### 1ac

#### In 1939 the power of nuclear energy was discovered – the military industrial complex prioritized its own interests and forced the scientific community to focus its research on Uranium – in doing so it marginalized research into thorium energy. This marginalization of thorium allowed for the creation of the uranium bombs that the United States dropped on Japan in 1945

Puplava, 11 [President, Chief Investment Strategist at PFS Group,” Kirk Sorensen States Thorium a Million Times More Energy Dense than Fossil Fuels“ <http://www.financialsense.com/contributors/james-j-puplava/kirk-sorensen-thorium-a-million-times-more-energy-dense-than-fossil-fuels>]

Kirk: (2:14) Yeah, I’d be happy to talk about that, and forgive me for maybe getting into a little bit of history, I love history, but it helps tounderstand why these things happened**.** You know, thorium and uranium were both discovered as elements in the late 1800s. And nobody really thought there was anything special out them until Marie Curie discovered that they were radioactive. And again, nobody understood what that meant. But in 1939, as you mentioned, the process of nuclear fission was first discovered by a chemist named Otto Hahn in Germany. And it was a totally new idea that you could actually split an atom release all this energy. And because this was discovered right at the beginning of World War II the obvious question was, can we use this to make an explosive? And that was the origin of the Manhattan project. They looked at uranium and uranium has two isotopes. One of which is uranium 235 and that is naturally fissile, you don’t have to do anything to it to make it fission. So that was the beginning of one kind of effort in the Manhattan project to manufacture a weapon. And then uranium 238, which was much more common, they found that they could bombarded it with neutrons and create a new element, plutonium, that was also fissile, and you could potentially use it for a nuclear explosive. So that was another line that was taken. And then they looked to thorium and said well could we try the same technique with thorium, and found that, yes, you could bombard thorium with a neutron and create uranium 233 and it was also fissile and could potentially form explosives. But there were certain severe drawbacks in the practicality of trying to use uranium 233 as a weapon. And so the attention focused overwhelmingly on separating the uranium isotopes and on converting some of that uranium into plutonium. Those were two directions that were taken during the Manhattan Project. And they resulted in the Hiroshima bomb, which was a uranium 235 bomb and the Nagasaki bomb, which was a plutonium bomb. After the war was over, the overwhelming concern of the US Atomic Energy Commission was to replenish our stockpile of nuclear weapons, which after Nagasaki, was depleted. We didn't have any more weapons, and that was one of the biggest security secrets in the United States at that time. We had to replenish that supply and so all the effort was put into creating materials intended for weapons. And because uranium and plutonium had shown themselves to be more amenable to that type of work than thorium, the work on thorium was neglected. It was only as we moved into the ‘50s that the idea of making electrical power from nuclear energy began to take prominence, and so because the uranium plutonium technologies were more understood, and considered a safer bet, that was where the bulk of the effort in the earlier atomic power program went, was to uranium and plutonium. Although at that time there was a small and beginning effort to investigate thorium, which as in turns out, has some very superior properties when your goal is to make nuclear power rather than to make nuclear weapons.

#### The uranium mining industry perpetuates an ongoing genocide on stolen Native American lands and the people who inhabit them - that guarantees structural discrimination, eviscerates tribal culture, causes widespread cancer and other negative health effects and replicates the logic of paternalism that has pervaded for centuries – the effects are disastrous and must be rejected. The 1AC is an affirmation of tribal calls for an end to uranium mining and dumping

Brook, 98 Ph.D. in Sociology, UC Davis (Daniel, “Environmental Genocide: Native Americans and Toxic Waste,” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 105-113, JSTOR, RBatra)

GENOCIDE AGAINST NATIVE AMERICANS CONTINUES in modern times with modern techniques. In the past, buffalo were slaughtered or corn crops were burned, thereby threatening local native populations; now the Earth itself is being strangled, thereby threatening all life. The government and large corporations have created toxic, lethal threats to human health. Yet, because "Native Americans live at the lowest socioeconomic level in the U.S." (Glass, n.d., 3), they are most at risk for toxic exposure. All poor people and people of color are disadvantaged, although "[flor Indians, these disadvantages are multiplied by dependence on food supplies closely tied to the land and in which [toxic] materials . . . have been shown to accumulate" (ibid.). This essay will discuss the genocide of Native Americans through environmental spoliation and native resistance to it. Although this type of genocide is not (usually) the result of a systematic plan with malicious intent to exterminate Native Americans, it is the consequence of ac-tivities that are often carried out on and near the reservations with reckless disregard for the lives of Native Americans.1

One very significant toxic threat to Native Americans comes from governmental and commercial hazardous waste sitings. Because of the severe poverty and extraordinary vulnerability of Native American tribes, their lands have been targeted by the U.S. government and the large corporations as permanent areas for much of the poisonous industrial by-products of the dominant society. "Hoping to take advantage of the devastating chronic unemployment, pervasive poverty and sovereign status of Indian Nations", according to Bradley Angel, writing for the international environmental organization Greenpeace, "the waste disposal industry and the U.S. government have embarked on an all-out effort to site incinerators, landfills, nuclear waste storage facilities and similar polluting industries on Tribal land "( Angel 1991, 1).

In fact, so enthusiastic is the United States government to dump its most dangerous waste from “the nation’s 110 commercial nuclear power plants” (ibid., 16) on the nation’s “565 federally recognized tribes” (Aug 1993, 9) that it “has solicited every Indian Tribe, offering millions of dollars if the tribe would host a nuclear waste facility” (Angel 1991, 15; emphasis added). Given the fact that Native Americans tend to be so materially poor, the money offered by the government or the corporations for this “toxic trade” is often more akin to bribery or blackmail than to payment for services rendered? In this way, the Mescalero Apache tribe in 1991, for example, became the ﬁrst tribe (or state) to ﬁle an application for a U.S. Energy Department grant “to study the feasibility of building a temporary [sic] stor- age facility for 15,000 metric tons of highly radioactive spent fuel” (Ale- wesasne Notes 1992, 11). Other Indian tribes, including the Sac, Fox, Ya- kima, Choctaw, Lower Brule Sioux, Eastem Shawnee, Ponca, Caddo, and the Skull Valley Band of Goshute, have since applied for the $100,000 exploratory grants as well (Angel 1991, 16-17).

