data show Üiat ttie sea level was virtually unchanged over the past 10,000 years since the present interglacial began. A few mm here or there doesn't impress people, until you consider that the rate is accelerating and that most scientists predict sea levels will rise 80-130 cm in just the next century. A sea level rise of 1.3 m (almost 4 feet) would drown many of the world's low-elevation cities, such as Venice and New Orleans, and low-lying countries such as the Netherlands or Bangladesh. A number of tiny island nations such as Vanuatu and the Maldives, which barely poke out above the ocean now, are already vanishing beneath the waves. Eventually their entire population will have to move someplace else.7 Even a small sea level rise might not drown all these areas, but they are much more vulnerable to the large waves of a storm surge (as happened with Hurricane Katrina), which could do much more damage than sea level rise alone. If sea level rose by 6 m (20 feet), most of die world's coastal plains and low-lying areas (such as the Louisiana bayous, Florida, and most of the world's river deltas) would be drowned.¶ Most of the world's population lives in lowelevation coastal cities such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Miami, and Shanghai. All of those cities would be partially or completely under water with such a sea level rise. If all the glacial ice caps melted completely (as they have several times before during past greenhouse episodes in the geologic past), sea level would rise by 65 m (215 feet)! The entire Mississippi Valley would flood, so you could dock an ocean liner in Cairo, Illinois. Such a sea level rise would drown nearly every coastal region under hundreds of feet of water, and inundate New York City, London and Paris. All that would remain would be the tall landmarks such as the Empire State Building, Big Ben, and the Eiffel Tower. You could tie your boats to these pinnacles, but the rest of these drowned cities would lie deep underwater.

#### We must act quickly with long term technological innovation to avoid the irreversible climate change triggered by 2°C.

Peters, et al., ’12(Glen (Center for International Climate and Environmental Research – Oslo); Robbie Andrew (Center for International Climate and Environmental Research – Oslo); Tom Boden (Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center (CDIAC), Oak Ridge National Laboratory); Josep Canadell (Global Carbon Project, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Canberra, Australia); Philippe Ciais (Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l’Environnement, Gif sur Yvette, France); Corinne Le Quéré (Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK); Gregg Marland (Research Institute for Environment, Energy, and Economics, Appalachian State University); Michael R. Raupach (Global Carbon Project, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Canberra, Australia); and Charlie Wilson (Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK), “The challenge to keep global warming below 2 °C”, Nature Climate Change, 12-2-12, RSR)

It is important to regularly re-assess the relevance of emissions scenarios in light of changing global circumstances3,8. In the past, decadal trends in CO2 emissions have responded slowly to changes in the underlying emission drivers because of inertia and path dependence in technical, social and political systems9. Inertia and path dependence are unlikely to be affected by short-term fluctuations2,3,9 — such as financial crises10 — and it is probable that emissions will continue to rise for a period even after global mitigation has started11. Thermal inertia and vertical mixing in the ocean, also delay the temperature response to CO2 emissions12. Because of inertia, path dependence and changing global circumstances, there is value in comparing observed decadal emission trends with emission scenarios to help inform the prospect of different futures being realized, explore the feasibility of desired changes in the current emission trajectory and help to identify whether new scenarios may be needed. Global CO2 emissions have increased from 6.1±0.3 Pg C in 1990 to 9.5±0.5 Pg C in 2011 (3% over 2010), with average annual growth rates of 1.9% per year in the 1980s, 1.0% per year in the 1990s, and 3.1% per year since 2000. We estimate that emissions in 2012 will be 9.7±0.5 Pg C or 2.6% above 2011 (range of 1.9–3.5%) and 58% greater than 1990 (Supplementary Information and ref. 13). The observed growth rates are at the top end of all four generations of emissions scenarios (Figs 1 and 2). Of the previous illustrative IPCC scenarios, only IS92-E, IS92-F and SRES A1B exceed the observed emissions (Fig. 1) or their rates of growth (Fig. 2), with RCP8.5 lower but within uncertainty bounds of observed emissions. Observed emission trends are in line with SA90-A, IS92-E and IS92-F, SRES A1FI, A1B and A2, and RCP8.5 (Fig. 2). The SRES scenarios A1FI and A2 and RCP8.5 lead to the highest temperature projections among the scenarios, with a mean temperature increase of 4.2–5.0 °C in 2100 (range of 3.5–6.2 °C)14, whereas the SRES A1B scenario has decreasing emissions after 2050 leading to a lower temperature increase of 3.5 °C (range 2.9–4.4°C)14. Earlier research has noted that observed emissions have tracked the upper SRES scenarios15,16 and Fig. 1 confirms this for all four scenario generations. This indicates that the space of possible pathways could be extended above the top-end scenarios to accommodate the possibility of even higher emission rates in the future. The new RCPs are particularly relevant because, in contrast to the earlier scenarios, mitigation efforts consistent with longterm policy objectives are included among the pathways2,. RCP3-PD (peak and decline in concentration) leads to a mean temperature increase of 1.5 °C in 2100 (range of 1.3–1.9 °C)14. RCP3–PD requires net negative emissions (for example, bioenergy with carbon capture and storage) from 2070, but some scenarios suggest it is possible to stay below 2 °C without negative emissions17–19. RCP4.5 and RCP6 — which lie between RCP3–PD and RCP8.5 in the longer term — lead to a mean temperature increase of 2.4 °C (range of 1.0–3.0 °C) and 3.0 °C (range of 2.6–3.7 °C) in 2100, respectively14. For RCP4.5, RCP6 and RCP8.5, temperatures will continue to increase after 2100 due to on-going emissions14 and inertia in the climate system12. Current emissions are tracking slightly above RCP8.5, and given the growing gap between the other RCPs (Fig. 1), significant emission reductions are needed by 2020 to keep 2 °C as a feasible goal18–20. To follow an emission trend that can keep the temperature increase below 2 °C (RCP3-PD) requires sustained global CO2 mitigation rates of around 3% per year, if global emissions peak before 202011,19. A delay in starting mitigation activities will lead to higher mitigation rates11, higher costs21,22, and the target of remaining below 2 °C may become unfeasible18,20. If participation is low, then higher rates of mitigation are needed in individual countries, and this may even increase mitigation costs for all countries22. Many of these rates assume that negative emissions will be possible and affordable later this century11,17,18,20. Reliance on negative emissions has high risks because of potential delays or failure in the development and large-scale deployment of emerging technologies such as carbon capture and storage, particularly those connected to bioenergy17,18. Although current emissions are tracking the higher scenarios, it is still possible to transition towards pathways consistent with keeping temperatures below 2 °C (refs 17,19,20). The historical record shows that some countries have reduced CO2 emissions over 10-year periods, through a combination of (non-climate) policy intervention and economic adjustments to changing resource availability. The oil crisis of 1973 led to new policies on energy supply and energy savings, which produced a decrease in the share of fossil fuels (oil shifted to nuclear) in the energy supply of Belgium, France and Sweden, with emission reductions of 4–5% per year sustained over 10 or more years (Supplementary Figs S17–19). A continuous shift to natural gas — partially substituting coal and oil — led to sustained mitigation rates of 1–2% per year in the UK in the 1970s and again in the 2000s, 2% per year in Denmark in the 1990–2000s, and 1.4% per year since 2005 in the USA (Supplementary Figs S10–12). These examples highlight the practical feasibility of emission reductions through fuel substitution and efficiency improvements, but additional factors such as carbon leakage23 need to be considered. These types of emission reduction can help initiate a transition towards trajectories consistent with keeping temperatures below 2 °C, but further mitigation measures are needed to complete and sustain the reductions. Similar energy transitions could be encouraged and co-ordinated across countries in the next 10 years using available technologies19, but well-targeted technological innovations24 are required to sustain the mitigation rates for longer periods17. To move below the RCP8.5 scenario — avoiding the worst climate impacts — requires early action17,18,21 and sustained mitigation from the largest emitters22 such as China, the United States, the European Union and India. These four regions together account for over half of global CO2 emissions, and have strong and centralized governing bodies capable of co-ordinating such actions. If similar energy transitions are repeated over many decades in a broader range of developed and emerging economies, the current emission trend could be pulled down to make RCP3‑PD, RCP4.5 and RCP6 all feasible futures. A shift to a pathway with the highest likelihood to remain below 2 °C above preindustrial levels (for example, RCP3-PD), requires high levels of technological, social and political innovations, and an increasing need to rely on net negative emissions in the future11,17,18. The timing of mitigation efforts needs to account for delayed responses in both CO2 emissions9 (because of inertia in technical, social and political systems) and also in global temperature12 (because of inertia in the climate system). Unless large and concerted global mitigation efforts are initiated soon, the goal of remaining below 2 °C will very soon become unachievable.

#### Reprocessing allows for nuclear power to transition to a carbon free economy fast enough to avoid catastrophic warming – best modeling flows aff.

Chakravorty et al., ’12 (Ujjayant (Professor and Canada Research Chair, Alberta School of Business and Department of Economics); Bertrand Magne (OECD Environment Directorate, Paris, France); Michel Moreaux (Emeritus Professor and IDEI Researcher, Toulouse School of Economics, University of Toulouse), “RESOURCE USE UNDER CLIMATE STABILIZATION: CAN NUCLEAR POWER PROVIDE CLEAN ENERGY?”, Journal of Public Economic Theory, Vol. 14, Issue 2, 2012, RSR)

This paper applies a model with price-induced substitution across resources to examine the role of nuclear power in achieving a climate stabilization target, such as that advocated by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). It asks an important policy question: is nuclear power a viable carbon-free energy source for the future? If so, then at what cost? The main insight is that nuclear power can help us switch quickly to carbon free energy, and if historical growth rates of nuclear capacity are preserved, the costs of reaching climate stabilization goals decline signiﬁcantly and may therefore be at the lower end of cost estimates that are reported by many studies. However, it is also clear from our results that nuclear is economical anyway, even without environmental regulation. Regulation only plays a major part when fast breeders are available and that too, in the somewhat distant future, towards the end of the century. To some extent, recent increases in efﬁciency in U.S. nuclear power attest to its economic advantages, even in a market with no environmental regulation (Davis and Wolfram 2011). The climate goal of 550 ppm of carbon can be achieved at a surplus cost of about 800 billion dollars, or about 1.3% of current world GDP, if no nuclear expansion is undertaken. Achieving this goal using nuclear power will result in a tripling of the share of world nuclear electricity generation by mid century with welfare gains of about half a trillion dollars (in discounted terms). The cost of providing energy will decrease by about $1.3 trillion or 2% of current world GDP, compared to the case in which the level of nuclear generation is frozen. These estimates of cost savings from nuclear power are signiﬁcant, and unlike in previous studies, are derived from an economic model with an explicit nuclear fuel cycle. However, nuclear power can be cost-effective for about 50 years or so, beyond which period, other technologies are likely to take over, including renewables, clean coal and next generation nuclear technologies that are much more efﬁcient in recycling waste materials. Ultimately, large-scale adoption of nuclear power will be hindered by the rising cost of uranium and the problem of waste disposal. Only signiﬁcant new developments such as the availability of new generation nuclear technology that is able to recycle nuclear waste may lead to a steady state where nuclear energy plays an important role. 31

#### Continued reliance on coal kills 13,000 people every year and spreads hazardous pollution

Zelman ‘11 (Joanna, The Huffington Post, "Power Plant Air Pollution Kills 13,000 People Per Year, Coal-Fired Are Most Hazardous: ALA Report", 3/15, [www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/14/power-plant-air-pollution-coal-kills\_n\_833385.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/14/power-plant-air-pollution-coal-kills_n_833385.html))

The American Lung Association (ALA) recently released a new report on the dramatic health hazards surrounding coal-fired power plants.¶ The report, “Toxic Air: The Case For Cleaning Up Coal-Fired Power Plants,” reveals the dangers of air pollution emitted by coal plants.¶ One of the starkest findings in the report claims, “Particle pollution from power plants is estimated to kill approximately 13,000 people a year.”¶ So what's the biggest culprit?¶ “Coal-fired power plants that sell electricity to the grid produce more hazardous air pollution in the U.S. than any other industrial pollution sources.” According to the report details, over 386,000 tons of air pollutants are emitted from over 400 plants in the U.S. per year. Interestingly, while most of the power plants are located in the Midwest and Southeast, the entire nation is threatened by their toxic emissions.¶ An ALA graph shows that while pollutants such as acid gases stay in the local area, metals such as lead and arsenic travel beyond state lines, and fine particulate matter has a global impact. In other words, while for some workers the pollution may be a tradeoff for employment at a plant, other regions don’t reap the same benefits, but still pay for the costs to their health.¶ The report connected specific pollutants with their health effects. According to the ALA, 76% of U.S. acid gas emissions, which are known to irritate breathing passages, come from coal-fired power plants. Out of all industrial sources, these plants are also the biggest emitter of airborne mercury, which can become part of the human food chain through fish and wildlife -- high mercury levels are linked to brain damage, birth defects, and damage to the nervous system. Overall, air pollutants from coal plants can cause heart attacks, strokes, lung cancer, birth defects, and premature death.¶ The American Lung Association isn’t the only group to connect coal plants with death and illness. A recent study released in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences found that, due in large part to health problems, coal costs the U.S. $500 billion per year. Specifically, the study found that the health costs of cancer, lung disease, and respiratory illnesses connected to pollutant emissions totaled over $185 billion per year.

