Terms of Reference

for Nuclear Power vs. Global Climate Change

Before we begin, I'd like to know your opinions about a few controversial issues that are bound to arise in subsequent discussions. I will pose these as bold assertions and you can express your reaction to each in as much or as little detail as you see fit. If you have a lot to say, please email me at jessh.brewer@gmail.com — otherwise (or in addition) please just check one of the boxes (AGREE | DISAGREE | UNDECIDED) for each below:

	AGREE	DISAGREE	UNDECIDED
Anthropic Global Climate Change (AGCC): Thanks to human activities and the "Greenhouse Effect", the Earth's atmosphere is retaining the Sun's heat more effectively, causing overall global warming, sea level rise and destabilized weather patterns, manifested as an increased frequency of extreme weather events of all sorts.			
The solution to AGCC is to stop mining and using fossil fuels, restore natural forests and grow back our soil for carbon sequestration.			
Modern civilization requires an enormous amount of energy, without which we would quickly starve. (In North America today, it takes on average over a liter of fuel to produce a liter of food.)			
Geothermal and hydroelectric power are already close to their limited capacity, whereas "renewable" energy sources such as solar and wind are intermittent and therefore inadequate to meet all our energy needs.			
No one has ever made a nuclear weapon from spent nuclear reactor fuel.			
Nuclear fission reactors have proven hundreds of times safer than coal-burning power plants, even if you include Chernobyl.			
Most radiation is relatively harmless and can even be beneficial to health.			