## **1AC**

#### **Despite failing mechanisms the Obama administration continues to back nuclear power as the keystone of its non-carbon energy policy**

Popular Science, 2011 [March 15th, “Secretary Chu Says U.S. Administration Remains Committed to Nuclear Power” <http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2011-03/secretary-chu-says-administration-remains-committed-us-nuclear-power-industry>, V. Guevara]

In testimony today before a Congressional subcommittee, Energy Secretary Steven Chu stood behind the U.S.’s nuclear energy industry, reiterating the administration’s commitment to diversifying the nations energy portfolio. That means a lot of things like wind, solar, and natural gas, Chu said. It also means [more nuclear](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/sc-dc-chu-nuclear-energy-20110316%2C0%2C6758322.story). Speaking to the energy and water subcommittee of the House appropriations committee today, Chu said that administration is also committed to learning from Japan’s experiences during its ongoing nuclear crisis. But he declined to speculate on whether Japan’s disaster would put the kibosh on America’s nuclear ambitions, saying it’s too early to tell. American nuclear power development ceased after the 1979 “partial meltdown” event at Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania, where a mix of design flaws, mechanical failures, and human errors allowed reactor coolant to escape the facility. But nuclear has experienced a resurgence of late, and the President’s 2012 budget calls for $36 billion in loan guarantees to spur growth in the field. Nuclear energy is seen as a key technology to bridge the gap between a carbon-based and a green economy. Chu took the opportunity to bolster assurances made earlier by the White House that America’s nuclear reactors are safe, and that the one-two punch (earthquake followed by tsunami) that compromised the Fukushima Daiichi reactors in Japan couldn’t cause a similar disaster here. That’s all well and good, but it does contradict what some nuclear experts have been saying this week. The Union of Concerned Scientists has been holding [daily pressers](http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear_power/nuclear_power_risk/safety/japan-nuclear-crisis-briefings.html?utm_source=SP&utm_medium=link2&utm_campaign=japan-nuclear-crisis-link2-3-15-11) since Monday, and not only have experts there pointed out that the U.S. has 23 of the same GE Mark 1 containment systems deployed at nuclear facilities around the country--that’s the same design used at Fukushima Daiichi--but also that in a situation where both the primary and secondary power sources fail, the majority of American nuke plants have half the backup battery power that Fukushima Daiichi had (Japan had eight hours of reserve battery power on hand; most American plants have four). We don’t bring this up to be alarmist or to stoke the fear machine, but to point out that even at home in good old, safe America there are safety and regulatory shortcomings that need addressing. Like, now. Sec. Chu assured Congress today that “We will learn from this.” Let’s hope so.

#### The Nuclear Regulatory Commission continues to grant license extensions

Rubin, 2012 [Joe, Center for Investigative Reporting “Aging Nuclear Reactors: Are we doing enough to ensure safety?” Huffington Post <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joe-rubin/nuclear-reactor-safety_b_1336085.html>, V. Guevara]

In the U.S., all nuclear power plants were initially licensed to operate for 40 years, and many aging plants are now reaching the end of that period. The NRC allows nuclear plants to apply for a 20-year license extension; so far 71 out of the country's 104 reactors [have been](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-07/california-nuclear-backlash-mounts-after-japan-meltdown-energy.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_hplink) relicensed. No applications for license renewal have been rejected.

#### The issue is not with nuclear power but with the reactor design. LFTRs, can’t meltdown and can’t be weaponized.

Blue Ribbon Commission, 2011 [May 19th, "The Thorium Paradigm" <http://www.brc.gov/sites/default/files/meetings/presentations/thorium_paradigm_package_m_conley.pdf>, V. Guevara]