#### Climate change disproportionately affects low socioeconomic communities.

Hoerner, ‘8 (J. Andrew, Former director of Research at the Center for a Sustainable Economy, Director of Tax Policy at the Center for Global Change at the University of Maryland College Park, and editor of Natural Resources Tax Review. He has done research on environmental economics and policy on behalf of the governments of Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United States. Andrew received his B.A. in Economics from Cornell University and a J.D. from Case Western Reserve School of Law—AND—Nia Robins—former inaugural Climate Justice Corps Fellow in 2003, director of Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative, “A Climate of Change African Americans, Global Warming, and a Just Climate Policy for the U.S.” July 2008, http://www.ejcc.org/climateofchange.pdf)

Everywhere we turn, the issues and impacts of climate change confront us. One of the most serious environmental threats facing the world today, climate change has moved from the minds of scientists and offices of environmentalists to the mainstream. Though the media is dominated by images of polar bears, melting glaciers, flooded lands, and arid desserts, there is a human face to this story as well. Climate change is not only an issue of the environment; it is also an issue of justice and human rights, one that dangerously intersects race and class. All over the world people of color, Indigenous Peoples and low-income communities bear disproportionate burdens from climate change itself, from ill-designed policies to prevent it, and from side effects of the energy systems that cause it. A Climate of Change explores the impacts of climate change on African Americans, from health to economics to community, and considers what policies would most harm or benefit African Americans—and the nation as a whole. African Americans are thirteen percent of the U.S. population and on average emit nearly twenty percent less greenhouse gases than non-Hispanic whites per capita. Though far less responsible for climate change, African Americans are significantly more vulnerable to its effects than non- Hispanic whites. Health, housing, economic well-being, culture, and social stability are harmed from such manifestations of climate change as storms, floods, and climate variability. African Americans are also more vulnerable to higher energy bills, unemployment, recessions caused by global energy price shocks, and a greater economic burden from military operations designed to protect the flow of oil to the U.S. Climate Justice: The Time Is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances are forged and traditional movements are transformed. An effective policy to address the challenges of global warming cannot be crafted until race and equity are part of the discussion from the outset and an integral part of the solution. This report finds that: Global warming amplifies nearly all existing inequalities. Under global warming, injustices that are already unsustainable become catastrophic. Thus it is essential to recognize that all justice is climate justice and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the fight to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting a sound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of color as any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice. Climate policies that best serve African Americans also best serve a just and strong United States. This paper shows that policies well-designed to benefit African Americans also provide the most benefit to all people in the U.S. Climate policies that best serve African Americans and other disproportionately affected communities also best serve global economic and environmental justice. Domestic reductions in global warming pollution and support for such reductions in developing nations financed by polluter-pays principles provide the greatest benefit to African Americans, the peoples of Africa, and people across the Global South. A distinctive African American voice is critical for climate justice. Currently, legislation is being drafted, proposed, and considered without any significant input from the communities most affected. Special interests are represented by powerful lobbies, while traditional environmentalists often fail to engage people of color, Indigenous Peoples, and low-income communities until after the political playing field has been defined and limited to conventional environmental goals. A strong focus on equity is essential to the success of the environmental cause, but equity issues cannot be adequately addressed by isolating the voices of communities that are disproportionately impacted. Engagement in climate change policy must be moved from the White House and the halls of Congress to social circles, classrooms, kitchens, and congregations. The time is now for those disproportionately affected to assume leadership in the climate change debate, to speak truth to power, and to assert rights to social, environmental and economic justice. Taken together, these actions affirm a vital truth that will bring communities together: Climate Justice is Common Justice. African Americans and Vulnerability In this report, it is shown that African Americans are disproportionately affected by climate change. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Climate Change and Global Warming Co-Pollutants ¶ • The six states with the highest African American population are all in the Atlantic hurricane zone, and are expected to experience more intense storms resembling Katrina and Rita in the future. ¶ • Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of heat waves or extreme heat events. African Americans suffer heat death at one hundred fifty to two hundred percent of the rate for non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Seventy-one percent of African Americans live in counties in violation of federal air pollution standards, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the white population. Seventy-eight percent of African Americans live within thirty miles of a coal-fired power plant, as compared to fifty-six percent of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Asthma has strong associations with air pollution, and African Americans have a thirty-six percent higher rate of incidents of asthma than whites. Asthma is three times as likely to lead to emergency room visits or deaths for African Americans. ¶ • This study finds that a twenty-five percent reduction in greenhouse gases—similar to what passed in California and is proposed in major federal legislation—would reduce infant mortality by at least two percent, asthma by at least sixteen percent, and mortality from particulates by at least 6,000 to 12,000 deaths per year. Other estimates have run as high as 33,000 fewer deaths per year. A disproportionate number of the lives saved by these proposed reductions would be African American. African Americans Are Economically More Vulnerable to Disasters and Illnesses ¶ • In 2006, twenty percent of African Americans had no health insurance, including fourteen percent of African American children—nearly twice the rate of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • In the absence of insurance, disasters and illness (which will increase with global warming) could be cushioned by income and accumulated wealth. However, the average income of African American households is fifty-seven percent that of non-Hispanic whites, and median wealth is only one-tenth that of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Racist stereotypes have been shown to reduce aid donations and impede service delivery to African Americans in the wake of hurricanes, floods, fires and other climate-related disasters as compared to non-Hispanic whites in similar circumstances. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Energy Price Shocks ¶ • African Americans spend thirty percent more of their income on energy than non-Hispanic whites. • Energy price increases have contributed to seventy to eighty percent of recent recessions. The increase in unemployment of African Americans during energy caused recessions is twice that of non-Hispanic whites, costing the community an average of one percent of income every year. • Reducing economic dependence on energy will alleviate the frequency and severity of recessions and the economic disparities they generate. African Americans Pay a Heavy Price and a Disproportionate Share of the Cost of Wars for Oil • Oil company profits in excess of the normal rate of profit for U.S. industries cost the average household $611 in 2006 alone and are still rising. • The total cost of the war in Iraq borne by African Americans will be $29,000 per household if the resulting deficit is financed by tax increases, and $32,000 if the debt is repaid by spending cuts. This is more than three times the median assets of African American households. A Clean Energy Future Creates Far More Jobs for African Americans • Fossil fuel extraction industries employ a far lower proportion of African Americans on average compared to other industries. Conversely, renewable electricity generation employs three to five times as many people as comparable electricity generation from fossil fuels, a higher proportion of whom are African American. ¶ • Switching just one percent of total electricity generating capacity per year from conventional to renewable sources would result in an additional 61,000 to 84,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030. ¶ • A well-designed comprehensive climate plan achieving emission reductions comparable to the Kyoto Protocol would create over 430,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030, reducing the African American unemployment rate by 1.8 percentage points and raising the average African American income by 3 to 4 percent.

#### Tax incentives would solve for reprocessing – makes it commercially more desirable

Lagus 5 (Todd, 2005 WISE Intern, University of Minnesota, WISE, “Reprocessing of Spent Nuclear Fuel: A Policy Analysis” <http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2005/lagus.pdf>, RSR)

The economic analysis shows that the reprocessing or even the once through nuclear cycle is not yet economically desirable to investors. However, changes in government policies, including environmental regulations already mentioned and economic policies, could improve the competitiveness of both technologies. The University of Chicago nuclear power study analyzes the effects of government involvement in the future of the once through cycle using several different forms of support: loan guarantees, accelerated depreciation, and investment tax credits. Loan guarantees in this case refer to the obligation of the government to repay part of the loan should a utility company not be able to repay. The 2005 Energy Bill, which passed in July 2005, would make advanced nuclear power plants eligible for federal loan guarantees and provide a tax credit for nuclear power production. This would lessen the risks associated with capital costs for investors, and according to the Chicago study, reduce the LCOE for a nuclear reactor by 4 mills/kWh to 6 mills/kWh. The next financial subject, accelerated depreciation, refers to the ability of an investor to utilize the investment tax deductions early on in the lifetime of the payment rather than receive the same deduction each year in a linear fashion. Accelerated depreciation helps investors absorb capital costs, which for nuclear power generation are large. The University of Chicago study calculates a reduction in the LCOE for a 7 year depreciation policy of 3 mills/kWh to 4 mills/kWh. Tax incentives for nuclear power production are the final policies that could make nuclear power and reprocessing more desirable. An investment tax credit of 10 percent would create an LCOE reduction between 6 mills/kWh and 8 mills/kWh, while a 20 percent credit could create cost reductions between 9 mills/kWh and 13 mills/kWh. 39 Production tax credits on a per kWh basis may also be used. Since reprocessing and the once through cycle are not appreciably different for the price, it is sufficient to assume 12 that similar effects for all three of these government policies would occur with policies applied to reprocessing. While it is no secret that monetary incentives would help the nuclear reprocessing investments, there is still the question of whether or not the government should provide economic support to the industry. As with any government funding, it is politically important not to be viewed by other energy generation industries, i.e. gas and coal, as favoring nuclear power over other sources. Given the recent concerns for global warming, tax incentives and loan guarantees for nuclear technologies seem like a realistic option especially in the absence of emission regulations. Accelerated depreciation also is an unobtrusive option that could help the industry by easing capital costs.

### Solvency

#### Observation Two: Solvency

#### Deliberative policymaking through debate is the crucial internal link to solving warming through public policy.

Herbeck and Isham 10 (Jon Isham Associate Professor of Economics, Middlebury College In the fall of 1999, Jon joined the department of economics and the program in environmental studies at Middlebury College. Jon teaches classes in environmental economics, environmental policy, introductory microeconomics, social capital in Vermont, and global climate change. Jon is co-editing a new book, Ignition: The Birth of the Climate Movement; has co-edited Social Capital, Development, and the Environment (Edward Elgar Publications); has published articles (several forthcoming) in Economic Development and Cultural Change, The Journal of African Economies, The Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Rural Sociology, Society and Natural Resources, The Southern Economic Journal, The Vermont Law Review, and the World Bank Economic Review; and has published book chapters in volumes from Ashgate Press, The New England University Press, Oxford University Press, and Cambridge University Press. His current research focuses on building the new climate movement; the demand for water among poor households in Cambodia; information asymmetries in low-income lending; and the effect of local social capital on environmental outcomes in Vermont. Herbeck, member of the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources and the Honors College, <http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/node/775>)