Indeed, since so many reservations are without major sources of outside revenue, it is not surprising that some tribes have considered proposals to host toxic waste repositories on their reservations. Native Americans, like all other victimized ethnic groups, are not passive populations in the face of destruction from imperialism and paternalism. Rather, they are active agents in the making of their own history. Nearly a century and a half ago, the radical philosopher and political economist Karl Marx realized that peo- ple “make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly found, given and transmitted from the past” (Marx 1978, 595). Therefore, “[t]ribal governments considering or planning waste facilities”, asserts Margaret Crow of California Indian Legal Services, “do so for a number of reasons” (Crow 1994, 598). First, lacking exploitable sub- terranean natural resources, some tribal governments have sought to em- ploy the land itself as a resource in an attempt to fetch a ﬁnancial return. Second, since many reservations are rural and remote, other lucrative business opportunities are rarely, if ever, available to them. Third, some res- ervations are sparsely populated and therefore have surplus land for busi- ness activities. And fourth, by establishing waste facilities some tribes would be able to resolve their reservations’ own waste disposal problems while simultaneously raising much-needed revenue.

As a result, “[a] small number of tribes across the country are actively pursuing commercial hazardous and solid waste facilities”; however, “[t]he risk and beneﬁt analysis performed by most tribes has led to decisions not to engage in commercial waste management” (z'bz'a'.). Indeed, Crow reports that by “the end of 1992, there were no commercial waste facilities operating on any Indian reservations” (2'bz'd.), although the example of the Campo Band of Mission Indians provides an interesting and illuminating exception to the trend. The Campo Band undertook a “proactive approach to siting a com- mercial solid waste landﬁll and recycling facility near San Diego, California. The Band infonned and educated the native community, developed an en- vironmental regulatory infrastructure, solicited companies, required that the applicant company pay for the Band’s ﬁnancial advisors, lawyers, and solid waste industry consultants, and ultimately negotiated a favorable contract” (Haner 1994, 106). Even these extraordinary measures, however, are not enough to protect the tribal land and indigenous people from toxic exposure. Unfortunately, it is a sad but true fact that “virtually every landﬁll leaks, and every incinerator emits hundreds of toxic chemicals into the air, land and water” (Angel 1991, 3). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency concedes that “[e]ven if the . . . protective systems work according to plan, the landﬁlls will eventually leak poisons into the environment” (ibid.). Therefore, even if these toxic waste sites are safe for the present genera- tion—a rather dubious proposition at best—they will pose an increasingly greater health and safety risk for all future generations. Native people (and others) will eventually pay the costs of these toxic pollutants with their lives, “costs to which [corporate] executives are conveniently immune” (Parker 1983, 59). In this way, private corporations are able to extemalize their costs onto the commons, thereby subsidizing their earnings at the expense of health, safety, and the environment.

Sadly, this may not be the worst environmental hazard on tribal lands. Kevin Grover and Jana Walker try “[t]o set the record straight” by claiming that “the bigger problem is not that the waste industry is beating a path to the tribal door [although it is of course doing so]. Rather, it is the unau- thorized and illegal dumping occurring on reservations. For most Indian communities the problem of open dumping on tribal lands -is of much greater concern than the remote prospect that a commercial waste disposal facility may be sited on a reservation” (Haner 1994, 107)?

There are two major categories of people who illegally dump waste on tribal land. They have been called “midnight dumpers” and “native entre- preneurs.” Midnight dumpers are corporations and people who secretly dump their wastes on reservations without the permission of tribal governments. Native entrepreneurs are tribal members who contaminate tribal land, without tribal permission, for private proﬁt or personal convenience. Both midnight dumpers and native entrepreneurs threaten Native American tribes in two signiﬁcant ways: tribal health and safety, and tribal sovereignty. First, toxic waste poses a severe health and safety risk. Some chemical agents cause leukemia and other cancers; others may lead to organ ailments, asthma, and other dysfunctions; and yet others may lead to birth defects such as anencephaly. Toxic waste accomplishes these tragic consequences through direct exposure, through the contamination of the air, land, and water, and through the bioaccumulation of toxins in both plants and animals. And because of what Ben Chavis in 1987 termed “environmental racism,” people of color (and poor people) are disproportionately affected by toxic waste. Native Americans are especially hard hit because of their ethnicity, their class, and their unique political status in the United States.

A second problem that Native Americans must confront when toxic waste is dumped on their lands is the issue of tribal sovereignty, and more speciﬁcally the loss of this sovereignty. “Native American governments re- tain all power not taken away by treaty, federal statute, or the courts. As an extension of this principle, native governments retain authority over members unless divested by the federal government” (Haner 1994, 109- 110). Jennifer Haner, a New York attorney, asserts that illegal dumping threatens tribal sovereignty because it creates the conditions that make federal government intervention on the reservations more likely (ibid., 121). The federal govemment can use the issue of illegally dumped toxic waste as a pretext to revert to past patterns of patemalism and control over Native American affairs on the reservations; Native Americans are viewed as irresponsible, the U.S. government as their savior.

Less abstract examples of threats to sovereignty include the experience of the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe. The Waste Tech Corporation “wanted to restrict the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe from having full access to their own tribal land . . . [and also wanted] the unilateral right to determine where access roads would be built, and the unilateral right to decide to take any additional land they desired” (Angel 1991, 3). Another concrete example is Waste Management, Inc.’s attempt to curtail the powers of the Campo Environ- mental Protection Agency and to dilute other tribal regulations. Amcor of- ficials at the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, as a further example, sought exemption from any environmental laws mandated for tribal lands after the contract was signed. All of these acts are threats to the sovereignty of Native American tribes and contribute to the genocidal project.

Tribal lands are detrimentally affected through other extemal and un- wanted environmental inﬂuences, as well. Indeed, “[olff-site pollution is [also] a major problem for Native Americans” (Lewis 1994, 189). There are many examples, and each one is a very signiﬁcant tragedy:

When tankers like the Exxon Valdez spill their cargoes of crude oil, they pollute thousands of miles of coastline . . . Pollutants from mining and processing plants migrate into reservation air and water. Cyanide heap-leach mining in Montana is pol- luting water on the Fort Belknap reservation. Radioactive pollution and toxic waste from the Hanford nuclear weapons plant threaten all tribes who depend on the Co- lumbia River . . . The Mdewakanton Sioux of Prairie Island, Minnesota, fear the health impacts of a nuclear power plant built on the edge of their small reservation, while the Western Shoshones protest the use of their land as a nuclear test site. Industrial waste dumps surround the St. Regis Indian Reservation, fouling the St. Lawrence River. Poorly treated urban waste and agricultural efﬂuent threatens nearby reservation en- vironments (z'bid.).