In the partial meltdown at Three Mile Island in 1979, the cooling system failed for a mere ten seconds. That’s all it took. At Fukushima, all the control rods dropped the moment the earthquake hit. Which was good; that stopped the fission process. But the fuel rods were still red hot, and they were still tightly packed together. And, there was no electric power to run the cooling system. So when the tsunami flooded the backup generators, everything went to hell in a hand basket. Nuclear power is wonderful stuff, but after a series of spectacular near misses and disasters, a lot of people have written off Uranium reactors as accidents waiting to happen. The numbers on the dice are too big, they’ll tell you. The risks are too great. They’ve had it up to here with nuclear power… But nuclear power isn’t the problem. The problem is with the reactors we’ve been using to produce it. LFTRs are completely different. For one thing, they can’t melt down. Ever. The reason is simple: How do you melt a liquid. Solid fluoride salt melts at 450°C. With a full load of atomic material, the temperature rises to about 700°C (1,300°F.) If the liquid fuel starts to overheat, it expands, which separates the radioactive particles and slows the fission process, cooling the molten salt back down again. This completely eliminates the need for control rods and a cooling system, as well as all of the problems, costs, and risks associated with a pressurized light water reactor. It also entirely eliminates any possibility of a meltdown. Better yet, the fuel will be piped through a processing unit, where the contaminants that spoil solid fuel rods are easily removed. This increases the fuel-burning efficiency of a LFTR to 99%, which greatly reduces the volume and the radioactivity of its waste. Liquid fuel changes everything. A LFTR never operates under pressure because even with a full load of nuclear material, the molten salt is still more than 500°C below its boiling point. And if it ever does start to get too hot, a freeze plug of solid salt in a drainpipe below the reactor will melt away. The fuel will empty into a large holding tank and solidify. On Friday afternoons at Oak Ridge, the research scientists would switch off a common household fan that cooled the freeze plug. The hot salt above the plug would melt it, and the fuel would drain out of the reactor by gravity. On Monday mornings, they would switch on the heating coils and re-melt the fuel, then pump it back into the reactor and turn on the freeze plug fan. Even Homer Simpson couldn’t screw that up. For five years, the reactor practically ran itself. They used to joke that the biggest problem they had was finding something to do. Passive safety isn’t just built into the LFTR; it’s built into the actual fuel itself. The genius of liquid fuel is that the stuff won’t even work unless it’s held within the confined space of a reactor. In a Uranium reactor, the solid fuel rods keep radiating heat even when the control rods are dropped. The cooling system never rests. But when a LFTR shuts down, the fuel shuts down and sleeps like a rock. Because of the constant and absolutely critical need for cooling, all Uranium reactors are located near a large body of water. It’s a tragedy that some were installed near the seashore, in the most earthquake-prone nation in the world, the very country that coined the word tsunami. But when you’re a small, crowded island nation hungry for carbon-free energy, you don’t have much of a choice… Until now. Because LFTRs are air-cooled. That changes everything as well. Because that means they can be installed anywhere. They can even be placed in underground vaults to ward off an attack or a natural disaster. If a vault is near the ocean, a tsunami would roll right over it, like a truck over a manhole cover.

#### Plan: the United States Federal Government should remove all restrictions to the formation of a thorium bank in the United States.

### Advantage 1 is Natives

#### When nuclear energy was discovered, the U.S. had two choices- Uranium or Thorium. One produces weapons while the other produces safe, efficient, waste-free energy. We chose wrong.

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.

#### Excess fissile material has been dumped on Native American tribes all over the country as we continue to push them off their land and into poverty. This is an ongoing Radioactive Genocide

Clarke 02: [Tracylee, Dept of Communication Faculty at California State Univ Channel Islands, environmental mediator and policy analyst "An Ideographic Analysis of Native American Sovereignty in the State of Utah Enabling Denotative Dissonance and Constructing Irreconcilable Conflict" Wicazo Sa Review, 17.2, pp 43-63, V. Guevara]

Targeting a Native American tribe to store nuclear waste is not specific to the Goshutes. Tribes in the United States are increasingly targeted by governments and corporations to consider the economic possibilities of storing nuclear waste on their reservations. The Pine Ridge Sioux, Chippewa, California Campo, Mescalero Apache, Northern Arapaho, Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone, Lower Brule Sioux, Chickasaw, Sac and Fox, Alabama-Quassarta, Ponca, Eastern Shawnee, Caddo, Yakima, and others have either been approached or have applied [End Page 43] to store nuclear waste on their reservations. 1 This has led to much controversy as conflicting ideas about the legal and moral implications of involving Native Americans in the problem of nuclear waste storage come to the forefront of the debate. "Nuclear power symbolizes many of the major social problems of technological change, its effect on traditional values, the industrialization of rural areas, the concentration of economic activity, the centralization of decision-making power, and the pervasive intrusion of government bureaucracies." 2 Some of those involved in the various tribal situations are supportive, but most disapprove, referring to the issue as "self cannibalism" or "radioactive genocide." 3

#### This construction of the waste-land has de-territorialized the land as Native American, and mapped it instead as “Native Corporation” this renders the native peoples invisible creating a form of empire to erase their communities.