 Getting to 350 parts per million CO2 in the atmosphere will require massive investments in clean-energy infrastructure—investments that can too often be foiled by a combination of special interests and political sclerosis. Take the recent approval of the Cape Wind project by the U.S. Department of the Interior. In some ways, this was great news for clean-energy advocates: the project’s 130 turbines will produce, on average, 170 megawatts of electricity, almost 75 percent of the average electricity demand for Cape Cod and the islands of Martha’s Vineyard and Nantucket.1 But, because of local opposition by well-organized opponents, the approval process was lengthy, costly, and grueling —and all for a project that will produce only 0.04 percent of the total (forecasted) U.S. electricity demand in 2010.2,3 Over the next few decades, the world will need thousands of large-scale, low-carbon electricity projects—wind, solar, and nuclear power will certainly be in the mix. But if each faces Cape Wind–like opposition, getting to 350 is unlikely. How can the decision-making process about such projects be streamlined so that public policy reflects the view of a well-informed majority, provides opportunities for legitimate critiques, but does not permit the opposition to retard the process indefinitely? One answer is **found in** a set of innovative policy-making tools founded on the principle of deliberative democracy, defined as “decision making by discussion among free and equal citizens.”4 Such approaches, which have been developed and led by the Center for Deliberative Democracy (cdd.stanford.edu), America Speaks (www.americaspeaks.org), and the Consensus Building Institute (cbuilding.org), among others, are gaining popularity by promising a new foothold for effective citizen participation in the drive for a clean-energy future. Deliberative democracy stems from the belief that democratic leadership should involve educating constituents about issues at hand, and that citizens may significantly alter their opinions when faced with information about these issues. Advocates of the approach state that democracy should shift away from fixed notions toward a learning process in which people develop defensible positions.5 While the approaches of the Center for Deliberative Democracy, America Speaks, and the Consensus Building Institute do differ, all of these deliberative methodologies involve unbiased sharing of information and public-policy alternatives with a representative set of citizens; a moderated process of deliberation among the selected citizens; and the collection and dissemination of data resulting from this process. For example, in the deliberative polling approach used by the Center for Deliberative Democracy, a random selection of citizens is first polled on a particular issue. Then, members of the poll are invited to gather at a single place to discuss the issue. Participants receive balanced briefing materials to review before the gathering, and at the gathering they engage in dialogue with competing experts and political leaders based on questions they develop in small group discussions. After deliberations, the sample is asked the original poll questions, and the resulting changes in opinion represent the conclusions that the public would reach if everyone were given the opportunity to become more informed on pressing issues.6 If policymakers look at deliberative polls rather than traditional polls, they will be able to utilize results that originate from an informed group of citizens. As with traditional polls, deliberative polls choose people at random to represent U.S. demographics of age, education, gender, and so on. But traditional polls stop there, asking the random sample some brief, simple questions, typically online or over the phone. However, participants of deliberative polls have the opportunity to access expert information and then talk with one another before voting on policy recommendations. The power of this approach is illustrated by the results of a global deliberative process organized by World Wide Views on Global Warming (www.wwviews.org), a citizen’s deliberation organization based in Denmark.7 On September 26, 2009, approximately 4,000 people gathered in 38 countries to consider what should happen at the UN climate change negotiations in Copenhagen (338 Americans met in five major cities). The results derived from this day of deliberation were dramatic and significantly different from results of traditional polls. Overall, citizens showed strong concern about global warming and support for climate-change legislation, contrary to the outcomes of many standard climate-change polls. Based on the polling results from these gatherings, 90 percent of global citizens believe that it is urgent for the UN negotiations to produce a new climate change agreement; 88 percent of global citizens (82 percent of U.S. citizens) favor holding global warming to within 2 degrees Celsius of pre-industrial levels; and 74 percent of global citizens (69 percent of U.S. citizens) favor increasing fossil-fuel prices in developed countries. However, a typical news poll that was conducted two days before 350.org’s International Day of Climate Action on October 24, 2009, found that Americans had an overall declining concern about global warming.7 How can deliberative democracy help to create solutions for the climate-change policy process, to accelerate the kinds of policies and public investments that are so crucial to getting the world on a path to 350? Take again the example of wind in the United States. In the mid-1990s, the Texas Public Utilities Commission (PUC) launched an “integrated resource plan” to develop long-term strategies for energy production, particularly electricity.8 Upon learning about the deliberative polling approach of James Fishkin (then at the University of Texas at Austin), the PUC set up deliberative sessions for several hundred customers in the vicinity of every major utility provider in the state. The results were a surprise: it turned out that participants ranked reliability and stability of electricity supply as more important characteristics than price. In addition, they were open to supporting renewable energy, even if the costs slightly exceeded fossil-fuel sources. Observers considered this a breakthrough: based on these public deliberations, the PUC went on to champion an aggressive renewable portfolio standard, and the state has subsequently experienced little of the opposition to wind-tower siting that has slowed development in other states.8 By 2009, Texas had 9,500 megawatts of installed wind capacity, as much as the next six states (ranked by wind capacity) in the windy lower and upper Midwest (Iowa, Minnesota, Colorado, North Dakota, Kansas, and New Mexico).9 Deliberative democracy has proven effective in a wide range of countries and settings. In the Chinese township of Zeguo, a series of deliberative polls has helped the Local People’s Congress (LPC) to become a more effective decision-making body.10 In February 2008, 175 citizens were randomly selected to scrutinize the town’s budget—and 60 deputies from the LPC observed the process. After the deliberations, support decreased for budgeting for national defense projects, while support rose for infrastructure (e.g., rural road construction) and environmental protection. Subsequently, the LPC increased support for environmental projects by 9 percent.10 In decades to come, China must be at the forefront of the world’s investments in clean-energy infrastructure. The experience of Zeguo, if scaled up and fully supported by Chinese leaders, can help to play an important role. Deliberative democracy offers one solution for determining citizen opinions, including those on pressing issues related to climate change and clean energy.

#### We have a moral obligation to stop warming---any alternative results in extinction.

Baker 12 (7/25/12, Suzy, Executive Director of PopAtomic Studios, the Nuclear Literacy Project , Climate Change and Nuclear Energy: We Need to Talk, ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/07/25/climate-change-and-nuclear-energy-we-need-to-talk/)

Ocean Acidification¶ While I was making artistic monuments to single celled organisms in the ceramics studio, new research was emerging about ocean acidification affecting these beautiful and integral pieces of our ecosystem. As the ocean absorbs excess carbon from humans burning fossil fuels, the pH of the ocean is rapidly changing. This means that our ancient oxygen-making pals cannot properly do their job. As their ocean home becomes inhospitable, they are dying off in droves. This not only impacts the ocean’s ability to naturally sequester man made carbon emissions; it also negatively impacts the entire food chain, since they are the primary food source for other multi-cellular ocean creatures, some of which we enjoy eating.¶ Oh, and did I mention that these little phytoplankton are also responsible for creating the ozone layer that protects all life on the planet from cosmic radiation, and they churn out 70-80% of the oxygen we breathe? These creatures are much more than just a pretty floating form.¶ Ocean acidification is the issue that brought me to supporting nuclear energy. Ocean acidification is an often-overlooked aspect of climate change that is potentially more threatening than the heat, the super storms, the fires, the drought, the crop losses, and all of the other trends that we are seeing now, which climate scientists have been warning us about for decades.¶ Climate Change and Nuclear Energy: Like Oil and Water?¶ It didn’t take long for me to find out that in the nuclear industry, climate change is not something we all agree on. Discussing climate change as a concern is often polarizing, and brings up intrinsic conflicts of interest in the larger energy sector (the companies who design/build/run the nuclear plants also happen to design/build/run the fossil fuel plants). I’ve been advised by people who deeply care about me, and the success of my organization, not to bring up climate at all, and to be extremely careful not to base my support of nuclear on climate issues. I’ve also been specifically advised not to make the argument that nuclear energy is the only solution to climate change.¶ When you are the new kid, it is usually best not to make waves if you can help it. So, for the most part, I have heeded that advice and held my tongue, despite myself.¶ However, as I watch the news (and my wilting vegetable garden) and see the magnitude of human suffering that is directly related to increasingly severe weather events, I cannot keep silent. Climate change is why I am here supporting nuclear energy, so what am I doing not talking about it?¶ The CEO of Exxon Mobile recently made clear that despite his company’s acknowledgement of the irrefutable evidence of climate change, and the huge ecological and human cost, he has no intentions of slowing our fossil fuel consumption. In fact, he goes as far to say that getting fossil fuels to developing nations will save millions of lives. While I agree that we need stronger, better energy infrastructure for our world’s poorest nations, I wholly disagree that fossils are the right fit for the job.¶ Fossil fuel usage could be cast as a human rights issue only to the extent that access to reliable and affordable electricity determines what one’s standard of living is. At the same time, fossil fuel usage is the single largest threat to our planet and every species on it. Disregarding the impacts that fossil fuel use poses, merely to protect and increase financial profits, is unethical, and cloaking fossil fuel use as a human rights issue is immoral.¶ Although we are all entitled to our own opinions and beliefs, the idea that climate change and ocean acidification are even up for debate is not reasonable. Just think: The CEO of the largest fossil fuel company in America freely speaks out about climate change, while nuclear energy advocates are pressured to stay silent on the subject.¶ Silence is No Longer an Option¶ I am someone who avoids conflict, who seeks consensus in my personal and professional lives, and so I have followed the advice of well-meaning mentors and stayed silent in hopes of preserving a false peace within my pro-nuclear circles, including my family and friends. But my keeping silent is now over— starting here and starting now—because this is too big and too important to stay silent. I am not alone in believing this, and the nuclear industry does itself no favors by tacitly excluding the growing movement of people who are passionate about the need to use nuclear energy to address climate change.¶ And nuclear power is the only realistic solution. It would be great if there were also other viable solutions that could be easily and quickly embraced; however, the numbers just don’t work out. Renewables and conservation may have done more good if we had utilized them on a large scale 40 years ago, when we were warned that our ecosystem was showing signs of damage from fossils fuels…but at this point it’s really too late for them. And burning more fossil fuels right now, when we have the technologies and know-how to create a carbon-free energy economy, would be the height of foolishness.¶ In the meantime, there is real human suffering, and we here in the developed world are directly causing it. Our poorest brothers and sisters cannot escape the heat. They cannot import food when their crops fail. They cannot buy bottled water when there is a drought. They cannot “engineer a solution” any more than my childhood friends the phytoplankton can.¶ ¶ Energy Choices as an Ethical Obligation¶ We have an ethical obligation to stop killing people with our energy consumption. That statement may sound oversimplified, but let’s be honest—we know that fossil fuels kill approximately 1.3 million people each year through respiratory diseases and cancers, and the death toll for climate change related events rises every day. Yet, we do nothing but dither about climate change politics. Where is the outrage?¶ The fossil fuel industry has been successful at presenting a united front and maintaining consistent strategic communications. In contrast, the safety record and clean energy contributions of nuclear are always overshadowed by politics favoring fossil fuel use. If anything, nuclear advocates should be particularly sensitive that the very same politics are happening with climate science.¶ We should be championing nuclear energy as a science-based solution, instead of enforcing a meek code of silence. People from outside the nuclear industry, like Gwyneth Cravens, Barry Brooks and Tom Blees, have pointed out these relationships, yet the nuclear industry has yet to internalize and accept these realities.¶ How can we expect people to listen to science and not politics when it comes to nuclear energy, but not climate change?¶ Disagreeing with a policy does not change the facts. You can disagree with policy to limit carbon emissions, but that doesn’t change the fact that our fossil fuel consumption is changing the PH of our oceans. Many people disagree with the use of nuclear energy, but that doesn’t change the fact that nuclear is our largest source of carbon free electricity and the safest source of electricity per kilowatt hour.¶ Nuclear Must Lead by Example¶ If we want the public to overcome the cognitive dissonance between science and policy when it comes to nuclear energy, we need to lead by example and overcome our own cognitive dissonance when it comes to climate change — even if it means risking our own interests as members of the larger energy industry. We are not going to run out of fossil fuels any time soon, so the decision to move to carbon-free energy—to move to nuclear energy—must be made willingly, and based on ethical principles, not the limits of our natural resources.¶ As green groups wait endlessly for renewable technologies to have some kind of breakthrough, and nuclear supporters stay mum on climate change, we continue using fossil fuels. Our collective inaction is allowing the destruction of our planet’s ecosystem, the dying of our oceans, and the suffering of the poorest members of our own species. The climate conversation has become so convoluted by politics and greed that many smart, compassionate people have “thrown in the towel.” We should be more concerned than ever at our lack of a comprehensive global response.¶ I strongly believe that there’s still time to reclaim the dialogue about climate change based on ocean acidification evidence, and to use nuclear technologies to improve the long-term outcome for our planet and our species. The first step is acknowledging the complicated and unique role of the nuclear industry in this conflict, and the conflicts of interest that are impeding open communication. The second step is to realize that the climate change community is a potential ally, and that openly addressing the subject of climate change in our communications is in the best interest of the nuclear community. The third step is choosing to do the right thing, not just the polite thing, and reclaim our legitimate role in the energy community as the “top dog” of carbon-free electricity, instead of quietly watching natural gas become “the new coal.”¶ Climate change is not going away—it is getting worse—and each one of us in the nuclear community has an ethical obligation to speak up and to do something about it. I am speaking up for the oceans, for the cyano-bacteria and diatoms and our shared mitochondrial RNA that still fills me with wonder at the beauty of this world. Please join me if you can, to speak up for what you love—and if you cannot, please understand that we all remain nuclear advocates, and that the nuclear community is much stronger with the no-longer-silent climate change harbingers in it.