Deadly environmental threats also emanate from uranium and coal mining, U.S. military target practice and war games, spent ammunition shells, dis- cardedbatteries, and asbestos. Sadly, this is only a partial list. In fact, a survey of only 25 Indian reservations revealed “that 1200 hazardous waste generators or other hazardous waste activity sites were located on or near . . . [those] reservations selected for the survey” (Williams 1992, 282). The issue is serious, the scope is wide, and the results are disastrous.Native Americans have always altered their environment, as well as hav- ing it altered by others. The environment, like culture, is inherently dy- namic and dialectical. Native Americans “used song and ritual speech to modify their world, while physically transforming that landscape with ﬁre and water, brawn and brain. They did not passively adapt, but responded in diverse ways to adjust environments to meet their cultural as well as material desires” (Lewis 1994, 188). However, the introduction of toxic waste and other environmental hazards, such as military-related degrada- tion, have catastrophically affected the present and future health and cul- ture of Native Americans.

Yet, Native Americans and other people of color, along with poor peo- ple, women, and environmentalists, have been organizing against toxic waste and ﬁghting back against the government and the corporations. In- deed, “the intersection of race discrimination and exposure to toxic haz- ards”, according to Andrew Szasz, Professor of Sociology at the University of Califomia, Santa Cruz, “is one of the core themes of the lanti—ltoxics movement” (Szasz 1994, 151).“ In spite of the often desperate poverty of Indian tribes, “a wave of resistance has erupted among Indian people in dozens of Indian Nations in response to the onslaught of the waste industry” (Angel 1991, 5). Sporadic resistance has also developed into organized and sustained opposition. Facing the threat of a toxic waste facility on their land in Dilkon, Arizona, in 1989, the Navajo formed a group called Citizens Against Ruining our Environment, also known as CARE. CARE fought the proposed siting by educating and organizing their community, and their success inspired other similarly situated Native Americans. (CARE later merged with other Navajo groups ﬁghting for the community and the en- vironment, to create a new organization, called Dine CARE). The following year, in June 1990, CARE hosted a conference in Dilkon called “Protecting Mother Earth: The Toxic Threat to Indian Land”, which brought together “over 200 Indian delegates from 25 tribes throughout North America” (ibid.).

The following year’s conference in South Dakota included “[o]ver 500 Indigenous delegates from 57 tribes” (z'bz'd., 6). It was at this second annual conference that the delegates created the Indigenous Environmental Net- work. The IEN states that it is “an alliance of grass roots peoples whose mission is to strengthen, maintain, protect and respect the traditional teach-ings, lifestyles and spiritual interdependence to the sacredness of Mother Earth and the natural laws” (Aug 1993, 7). This is wholly in concert with “the most enduring characteristic of American Indians throughout the his- tory of the continent: the ability to incorporate technological, natural, and social changes while maintaining cultural continuity” (Crow 1994, 593). Therein lies the natural afﬁnity between Indian opposition to toxic waste and the broader environmental justice movement. “Environmental justice,” according to the journal of the Citizens’ Clearinghouse for Hazardous Waste, Everyoneis Backyard, “is a people-oriented way of addressing ‘en- vironmentalism’ that adds a vital social, economic and political element . . . When we ﬁght for environmental justice, we ﬁght for our homes and families and struggle to end economic, social and political domination by the strong and greedy” (Szasz 1994, 152-153).

Fighting for environmental justice is a form of self-defense for Native Americans. As the Report of Women of All Red Nations declared, “To con- taminate Indian water is an act of war more subtle than military aggression, yet no less deadly . . . Water is life” (February 1980, in Collins Bay Action Group 1985, 4). Toxic pollution—coupled with the facts of environmental racism, pervasive poverty, and the unique status of Native Americans in the United States—“really is a matter of GENOCIDE. The Indigenous peo- ple were colonized and forced onto reservations . . . [Native Americans are] poisoned on the job. Or poisoned in the home . . . Or forced to re- locate so that the land rip—offs can proceed without hitch. Water is life but the corporations are killing it. It's a genocide of all the environment and all species of creatures” (Bend 1985, 25; emphasis in original). In effect, toxic pollution is a genocide through geocide, that is, a killing of the people through a killing of the Earth.

Environmental threats are, unfortunately, not new. In the mid-1800s, Chief Seattle of the Suquamish tribe reportedly stated that “[t]he Earth does not belong to [human beings]; [hurnansl belong to the Earth. This we know. All things are connected like the blood which unites one family. All things are connected. Whatever befalls the Earth befalls the [children] of the Earth. [Human beings] did not weave the web of life; [they are] merely a strand in it. Whatever [they do] to the web, [they do to themselvesl” (Chief Seattle 1987, 7). In this vein, genocide is ultimately also suicide.

Five hundred years after the commencement of colonialism and geno- cide, “the exploitation and assault on Indigenous people and their land continues. Instead of conquistadors armed with weapons of destruction and war, the new assault is disguised as ‘economic development’ promoted by entrepreneurs pushing poisonous technologies. The modem-day invad- ers from the waste disposal industry promise huge amounts of money, make vague promises about jobs, and make exaggerated and often false claims about the alleged safety of their dangerous proposals” (Angel 1991, 1). Yet, also 500 years later, Native Americans are still resisting the on- slaught and are still (re)creating themselves and their cultures. And increas- ingly, Native Americans are better organized and more united than ever in their struggle against environmental racism and for environmental justice.

#### And, nuclear reactors are a unique site of activism – the anti –nuclear movement has been fueled for nearly 70 years and their attempt to rectify injustice continues to this day – acknowledging our privilege and attempting to change the situation is preferable to letting the status quo continue in perpetuity

Ogley-Oliver, 12 [8-7-2012, “Development of Activism: The Elders of the Antinuclear¶ Movement” Emma JF, GSU Psychology Dissertation, <http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1104&context=psych_diss>]