Noon 07 [David, Assistant Prof of history at University of Alaska, Southeast "The Triumph of Death: National Security and Imperial Erasures in Don DeLillo's Underworld" Canadian Review of American Studies, 37.1, pp 83-110, V. Guevara]

As Kuletz explains, the land-based native populations who reside¶ in the nuclear landscape bear its weight disproportionately.¶ Canadian Reviewof American Studies 37 (2007)¶ 100¶ Their lands have effectively been constructed in policy discourse¶ as ‘‘wastelands’’ that are, meanwhile, available for massive¶ commitments to resource extraction and waste disposal.¶ Throughout the cold war—and after—the mining and milling¶ of uranium took place in the Navajoan desert, on lands¶ traditionally occupied by Navajo, Hopi, Pueblo, and Ute peoples;¶ additional ancestral lands have been withdrawn from Western¶ Shoshone, Southern Paiute, and other communities to construct¶ the nuclear West, including the Nevada Test Site; other research¶ and testing facilities (such as Los Alamos and White Sands)¶ are located adjacent to Pueblo and Apache land, creating toxic¶ downwind conditions; and the disposal of high- and low-level¶ waste has centred on reservation land held by Mescalero Apache,¶ Skull Valley Goshute, and San Ildefonso Pueblo, among¶ other tribes. The controversial Yucca Mountain site, set to receive¶ the nation’s entire supply of high-level nuclear waste by 2010¶ at the earliest, is located on land sacred to Western Shoshone,¶ Southern Paiute, and Owens Valley Paiute communities¶ (Kuletz 10–2).¶ The nuclear West and its indigenous populations have been¶ ‘‘deterritorialized’’ in multiple ways, so that the region’s Indian¶ presence has gone virtually unrepresented at a number of crucial¶ discursive points (e.g., policy making, epidemiological studies, film¶ and fiction, and so on). Repeating the forms of blindness that are¶ vital to the making of empire, the erasure of native communities¶ from the politics and geography of the nuclear West is required so¶ that the landscape may once more be imagined as empty, useless¶ for anything beyond the bonanza economy of extraction and¶ disposal. Invisible within the construction of the nuclear landscape,¶ indigenous peoples are likewise invisible to the affiliated scientific¶ and technical communities that monitor the consequences of weapons¶ research and testing.

#### This new bribery takes their sovereignty and their lives. This is genocide pure and simple

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)

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 contaminate 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 people 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.¶

#### Remaining silent to Native American genocide results in the extermination of peoples elsewhere. This genocide will come up in other places even worse than before.

Schwab 06, [Gabriele, “Writing against memory and forgetting” Literature and Medicine 25.1 (2006) 95-121]