#### Taking action against warming represents an opportunity to reform status quo politics for a more just society.

Smith ‘10 (Brendan, co-founder of Labor Network for Sustainability, 11-23, “Fighting Doom: The New Politics of Climate Change,” Common Dreams, <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/11/23-1>)

I admit I have arrived late to the party. Only recently have I begun to realize what others have known for decades: The climate crisis is not, at its core, an environmental issue. In fact it is not an "issue" at all; it is an existential threat to every human and community on the planet. It threatens every job, every economy in the world. It threatens the health of our children. It threatens our food and water supply. Climate change will continue to alter the world our species has known for the past three thousand years. As an oyster farmer and longtime political activist, the effects of climate change on my life will be neither distant nor impersonal. Rising greenhouse gases and ocean temperatures may well force me to abandon my 60-acre farm within the next forty years. From France to Washington state, oystermen are already seeing massive die-offs of seed oysters and the thinning shells science has long predicted. I can see the storm clouds and they are foretelling doom. But my political alter ego is oddly less pessimistic. Rather than triggering gloom, the climate crisis has surprisingly stirred up more hope than I have felt in twenty years as a progressive activist. After decades of progressive retreat it is a strange feeling. But I am haunted by the suspicion that this coming crisis may be the first opportunity we have had in generations to radically re-shape the political landscape and build a more just and sustainable society. The Power of Doom The modern progressive movement in the U.S. has traditionally grounded its organizing in the politics of identity and altruism. Organize an affected group -- minorities, gays, janitors or women -- and then ask the public at large to support the cause -- prison reform, gay marriage, labor rights, or abortion -- based on some cocktail of good will, liberal guilt, and moral persuasion. This strategy has been effective at times. But we have failed to bring these mini-movements together into a force powerful enough to enact broad-based social reform. It takes a lot of people to change society and our current strategy has left us small in numbers and weak in power. The highlights of my political life -- as opposed to oystering -- have been marked by winning narrow, often temporary, battles, but perennially losing the larger war. I see the results in every direction I look: growing poverty and unemployment, two wars, the rise of the right, declining unionization, the failure of the Senate's climate legislation and of Copenhagen, the wholesale domination of corporate interests. The list goes on and on. We have lost; it's time to admit our strategy has been too tepid and begin charting anew. This time can be different. What is so promising about the climate crisis is that because it is not an "issue" experienced by one disenfranchised segment of the population, it opens the opportunity for a new organizing calculus for progressives. Except for nuclear annihilation, humanity has never faced so universal a threat where all our futures are bound inextricably together. This universality provides the mortar of common interest required for movement building. We could literally knock on every door on the planet and find someone -- whether they know it or not -- who has a vital self-interest in averting the climate crisis by joining a movement for sustainability. With all of humanity facing doom, we can finally gather under one banner and count our future members not in the thousands but in the millions, even billions. But as former White House "Green Jobs Czar" Van Jones told the New Yorker in 2009, "The challenge is making this an everybody movement, so your main icons are Joe Six-Pack, Joe the Plumber, becoming Joe the Solar Guy, or that kid on the street corner putting down his handgun, picking up a caulk gun." The climate crisis is carrying us into uncharted waters and our political strategy needs to be directed toward making the climate movement an "everybody movement." Let me use a personal example. As an oysterman on Long Island Sound my way of life is threatened by rising greenhouse gases and ocean temperatures. If the climate crisis is not averted my oysters will die and my farm will be shuttered. Saving my livelihood requires that I politically engage at some level. Normally I would gather together my fellow oyster farmers to lobby state and federal officials and hold a protest or two. Maybe I would find a few coalitions to join. But we would remain small in number, wield little power, and our complaints about job loss would fall on largely unsympathetic ears in the face of so many suffering in so many ways. And what would we even petition our government to do about the problem? Buyouts and unemployment benefits? Re-training classes? Our oysters will still die and we will still lose our farms. To save our lives and livelihood we need to burrow down to the root of the problem: halting greenhouse gas emissions. And halting emissions requires joining a movement with the requisite power to dismantle the fossil fuel economy while building a green economy. To tackle such a large target requires my support for every nook and cranny effort to halt greenhouse gases and transition to a green economy. I need to gather up my fellow oyster farmers and link arms with students blocking new coal-fired power plants while fighting for just transition for coal workers; I need to join forces with other green workers around the country to demand government funding for green energy jobs, not more bank and corporate bailouts; I need to support labor movement efforts in China and elsewhere to climb out of poverty by going "green not dirty." I have a stake in these disparate battles not out of political altruism, but because my livelihood and community depend on stopping greenhouse gases and climate change. In other words, the hidden jewel of the climate crisis is that I need others and others need me. We are bound together by the same story of crisis and struggle. Some in the sustainability movement have been taking advantage of the "power of doom" by weaving together novel narratives and alliances around climate change. Groups in Kentucky are complementing their anti-mountain top removal efforts by organizing members of rural electrical co-ops into "New Power" campaigns to force a transition from fossil fuels to renewable power -- and create jobs in the process. Police unions in Canada, recognizing their members will be first responders as climate disasters hit, have reached out to unions in New Orleans to ensure the tragedies that followed Katrina are not repeated. Artists, chefs, farmers, bike mechanics, designers, and others are coalescing into a "green artisan movement" focused on building vibrant sustainable communities. Immigrant organizers, worried about the very real possibility of ever-worsening racial tensions triggered by millions of environmental refugees flooding in from neighboring countries, are educating their membership about why the climate crisis matters. My hope is that over the coming years we will be able to catalog increasing numbers of these tributaries of the climate crisis. Our power will not stem from a long list of issue concerns or sponsors at events -- we have tried that as recently as the October 2nd Washington D.C. "One Nation Working Together" march with little impact. Nor, with the rise of do-it-yourself organizing, will our power spring from top-down political parties of decades past. Instead oystermen like me, driven by the need to save our lives and livelihood, will storm the barricades with others facing the effects of the climate crisis. We will merge our mini-movements under a banner of common crisis, common vision and common struggle. We will be in this fight together and emerge as force not to be trifled with. This Time We Have an Alternative I am also guardedly optimistic because this time we have an alternative. My generation came of age after the fall of communism, and as a result, we have been raised in the midst of one-sided debate. We recognize that neoliberalism has ravaged society, but besides nostalgic calls for socialism, what has been the alternative? As globalization swept the globe, we demanded livable wages and better housing for the poorest in our communities; we fought sweatshops in China; we lobbied for new campaign finance and corporate governance laws. But these are mere patchwork reforms that fail to add up to a full-blown alternative to our current anti-government, free-market system. Never being able to fully picture the progressive alternative left me not fully trusting that progressive answers were viable solutions. But when I hear the proposed solutions to the climate crisis, the fog lifts. I can track the logic and envision the machinery of our alternative. And it sounds surprisingly like a common sense rebuttal to the current free-market mayhem: We face a global emergency of catastrophic proportions. Market fundamentalism will worsen rather than solve the crisis. Instead we need to re-direct our institutions and economic resources toward solving the crisis by replacing our carbon-based economy with a green sustainable economy. And by definition, for an economy to be sustainable it must addresses the longstanding suffering ordinary people face in their lives, ranging from unemployment and poverty to housing and healthcare. For years I have tossed from campaign to campaign, but the framework of our new progressive answer to the climate crisis now provides a roadmap for my political strategy. It helps chart my opponents -- coal companies and their political minions, for example -- as well as my diverse range of allies. It lays out my policy agenda, ranging from creating millions of new green jobs to building affordable green housing in low-income communities. I finally feel confident enough in my bearings to set sail. The Era of Crisis Politics While building a new green economy makes sense on paper, it is hard to imagine our entrenched political system yielding even modest progressive reform, let alone the wholesale re-formatting of the carbon economy. But I suspect this will change in the coming years, with our future governed by cascading political crises, rather than political stasis. We are likely entering an era of crisis politics whereby each escalating environmental disaster -- ranging from water shortages and hurricanes to wildfires and disease outbreaks -- will expose the impotence of our existing political institutions and economic system. In the next 40 years alone, scientists predict a state of permanent drought throughout the Southwest US and climate-linked disease deaths to double. As Danny Thompson, secretary-treasurer of the Nevada AFL-CIO, told the Las Vegas Review Journal, the ever-worsening water crisis could be "the end of the world" that could "turn us upside down, and I don't know how you recover from that." As if that is not enough, these crises will be played out in the context of a global economy spiraling out of control. Each hurricane, drought or recession will send opinion polls and politicians lurching from right to left and vice versa. Think of how quickly, however momentarily, the political debate pivoted in the wake of Katrina, the BP disaster, and the financial crisis. As White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel famously said "Never let a serious crisis go to waste...It's an opportunity to do things you couldn't do before." While addressing the climate crisis requires radical solutions that cannot be broached in today's political climate, each disaster opens an opportunity to advance alternative agendas -- both for the left and right. While politicians debate modest technical fixes, ordinary people left desperate by floods, fires, droughts and other disasters will increasingly -- and angrily -- demand more fundamental reforms. While our current policy choices appear limited by polls and election results, in an era of crisis politics what appears unrealistic and radical before a storm may well appear as common sense reform in its wake. My generation has been raised in the politics of eternal dusk. Except for a passing ray of hope during the Obama campaign, our years have been marked by the failure of every political force in society -- whether it be political elites or social movement leaders -- to address the problems we face as a nation and world. They have left us spinning towards disaster. We can forge a better future. Climate-generated disasters will bring our doomed future into focus. The failure of political elites to adequately respond to these cascading crises will transform our political landscape and seed the ground for social movements. And if we prepare for the chaos and long battle ahead, our alternative vision will become a necessity rather than an impossibility. As a friend recently said to me, "God help us, I hope you're right."

#### The state is inevitable and an indispensable part of the solution to warming

Eckersley 4 (Robyn, Reader/Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Melbourne, “The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty”, MIT Press, 2004, Google Books, pp. 3-8)

While acknowledging the basis for this antipathy toward the nation- state, and the limitations of state-centric analyses of global ecological degradation, I seek to draw attention to the positive role that states have played, and might increasingly play, in global and domestic politics. Writing more than twenty years ago, Hedley Bull (a proto-constructivist and leading writer in the English school) outlined the state's positive role in world affairs, and his arguments continue to provide a powerful challenge to those who somehow seek to "get beyond the state," as if such a move would provide a more lasting solution to the threat of armed conflict or nuclear war, social and economic injustice, or environmental degradation.10 As Bull argued, given that the state is here to stay whether we like it or not, then the call to get "beyond the state is a counsel of despair, at all events if it means that we have to begin by abolishing or subverting the state, rather than that there is a need to build upon it.""¶ In any event, rejecting the "statist frame" of world politics ought not prohibit an inquiry into the emancipatory potential of the state as a crucial "node" in any future network of global ecological governance. This is especially so, given that one can expect states to persist as major sites of social and political power for at least the foreseeable future and that any green transformations of the present political order will, short of revolution, necessarily be state-dependent. Thus, like it or not, those concerned about ecological destruction must contend with existing institutions and, where possible, seek to "rebuild the ship while still at sea." And if states are so implicated in ecological destruction, then an inquiry into the potential for their transformation even their modest reform into something that is at least more conducive to ecological sustainability would seem to be compelling.¶ Of course, it would be unhelpful to become singularly fixated on the redesign of the state at the expense of other institutions of governance. States are not the only institutions that limit, condition, shape, and direct political power, and it is necessary to keep in view the broader spectrum of formal and informal institutions of governance (e.g., local, national, regional, and international) that are implicated in global environmental change. Nonetheless, while the state constitutes only one modality of political power, it is an especially significant one because of its historical claims to exclusive rule over territory and peoples—as expressed in the principle of state sovereignty. As Gianfranco Poggi explains, the political power concentrated in the state "is a momentous, pervasive, critical phenomenon. Together with other forms of social power, it constitutes an indispensable medium for constructing and shaping larger social realities, for establishing, shaping and maintaining all broader and more durable collectivities."12 States play, in varying degrees, significant roles in structuring life chances, in distributing wealth, privilege, information, and risks, in upholding civil and political rights, and in securing private property rights and providing the legal/regulatory framework for capitalism. Every one of these dimensions of state activity has, for good or ill, a significant bearing on the global environmental crisis. Given that the green political project is one that demands far-reaching changes to both economies and societies, it is difficult to imagine how such changes might occur on the kind of scale that is needed without the active support of states. While it is often observed that states are too big to deal with local ecological problems and too small to deal with global ones, the state nonetheless holds, as Lennart Lundqvist puts it, "a unique position in the constitutive hierarchy from individuals through villages, regions and nations all the way to global organizations. The state is inclusive of lower political and administrative levels, and exclusive in speaking for its whole territory and population in relation to the outside world."13 In short, it seems to me inconceivable to advance ecological emancipation without also engaging with and seeking to transform state power.¶ Of course, not all states are democratic states, and the green movement has long been wary of the coercive powers that all states reputedly enjoy. Coercion (and not democracy) is also central to Max Weber's classic sociological understanding of the state as "a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory."14 Weber believed that the state could not be defined sociologically in terms of its ends\* only formally as an organization in terms of the particular means that are peculiar to it.15 Moreover his concept of legitimacy was merely concerned with whether rules were accepted by subjects as valid (for whatever reason); he did not offer a normative theory as to the circumstances when particular rules ought to be accepted or whether beliefs about the validity of rules were justified. Legitimacy was a contingent fact, and in view of his understanding of politics as a struggle for power in the context of an increasingly disenchanted world, likely to become an increasingly unstable achievement.16¶ In contrast to Weber, my approach to the state is explicitly normative and explicitly concerned with the purpose of states, and the democratic basis of their legitimacy. It focuses on the limitations of liberal normative theories of the state (and associated ideals of a just constitutional arrangement), and it proposes instead an alternative green theory that seeks to redress the deficiencies in liberal theory. Nor is my account as bleak as Weber's. The fact that states possess a monopoly of control over the means of coercion is a most serious matter, but it does not necessarily imply that they must have frequent recourse to that power. In any event, whether the use of the state's coercive powers is to be deplored or welcomed turns on the purposes for which that power is exercised, the manner in which it is exercised, and whether it is managed in public, transparent, and accountable ways—a judgment that must be made against a background of changing problems, practices, and under- standings. The coercive arm of the state can be used to "bust" political demonstrations and invade privacy. It can also be used to prevent human rights abuses, curb the excesses of corporate power, and protect the environment.¶ In short, although the political autonomy of states is widely believed to be in decline, there are still few social institution that can match the same degree of capacity and potential legitimacy that states have to redirect societies and economies along more ecologically sustainable lines to address ecological problems such as global warming and pollution, the buildup of toxic and nuclear wastes and the rapid erosion of the earth's biodiversity. States—particularly when they act collectively—have the capacity to curb the socially and ecologically harmful consequences of capitalism. They are also more amenable to democratization than cor- porations, notwithstanding the ascendancy of the neoliberal state in the increasingly competitive global economy. There are therefore many good reasons why green political theorists need to think not only critically but also constructively about the state and the state system. While the state is certainly not "healthy" at the present historical juncture, in this book I nonetheless join Poggi by offering "a timid two cheers for the old beast," at least as a potentially more significant ally in the green cause.17