Social and Environmental Injustices According to the NRC (2010), the vast majority of¶ new reactors are proposed for the southeastern U.S. Many of these locales (like Waynesboro,¶ Georgia) tend to be poor communities of color that are economically dependent upon the nuclear¶ industry and already disproportionately burdened with radioactive and other toxic wastes¶ (Alldred & Schrader-Frechette, 2009; Bullard, 1990; Culley & Angelique, 2011). Environmental¶ injustices associated with the nuclear industry are pervasive, particularly related to the¶ contamination of Native American lands due to uranium mining, processing, and waste disposal¶ (Churchill & LaDuke, 1983; Pasternak, 2010).¶ Alldred and Shrader-Frechette (2009) highlighted historical injustices related to the¶ nuclear industry stating the public health risks largely affecting indigenous peoples and poor¶ communities of color. For example, public health information about uranium was not widely¶ disseminated among Navajo uranium miners (Dawson, 1992; Pasternak, 2010) and thus Navajo¶ people only organized in protest after 1973, once miners and others living near mining and¶ enrichment sites developed cancer (Brugge & Goble, 2002). It appears that uranium mining and¶ related processes had a negative affect primarily on indigenous people in the U.S., due to lack of¶ alternative employment (Brugge & Goble, 2002) and the fact that the majority (70%) of uranium¶ is located on native lands (World Information Service on Energy (WISE), 2006). Furthermore,¶ since existing nuclear reactors are predominantly located in poor communities, this can lead to¶ radiation exposures above daily permissible levels outlined by federal environmental and public¶ health officials (Alldred & Schrader-Frechette, 2009). Taken together, these examples document¶ 6¶ on-going social and environmental injustices associated with the nuclear industry (Alldred &¶ Schrader-Frechette, 2009; Bullard & Johnson, 2000; Culley & Angelique, 2011; Ogley-Oliver,¶ Zorland, & Culley, 2007; Pasternak, 2010). These social and environmental injustices are further¶ delineated when the entire scope of social costs of the nuclear industry is considered.¶ Social Costs of the Nuclear Industry Since the inception of the nuclear industry, scholars¶ have documented numerous social costs that have driven the anti-nuclear movement. Social costs¶ include those related to human health such as cancer (Aamodt, 1984; Boice, Cohen, Mumma,¶ Chadda, & Blot, 2008; Gilliland, Hunt, Pardilla, & Key, 2000; Wing, Richardson, Armstrong, &¶ Crawford-Brown, 1997), leukemia (Spix, Schmiedel, Kaatsch, Schulze-Rath, & Blettner, 2008),¶ birth defects (Johnson & Rouleau, 1991), and psychological stress (Fleming, Baum, Gisriel,¶ Gatchel, 1982; Cleary & Houts, 1984; Culley, 1998; Culley & Angelique, 2003; Prince-Embury¶ & Rooney, 1987a; Prince-Embury & Rooney, 1987b). Environmental costs include air, water,¶ and soil pollution (Georgia Department of Environmental Protection Division, 2004). Additional¶ social costs include a history of economic problems in part due to construction cost overruns,¶ reliance on public funding, and the lack of private insurance for the nuclear industry, which is¶ wholly funded by taxpayers as outlined in the Price Anderson Limited Liability Act (Culley &¶ Angelique, 2011; Culley & Angelique, 2010). The magnitude of negative outcomes associated¶ with the nuclear industry has fueled the anti-nuclear movement for over 70 years.¶ Past and current work of the anti-nuclear movement reflects efforts conducted by other¶ social movements seeking to rectify social and environmental injustices. Individual activists¶ make up the core of social movements (Stern, Dietz, Abel, Guagnano, & Kalof, 1999) as those¶ who ultimately strive to promote democracy (Giddens, 1985) and gain control over political authorities (Tilly, 1985) via collective social action.

#### And, voting aff serves to reframe the debate about nuclear power from proliferation and terrorism to the forgotten victims of uranium production – we take a stance that brings to light these genocidal acts and create opposition to governmental nuclearism

Indian Country Today 06—reviewing a book, “The Navajo People and Uranium Mining,” edited by Doug Brugge, Timothy Benally and Esther Yazzie-Lewis (11/29/2006, Navajo Nation battles yellow ‘monster’, <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/ictarchives/2006/11/29/navajo-nation-battles-yellow-%E2%80%98monster%E2%80%99-129124>, RBatra)

These days we speak of weapons of mass destruction without truly considering the historical weight of those words. The phrase is bandied about by talking heads without an ounce of emotion or regret. That the United States is trying to halt the proliferation of nuclear programs for the sake of preventing mass casualties by terrorist attack, while maneuvering constantly to maintain its status as a world superpower, is ironic. The earthly material used to transform the United States into the world’s most powerful political and military force, uranium, has proven just as massively destructive as the nuclear weapons it spawned.

A new book, “The Navajo People and Uranium Mining,” edited by Doug Brugge, Timothy Benally and Esther Yazzie-Lewis, is the documented history of the forgotten victims of America’s Cold War, according to Navajo Nation President Joe Shirley Jr. Generations of indigenous people living and breathing on Navajo land have suffered the deadly effects of uranium mining, without compassion or just compensation from the federal government. Shirley described the uranium mining era as genocide. “There is no other word for what happened to Navajo uranium miners,” he said.

Leetso, “yellow dirt” in Dine’, is found throughout Navajoland. A map of mining areas shows a dozen mines in Navajo alone, and a few others in the vast outlying territory. As in countless stories of the exploitation of indigenous resources, the Navajo and Hopi people were the last to know the true effects of their mining efforts.

The Dine’ are people with the utmost respect for the ground on which they live. The world’s largest deep uranium mine is at the foot of Tsoodzil, the Navajo sacred mountain of the south. Imagine the spiritual loss for a people whose ancient ways tell them it is disrespectful to dig into the Earth with steel tools or machinery. The miners themselves suffered often fatal radiation-related diseases and dangerous threats to their way of life as Dine’. These are the primary handlers of the uranium; countless secondary victims live today in communities wasted by invisible radiation exposure that runs deadly through families, hogans and playgrounds. Even the wind itself blows radioactive dust throughout the land. The result, lamented Shirley, has “cost the Navajo Nation the accumulated wisdom, knowledge, stories, songs and ceremonies of hundreds of our people.”

Victims of radiation poisoning and their descendants have received very little federal compensation. The 1990 Radiation Exposure Compensation Act was initially drafted to address concerns of non-Native miners. They received some 80 percent of $300 million. Native miners and their families received 12 percent, or roughly $4 million. A quick look at the RECA compensation guidelines gives one the scope of the physical effects of radiation exposure. Eligible claimants can be compensated for leukemia, lymphomas and chronic renal disease, as well as a host of “primary” cancers affecting the brain, thyroid, lung, colon and ovary, among many others. The guidelines provide for “compassionate” compensation, to exact dollar amounts, for eligible claimants.

Many Navajo claims were denied, deemed ineligible for failure to produce a birth date or birth certificate. According to Navajo Nation communications, Shirley acknowledged this bureaucratic challenge at an update in September. He told the elderly miners, “Many of you were born at home in a hogan and didn’t receive a piece of paper with this information on it. Our mothers gave birth to us holding on to a sash belt and we remember a specific season, not a date and time.”

Again, we find Indian people faced with somewhat irrelevant questions of citizenship and worthiness in their search for justice and restitution. Whatever compensation is provided by RECA, it will never amend the destruction caused to the fabric of Navajo lifeways. Death and disease can be documented; social collapse over the course of generations is more difficult to record. The discovery and mining of uranium produced more than atomic energy for the power-hungry United States. Boomtowns rose out of sacred lands, creating an entirely new socioeconomic dynamic that was alien to the traditional Navajo way of life. The mining industry has polluted bodies and minds, water and soil. There has been no just compensation for Indian peoples affected by leetso.

