#### They fail to create a hybridized discourse. Quaring rhetoric allows us to occupy the inbetween spaces in rhetoric – we must go farther to recognize the intersections of different communities.

Johnson ‘07

Julie M. Johnson: PhD director of the Writing and Oral communication programs at Hamline University. “On the development of

counter-racist quare public address studies’ in Queering Public Address ed. Charles Morris III. 2007 (132).

Mercer’s quare scholarship provides an important insight relative to my concern for the twin problems of individualism and representation: Our politics, Mercer argues, “should be seen as a hybridized form of political and cultural practice. By this I mean precisely because of our lived experiences of discrimination in and by exclusion from the black community, we locate ourselves in the spaces between different communities—at the intersections of power relations determined by race, class, gender and sexuality.”

Only clash allows us to minimize harmful effects of that persuasion because it subjects all attempts at persuasion to rigorous scrutiny

Talisse 5—Professor of Philosophy @Vandy

Robert, *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, Deliberativist responses to activist challenges, 31(4) p. 429-431

The argument thus far might appear to turn exclusively upon different conceptions of what reasonableness entails. The deliberativist view I have sketched holds that reasonableness involves some degree of what we may call epistemic modesty. On this view, the reasonable citizen seeks to have her beliefs reﬂect the best available reasons, and so she enters into public discourse as a way of testing her views against the objections and questions of those who disagree; hence she implicitly holds that her present view is open to reasonable critique and that others who hold opposing views may be able to offer justiﬁcations for their views that are at least as strong as her reasons for her own. Thus any mode of politics that presumes that discourse is extraneous to questions of justice and justiﬁcation is unreasonable. The activist sees no reason to accept this. Reasonableness for the activist consists in the ability to act on reasons that upon due reﬂection seem adequate to underwrite action; discussion with those who disagree need not be involved. According to the activist, there are certain cases in which he does in fact know the truth about what justice requires and in which there is no room for reasoned objection. Under such conditions, the deliberativist’s demand for discussion can only obstruct justice; it is therefore irrational. It may seem that we have reached an impasse. However, there is a further line of criticism that the activist must face. To the activist’s view that at least in certain situations he may reasonably decline to engage with persons he disagrees with (107), the deliberative democrat can raise the phenomenon that Cass Sunstein has called ‘group polarization’ (Sunstein, 2003; 2001a: ch. 3; 2001b: ch. 1). To explain: consider that political activists cannot eschew deliberation altogether; they often engage in rallies, demonstrations, teach-ins, workshops, and other activities in which they are called to make public the case for their views. Activists also must engage in deliberation among themselves when deciding strategy. Political movements must be organized, hence those involved must decide upon targets, methods, and tactics; they must also decide upon the content of their pamphlets and the precise messages they most wish to convey to the press. Often the audience in both of these deliberative contexts will be a self-selected and sympathetic group of like-minded activists. Group polarization is a well-documented phenomenon that has ‘been found all over the world and in many diverse tasks’; it means that ‘members of a deliberating group predictably move towards a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ predeliberation tendencies’ (Sunstein, 2003: 81–2). Importantly, in groups that ‘engage in repeated discussions’ over time, the polarization is even more pronounced (2003: 86 Hence discussion in a small but devoted activist enclave that meets regularly to strategize and protest ‘should produce a situation in which individuals hold positions more extreme than those of any individual member before the series of deliberations began’ (ibid.) 17 The fact of group polarization is relevant to our discussion because the activist has proposed that he may reasonably decline to engage in discussion with those with whom he disagrees in cases in which the requirements of justice are so clear that he can be conﬁdent that he has the truth. Group polarization suggests that deliberatively confronting those with whom we disagree is essential even when we have the truth. For even if we have the truth, if we do not engage opposing views, but instead deliberate only with those with whom we agree, our view will shift progressively to a more extreme point, and thus we lose the truth. In order to avoid polarization, deliberation must take place within heterogeneous ‘argument pools’ (Sunstein, 2003: 93). This of course does not mean that there should be no groups devoted to the achievement of some common political goal; it rather suggests that engagement with those with whom one disagrees is essential to the proper pursuit of justice. Insofar as the activist denies this, he is unreasonable.