#### Short-term market mechanisms are the only solution to environmental destruction

Bryant 12 (Levi, professor of philosophy at Collin College, We’ll Never Do Better Than a Politician: Climate Change and Purity, 5/11/12, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/)

Somewhere or other Latour makes the remark that we’ll never do better than a politician. Here it’s important to remember that for Latour– as for myself –every entity is a “politician”. Latour isn’t referring solely to those persons that we call “politicians”, but to all entities that exist. And if Latour claims that we’ll never do better than a politician, then this is because every entity must navigate a field of relations to other entities that play a role in what is and is not possible in that field. In the language of my ontology, this would be articulated as the thesis that the local manifestations of which an entity is capable are, in part, a function of the relations the entity entertains to other entities in a regime of attraction. The world about entities perpetually introduces resistances and frictions that play a key role in what comes to be actualized. ¶ It is this aphorism that occurred to me today after a disturbing discussion with a rather militant Marxist on Facebook. I had posted a very disturbing editorial on climate change by the world renowned climate scientist James Hansen. Not only did this person completely misread the editorial, denouncing Hansen for claiming that Canada is entirely responsible for climate change (clearly he had no familiarity with Hansen or his important work), but he derided Hansen for proposing market-based solutions to climate change on the grounds that “the market is the whole source of the problem!” It’s difficult to know how to respond in this situations.¶ read on! ¶ It is quite true that it is the system of global capitalism or the market that has created our climate problems (though, as Jared Diamond shows in Collapse, other systems of production have also produced devastating climate problems). In its insistence on profit and expansion in each economic quarter, markets as currently structured provide no brakes for environmental destructive actions. The system is itself pathological.¶ However, pointing this out and deriding market based solutions doesn’t get us very far. In fact, such a response to proposed market-based solutions is downright dangerous and irresponsible. The fact of the matter is that 1) we currently live in a market based world, 2) there is not, in the foreseeable future an alternative system on the horizon, and 3), above all, we need to do something now. We can’t afford to reject interventions simply because they don’t meet our ideal conceptions of how things should be. We have to work with the world that is here, not the one that we would like to be here. And here it’s crucial to note that pointing this out does not entail that we shouldn’t work for producing that other world. It just means that we have to grapple with the world that is actually there before us.¶ It pains me to write this post because I remember, with great bitterness, the diatribes hardcore Obama supporters leveled against legitimate leftist criticisms on the grounds that these critics were completely unrealistic idealists who, in their demand for “purity”, were asking for “ponies and unicorns”. This rejoinder always seemed to ignore that words have power and that Obama, through his profound power of rhetoric, had, at least the power to shift public debates and frames, opening a path to making new forms of policy and new priorities possible. The tragedy was that he didn’t use that power, though he has gotten better.¶ I do not wish to denounce others and dismiss their claims on these sorts of grounds. As a Marxist anarchists, I do believe that we should fight for the creation of an alternative hominid ecology or social world. I think that the call to commit and fight, to put alternatives on the table, has been one of the most powerful contributions of thinkers like Zizek and Badiou. If we don’t commit and fight for alternatives those alternatives will never appear in the world. Nonetheless, we still have to grapple with the world we find ourselves in. And it is here, in my encounters with some Militant Marxists, that I sometimes find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are unintentionally aiding and abetting the very things they claim to be fighting. In their refusal to become impure, to work with situations or assemblages as we find them, to sully their hands, they end up reproducing the very system they wish to topple and change. Narcissistically they get to sit there, smug in their superiority and purity, while everything continues as it did before because they’ve refused to become politicians or engage in the difficult concrete work of assembling human and nonhuman actors to render another world possible. As a consequence, they occupy the position of Hegel’s beautiful soul that denounces the horrors of the world, celebrate the beauty of their soul, while depending on those horrors of the world to sustain their own position. ¶ To engage in politics is to engage in networks or ecologies of relations between humans and nonhumans. To engage in ecologies is to descend into networks of causal relations and feedback loops that you cannot completely master and that will modify your own commitments and actions. But there’s no other way, there’s no way around this, and we do need to act now.

**Education about federal policies must be informed by climate science – that is key to check special interests from causing warming, and it’s low now.**

Hansen, ‘9 (James, heads the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and adjunct professor in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University, December, Storms of My Grandchildren, xi)

I believe the biggest obstacle to solving global warming is the role of money in politics, the undue sway of special interests. **But the public, and young people in particular, will need to get involved in a major way.** “What?” you say. You already did get involved by working your tail off to help elect President Barack Obama. Sure, I (a registered Independent who has voted for both Republicans and Democrats over the years) voted for change too, and I had moist eyes during his Election Day speech in Chicago. That was and always will be a great day for America. But let me tell you: President Obama does not get it. He and his key advisers are subject to heavy pressures, and so far the approach has been, “Let’s compromise.” **So you still have a hell of a lot of work ahead of you**. You do not have any choice. Your attitude must be “Yes, we can.” I am sorry to say that most of what our politicians are doing on the climate front is greenwashing – their proposals sound good, but they are deceiving you and themselves at the same time. Politicians think that if matters look difficult, compromise is a good approach. **Unfortunately, nature and the laws of physics cannot compromise – they are what they are.** Policy decisions on climate change are being deliberated every day by those without full knowledge of the science, and often with intentional misinformation spawned by special interests. This book was written to help rectify the situation. Citizens with a special interest – in their loved ones – need to become familiar with the science, exercise their democratic rights, and pay attention to politicians’ decisions. Otherwise, it seems, short-term special interests will hold sway in capitals around the world – and we are running out of time.

#### We have to use risk and fear in the context of warming – it’s the only way to motivate the public to action.

Romm ‘12 (Joe, Fellow at American Progress. Apocalypse Not: The Oscars, The Media And The Myth of ‘Constant Repetition of Doomsday Messages’ on Climate. <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/26/432546/apocalypse-not-oscars-media-myth-of-repetition-of-doomsday-messages-on-climate/?mobile=nc>)

The two greatest myths about global warming communications are 1) constant repetition of¶ doomsday messages has been a major, ongoing strategy and 2) that strategy doesn’t work and¶ indeed is actually counterproductive!¶ These myths are so deeply ingrained in the environmental and progressive political community¶ that when we finally had a serious shot at a climate bill, the powers that be decided not to focus on the threat posed by climate change in any serious fashion in their $200 million¶ communications effort (see my 6/10 post “Can you solve global warming without talking about¶ global warming?“). These myths are so deeply ingrained in the mainstream media that such¶ messaging, when it is tried, is routinely attacked and denounced — and the flimsiest studies¶ are interpreted exactly backwards to drive the erroneous message home (see “Dire straits:¶ Media blows the story of UC Berkeley study on climate messaging“)¶ The only time anything approximating this kind of¶ messaging — not “doomsday” but what I’d call blunt,¶ science-based messaging that also makes clear the problem is solvable — was in 2006 and 2007 with the¶ release of An Inconvenient Truth (and the 4 assessment¶ reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change¶ and media coverage like the April 2006 cover of Time). The¶ data suggest that strategy measurably moved the public to¶ become more concerned about the threat posed by global¶ warming (see recent study here).¶ You’d think it would be pretty obvious that the public is not going to be concerned about an issue unless one explains why they should be concerned about an issue.¶ And the social science literature, including the vast¶ literature on advertising and marketing, could not be clearer that only repeated messages have any chance of sinking in and moving the needle.¶ Because I doubt any serious movement of public opinion¶ or mobilization of political action could possibly occur until these myths are shattered, I’ll do a multipart series on this subject, featuring public opinion analysis, quotes by leading experts, and the latest social¶ science research.¶ Since this is Oscar night, though, it seems appropriate to start by looking at what messages the public are¶ exposed to in popular culture and the media. It ain’t doomsday. Quite the reverse, climate change has been¶ mostly an invisible issue for several years and the message of conspicuous consumption and business-asusual reigns supreme.¶ The motivation for this post actually came up because I received an e-mail from a journalist commenting that¶ the “constant repetition of doomsday messages” doesn’t work as a messaging strategy. I had to demur, for the¶ reasons noted above.¶ But it did get me thinking about what messages the public are exposed to, especially as I’ve been rushing to see¶ the movies nominated for Best Picture this year. I am a huge movie buff, but as parents of 5-year-olds know, it¶ isn’t easy to stay up with the latest movies.¶ That said, good luck finding a popular movie in recent years that even touches on climate change, let alone one¶ a popular one that would pass for doomsday messaging. Best Picture nominee The Tree of Life has been billed¶ as an environmental movie — and even shown at environmental film festivals — but while it is certainly¶ depressing, climate-related it ain’t. In fact, if that is truly someone’s idea of environmental movie, count me out.¶ The closest to a genuine popular climate movie was the dreadfully unscientific The Day After Tomorrow, which¶ is from 2004 (and arguably set back the messaging effort by putting the absurd “global cooling” notion in¶ people’s heads! Even Avatar, the most successful movie of all time and “the most epic piece of environmental¶ advocacy ever captured on celluloid,” as one producer put it, omits the climate doomsday message. One of my¶ favorite eco-movies, “Wall-E, is an eco-dystopian gem and an anti-consumption movie,” but it isn’t a climate¶ movie.¶ I will be interested to see The Hunger Games, but I’ve read all 3 of the bestselling post-apocalyptic young adult¶ novels — hey, that’s my job! — and they don’t qualify as climate change doomsday messaging (more on that¶ later). So, no, the movies certainly don’t expose the public to constant doomsday messages on climate.¶ Here are the key points about what repeated messages the American public is exposed to:¶ 1. The broad American public is exposed to virtually no doomsday messages, let alone constant ones, on climate change in popular culture (TV and the movies and even online). There is not one single TV show on¶ any network devoted to this subject, which is, arguably, more consequential than any other preventable¶ issue we face.¶ 2. The same goes for the news media, whose coverage of climate change has collapsed (see “Network News¶ Coverage of Climate Change Collapsed in 2011“). When the media do cover climate change in recent years,¶ the overwhelming majority of coverage is devoid of any doomsday messages — and many outlets still¶ feature hard-core deniers. Just imagine what the public’s view of climate would be if it got the same¶ coverage as, say, unemployment, the housing crisis or even the deficit? When was the last time you saw an¶ “employment denier” quoted on TV or in a newspaper?¶ 3. The public is exposed to constant messages promoting business as usual and indeed idolizing conspicuous¶ consumption. See, for instance, “Breaking: The earth is breaking … but how about that Royal Wedding?¶ 4. Our political elite and intelligentsia, including MSM pundits and the supposedly “liberal media” like, say,¶ MSNBC, hardly even talk about climate change and when they do, it isn’t doomsday. Indeed, there isn’t even¶ a single national columnist for a major media outlet who writes primarily on climate. Most “liberal”¶ columnists rarely mention it. 5. At least a quarter of the public chooses media that devote a vast amount of time to the notion that global¶ warming is a hoax and that environmentalists are extremists and that clean energy is a joke. In the MSM,¶ conservative pundits routinely trash climate science and mock clean energy. Just listen to, say, Joe¶ Scarborough on MSNBC’s Morning Joe mock clean energy sometime.¶ 6. The major energy companies bombard the airwaves with millions and millions of dollars of repetitious profossil-fuel ads. The environmentalists spend far, far less money. As noted above, the one time they did run a¶ major campaign to push a climate bill, they and their political allies including the president explicitly did¶ NOT talk much about climate change, particularly doomsday messaging¶ 7. Environmentalists when they do appear in popular culture, especially TV, are routinely mocked.¶ 8. There is very little mass communication of doomsday messages online. Check out the most popular¶ websites. General silence on the subject, and again, what coverage there is ain’t doomsday messaging. Go to¶ the front page of the (moderately trafficked) environmental websites. Where is the doomsday?¶ If you want to find anything approximating even modest, blunt, science-based messaging built around the¶ scientific literature, interviews with actual climate scientists and a clear statement that we can solve this¶ problem — well, you’ve all found it, of course, but the only people who see it are those who go looking for it.¶ Of course, this blog is not even aimed at the general public. Probably 99% of Americans haven’t even seen one¶ of my headlines and 99.7% haven’t read one of my climate science posts. And Climate Progress is probably the¶ most widely read, quoted, and reposted climate science blog in the world.¶ Anyone dropping into America from another country or another planet who started following popular culture¶ and the news the way the overwhelming majority of Americans do would get the distinct impression that¶ nobody who matters is terribly worried about climate change. And, of course, they’d be right — see “The failed¶ presidency of Barack Obama, Part 2.”¶ It is total BS that somehow the American public has been scared and overwhelmed by repeated doomsday¶ messaging into some sort of climate fatigue. If the public’s concern has dropped — and public opinion analysis¶ suggests it has dropped several percent (though is bouncing back a tad) — that is primarily due to the conservative media’s disinformation campaign impact on Tea Party conservatives and to the treatment of this as a nonissue by most of the rest of the media, intelligentsia and popular culture.¶ What’s amazing to me is not the public’s supposed lack of concerned about global warming — another myth,¶ debunked here — but that the public is as knowledgable and concerned as it is given the realities discussed¶ above!¶ In Part 2, I’ll discuss how we know that this works — blunt, science-based messages that lay out the realistic¶ threat posed by our inaction and the myriad cost-effective solutions available now, repeated as often as¶ possible from multiple sources.