These issues became a priority when the Navajo Nation Council passed the Dine’ Natural Resources Protection Act of 2005. This law prohibits uranium mining and processing throughout Navajo country. However, there is a looming threat to Navajo sovereignty, as the market price for uranium has taken a sharp upward turn in the last two years amid widespread talk of alternative energy production. Already speculators are seeking state and federal permission to reopen mines that, although government-controlled, are situated on Navajo territory.

Avoiding “a repeat of one of the most sorrowful periods in the Navajo Nation’s history” will be the focus of its Indigenous World Uranium Summit. The nation expects international guests, other Indian tribes and federal legislators at the gathering, which begins Nov. 30 in Window Rock, Ariz. Speaking in holistic terms about their effort to prevent future uranium mining, the Navajo have on their agenda a range of topics from the legacy of mining, community health studies and traditional cultural teachings, to market forces affecting the new uranium boom and sustainable development of alternative energy sources.

The Navajo grass-roots campaign to stop uranium mining has reached the height of a world summit. Exploitation of indigenous resources and the destruction of people and communities can no longer be considered collateral damage by those seeking enriching economic opportunities. We commend the Navajo Nation for telling its story so effectively, and for its resolve in keeping its future generations safe from harm.

#### And, switching to thorium reactors prevents the need for more uranium mining

**Clark, 09** [Thorium nuclear power Switching from uranium to thorium as our primarily nuclear fuel could lead to cheaper, safer and more sustainable nuclear power, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/jul/13/manchester-report-nuclear>]

The uranium that makes conventional [nuclear power](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/nuclearpower) possible has a number of significant disadvantages. For one thing, [uranium reactors generate large quantities of waste](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/nuclear-waste). Much of this remains dangerous for thousands of years, and a proportion of it can be used to produce weapons-grade plutonium. A second issue is that uranium is a comparatively scarce material, which exists in significant quantities in only a small number of countries. The theoretical risk of giant explosions caused by uranium reactors is a further concern. For all of these reasons, a growing number of scientists and [energy](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/energy) experts believe that the world should switch from uranium to thorium as its primary nuclear fuel. Compared to uranium, thorium is far more abundant as well as much more energy-dense. In addition, the waste products generated by thorium are virtually impossible to turn into plutonium – and they remain dangerous for hundred of years rather than thousands. There are a number of different ways to use thorium to produce electricity. In Manchester, Kirk Sorensen made the case for liquid-fluoride reactors. This technology was developed by the US military in the 1950s and 1960s and was shown to have many benefits. For example, reactors of this type can be smaller than conventional uranium reactors, partly thanks to their low-pressure operation. Despite its early promise, research into liquid-fluoride thorium reactors was abandoned – the most likely reason being that the technology offered no potential for producing nuclear weapons. Sorensen estimates that between 5,000-6,000 tonnes of thorium could produce as much energy as the world currently consumes each year.

#### And, it causes an immediate cessation of mining

Barton, ‘9 [Charles, retired counselor, writes for Energy From Thorium, “The Liquid Fluoride Thorium Paradigm,” http://www.theoildrum.com/node/4971/]

LFTR(s) are 100-300 times more fuel efficient than LWRs. In addition to solving the nuclear waste problem, they can operate for several centuries using only uranium and thorium that has already been mined. Thus they eliminate the criticism that mining for nuclear fuel will use fossil fuels and add to the greenhouse effect.

#### And, eliminating nuclear power doesn’t solve – only thorium eliminates current uranium and toxic waste stockpiles

Rhodes, 12 [February, Professor Chris Rhodes is a writer and researcher. He studied chemistry at Sussex University, earning both a B.Sc and a Doctoral degree (D.Phil.); rising to become the youngest professor of physical chemistry in the U.K. at the age of 34. A prolific author, Chris has published more than 400 research and popular science articles (some in national newspapers: The Independent and The Daily Telegraph) He has recently published his first novel, "University Shambles" was published in April 2009 (Melrose Books), “Hopes Build for Thorium Nuclear Energy”, <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Hopes-Build-for-Thorium-Nuclear-Energy.html>]