### And, lack of clash turns the case- without deliberative engagement of debate, hierarchical dominance and exclusion are more likely

Tonn 5—Prof of Communication @ Maryland

Mari Boor, Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public, Rhetoric & Public Affairs 8.3 (2005) 405-430, muse

This widespread recognition that access to public deliberative processes and the ballot is a baseline of any genuine democracy points to the most curious irony of the conversation movement: portions of its constituency. Numbering among the most fervid dialogic loyalists have been some feminists and multiculturalists who represent groups historically denied both the right to speak in public and the ballot. Oddly, some feminists who championed the slogan "The Personal Is Political" to emphasize ways relational power can oppress tend to ignore similar dangers lurking in the appropriation of conversation and dialogue in public deliberation. Yet the conversational model's emphasis on empowerment through intimacy can duplicate the power networks that traditionally excluded females and nonwhites and gave rise to numerous, sometimes necessarily uncivil, demands for democratic inclusion. Formalized participation structures in deliberative processes obviously cannot ensure the elimination of relational power blocs, but, as Freeman pointed out, the absence of formal rules leaves relational power unchecked and potentially capricious. Moreover, the privileging of the self, personal experiences, and individual perspectives of reality intrinsic in the conversational paradigm mirrors justifications once used by dominant groups who used their own lives, beliefs, and interests as templates for hegemonic social premises to oppress women, the lower class, and people of color. Paradigms infused with the therapeutic language of emotional healing and coping likewise flirt with the type of psychological diagnoses once ascribed to disaffected women. But as Betty Friedan's landmark 1963 The Feminist Mystique argued, the cure for female alienation was neither tranquilizers nor attitude adjustments fostered through psychotherapy but, rather, unrestricted opportunities.102 [End Page 423] The price exacted by promoting approaches to complex public issues—models that cast conventional deliberative processes, including the marshaling of evidence beyond individual subjectivity, as "elitist" or "monologic"—can be steep. Consider comments of an aide to President George W. Bush made before reports concluding Iraq harbored no weapons of mass destruction, the primary justification for a U.S.-led war costing thousands of lives. Investigative reporters and other persons sleuthing for hard facts, he claimed, operate "in what we call the reality-based community." Such people "believe that solutions emerge from [the] judicious study of discernible reality." Then baldly flexing the muscle afforded by increasingly popular social-constructionist and poststructuralist models for conflict resolution, he added: "That's not the way the world really works anymore . . . We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality—judiciously, as you will—we'll act again, creating other new realities."103 The recent fascination with public conversation and dialogue most likely is a product of frustration with the tone of much public, political discourse. Such concerns are neither new nor completely without merit. Yet, as Burke insightfully pointed out nearly six decades ago, "A perennial embarrassment in liberal apologetics has arisen from its 'surgical' proclivity: its attempt to outlaw a malfunction by outlawing the function." The attempt to eliminate flaws in a process by eliminating the entire process, he writes, "is like trying to eliminate heart disease by eliminating hearts."104 Because public argument and deliberative processes are the "heart" of true democracy, supplanting those models with social and therapeutic conversation and dialogue jeopardizes the very pulse and lifeblood of democracy itself.

#### Technical changes don’t solve prolif – it’s motivated by a still existing political desire

Acton 9 (James M. Acton is an associate in the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and frequent contribu- tor to the prominent blog Arms Control Wonk. a member of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, The myth of proliferation-resistant technology, December)

Forty years on, Hardin’s central thesis—that it is impossible to solve a political problem with a technical solution—is still salient and applicable to more than just managing population. At the mo- ment, a number of initiatives promote a technological approach to solve—or at least ameliorate—the problem of nuclear proliferation through the misuse of civilian nuclear facilities (particularly reac- tors and reprocessing plants). Their aim is to make novel nuclear technologies “proliferation resistant.” There is nothing wrong per se with technology that makes the di- version of nuclear material harder or more likely to be detected. Yet a failure to appreciate fully the political dimension of nonprolifera- tion risks makes the concept of proliferation resistance at best ir- relevant and at worst counterproductive. For the anticipated global expansion of nuclear energy to not exacerbate nuclear insecurity, a more politically savvy approach to proliferation resistance is needed.