**Human beings have always silenced violent histories**. Some histories, collective and personal, are so violent we would not be able to live our daily lives if we did not at least temporarily sileonce them. A certain amount of splitting is conducive to survival. Too much **silence**, however, **becomes haunting.** Abraham and Torok link the formation of the crypt with silencing, secrecy, and the phantomatic return of the past. While the secret is intrapsychic and indicates an internal psychic splitting, it can be collectively deployed and shared by a people or a nation. **The** collective or communal **silencing of violent histories leads to the** transgenerational transmission of trauma and the specter of an involuntary **repetition of cycles of violence**. We know this from history, from literature, and from trauma studies. In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, for example, Hannah **Arendt writes about the "phantom world of the dark continent**."[5](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/literature_and_medicine/v025/25.1schwab.html#FOOT5) **Referring to** the **adventurers, gamblers, and criminals who came as luck hunters to South Africa during the gold rush, Arendt describes them as "an inevitable residue of the capitalist system and even the representatives of an economy that relentlessly produced a superfluity of men and capital**" (189). "They were not individuals like the old adventurers," she continues, drawing on Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, "**they were the shadows of events with which they had nothing to do"** (189). **They found the full realization of their "phantomlike-existence" in the destruction of native life**: "Native life lent **these ghostlike events a seeming guarantee against all consequences because anyhow it looked to these men like a 'mere play of shadows**. **A play of shadows, the dominant race could walk through unaffected and disregarded in the pursuit of incomprehensible aims and needs**'" (190). **When European men massacred** these **indigenous peoples,** Arendt argues, **they did so without allowing themselves to become aware of the fact that they had committed murder**. Like Conrad's character **[End Page 100]** Kurtz, many of these adventurers went insane. **They had buried and silenced their guilt;** they had buried **and** silenced their **humanity**. But their deeds came back to haunt them in a vicious cycle of repetition. Arendt identifies **two main political devices for imperialist rule: race and bureaucracy. "Race . . . ,"** she writes, "**was an escape into an irresponsibility where nothing human could any longer exist, and bureaucracy was the result of a responsibility that no man can bear for his fellow-man and no people for another people**" (207). **While the genocide of indigenous peoples under colonial and imperial rule was silenced in a defensive discourse of progressing civilization, it returned with a vengeance**. **Race and bureaucracy were** the two main **devices** **used** **under fascism during the haunting return to the heart of Europe of the violence against other humans developed under colonial and imperial rule. The ghosts of colonial and imperial violence propelled the Jewish holocaust**, Arendt shows. In a similar vein, in *Discourse on Colonialism*, Aime Cesaire talks about **the rise of Nazism in Europe as a "terrific boomerang effect**."[6](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/literature_and_medicine/v025/25.1schwab.html#FOOT6) He argues **that before the people in Europe became the victims of Nazism, they were its accomplices**, that "**they tolerated** that **Nazism before it was inflicted on them**, that **they** absolved it**, shut their eyes to it, legitimized it**, **because**, until then**, it [had] been applied only to non-European peoples**" (36). Cesaire continues, "Yes, it would be worthwhile to study clinically, in detail, the steps taken by Hitler and Hitlerism and to reveal to the very distinguished, very humanistic, very Christian bourgeois of the twentieth century that without being aware of it, **he has a Hitler inside him, that Hitler *inhabits* him, that Hitler is his *demon***" (36, Cesaire's italics). **This is as close as we can come to the argument that, until they face the ghosts of their own history and take responsibility for all the histories of violence committed under their rule, Europeans encrypt the ghost of Hitler in their psychic life.** Cesaire's statement also contains an argument about what Ashis Nandy calls "isomorphic oppressions," that is, about the fact that **histories of violence create psychic deformations not only in the victims but also in the perpetrators**.[7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/literature_and_medicine/v025/25.1schwab.html#FOOT7) **No one colonizes innocently**, Cesaire asserts, and no one colonizes with impunity either. One of the psychic deformations of the perpetrator is that he turns himself into the very thing that he projects onto and tries to destroy in the other: **"[T]he colonizer**, who in order **to ease his conscience gets into the habit of seeing the other man as *an animal*, accustoms himself to treating him like an animal, and tends objectively to transform *himself* into an animal**. It is this result, this boomerang effect of colonization that I wanted to point **[End Page 101]** out" (41, Cesaire's italics).[8](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/literature_and_medicine/v025/25.1schwab.html#FOOT8) What Cesaire calls **the "boomerang effect" emerges from a dialectics of isomorphic oppression that as a rule remains largely unacknowledged and relegated to the cultural unconscious**. **Together with the ghost effect that emerges from the silencing of traumatic memories, this boomerang effect increases the danger of the repetition and ghostly return of violent histories**. What do we have to offset such a vicious circle of violent returns? Many victims emphasize testimony, witnessing, mourning, and reparation. Many theories, including psychoanalysis, concur with this assumption.

#### We don’t need to mine anymore we already have the existing thorium just lying around.

Barton 09, [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.

#### A switch to thorium would use up all of the existing nuclear waste and prevent new waste from being dumped.

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.

### Advantage 2 is Stewardship

#### The START II negotiations yielded a significant arms reduction agreement. The U.S. and the Russians are already disarming to historic levels

Kissinger & Scowcroft, 2012 [Henry Kissinger, Frmr. Secretary of State and National Security Advisor & Brent Scowcroft, Frmr National Security Advisor, Washington Post, " Nuclear weapons reductions must be part of strategic analysis" <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/nuclear-weapon-reductions-must-be-part-of-strategic-analysis/2012/04/22/gIQAKG4iaT_story.html>, V. Guevara]

A New START treaty reestablishing the process of nuclear arms control has recently taken effect. Combined with reductions in the U.S. defense budget, this will bring the number of nuclear weapons in the United States to the lowest overall level since the 1950s. The Obama administration is said to be considering negotiations for a new round of nuclear reductions to bring about ceilings as low as 300 warheads.

#### The impact to disarmament is linear - each decommissioned warhead reduces the risk of the ultimate tragedy

Freeman, 2009 [Lawrence, Prof of war studies at King's College in London and vice principal of the college, "A new theory for nuclear disarmament" Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, V. Guevara]

The numbers ¶ games became complicated by questions of first and second strikes, ¶ but by the end of the Cold War, the United States and Russia each ¶ had well over 20,000 warheads. The arsenals are down to about 5,000 warheads, ¶ with about half that number operational. ¶ President Obama has now mentioned a ¶ target for the next round of strategic arms ¶ talks of about 1,000. A reasonable expectation may be closer to 1,500.¶ It would be ¶ wrong to dismiss the significance of such ¶ a move. Every weapon decommissioned is ¶ one less that might be the subject of some ¶ future, catastrophic accident or security ¶ scare, or mitigation of the ultimate tragedy ¶ should nuclear exchanges begin in earnest.