There is much written to the effect that thorium might prove a more viable nuclear fuel, and an energy industry based upon it, than the current uranium-based process which serves to provide both energy and weapons - including "depleted uranium" for armaments and missiles. There are different ways in which energy might be extracted from thorium, one of which is the accelerator-driven system (ADS). Such accelerators need massive amounts of electricity to run them, as all particle accelerators do, but these are required to produce a beam of protons of such intensity that until 10 years ago the prevailing technology meant that it could not have been done. As noted below, an alternative means to use thorium as a fuel is in a liquid fluoride reactor (LFR), also termed a molten salt reactor, which avoids the use of solid oxide nuclear fuels. Indeed, China has made the decision to develop an LFR-based thorium-power programme, to be active by 2020.¶ Rather like nuclear fusion, the working ADS technology is some way off, and may never happen, although Professor Egil Lillestol of Bergen University in Norway is pushing that the world should use thorium in such ADS reactors. Using thorium as a nuclear fuel is a laudable idea, as is amply demonstrated in the blog "Energy from Thorium" (<http://thoriumenergy.blogspot.com/>). However, the European Union has pulled the plug on funding for the thorium ADS programme, which was directed by Professor Carlo Rubbia, the Nobel Prize winner, who has now abandoned his efforts to press forward the programme, and instead concentrated on solar energy, which was another of his activities. Rubbia had appointed Lillestol as leader of the CERN physics division over two decades ago, in 1989, who believes that the cause is not lost.¶ Thorium has many advantages, not the least being its greater abundance than uranium. It is often quoted that there is three times as much thorium as there is uranium. Uranium is around 2 - 3 parts per million in abundance in most soils, and this proportion rises especially where phosphate rocks are present, to anywhere between 50 and 1000 ppm. This is still only in the range 0.005% - 0.1% and so even the best soils are not obvious places to look for uranium. However, somewhere around 6 ppm as an average for thorium in the Earth's crust is a reasonable estimate. There are thorium mineral deposits that contain up to 12% of the element, located at the following tonnages in Turkey (380,000), Australia (300,000), India (290,000), Canada and the US combined (260,000)... and Norway (170,000), perhaps explaining part of Lillestol's enthusiasm for thorium based nuclear power. Indeed, Norway is very well endowed with natural fuel resources, including gas, oil, coal, and it would appear, thorium.¶ An alternative technology to the ADS is the "Liquid Fluoride Reactor" (LFR), which is described and discussed in considerable detail on the <http://thoriumenergy.blogspot.com/> blog, and reading this has convinced me that the LFR may provide the best means to achieve our future nuclear energy programme. Thorium exists naturally as thorium-232, which is not of itself a viable nuclear fuel. However, by absorption of relatively low energy "slow" neutrons, it is converted to protactinium 233, which must be removed from the reactor (otherwise it absorbs another neutron and becomes protactinium 234) and allowed to decay over about 28 days to uranium 233, which is fissile, and can be returned to the reactor as a fuel, and to breed more uranium 233 from thorium. The "breeding" cycle can be kicked-off using plutonium say, to provide the initial supply of neutrons, and indeed the LFR would be a useful way of disposing of weapons grade plutonium and uranium from the world's stockpiles while converting it into useful energy.¶ The LFR makes in-situ reprocessing possible, much more easily than is the case for solid-fuel based reactors. I believe there have been two working LFR's to date, and if implemented, the technology would avoid using uranium-plutonium fast breeder reactors, which need high energy "fast" neutrons to convert uranium 238 which is not fissile to plutonium 239 which is. The LFR is inherently safer and does not require liquid sodium as a coolant, while it also avoids the risk of plutonium getting into the hands of terrorists. It is worth noting that while uranium 235 and plutonium 239 could be shielded to avoid detection as a "bomb in a suitcase", uranium 233 could not, because it is always contaminated with uranium 232, which is a strong gamma-ray emitter, and is far less easily concealed.¶ It has been claimed that thorium produces "250 times more energy per unit of weight" than uranium. Now this isn't simply a "logs versus coal on the fire" kind of argument, but presumably refers to the fact that while essentially all the thorium can be used as a fuel, the uranium must be enriched in uranium 235, the rest being "thrown away" and hence wasted as "depleted" uranium 238 (unless it is bred into plutonium). If both the thorium and uranium were used to breed uranium 233 or plutonium 239, then presumably their relative "heat output" weight for weight should be about the same as final fission fuels? If this is wrong, will someone please explain this to me as I should be interested to know?¶ However, allowing that the LFR in-situ reprocessing is a far easier and less dangerous procedure, the simple sums are that contained in 248 million tonnes of natural uranium, available as a reserve, are 1.79 million tonnes of uranium 235 + 246.2 million tonnes of uranium 238. Hence by enrichment 35 million tonnes (Mt) of uranium containing 3.2% uranium 235 (from the original 0.71%) are obtained. This "enriched fraction" would contain 1.12 Mt of (235) + 33.88 Mt of (238), leaving in the other "depleted" fraction 248 - 35 Mt = 213 Mt of the original 248 Mt, and containing 0.67 Mt (235) + 212.3 Mt (238). Thus we have accessed 1.79 - 0.67 = 1.12 Mt of (235) = 1.12/224 = 4.52 x 10\*-3 or 0.452% of the original total uranium. Thus on a relative basis thorium (assuming 100% of it can be used) is 100/0.452 = 221 times as good weight for weight, which is close to the figure claimed, and a small variation in enrichment to a slightly higher level as is sometimes done probably would get us to an advantage factor of 250!¶ Plutonium is a by-product of normal operation of a uranium-fuelled fission reactor. 95 to 97% of the fuel in the reactor is uranium 238. Some of this uranium is converted to plutonium 239 and plutonium 241 - usually about 1000 kg forms after a year of operation. At the end of the cycle (a year to 2 years, typically), very little uranium 235 is left and about 30% of the power produced by the reactor actually comes from plutonium. Hence a degree of "breeding" happens intrinsically and so the practical advantage of uranium raises its head from 1/250 (accepting that figure) to 1/192, which still weighs enormously in favour of thorium!¶ As a rough estimate, 1.4 million tonnes of thorium (about one third the world uranium claimed, which is enough to last another 50 years as a fission fuel) would keep us going for about 200/3 x 50 = 3,333 years. Even if we were to produce all the world's electricity from nuclear that is currently produced using fossil fuels (which would certainly cut our CO2 emissions), we would be O.K. for 3,333/4 = 833 years. More thorium would doubtless be found if it were looked for, and so the basic raw material is not at issue. Being more abundant in most deposits than uranium, its extraction would place less pressure on other fossil fuel resources used for mining and extracting it. Indeed, thorium-electricity could be piped in for that purpose.¶ It all sounds great: however, the infrastructure would be huge to switch over entirely to thorium, as it would to switch to anything else including hydrogen and biofuels. It is this that is the huge mountain of resistance there will be to all kinds of new technology. My belief is that through cuts in energy use following post peak oil (and peak gas), we may be able to produce liquid fuels from coal, possibly using electricity produced from thorium, Thorium produces less of a nuclear waste problem finally, since fewer actinides result from the thorium fuel cycle than that from uranium. Renewables should be implemented wherever possible too, in the final energy mix that will be the fulcrum on which the survival of human civilization is poised.

#### Therefore, we believe that the United States federal government should retrofit existing nuclear reactors in the United States to use thorium based nuclear power technology.

#### And, laws are on the books now that ensure the preservation of status quo technology – USFG deployment of Thorium catalyzes a tech transition across the country

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

 In the United States, it is the responsibility of industry to design, construct, and operate commercial nuclear power plants. However, DOE has statutory authority under the Atomic Energy Act to promote and support nuclear energy technologies for commercial applications. In general, appropriate government roles include researching high-potential technologies beyond the investment horizon of industry and also reducing the technical risks of new technologies. In the case of new commercial reactor designs, potential areas of NE involvement could include: Enabling new technologies to be inserted into emerging and future designs by providing access to unique laboratory resources for new technology development and, where appropriate, demonstration. • Working through the laboratories and universities to provide unique expertise and facilities to industry for R&D in the areas of: o Innovative concepts and advanced technologies. o Fundamental phenomena and performance data. o Advanced modeling and simulation capabilities. APRIL 2010 22 34 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP o New technology testing and, if appropriate, demonstration. o Advanced manufacturing methods. Representative R&D activities that support each of the roles stated above are presented below. The level of DOE investment relative to industry investment will vary across the spectrum of these activities, with a generally increasing trend in DOE investment for longer-term activities. Finally, there is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaborations with other nations through multilateral and bilateral agreements including the Generation IV International Forum, which is investigating multiple advanced reactor concepts. DOE is also a participant in OECD/NEA and IAEA initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems.