#### Peaceful nuclear cooperation causes prolif

Fuhrmann 9 (Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, Abstract of “Spreading Temptation: Proliferation and Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreements Matthew Fuhrmann”,, International Security Summer 2009, Vol. 34, No. 1, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.7)

Peaceful nuclear cooperation—the transfer of nuclear technology, materials, or know-how from one state to another for peaceful purposes—leads to the spread of nuclear weapons. In particular, countries that receive peaceful nuclear assistance are more likely to initiate weapons programs and successfully develop the bomb, especially when they are also faced with security threats. Statistical analysis based on a new data set of more than 2,000 bilateral civilian nuclear cooperation agreements signed from 1950 to 2000 lends strong support for this argument. Brief case studies of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapons programs provide further evidence of the links between peaceful nuclear assistance and proliferation. The finding that supplier countries inadvertently raise the risks of nuclear proliferation poses challenges to the conventional wisdom. Indeed, the relationship between civilian nuclear cooperation and proliferation is surprisingly broad. Even assistance that is often viewed as innocuous, such as training nuclear scientists or providing research or power reactors, increases the likelihood that nuclear weapons will spread. “Proliferation-proof” nuclear assistance does not exist. With a renaissance in nuclear power on the horizon, major suppliers, including the United States, should reconsider their willingness to assist other countries in developing peaceful nuclear programs.

#### The nuclear industry is a net loss for jobs – researchers prove.

Warnock 2012 (Wall street Journal, Fukushima Watch: No Reactors, Fewer Jobs?, <http://blogs.wsj.com/japanrealtime/2012/07/13/fukushima-watch-no-reactors-fewer-jobs/>) JA

Losing jobs in the nuclear power industry would likely mean an increase in jobs elsewhere. [A group of researchers from Osaka University](http://www.iser.osaka-u.ac.jp/library/dp/2012/DP0846.pdf) estimate that eliminating nuclear power in Japan by 2020 and increasing renewable energy use to 20% of the total could create 200,000 to 300,000 new jobs annually. Central Research Institute, Inc., a consulting company in Tokyo, predicts that the renewable energy sector, including wind and solar power, [will employ 1.4 million people by 2020](http://www.sodan.info/change/energy.html), as the renewables market expands in size to ¥50 trillion and beyond. The Ministry of the Environment, in a report published in 2010, said that increasing the amount of renewable energy to more than 10% of the nation’s total energy output by 2020, [could create between 458,000 to 627,000 jobs](http://www.env.go.jp/earth/report/h22-05/00_gaiyo.pdf).

#### Storage of excess waste creates a high risk of toxic nuclear waste contamination of air and major aquifers

Trento 12 (Joseph, has spent more than 35 years as an investigative journalist, working with both print and broadcast outlets and writing extensively. Before joining the National Security News Service in 1991, Trento worked for CNN‘s Special Assignment Unit, the Wilmington News Journal, and prominent journalist Jack Anderson. Trento has received six Pulitzer nominations and is the author of five books, EPA Helpless to Stop Further Pollution at Major Superfund Site, July 13th, http://www.dcbureau.org/201207137454/national-security-news-service/epa-helpless-to-stop-further-pollution-at-major-superfund-site-nnsa-to-resume-plutonium-separation-at-the-savannah-river-sites-h-canyon-for-mox-fuel.html)