#### In order to reach Schell’s “end state” we must do more than dismantle our nuclear arsenal, we have to make it disappear. The primary consideration is not the number of remaining weapons but our capacity to rebuild them.

Drell & Goodby, 2009 [Sidney D. Drell, physicist and arms control expert. He is a professor emeritus at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center and a senior fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution, James E. Goodby, Frmr specialist with the US Atomic Energy Commission, vice chairman of START I and non proliferation expert, Fellow at Hoover & Brookings, "A World without Nuclear Weapons: End Stat Issues" Hoover Institution, <http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/Sidney_Drell_James_Goodby_A_World_Without_Nuclear_Weapons_1.pdf>, V. Guevara]

In his 1984 book, The Abolition, Schell describes a condition that we think of as the end state:¶ As reductions continued, the capacity for retaliation would consist less and less of the possession of weapons and more and more of the capacity for rebuilding them, until, at the level of zero, that capacity would be all. Indeed, the more closely we look at the zero point the less of a watershed it seems to be. Examined in detail, it reveals a wide range of¶ alternatives, in which the key issue is no longer the number of weapons in existence but the extent of the capacity and the level of readiness for building more.¶ 9¶ Although it will not be easy to make the political, technical, and military changes necessary to alter the current nuclear-deterrence paradigm, we believe it is possible to make them.¶ These changes would result in a huge improvement over the conditions under which humanity has lived for many decades. The nuclear sword of Damocles would be leashed more ﬁrmly than ever. As Schell suggested, nuclear deterrence would still exist, but it would be latent or virtual rather than made manifest through the deployment of nuclear forces ready for prompt launch. There can be no ﬁnal escape from the catastrophic consequences of initiating nuclear conﬂict. But there could be much more time for careful consideration of the consequences and time to devise less apocalyptic alternatives. Leaders would have time to reﬂect on Ronald Reagan’s conclusion that “a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

#### LFTRs consume the nuclear materials of decommissioned weapons and turns it into fuel for the reactor. The end product of which can never be weaponized

Sorensen, 2010 [Kirk, Fmr NASA engineer & Founder of Flibe Energy, TEAC2 Conference Keynote, <http://energyfromthorium.com/2010/03/29/>, V. Guevara]

Then there’s thorium. Thorium has a special property—it breeds to uranium-233 and uranium-233 fissions and gives off 2 or 3 neutrons that enable it to keep converting more thorium into uranium-233 and burning it. This means that once we start a thorium reactor we can keep it going indefinitely just by adding thorium. But how do we get it started? How much uranium-233 do we need? Well, most of the studies done by Oak Ridge in the 1960s indicated that we could start a one-gigawatt thorium reactor with about 1 tonne of uranium-233. How much do we have right now? About one tonne. So we could only start one reactor, right? With uranium-233, yes, but we need to go about quickly “converting” our fissile materials into uranium-233 so we can start more. Why does it only take one tonne of uranium-233 to start a thorium reactor but it takes 10-15 tonnes of plutonium to start a fast breeder? Here’s why—things look different when you’re a slowed-down neutron versus a fast neutron. When you’re a fast neutron all of this fuel looks really small to you, and you have a lot less probability of causing fission. So you need a lot more fuel to insure that you get enough collisions with fuel to generate the energy you need. On the other hand, when you’re a slowed-down neutron each fuel nucleus looks a lot bigger and you have a much better chance of causing a fission. So having slowed-down neutrons makes your fuel go a lot further than using fast neutrons. This is the basic reason why a thorium reactor with slowed-down neutrons can start with a lot less fuel for a given power rating than a fast reactor with fast neutrons. Each little bit of fuel counts for a lot more in a reactor with slowed-down neutrons. We don’t have to limit ourselves to just uranium-233 to start these thorium reactors. We can use the highly-enriched uranium that we’re recovering from all of the nuclear weapons that we are decommissioning to help us. We can use the plutonium we’re recovering from those weapons. We can use the plutonium that’s been generated in our reactors over the last sixty years to help us. By using slowed-down neutrons and thorium, the startup power of this fuel is magnified by about 1000 to 1500% over a fast reactor.