## 2AC

### Godzilla

#### Permutation do both.

#### Reprocessing resolves the need for uranium mining.

Sayre 11 (Edwin, engineering consultant, “Commercial Value of Used Nuclear Fuel Reprocessed with Elements Separated, Purified and Reduced to Metals”, NIST, 2011, <http://www.nist.gov/tip/wp/pswp/upload/164_commercial_value_used_nuclear_fuel_reprocessed.pdf>)

The commercial value of the elements in the used fuel as indicated in Table 1 is a big ¶ surprise for most people. The commercial value of over twenty million dollars a year each 1000 MW reactor is based on today’s value for the rare metals in the fission ¶ products and the fissile metals to be recycled in fuel. The accelerated use of these ¶ elements with future technology will probably make them worth more than double that ¶ commercial value in 2050.¶ The United States should be interested in determining the cost of reprocessing the used ¶ fuel and preparing the elements for commercial use. It is estimated roughly that there ¶ will be a considerable profit in the processing of the elements in the used fuel. DOE is ¶ supporting technical proposals for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative (AFCI) for ¶ computing and simulating the operations required for processing the used fuel and ¶ separating out the commercial elements to determine the cost. There will be further ¶ programs to optimize the technology for the processing and establishing the required ¶ facilities. It would be economically ideal to start up the first reprocessing facilities by ¶ 2020 to start using the used fuel with over 50 years of aging. ¶ Many other countries are moving forward in the reprocessing and recycling the actinides ¶ in fast breeder reactors to make fuel from all low enriched fuel for the future use in the ¶ thermal reactor power plants. There is enough used nuclear fuel and the uranium 238 ¶ stored away to meet all of the US energy requirements for the next 500 years with the ¶ proper technical planning and program operation.

#### Reprocessing would remove the waste problem – the waste we currently store can be reused

Bastin 8 (Clinton, Former Chemical Engineer at the Atomic Energy Commission, 21st Century Science and Technology, “We Need to Reprocess Spent Nuclear Fuel, And Can Do It Safely, At Reasonable Cost”, 2008, [http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202008/ Summer\_2008/Reprocessing.pdf](http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202008/Summer_2008/Reprocessing.pdf), RSR)

The concept of used nuclear fuel as “nuclear waste” is a fiction created by the opponents of nuclear energy. Used nuclear fuel isn’t waste at all, but a renewable resource that can be reprocessed into new nuclear fuel and valuable isotopes. When we entered the nuclear age, the great promise of nuclear energy wasitsrenewability, making it an inexpensive and efficient way to produce electricity. It was assumed that the nations making use of nuclear energy would reprocess their spent fuel, completing the nuclear fuel cycle by recycling the nuclear fuel after it was burned in a reactor, to extract the 95 to 99 percent of unused uranium in it that can be turned into new fuel. This means that if the United States buries its 70,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel, we would be wasting 66,000 metric tons of uranium-28, which could be used to make new fuel. In addition, we would be wasting about 1,200 metric tons of fissile uranium-25 and plutonium-29, which can also be burned as fuel. Because of the high energy density in the nucleus, this relatively small amount of U.S. spent fuel (it would fit in one small house) is equivalent in energy to about 20 percent of the U.S. oil reserves. About 96 percent of the spent fuel the United States is now storing can be turned into new fuel. The 4 percent of the socalled waste that remains—2,500 metric tons—consists of highly radioactive materials, but these are also usable. There are about 80 tons each of cesium-17 and strontium-90 that could be separated out for use in medical applications, such as sterilization of medical supplies. Using isotope separation techniques, and fast-neutron bombardment for transmutation (technologies that the United States pioneered but now refuses to develop), we could separate out all sorts of isotopes, like americium, which is used in smoke detectors, or isotopes used in medical testing and treatment. Right now, the United Statesmust import 90 percent of its medical isotopes, used in 40,000 medical procedures daily. The diagram shows a closed nuclear fuel cycle. At present, the United States has no reprocessing, and stores spent fuel in pools or dry storage at nuclear plants. Existing nuclear reactors use only about 1 percent of the total energy value in uranium resources; fast reactors with fuel recycle would use essentially 100 percent, burning up all of the uranium and actinides, the long-lived fission products. In a properly managed and safeguarded system, the plutonium produced in fast reactors would remain in its spent fuel until needed for recycle.Thus, there need be no excess buildup of accessible plutonium. The plutonium could also be fabricated directly into new reactor fuel assemblies to be burned in nuclear plants.

#### 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

#### Resolving both of these issues is necessary to reject the harms of the bad side of nuclear technology by recognizing and ending the violence on the fourth world.

Kato, Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, 1993

(Masahide "Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze," Alternatives: Global, Local, Political. Pages 352-354, MAG)

Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the interimperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of fantasy, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of "nuclear testing" since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth.28 The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192 times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times).29 The primary targets of warfare ("test site" to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times).30 Moreover, although I focus primarily on "nuclear tests" in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets.

#### We have to try our best to pragmatically engage the state – even if we can’t predict all the consequences – our affirmative is better than blanket rejection of all solutions.

Fan, professor of Public Administration and Institute of Public Policy – Tamkang University, ‘6

[Mei-Fang, “Environmental Justice and Nuclear Waste Conflicts in Taiwan,” Environmental Politics, Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 417 – 434, June]

It is necessary to rethink the multiple conceptions of environmental justice articulated by the Yami and Taiwanese groups. This section focuses on the questions of how we might respond to differing ways of understanding environmental justice, deal with the divisions within a multicultural society and **formulate environmental policy** regarding nuclear waste dilemmas. The Yami professional and teenage student groups tended to stress the preservation of a liveable environment for future generations and regarded it as the core element of the environmental justice movement and the basis for the Yami’s opposition to nuclear waste. Instead, for most of the Taiwanese participants, the Yami’s anti-nuclear movement did not exactly correspond to the claims of environmental justice. Those Taiwanese participants who hold utilitarian views considered that the Yami anti-nuclear waste movement involved political consideration, self-interest and the attempt to obtain benefits or celebrity. The gap between the Yami and Taiwanese groups and the lack of mutual understanding and communication between them are significant. The Yami groups expressed their doubts as to whether the Taiwanese people would treat the tribesmen sincerely as partners in dealing with environmental problems, while the Taiwanese participants seemed to view the Yami as insular. A growing number of environmental ethicists have tried to rethink the problem of what practical effect environmental ethics has had on the formation of environmental policy. Contrary to a monistic approach, moral pluralism as a practical philosophy allows a form of agreement on real cases in which agreement on the general formulation of moral principles is not essential. Practical philosophy seeks the integration of multiple values and tries to reduce the distance between disputants by finding a general policy direction that can achieve greater consensus. It searches for workable solutions to specific problems or a range of actions that are morally permissible or acceptable to a wide range of worldviews (Norton, 1995: 129– 33). The multiple conceptions of environmental justice articulated by the Yami and Taiwanese groups in the context of nuclear waste controversies provide support for a pluralistic account of environmental values rather than a monistic philosophical stance. A foundational approach to ethics that requires the application of a single theory **functionally equivalent to truth** fails to take a variety of conflicting moral insights into account and limits alternatives to nuclear waste management. In contrast, pragmatism represents an engagement with the actual problems in the specific historical and social context. Environmental pragmatism draws upon the pragmatist philosophical and political tradition in American thought, advocating a serious inquiry into the practical merits of moral pluralism (Light & Katz, 1996). The American philosophical school, represented mainly in the late 19th- and early 20thcentury writings of Charles Peirce, William James and John Dewey is marked most notably by its anti-foundational character that denies the existence of ‘a priori or self-justifying ‘‘truths’’ and moral absolutes’ (Minteer & Manning, 1999: 193). For Light (1996), there is much that we do agree on that has not been put into environmental policy or communicated to the public effectively. From the metaphilosophical perspective, what environmental pragmatists agree on is that the truth of any particular theoretical framework is not always fundamental for specific environmental problems and the ‘appropriateness of any one theory in a particular case is contingent on historical, cultural, social and resource conditions’. Environmental pragmatism chooses the approach that is most appropriate for purposes of environmental practice regardless of its theoretical origin (Light, 1996: 172, 177). Considering the multiple values held by the Yami and Taiwanese groups in the nuclear waste disputes, abstract moral norms provided by environmental ethicists do not appear to resolve the practical problems faced by the local residents on Orchid Island. **Instead of asking environmental ethicists to give up** their **debates** **about** non-anthropocentric natural **value**, environmental pragmatism endorses a pluralism that acknowledges the possible necessity of sometimes using the anthropocentric description of the value of nature to help support a morally responsible policy (Light, 2004). Furthermore, the pragmatists admit that our understandings and concepts are fallible, and that experience can at any time reveal our beliefs or the meaning of an idea as false. Environmental pragmatism recognises the importance of many diverse individuals, experiences and concepts coming together to offer insights into actual problems in the public sphere (Parker, 1996). A growing body of research has demonstrated the validity of a pragmatic approach to specific environmental and social issues, including the cases of policymaking for leaded gasoline (Thomson, 2003), forest resource management (Castle, 1996), animal welfare and hunting (Light, 2004). Environmental pragmatism, representing a democratic respect for diverse public values and ethical positions regarding the environment, is relevant to the multiple understandings of environmental justice.