#### And, we believe the debate space is a space for democratic education – people need to understand the deleterious implications of Thorium and the threat that it poses to civilians and the environment – raising collective awareness increases the likelihood of government change

Barzowski, 12 [April, Samantha, University of Pittsburgh Department of Mechanical Engineering “THORIUM REACTORS AS AN ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCE”, <http://136.142.82.187/eng12/history/spring2012/pdf/2145.pdf>]

The United States government and the public need to be educated about thorium energy, especially the fact that thorium reactors are much safer than the existing nuclear reactors. The biggest fear the public has about nuclear energy is a nuclear meltdown. As discussed in the sections above, thorium reactors have a self-shutdown system, and have a considerably lesser chance of meltdown than uranium reactors. The waste from liquid fluoride thorium reactors is less likely to be turned into bombs, is less in quantity and takes a shorter period of time to decompose. Also, by realizing that uranium reactors pose a threat to the surrounding civilians and environment in the event of a nuclear meltdown, and that LFTRs are meltdown proof, then the United States government may consider that option of building reactors that run on thorium.

#### And, we believe that we can use our voices as college students to let others know about the change we would like to see in our government – we will insert into the debate a record of our signature of a petition directly to the President

<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/2/Green-Energy/>



And, here is another screen shot

 

#### And, we aren’t naïve enough to think that signing a single petition will radically alter politics, but it does have a profound and transformational effect on how Pappas and I view the debate space

Coventry, 12 [John, Director of Communications, Change.org, A Branson Pickle - Can Online Petitions Shape Democracy?, <http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/john-coventry/a-branson-pickle-can-onli_b_1842181.html>]

 As of today, around 165,000 people have signed it. A very quick search throws up over 2,000 bits of media coverage about it. One of the great social injustices of our time? Nope. Richard Branson's [lost the franchise for the West Coast Main Line rail service](http://epetitions.direct.gov.uk/petitions/37180). Despite the huge outpouring of public devotion to Virgin Trains, it looks rather like the Government will press on with plans to give First Group the contract. So this must prove, once and for all, that online petitions don't work right? Wrong. Ask Richard Branson. He didn't set up the petition on [Government's own e-petition](http://epetitions.direct.gov.uk/) site but he's certainly scored hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of free media coverage with passengers telling the world how brilliant his company is. The pressure's on the Government here, and not least because they tell the punters that if 100,000 people sign a petition, this 'triggers' a debate in parliament. This isn't strictly speaking the case - but more on that in a bit. [On Radio Five Live on Tuesday night](http://www.bbc.co.uk/i/b01m6cm2/), (about 40 mins in) they had a discussion about online petitions. The debate went thus: Politicians don't listen, there's no intellectual rigour to it, and back in my day we stood out in the pouring rain and got signatures on a clipboard. THAT WAS PROPER CAMPAIGNING MY LAD - WHEN MEN WERE MEN AND... you get the picture. Then comes the usual but baffling line: "people just click sign and never think of it again." This perceived disengagement from the issue at hand is known by the cynical as 'clicktivism'. It does make me think though - when people used to sign petitions on a clipboard, in the pouring rain, when men where men etc - did anyone call that 'pen-tivsm' and bemoan the fact that people weren't using quills any more? People engage with issues on different levels. Some man the barricades, some click 'like' on Facebook. But to say that something's less valuable because it's on the internet - the world's most powerful communication tool - is nonsense. To say there's no intellectual debate or discussion about them is just plain wrong - have you read twitter? Seen comment threads on Facebook? Blogs online news sites? Debate is everywhere, more than it ever has been. So do they work? Jayne Linney thinks they do. After weeks of frustration that villain-du-jour ATOS wouldn't record her disability assessment [she started a campaign on Change.org](http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.change.org%2Fen-GB%2Fpetitions%2Fatos-respect-my-rights-and-record-my-disability-assessment-cc-dwppressoffice&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNFGfOLZh3TizMOPOScRqNvAFubPUQ) to get them to change their mind. It got just over 1,000 signatures - then MPs got involved and a bona fide campaign broke out. [She won it.](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/disabled-woman-took-on-welfare-system--and-won-8037165.html)  Ask Derek Macabrey. Flabbergasted at plans by Newtownabbey council to build a huge cemetery opposite a childrens hospice, [he launched a petition on Change.org](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/john-coventry/he%20launched%20a%20petition%20on%20Change.org). More than 6,000 people backed it. [The council is now looking for an alternative site](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/john-coventry/The%20council%20is%20now%20looking%20for%20an%20alternative%20site). There are hundreds if not thousands of these kinds of victories all over the world. Do politicians listen? Well they listened to the half a million people who signed the 38 Degrees petition for a u-turn on forest privatisation last year. This campaign is a show-stopping example of the power of the petition to inspire debate, offline political engagement and well rounded campaigns that now mean our forests wont be provided in partnership with McDonalds. As for the Government's site - if they don't have a commons debate on the West Coast Mainline issue people might, understandably, ask what the point of it is. The debate 'trigger' is the big selling point of the Government's site and while it's a great thing to have such an accessible tool for citizens to engage with government if it doesn't do what it says it claims to do then that's a problem. Thousands who may have never engaged in an issue in this way are looking to see whether the Government is actually listening to them. Signing a petition is not a silver bullet for challenging those in power. But building movements of people is certainly a huge part of it. And what's even more important at a time when people are almost entirely sceptical of politics and politicians, is that it's putting power in the hands of the people - and that's what real change is all about.

#### And, we fully acknowledge that the government has hardly been a just actor, while researching our aff we came across a proposal that demonstrates some of the flaws of the current political process – Senator Orrin hatch of Utah has simultaneously supported uranium mining and Thorium expansion – we think that he epitomizes what happens when politics goes wrong. When people are no longer vigilant and we accept every tenant of the conventional political process then progressive change can’t happen – conventional politics shouldn’t be the barometer by which you make a determination about the plans effect – don’t tie us to a wholesale defense of the establishment, but ask yourself could the establishment do some good in this case? We think the answer to that question is undoubtedly yes. Disingenuous politics can and do exist, but voting aff is the first step in changing that process the question of what the federal government should do is important – we cannot reduce decision making to utilitarian exercises – the process of deliberating about what might be possible makes the process more intelligent and creates the possibility for us to actively engage with external venues for action

**Hanghoj, 08** [Thorkild Hanghøj, Copenhagen, 2008 , PhD project, University of Aarhus, an assistant professor., <http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information_til/Studerende_ved_SDU/Din_uddannelse/phd_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf>]