#### If we don’t deplete the weapons stockpile by consuming the fissile material for power, then the state will continue to hold nuclear weapons as an inexorable legacy worthy of noncontingent preservation

Taylor and Hendry, 2008 [Bryan C., Associate Prof of Communication @ UC Boulder & Judith, Lecturer Dept of Communication and Journalism at University of New Mexico Albuquerque, Summer "Insisting on Persisting: The Nuclear Rhetoric of 'Stockpile Stewardship'" Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 11.2, V. Guevara]

There is much at stake, then, in how nuclear stewardship rhetoric is produced,¶ circulated, and taken up by citizens as “equipment for living” in post–Cold War¶ culture. In this essay, we argue that nuclear officials have employed stewardship¶ rhetoric to cast themselves as exclusive guardians of nuclear resources for the¶ benefit of current and future generations, and to deflect undesirable challenges¶ posed to their continued legitimacy and authority by public reconsideration¶ of nuclear deterrence. Nuclear stewardship discourse, however, is polysemic,¶ unstable, and contested. As a result, its associated rhetoric forms a symbolic site¶ of struggle through which the possibilities of nuclear democracy are alternately¶ opened and foreclosed.¶ We argue that the official rhetoric of stockpile stewardship has succeeded—¶ at least temporarily—in sustaining nuclear weapons institutions through the¶ legitimation crisis posed by the end of the Cold War. While ostensibly promoting¶ the values of stewardship, that rhetoric tilts strongly toward nuclear¶ “guardianship.”7 It continues to employ misleading euphemisms and dauntingly¶ arcane professional codes that insulate nuclear weapons development¶ from adequate oversight and opportunity for dissent. It naturalizes nuclear¶ weapons as a noncontingent artifact of U.S. national security, and minimizes¶ the risks posed by historical and continued nuclear weapons development (for¶ example, in catalyzing international nuclear proliferation). We develop these¶ claims through a critique of three themes in SSP rhetoric.8

#### The elimination of nuclear weapons provides a site of resistance to the military industrial complex’s use of nuclear material. This debate demands that the state reconceive nuclear use as a civilian program instead of normalizing nuclear as a strictly weaponized product that is owned and maintained only by the state.

Taylor and Hendry, 2008 [Bryan C., Associate Prof of Communication @ UC Boulder & Judith, Lecturer Dept of Communication and Journalism at University of New Mexico Albuquerque, Summer "Insisting on Persisting: The Nuclear Rhetoric of 'Stockpile Stewardship'" Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 11.2, V. Guevara]

¶ What then, we may ask, does this debate portend for the future of nuclear¶ weapons, rhetoric, and democracy? Traditionally, the relationship between these¶ phenomena has been, if not antithetical, then deeply conflicted. Oppressive¶ conditions of secrecy, security, centralization, and containment surrounding¶ the institutionalization of nuclear weapons have undermined the willingness¶ and ability of citizens to acquire, deliberate, and act on nuclear information.¶ As a result of decades of conditioning by exclusionary technocratic discourse,¶ the nuclear public has arguably become fragmented, alienated, uninformed,¶ and unable to generate forceful and reasoned discourse. Its members have been¶ dubiously positioned in official rhetoric as passive—and nominally consenting—¶ spectators of a grand, expensive, and terribly dangerous nuclear drama.80¶ As a result, notes political scientist James A. Stegenga, “[t]he main reason that¶ it is difficult to determine the extent of [actual] support for or opposition to¶ nuclear deterrence is that the democratic debate that should furnish the answer¶ has . . . been a shriveled, truncated affair. It has been impaired by various forms¶ of . . . deception, manipulation, intimidation, and discouragement.”81 Here¶ we may consider psychologist Robert J. Lifton and political scientist Richard¶ Falk’s warning that such conditions lead to the “perpetuation of dangerous¶ self-deception and the prevention of the kind of informed exchange that might¶ result in more constructive [nuclear] policies.”82¶ In response, rhetorical critics have sought to challenge the unwarranted¶ exclusion of cultural and political diversity from spheres of nuclear deliberation,¶ and to restore their integrity as a standard for adequate representation of¶ human interests in the management of potentially world-ending military technology.¶ In this process, critics have clarified the intransigence of Cold War and¶ “nuclearist” rhetoric in normalizing nuclear weapons as a legitimate and necessary¶ means of preserving U.S. national security. In this essay, we have argued¶ that the flexibility of this rhetoric has enabled nuclear weapons institutions to, at¶ least temporarily, survive the challenge posed to their authority and mission by¶ the end of the Cold War. Nonetheless, observes Richard Falk, the extraordinary¶ level of violence associated with the use of nuclear weapons creates an ongoing¶ moral and political crisis for all nominally democratic states who develop them:¶ “Normative opposition to nuclear weapons or doctrines inevitably draws into question the legitimacy of state power and is, therefore, more threatening to¶ governmental process than a mere debate about the property of nuclear weapons¶ as instruments of statecraft.”83 For this and other reasons discussed in this¶ essay, nuclear policy rhetoric is highly resistant to changes that arise in cultural¶ consciousness in response to shifting political conditions.¶ As a result, we judge official SSP rhetoric to be an institutional defense¶ mounted against the possibility of undesirable, externally imposed change¶ created as U.S. citizens consider the need for continued nuclear deterrence in¶ the absence of a traditional superpower enemy. Our critique demonstrates the¶ need to reinvigorate the dormant nuclear-public sphere so that citizens—and¶ their elected officials—can adequately deliberate issues surrounding management¶ of the nuclear arsenal. To achieve this goal, significant support must be¶ provided for remedies that empower public understanding of associated technical,¶ value, and policy issues. Ideally, robust programs of education and debate¶ would enable speakers to develop¶ a framework for discussion that allows explicit room for diverse interpretations,¶ to make it possible to recognize common goals where they exist, acknowledge the¶ internal consistency of other positions, and articulate clearly those areas where¶ participants can agree to disagree.84 Subsequent deliberation should consider not only narrow technical arguments¶ but also cherished Maintainer premises, including that SSP officials are¶ the sole credible and dispassionate judges of nuclear safety and reliability; that¶ claims of “confidence” in stockpile “reliability” are referential in nature, and¶ not constitutive or performative; that alleged decreases of warhead safety and¶ reliability resulting from the CTBT genuinely compromise national security;¶ and that nuclear weapons are a necessary or effective instrument of that security.¶ As a result, new options for thought and action may emerge for nuclear¶ officials, workers, and citizens who are currently producing—whether by direct¶ action or tacit consent—the future of nuclear weapons.¶ In the absence of such efforts, deliberation surrounding stockpile stewardship¶ will default to its traditional “guardianship” structure, in which scientific,¶ military, and policy elites presume to control that process in order to protect the¶ public from itself. Indeed, this presumption is exacerbated by the SSP’s “surprisingly¶ strong assumption that the function of the stockpile as a deterrent is¶ based on the credibility of weapons designers and engineers, rather than the¶ technical characteristics of the weapons themselves.”85 One means of transforming this rhetorical situation, then, involves directly engaging the incongruity between nuclear officials’ nominal deference to the demos as owner of the nuclear object, and their actual wariness of citizen voice. Far from intruding on the domain of nuclear policy, citizens and scholars engaging in this debate¶ would be performing necessary—and otherwise neglected—oversight functions.¶ As rhetorical critic David J. Tietge notes, it is a characteristic of the Cold¶ War that nuclear scientists had time to create, but not to adequately anticipate¶ or reflect upon the appropriations and consequences of their creations.86