#### Our tech optimism based on empirical research is good---prefer specific experts.

Krier, Professor of Law at the University of Michigan, ‘85

[James, “The Un-Easy Case for Technological Optimism,” Michigan Law Review, Vol. 84, No. 3; December 1985, pp. 405-429]

A technological optimist is not simply a person with unqualified enthusiasm about technological promise. Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was an enthusiast, but he was not a technological optimist as the term is currently used. Saint-Simon, rather, was a utopian who happened to attach his vision to technocratic expertise.4 He was the forefather of Technocracy, an active utopian movement in the 1930s and one not entirely dead even today.5 Technological optimists are not utopians, but something less - let us say quasi-utopians, after a recent usage (applied to himself) of Robert Dahl's.6 Unlike any self-respecting pure utopian, quasi-utopians (and technological optimists) seek not perfection but tolerable imperfection, tolerable because it is better than anything else they consider attainable though not nearly as good as lots of alternatives that can be imagined. But technological optimists are also something more than mere believers, or faddists, or techniks.7 Their views are rigorously formulated, grounded in an apparent reality, based on knowledge and experience, and artfully defended. There are no crazies among the best of the optimists; they are conservative, respected experts who command enormous authority. They have a very specific position namely, "that exponential technological growth will allow us to expand resources ahead of exponentially increasing demands."8 This is the precise meaning of technological optimism as a term of art.

### Sorcerer K

#### Permutation do both.

#### Reprocessing is not some technocratic solution to the problem of waste – it’s just common sense

Byrd, Executive Director of the National Association of Neighborhoods, ‘11

[Ricardo, Testimony to the Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future, October 2011]

Good Afternoon. My name is Ricardo C. Byrd. I am the Executive Director of the National Association of Neighborhoods (NAN), an organization that started in 1975. I also serve as the Co-Chairperson of the AREVA North America Community Advisory Council. I am not a nuclear policy or scientific expert; but I am an expert in the application of grass roots common sense to environmental public policy questions. America’s nuclear future is crying out for the application of more common sense. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to comment on the commission’s draft report. This draft report is a good start; however, it is not yet good enough. The report can and must be made better to respond to the need for a clear, time sensitive yet cost effective path for the disposal of the nation’s nuclear waste. The National Association of Neighborhoods is not new to today’s topic. You might wonder why my organization is interested in spent nuclear fuel; after all, we traditionally focus on grass roots empowerment issues, housing, crime, transportation, environmental justice and jobs. Allow me a moment to explain; almost every major electric utility is accessing our members; ratepayers, customers like you and me; a fee, a tax, for the disposal of nuclear waste. Most Americans have no idea that their monthly electric bill includes a fee dedicated to the disposal of spent nuclear fuel. This stealth electric utility tax comes out of our pockets; and with today’s challenging economy, most of us are struggling to count every penny. As early as 1996, the National Association of Neighborhoods inquired how the Nuclear Waste Fund was being spent. In 1997 and 1998, we organized, with the support of the Nuclear Energy Institute, delegations of grass roots, minority business and civil rights organizations, to visit Yucca Mountain, the nation’s planned nuclear waste repository. The National Association of Neighborhoods arranged for minority organizations to see the Indian Point Nuclear Plant in 2007; and in 2008 and 2010, my organization participated in two non-traditional stakeholders visits to France, sponsored by AREVA. In France, we were able to see how the French, with almost 80% of their electric power being generated using nuclear power, addressed their spent nuclear fuel issues. We are here today because the National Association of Neighborhoods is concerned with how the BRC Draft Report can be made better. We offer three recommendations: 1. Reduce the Size of the Problem According to the BRC Draft Report, “…At present, nearly all of the nation’s existing inventory of SNF [Spent Nuclear Fuel] is being stored at the reactor sites where it was generated—about three-quarters of it in shielded concrete pools and the remainder in dry casks above ground. The quantity of commercially-generated spent reactor fuel currently being stored in this manner totals close to 65,000 metric tons.” France is reducing the volume of its spent nuclear fuel by approximately 75% by reprocessing it. If the United States used reprocessing, we would have less than 17,000 tons to dispose of. 2. Turn Spent Nuclear Fuel into a Strategic Asset Reprocessing spent nuclear fuel into new fuel will create a strategic nuclear fuel reserve. This strategy of reprocessing has worked in Europe for over 20 years. Having a nuclear fuel reserve will guarantee supplies that can keep our reactors operating. 3. Push the Restart Button Now - Through the Use of “Off the Shelf” Technology The National Association of Neighborhoods agrees with the BRC recommendation that we need to move forward with consolidated interim storage capacity. However, we strongly disagree with BRC that there is a need to wait for “new technologies to materialize” before making a decision about reprocessing spent nuclear fuel. The French, the Chinese, the Japanese and the Russians are not waiting “for new technologies to materialize” nor should we. All of humanity has a dog in this fight for safe, reliable, and affordable sources of clean energy.

### Wilderson

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

Themba-Nixon 2k, 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.

#### Focusing upon the traumatic elements of black subjectivity denies the agency present within black attempts at thwarting white supremacy and domination

Walker 12 (Tracey, Graduate of Psychosocial Studies at Birbeck University of London, Graduate Journal of Social Science July 2012, Vol. 9, Issue 2, " The Future of Slavery: From Cultural Trauma to Ethical Remembrance" http://gjss.org/images/stories/volumes/9/2/Walker%20Article.pdf)

To argue that there is more to the popular conception of slaves as victims who experienced social death within the abusive regime of transatlantic slavery is not to say that these subjectivities did not exist. When considering the institution of slavery we can quite confidently rely on the assumption that it did indeed de- stroy the self-hood and the lives of millions of Africans. Scholar Vincent Brown (2009) however, has criticised Orlando Patterson’s (1982) seminal book Slavery and Social Death for positioning the slave as a subject without agency and maintains that those who managed to dislocate from the nightmare of plantation life ‘were not in fact the living dead’, but ‘the mothers of gasping new societies’ (Brown 2009, 1241).¶ The Jamaican Maroons were one such disparate group of Africans who managed to band together and flee the Jamaican plantations in or- der to create a new mode of living under their own rule. These ‘run- aways’ were in fact ‘ferocious fight- ers and master strategists’, building towns and military bases which en- abled them to fight and successfully win the war against the British army after 200 years of battle (Gotlieb 2000,16). In addition, the story of the Windward Jamaican Maroons disrupts the phallocentricism in- herent within the story of the slave ‘hero’ by the very revelation that their leader, ‘Queen Nanny’ was a woman (Gotlieb 2000). As a leader, she was often ignored by early white historians who dismissed her as an ‘old hagg’ or ‘obeah’ woman (possessor of evil magic powers) (Gotlieb 2000, xvi). Yet, despite these negative descriptors, Nanny presents an interesting image of an African woman in the time of slavery who cultivated an exceptional army and used psychological as well as military force against the English despite not owning sophisticated weapons (Gotlieb 2000). As an oral tale, her story speaks to post-slavery generations through its representa- tion of a figure whose gender defy- ing acts challenged the patriarchal fantasies of the Eurocentric imagi- nary and as such ‘the study of her experiences might change the lives of people living under paternalistic, racist, classist and gender based oppression’ (Gotlieb 2000, 84).¶ The label of ‘social death’ is re- jected here on the grounds that it is a narrative which is positioned from the vantage point of a European hegemonic ideology. Against the social symbolic and its gaze, black slaves were indeed regarded as non-humans since their lives were stunted, diminished and deemed less valuable in comparison to the Europeans. However, Fanon’s (1967) assertion that ‘not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man’ (Fanon 1967, 110) helps us to un- derstand that this classification can only have meaning relative to the symbolic which represents the alive-ness of whiteness against the back- drop of the dead black slave (Dyer 1997). Butler (2005) makes it clear that the ‘death’ one suffers relative to the social symbolic is imbued with the fantasy that having constructed the Other and interpellated her into ‘life’, one now holds the sovereignty of determining the subject’s right to live or die: ¶ this death, if it is a death, is only the death of a certain kind of sub- ject, one that was never possible to begin with, the death of the fan- tasy of impossible mastery, and so a loss of what one never had, in other words it is a necessary grief (Butler 2005, 65).¶ The point to make here is that al- though the concept of social death has proved useful for theorists to de- scribe the metaphysical experience of those who live antagonistically in relation to the social symbolic, it is nevertheless a colonial narrative within which the slaves are confined to a one dimensional story of terror. In keeping with Gilroy’s (1993b) argument that the memory of slav- ery must be constructed from the slaves’ point of view, we might in- stead concentrate, not on the way in which the slaves are figured within the European social imaginary, but on how they negotiated their own ideas about self and identity. We might therefore find some value in studying a group like the Maroons who not only managed to create an autonomous world outside of the¶ hegemonic discourse which ne- gated them, but also, due to their unique circumstances, were forced to create new modes of communi- cation which would include a myriad of African cultures, languages and creeds (Gottlieb 2000). This cre- ative and resistive energy of slave subjectivity not only disrupts the colonial paradigm of socially dead slaves, but also implies the ethical tropes of creation, renewal and mu- tual recognition.¶ In contrast, the passive slave proved to feature heavily in the 2007 bicentenary commemorations causing journalist Toyin Agbetu to interrupt the official speeches and exclaim that it had turned into a discourse of freedom engineered mostly by whites with stories of black agency excluded8. Young’s argu- ment that ‘one of the damaging side effects of the focus on white peo- ple’s role in abolition is that Africans are represented as being passive in the face of oppression’, appears to echo the behaviour in the UK today given that a recent research poll re- veals that the black vote turnout is significantly lower than for the white majority electorate and that forty percent of second generation ‘immi- grants’ believe that voting ‘doesn’t matter’.9 Yet, Gilroy (1993a) argues that this political passivity may not simply be a self fulfilling prophecy, but might allude to the ‘lived contra- diction’ of being black and English which affects one’s confidence about whether opinions will be validated in a society that, at its core, still holds on to the fantasy of European supe- riority (Gilroy 1993a). Without con- sidering the slaves’ capacity for sur- vival and their fundamental role in overthrowing the European regime of slavery, we limit the use–value of the memory and risk becoming overly attached to singular slave subjectivities seeped in death and passivity. The Maroons story how- ever, enables slave consciousness to rise above the mire of slavery’s abject victims and establishes an ethical relation with our ancestors who lived and survived in the time of slavery.

#### Referring to the “black body” as a site of contestation in physical objectified terms is part of a duality that elevates the white mind and justifies further oppression.

Alley-Young 8 (July 2008, Gordon Alley-Young, Assistant Professor in the Department of Communications and Performing Arts at Kingsborough Community College-City University of New York, “Articulating Identity: Refining Postcolonial and Whiteness Perspectives on Race within Communication Studies,” The Review of Communication Vol. 8, No. 3, July 2008)

Descartes’ (1968) mind-body dichotomy holds that the body is divisible into its constitutive parts but that the mind is not. Postcolonial writers adapt Descartes’ (1968) dichotomy to explain how the colonial relationship situated whites and natives. In the postcolonial dichotomy white represents the mind and logic, perceiving natives as physical and illogical bodies requiring domination and control. Mohanram (1999, p. 15) cites claims of a ‘‘European universal subject’’ in colonial discourse. Such claims position white colonials as mobile, transportable, and logical as compared to the native person who is fixed to physical place and illogical. Such thinking allowed imperial nations to justify colonization as imposing logic and order on what they perceived to be illogical and underdeveloped people.¶ The postcolonial mind body dichotomy leaves the dimensions of the white body undeveloped. Dyer (1997, p. 6) describes experiencing his white body as ‘‘tightness, with self-control, self-consciousness, mind over body’’ when dancing among black bodies. Dyer’s (1997) comments suggest an experience of the white body that is informed by Cartesian thought. However, Dyer (1997) also seems to suggest that this white􏰀black physical difference is a reality, even if a socially constructed reality, while postcolonialism is suspect of such distinctions. Postcolonial writer Fanon (1967, p. 129) cites a frustrated friend who states, ‘‘When the whites feel that they have become too mechanized, they turn to the man of colour . . . for a little human sustenance.’’¶ In conflating whiteness with the mind this dichotomy suggests a rational, logical, and absent white body. The colonial perspective views the mind’s control over the white body as preferable to the body acting on its own physical impulses. The colonial perspective seeks to restrain, regulate, and/or educate the native body. The problem, Mohanram (1999) notes, is that the dichotomy reifies white colonialists’ belief that the white mind can develop but the black body cannot. This dichotomy negates native subjectivity by making natives physical bodies and thus objects that can be owned by the colonizer. Banton (2002) notes that, despite all the differences inherent in the colonial relationship, it was ‘‘complexion that came above all to serve as the sign of where a person belonged in the new social order’’ (p. 25). The black body became an object owned by this new social order. The dichotomy is a hierarchy but also a separation of subject from object.¶ One consequence of communicating about the native/black body as a physical object is that natives become hyper-sexualized (Mohanram, 1999) in the white imagination as sexually endowed (Dyer, 1997) and/or sexually violent (Fanon, 1967). Such myths reinforced colonizers’ resolve to control and restrict native bodies. This consequence surfaces in white, female colonists’ preoccupation with saving the native woman (Gandhi, 1998; Mohanram, 1999; Trinh, 1986/1987a, 1986/1987b). Colonial women perceived native men to be violent, oppressive tyrants and the native woman to be ignorant of their own oppression, thus requiring the help of enlightened, white, western women. This paternalistic thinking ignores native women’s strong cultural allegiances and views native culture as physically oppressive and needing western intervention.