The ongoing problems with disposing of highly radioactive waste have been 60 years in the making. Starting in the 1950s, five reactors designed to produce nuclear weapons grade materials churned out plutonium at a blistering pace. The fuel was then sent to two huge plants at SRS called canyons to chemically separate the plutonium from other elements and turn it into pits for nuclear bombs. Everything the radioactive chemicals and waste touched became contaminated with radioactivity. The giant F and H Canyons have accumulated a generation’s worth of plutonium particles in every nook and cranny of these huge and decaying buildings. The F Canyon is in the worst condition and is a few hundred yards from the new MOX plant under construction. There is also the plumbing – hundreds of miles of pipes connecting these canyons to two tank farms where scores of carbon steel tanks – each the size of a National Basketball Association Court – hold the deadly toxic brew from the nuclear separation process. The tanks began to corrode and rust not long after their installation in the damp South Carolina climate. At least a dozen of them began leaking into the sandy soil. That deterioration process is hurried by radiation which damages and breaks down metals and cement. The lesson of SRS and other DOE sites is that the radiation over time will defeat anything mankind has contrived to contain it. More than a billion dollars of President Obama’s Recovery Act monies have been spent to clean up SRS, yet it is more dangerous today than it was before the vast amounts were spent. The “clean-up” undertaken by contractors with DOE oversight is at best a temporary solution to a problem Americans will face for thousands of years. Instead of actually removing and remediating radioactive elements at the site, vast amounts of grout or cement are used to bury old reactors and fill the waste tanks. Experts believe that at best the cement will last about 30 to 50 years, while the radiological power of the waste would take hundreds and even thousands of years to decay. Because radiation cannot be destroyed – simply isolated and contained – these monies are being spent for a comparatively very short term for which future generations will have to contend, much like the SRS workers are dealing with the Cold War legacy waste. More troubling, according to SRS veteran engineer William Lawless, is that like the Japanese reactors that failed and exploded after the earthquake in 2011, the tanks at SRS build up explosive hydrogen that present a constant danger of high level nuclear waste being released in a massive explosion at one or more of the tanks. The Atlanta Office of the Environmental Protection Agency is supposed to oversee the clean-up at SRS as a designated Superfund site. But NNSA operates under the Atomic Energy Act that exempts it from EPA authority to stop it from increasing radioactive pollution at the site. EPA official Rob Pope and his colleagues are unable to stop NNSA from adding high-level radioactive waste to the leaking tanks at SRS that were supposed to be emptied, grouted and shuttered. “We have no operational authority because of the way the Atomic Energy Act is written. The ongoing operations are exempt from EPA oversight,” Pope said. Saltstone Facility NNSA is not like a conventional chemical or mining company that the EPA could stop from continuing to pollute at a declared Superfund site. At SRS and the other major federal nuclear sites, the Atomic Energy Act allows NNSA to operate in any manner it deems appropriate. Its powers exceed the EPA’s in all nuclear matters – including private nuclear waste dump sites. The only way EPA can assist in the clean-up is if there is an accident or radiation leak and even then the EPA must defer to DOE. More startling is that even if EPA officials detect or suspect potential problems at SRS, they have no power to prevent them. For example, if a safety issue threatened the release of a deadly and powerful carcinogen like plutonium oxide from the H Canyon or MOX plant, EPA does not have the power to take preventative action. While the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) has serious concerns about the eighteen pollution plumes at SRS and other waste issues, the state agency also has limited ability to stop ongoing activities that result in current pollution on the federally controlled site. DHEC Federal Facilities Liaison Shelly Wilson said in an email, ”Treatment of high level waste and tank closure remain high focus areas of DHEC for Savannah River Site due to the risk posed by toxic and radioactive liquid in aging tanks. The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) has discussed with Department of Energy the possible addition of relatively small volumes to the high level waste tanks. DHEC respects that this is a DOE decision, ultimately subject to regulatory milestones for overall waste treatment and tank closure.” Glass Containers The most toxic liquid waste and sludge from the H Canyon is sent in tiny batches from the Tank Farms to a nearby Defense Waste Processing Facility to vitrify the plutonium-riddled waste in glass. Even these glass and stainless steel canisters will break down before the plutonium decays. These canisters were supposed to be shipped to a national repository for long term storage. Because the Obama administration shuttered Yucca Mountain, the canisters are being storied in shallow cement silos next to the DWPF. SRS sits on an active earthquake fault. “Earthquakes are not an uncommon occurrence in South Carolina,” the state’s Department of Natural Resources website says. SRS also sits on one of the South’s most important aquifers. According to leading geologists, its hot, humid, swampy location on the Savannah River make it uniquely unsuitable for long term storage of radioactive waste. South Carolina is subject to tornados, hurricanes and other natural threats that seriously complicate safety storing nuclear waste in these temporary storage facilities. The DWPF is years behind schedule in reducing and isolating tank waste. Now the NNSA is proposing to increase the amount of waste that will need to be processed through the tanks to the DWPF to the storage canisters. To complicate matters, NNSA is creating more radioactive waste at the site on a daily basis as it processes radioactive weapons materials coming into SRS from around the world as part of U.S. nuclear nonproliferation programs. Some of that material has been run through H Canyon and has produced additional tank waste as the weapons grade material is blended down into reactor fuel.

#### High cost tradeoff to nuclear waste disposal

Nathwani 9 (Jatin S. Nathwani, Department of Management Sciences & The Institute for Risk Research, University of Waterloo, “THE UNINTENDED SOCIAL RISKS OF NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL” www.irr-neram.ca/pdf\_files/waste\_disposal.pdf)

The cost of a nuclear waste disposal project is large, in excess of $10,000,000,000 (ten billion dollars; more rigorous estimates are in the $14-15 billion range). To spend such an amount on the disposal of waste is equivalent to committing in the order of $ 500,000,000 (five hundred million dollars) every year in perpetuity to an unproductive investment. The permanent loss to any nation is roughly equivalent to foregoing half a dozen new hospitals, a new university, several opera houses, and or substantive renewal of the urban infrastructure such as public transit facilities: every year - forever! The wisdom certainly resides within the body politic for not committing such a transparent act of folly. But then, one can never be sure. It is worth emphasizing that the resources directed at reducing a very small hypothetical risk from nuclear waste storage will most certainly result in our inability to pursue other important educational, social and cultural goals.