#### The affirmative ballot is a call to challenge state-activism. Lifting federal restrictions on access to thorium allows private individuals to develop LFTRs, which are designed to consume the nuclear state. It is only by restricting government activity, that we can achieve a free life. Affirming individual liberty versus a status quo of statist control is the only way to avoid extinction.

Kateb, 1986 [George, Professor Emeritus of Politics at Princeton University, "Nuclear Weapons and Individual Rights" Dissent Magazine, V. Guevara]

One task of a renewed and revised individualism is to challenge everyday state-activism.¶ Remote as the connection may seem, the encouragement of state-activism, or the failure to¶ resist it, contributes to nuclear statism, and¶ thus to the disposition to accept and inflict¶ massive ruin and, with that, the unwanted and¶ denied possibility of extinction. In the nuclear¶ situation, one must be attentive to even remote¶ 170 connections that may exist between human¶ activity and human extinction.¶ There are no certainties of analysis on these¶ possible connections. And so far the worst¶ speculative connection is not exemplified in¶ American society. I only mean to refer to the¶ hypothesis offered independently first by Hannah Arendt and then by Michel Foucault;¶ namely, that where the state is regarded both¶ by itself and by the population not as a mere¶ protector of life against domestic or foreign¶ violence but as the source of contented and¶ adjusted and regularized life (through its welfarist policies and other interventions), it is¶ subtly empowered to take the next step and¶ become the source of mass death. What it gives it can take away, like God. But though still¶ short of this extreme, American society is full¶ of serious tendencies of state-activism that indirectly cooperate with the possibility of extinction.¶ BY CONTINUOUSLY EXPANDING THE SCOPE of¶ governmental activity, these tendencies work¶ against one of the principal constituent elements of individualism, the idea that each¶ person should be subject to the smallest possible amount of government regulation that goes¶ beyond insuring the obligation that binds individuals as well as the government: the acknowledgment of and respect for rights. Indeed, the¶ protection of rights and the restriction of governmental activity are jointly at the service of a¶ free life.¶ One's life is not supposed to be arranged or¶ designed by government nor have meaning or¶ coherence given to it by government; nor is one¶ supposed to be helped too much, or saved from¶ oneself, or looked at closely or continuously.¶ One is supposed to be free, autonomous, selfreliant. Individual rights are not always¶ abridged when government acts to substitute¶ itself for the individual and tries to lead our¶ lives for us. Government may abide by the¶ constitutional limitations on itself, and nevertheless fill up too many vacant places in a¶ person's life, thus leaving too little raw material¶ out of which a person develops on his or her¶ own. This ideal of free being is under relentless¶ attack; but the attack could not score its successes unless we cooperated. In cooperating we¶ forget the ideal, or let preliminary aspects of it,¶ like the pursuit of interests and self-regarding¶ claims, exhaustively define the whole ideal.¶ The very notion of rights becomes bloated¶ because of obsession with interests and claims¶ and turns false to itself.¶ Resistance must be offered from within the¶ ideal, not from collectivism or communitarianism, which are both on the side of making a¶ people systematically docile and ready for mobilization. Even if nuclear weapons did not¶ exist, and there were no possibility of extinction, the fight against state-activism would¶ have to be carried on. But the link between¶ state-activism and extinction suggests itself, and a cultivated individualism must be enlisted¶ against such activism and in behalf of avoiding¶ massive ruin and the possibility of extinction.