#### K doesn’t solve the case: Envisioning the end of the world does not solve the case. 1) Wilderson’s end of the war is apocryphal not apocalyptic. It’s imaginative not actual. 2) His end of the world is the end of civil society, not extinction. 5

#### Assigning “social death” to individual identities casts Blacks as passive victims – this framing gets manipulated to legitimize a new wave of antiblackness

Muhwati 5 (Itai Muhwati is a Lecturer in the Department of African Languages and Literature at the University of Zimbabwe, “Mass Neurosis, Entrapment, Closure and the Race’s Race of Life in Masango Mavi (1998) and Mapenzi (1999)” http://www.researchgate.net/publication/43090930\_Mass\_Neurosis\_Entrapment\_Closure\_and\_the\_Races\_Race\_of\_Life\_in\_Masango\_Mavi%281998%29\_and\_Mapenzi\_%281999%29

The African image in quite a number of literary creations in Zimbabwean literature is palpably bedridden in intensive care. This image finds revelation in the titles themselves. The physical wreckage and spiritual paralysis that is by definition an expression of this image, leads to an agonising realisation that, in life’s vicissitudes, and life’s race of race survival, African people remain undeveloped and fledgling stutters. The images of characters in these novels whose titles are vapid project Africans as victims of collective inertia, wallowing in cultural and historical amnesia and disintegrating in irretrievable mentacide. As a result, in terms of agency and mobility, the African race remains glued on the starting line, quite overwhelmed by the seemingly insurmountable hurdles in the race of life. Through the choice of titles, most of the writers seem to have adopted a modality that inordinately projects social death and a host of other social sicknesses as new forms of social identity in the contemporary dispensation. While their absolutisation of mass neurosis, closure and entrapment might be said to be a reflection of the state of the nation in the post independence period, it is also estimable that such images of social sickness, paralysis and mass neurosis can be manipulated by Africa’s anthropological detractors in their justification of a static and back pedalling African race, particularly along the evolutionary spectrum, which is presented as a universal standard of valuation. The paper also puts forth argument that, the adoption of an axiological paradigm that legitimises closure and race entrapment nullifies any prospects towards racial salvation. It is an act of defining the African race as doomed. Such a definition which trivialises the African existential trajectory pays homage to the subversive labels that Europe has generously donated to Africa. Such labels include Third World; Underdeveloped; Dark Continent; Poor majority, cultural other and many more. These are designations that bespeak helplessness and mass neurosis.

#### Optimism produces joy that makes radical, collective political struggle possible—their advocacy causes disengagement which turns their impacts and destroys value to life

Jensen 1 (Robert Jensen is Professor of Journalism @ University of Texas, Austin. “Critical Hope: Radical Citizenship in Reactionary Times,” 12-17-01, http://uts.cc.utexas.edu/~rjensen/freelance/attack20.htm)

Just as we have to distinguish between critique and cynicism, we have to realize that hope is not synonymous with optimism. I am hopeful, but I am not necessarily always optimistic, at least not about the short-term possibilities. These systems and structures of power, these illegitimate structures of authority, are deeply entrenched. They will not be dislodged easily or quickly. Optimism and pessimism should hang on questions of fact -- we should be optimistic when the facts argue for optimism.¶ For example, I am against the illegitimate structure of authority called the corporation. I want to see different forms of economic organization emerge. I am hopeful about the possibilities but not optimistic that in my lifetime I will see the demise of capitalism, corporations, and wage slavery. Still, I will do certain things to work toward that.¶ The same can be said of the problem of U.S. aggression against innocent people in the rest of the world, particularly these days in Afghanistan, where the aggression is most intense. Given the bloody record of the United States in the past 50 years and the seemingly limitless capacity of U.S. officials to kill without conscience, I must confess I am not optimistic that such aggression will stop anytime soon, in large part because those corporate structures that drive the killing are still around. But I will do certain things to work against it.¶ Or take the large state research university. I am concerned about how the needs of students are systematically ignored and the needs of corporate funders are privileged, how critical thinking is squashed not by accident but by design. I am concerned about the illegitimate structures of authority that I work in and that compel me to act in ways against the interests of students. I am not optimistic that the structure of big research universities is going to change anytime soon. But I will do certain things to work against the structures.¶ So, why would I do any of those things if my expectations of short-term success are so low? One reason is that I could be wrong about my assessment of the likelihood of change. I’ve been wrong about a lot of things in my life; the list grows every day. For all I know, corporate capitalism is on the verge of collapse, and if we just keep the pressure on it will start to unravel tomorrow. Or perhaps public discontent with murderous U.S. foreign policy is just about ready to crystallize and mobilize people. Or perhaps the contradictions of these behemoth universities are becoming so apparent that the illegitimate structures of authority are about to give way to something that deserves the label “higher education.”¶ History is too complex and contingent for any of us to make predictions. We simply don’t have the intellectual tools to understand with much precision how and why people and societies change. History is a rough guide, but it offers no social-change equation. Still, there’s really no reasonable alternative except to keep plugging away. Basically, there are two choices, which are common sense but that I didn’t figure out until I heard them articulated by Noam Chomsky: We can either predict the worst -- that no change is possible -- and not act, in which case we guarantee there will be no change. Or we can understand that change always is possible, even in the face of great odds, and act on that assumption, which creates the possibility of progress. (See Chomsky’s interview with Michael Albert at http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/interviews/9301-albchomsky-2.html)¶ Every great struggle for justice in human history began as a lost cause. When Gabriel Prosser made plans to take Richmond, Virginia, in 1800, the first large-scale organized slave revolt, he was fighting a lost cause, for which he was hanged. When eight Quakers got together in 1814 in Jonesboro, Tennessee, to form the first white anti-slavery society in the United States (the Tennessee Society for the Manumission of Slaves) they were fighting a lost cause. A lost cause that eventually won.¶ But that can’t be the only answer to the question “why should I be politically active.” We are human beings, not machines, and we all have needs. It is hard to sustain yourself in difficult work if the only reward is the possibility that somewhere down the line your work may have some positive effect, though you may be long dead. That’s a lot to ask of people. We all want more than that out of life. We want joy and love. At least every now and then, we want to have a good time, including a good time while engaged in our work. No political movement can sustain itself indefinitely without understanding that, not just because people need -- and have a right -- to be happy, but because if there is no joy in it, then movements are more likely to be dangerous. The joy -- the celebration of being human and being alive in connection with others -- is what must fuel the drive for change.¶ People find joy in many different ways. As many people over the years have pointed out, one source of joy is in the struggle. I have spent a lot of time in the past few years doing political work, and some of that work isn’t terribly fun. Collating photocopies for a meeting for a progressive political cause isn’t any more fun than collating photocopies for a meeting at a marketing company. But it is different in some ways: It puts you in contact with like-minded people. It sparks conversation. It creates space in which you can think and feel your way through difficult questions. It’s a great place to laugh as you staple. It provides the context for connections that go beyond superficial acquaintanceships.¶ The joy is in the struggle, but not just because in struggle one connects to decent people. The joy is also in the pain of struggle. Joy is multilayered -- one key aspect of it is discovery, and one way we discover things about ourselves and others is through pain. Struggle confronts pain, and confronting pain is part of joy. The pain is there, in all our lives; there is no human life without pain. Pain can become part of joy when it is confronted. Struggle confronts pain. Struggle produces joy.¶ The joy is in the struggle. The struggle is not just the struggle against illegitimate structures of authority in the abstract. The struggles are in each of us -- struggles to find the facts, to analyze clearly, to imagine solutions, to join with others in collective action for justice, and struggles to understand ourselves in relation to each other and ourselves as we engage in all these activities.¶ I realize that this struggle doesn’t seem appealing to many. I have heard lots of people lately say that they can’t cope with the complexity of politics. It seems too much, too big, too confusing. All they can handle, they say, is to focus on their individual lives and do the best to fix their lives. I think these folks misunderstand not just their moral obligation but the nature of progress, individual and collective. We don’t fix ourselves in isolation. We don’t build decent lives by cutting ourselves off from problems just because they are complex. Yes, there are times when difficult situations force us to turn inward and deal with pressing problems in our lives. I have done that, and I see no need to apologize for it. But I am arguing against the permanent division of our lives into these artificial categories. Our problems are never wholly individual, and hence they can’t be fixed in individual ways. Part of the solution is always to be found in the bigger struggle, in which we all have a part.¶ § Marked 20:47 § I have learned that there is great joy in that bigger struggle. And that leads us back to the abandonment of cynicism and the embrace of hope. Cynicism is a sophomoric and self-indulgent retreat from the world and all its problems. Hope is a mature and loving embrace of the world and all its promise. That does not mean one should have unfounded or naive hope. Wendell Berry reminds us that history shows that “massive human failure” is possible, but:¶ “[H]ope is one of our duties. A part of our obligation to our own being and to our descendants is to study our life and our condition, searching always for the authentic underpinnings of hope. And if we look, these underpinnings can still be found.” [Sex, Economy, Freedom & Community (New York: Pantheon, 1993), p. 11.]¶ Hope is one of our duties. But that does not mean it is always easy. There are many times, especially since September 11, that I have had to struggle to hold onto hope. The combination of seeing the World Trade Center towers fall in an instance and then watching the unfolding of an illegal and immoral war on Afghanistan has tested my own sense of hope. I managed to hold on for a couple of months, but in the few days before I sat down to write this I could feel my sense of hope fading. At the same time that I have been writing and thinking about the war, I also have been continuing my work on sexual violence and pornography. Both spark the same feeling in my gut -- despair over how cruel people, especially men, can be. When I have to face humans’ willingness to inflict pain -- and ability to find pleasure in inflicting pain -- whether in the realm of the global or the intimate, some part of me wants to die; I can’t bear it. Maybe some part of me does die.¶ In the few days before I wrote this, I especially was having trouble in the mornings; lying awake in bed in the dark; trying to reclaim that sense of hope so that getting out of bed would make sense; trying not to think about the war but realizing that not thinking about it would be even worse; dying a little bit inside every morning, in the dark.¶ But those authentic underpinnings of hope remain. On the day I wrote this, I had a meeting with a student on my campus who had read something I had written about the war and wanted to talk. She said she didn’t have anything in particular to ask me. She just wanted to talk to someone who didn’t think she was crazy. All around her at work and school, people -- pro, con or neutral -- were refusing to talk about the war, she said. So we talked for a bit. We did politics, in a small way, the way politics is most often done. We talked about how she might organize a political group on campus. But maybe more important, we shored up each other’s sense of hope. We could talk about the pain and craziness of the war without turning away.¶ Real hope -- the belief in the authentic underpinnings of hope -- is radical. A belief that people are not evil and stupid, not consigned merely to live out pre-determined roles in illegitimate structures of authority, is radical. The willingness to act publicly on that hope and that belief is radical.¶ We all live in a society that would prefer that we not be radical, that we not understand any of this. We live in a society that prefers productive but passive people. I work at a university that is part of that society, and has many of the same problems. Many classes at the university are either explicitly or implicitly designed to convince students that everything I have argued here is fundamentally loony. The same goes for much of what comes to us through the commercial mass media. Some of what I say indeed may be misguided; as I said, I understand that I could be, and often am, wrong.¶ But, even if I’m wrong in some ways, I’d rather be wrong with hope than cynicism. I’d rather be naive than hip. I’d rather work for a just and sustainable world and fail than abandon the hope. I understand that this position is not wholly logical; it is based on a sense of how we can best make good on the gifts that come with being part of the human community. It is based on a faith in something common to us all, a capacity that is difficult to name, but which is perhaps best summed up by a phrase once used by the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire. Our task simply put, Freire said, is “to change some conditions that appear to me as obviously against the beauty of being human.” [Myles Horton and Paulo Freire, We Make the Road by Walking (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), p. 131.]