Joas’ re-interpretation of Dewey’s pragmatism as a “theory of situated creativity” raises a critique of humans as purely rational agents that navigate instrumentally through meansendsschemes (Joas, 1996: 133f). This critique is particularly important when trying to understand how games are enacted and validated within the realm of educational institutions that *by definition* are inscribed in the great modernistic narrative of “progress” where nation states, teachers and parents expect students to acquire specific skills and competencies (Popkewitz, 1998; cf. chapter 3). However, as Dewey argues, the actual *doings* of educational gaming cannot be reduced to rational means-ends schemes. Instead, the situated interaction between teachers, students, and learning resources are played out as contingent re-distributions of means, ends and ends in view, which often make classroom contexts seem “messy” from an outsider’s perspective (Barab & Squire, 2004). 4.2.3. Dramatic rehearsalThe two preceding sections discussed how Dewey views play as an imaginative activity of educational value, and how his assumptions on creativity and playful actions represent a critique of rational means-end schemes. For now, I will turn to Dewey’s concept of *dramatic rehearsal*, which assumes that social actors deliberate by projecting and choosing between various scenarios for future action. Dewey uses the concept dramatic rehearsal several times in his work but presents the most extensive elaboration in *Human Nature and Conduct*: Deliberation is a dramatic rehearsal (**in imagination**) of various competing possible lines of action… [It] is an experiment in finding out what the various lines of possible action are really like (...) Thought runs ahead and foresees outcomes, and thereby avoids having to await the instruction of actual failure and disaster. An act overtly tried out is irrevocable, its consequences cannot be blotted out. An act tried out in imagination is not final or fatal. It is retrievable (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). 86 This excerpt illustrates how Dewey views the process of decision making (deliberation) through the lens of an imaginative *drama* metaphor. Thus, decisions are made through the imaginative projection of outcomes, where the “possible competing lines of action” are resolved through a thought experiment. Moreover, Dewey’s compelling use of the drama metaphor also implies that decisions cannot be reduced to utilitarian, rational or mechanical exercises, but that they have emotional, creative and personal qualities as well. Interestingly, there are relatively few discussions within the vast research literature on Dewey of his concept of dramatic rehearsal. A notable exception is the phenomenologist Alfred Schütz, who praises Dewey’s concept as a “fortunate image” for understanding everyday rationality (Schütz, 1943: 140). Other attempts are primarily related to overall discussions on moral or ethical deliberation (Caspary, 1991, 2000, 2006; Fesmire, 1995, 2003; Rönssön, 2003; McVea, 2006). As Fesmire points out, dramatic rehearsal is intended to describe an important *phase* of deliberation that does not characterise the whole process of making moral decisions, which includes “duties and contractual obligations, short and long-term consequences, traits of character to be affected, and rights” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Instead, dramatic rehearsal should be seen as the *process* of “crystallizing possibilities and transforming them into directive hypotheses” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Thus, deliberation can in no way guarantee that the response of a “thought experiment” will be successful. But what it can do is make the process of choosing **more intelligent** than would be the case with “blind” trial-and-error (Biesta, 2006: 8). The notion of dramatic rehearsal provides a valuable perspective for understanding educational gaming as a simultaneously *real* and *imagined* inquiry into domain-specific scenarios. Dewey defines dramatic rehearsal as the capacity to stage and evaluate “acts”, which implies an “irrevocable” difference between acts that are “tried out in imagination” and acts that are “overtly tried out” with real-life consequences (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). This description shares obvious similarities with games as they require participants to inquire into and **resolve scenario-specific problems** (cf. chapter 2). On the other hand, there is also a striking difference between moral deliberation and educational game activities in terms of the actual *consequences* that follow particular actions. Thus, when it comes to educational games, acts are both imagined and tried out, but *without* all the real-life consequences of the practices, knowledge forms and outcomes that are being simulated in the game world. Simply put, there is a difference in *realism* between the dramatic rehearsals of everyday life and in games, which only “play at” or simulate the stakes and 87 risks that characterise the “serious” nature of moral deliberation, i.e. a real-life politician trying to win a parliamentary election experiences more personal and emotional risk than students trying to win the election scenario of *The Power Game*. At the same time, the lack of real-life consequences in educational games makes it possible to design a relatively safe learning environment, where teachers can *stage* particular game scenarios to be enacted and validated for *educational purposes*. In this sense, educational games are able to provide a safe but meaningful way of letting teachers and students make mistakes (e.g. by giving a poor political presentation) and dramatically rehearse particular “competing possible lines of action” that are *relevant* to particular educational goals (Dewey, 1922: 132). Seen from this pragmatist perspective, the educational value of games is not so much a question of learning facts or giving the “right” answers, but more a question of exploring the contingent outcomes and domain-specific processes of problem-based scenarios.

#### And, voting neg is a vote to keep harmful laws on the books – when faced with the choice of keeping crack cocaine sentencing laws, the Jim Crowe laws, Plessy v. Ferguson, the 3/5ths clause and a host of other harmful policies we should stand resolved against them –refusing to participate in governmental action is worse for everyone -- the way that revolutions and insurrections are successful is by having actions come after them.

APA, 04 [American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality, American Political Science Association, <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/taskforcereport.pdf>]

What government does not do is just as important as what it does.35 What our government does these days is especially responsive to the values and interests of the most privileged Americans. Harder to pin down is the effect of disparities of influence on what government fails to do. Through much of U.S. history, our government has responded to the life circumstances of ordinary Americans by enacting major policies to spread opportunities and provide security to millions of individuals and families. Public education, Social Security and Medicare, the G.I. Bill, home-mortgage programs, certain farm programs, and many other efforts have **enhanced the quality of life for millions** of regular Americans.

What is particularly relevant for understanding political inequality in America today is that many these broadly inclusive government programs also encouraged ordinary citizens to become more active participants in our democracy — they helped equalize the voice of citizens in the halls of government. The United States pioneered schooling for all, spending about as much or more than many advanced industrialized countries. Promotion of education has helped to open the door to opportunity for students who work hard, to propel the country’s economy, and to lower economic disparities. It has also boosted participation in volunteer organizations and democratic life. In higher education, the G.I. Bill extended generous assistance to attend universities, community colleges, and vocational schools for millions of veterans of World War II and the Korean War.36 Since the 1970s, federal programs like the Pell Grants and state initiatives have allowed millions of lower- and middle-income students to pursue post-secondary schooling.

Similarly, Social Security, which provides protection against low income in retirement to employees who contribute to the system, has helped to foster an extraordinary level of participation by the elderly in the electoral process and civic life. Social Security has encouraged participation by low- and moderate-income seniors, which means that the elderly are less subject to the skew in favor of the affluent and better educated that generally characterizes political participation in the United States.37