#### All the private sector needs is for Congress to authorize a thorium bank to allow for the development of thorium for energy

Halper, 2012 [Mark, Smart Planet Contributing Editor & Forbes writer, “Join the Thorium Bank” Smart Planet, <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/intelligent-energy/solve-the-energy-and-rare-earth-crisis-join-the-thorium-bank/17845>, V. Guevara]

¶ Two problems: Most countries in the West lack policy that supports thorium nuclear.¶ Likewise, countries like the U.S. years ago took measures that handed the rare earth¶ business to China.¶ Another issue: Although mining monazite¶ in say, the U.S., could help free the country¶ from China’s rare earth shackles, the¶ presence of thorium in the rock discourages¶ such initiative. That’s because - with no¶ federal thorium nuclear approval in place -¶ mildly radioactive thorium is a costly rare¶ earth byproduct that someone has to safely¶ store away.¶ You would think it’s high time to solve this¶ riddle.¶ Jim Kennedy’s Thorium Bank to the rescue!¶ Kennedy, one of the organizers of the recent Thorium Energy Alliance Conference in¶ Chicago, made a compelling case at the conference for Congress to authorize - but not¶ fund - a “cooperative” responsible for not only taking the thorium off the hands of rare¶ earth mining companies, but also for developing thorium uses and markets, including¶ energy.¶ You can watch a video of Kennedy making his case below. In it, he describes how he¶ and fellow TEAC organizer John Kutsch have been lobbying Congress - so far¶ unsuccessfully.¶ Kennedy is a St. Louis consultant who is also president of a company called ThREEM3¶ that owns rights to the rare earth byproducts from Missouri’s Pea Ridge iron ore mine¶ (which would come from monazite at the mine, I believe).¶ He notes, ”As John and I have been trying to convince Congress…you could create a¶ rare earth cooperative that could receive the thorium-baring monazites, and essentially¶ pull out the rare earths, and then take the thorium liability and hand it over to another¶ entity, something we can just simply call the thorium bank.¶ “And the thorium bank would have a very simple elegant one sentence piece of¶ legislation along with it that says, ‘Congress gives the thorium bank the authority to¶ develop uses and markets for thorium, including energy.’ ”¶ That, he says, would provide “the big tent to develop a thorium energy economy,” and¶ would include Western partners and owners who would participate in the revenue¶ stream and, by the way, create jobs.¶ Kennedy suggests calling the entity the “Thorium Storage and Industrial Products¶ Corporation.”¶ He describes it as, “Something to give the public confidence - a federally chartered¶ facility that’s going to accept every single gram of thorium and all the other actinides¶ that are produced.¶ “That thorium bank would solve the rare earth crisis in the United States in Japan in¶ Korea in Europe. Everyone could participate and own. And own the offtake. Because it¶ would be a co-op. And then you would relegate the risk over to this facility. And this¶ facility would be the big tent where people could come in and either contribute capital¶ or IP.”¶ Kennedy, a firm believer in market forces, bristles at people who have objected to his¶ proposed co-operative as “socialistic.”¶ “They forgot how the highway system was built, or how we led the world in avionics.”¶ He points out that the plan put forth by him and Kutsch, “Isn’t asking the government¶ for a dime. We’re just saying give us a pathway so that people can invest intelligently¶ and safely.”