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**Tanya and I affirm the resolution: The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in domestic nuclear energy.**

**Contention 1: American hegemony**

**American adversaries dominate nuclear energy**

**Cohen 24**(Dr. Ariel Cohen, Ph.D. is a Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council and the Founding Principal of International Market Analysis, a Washington, D.C.-based global risk advisory boutique. He is also Managing Director of the Energy, Growth, and Security Program (EGS) and a Senior Fellow with the International Tax and Investment Center (ITIC). 7 June 2024, “China And Russia Now Dominate The Global Nuclear Trade” Forbes,<https://www.forbes.com/sites/arielcohen/2024/06/07/china-and-russia-now-dominate-the-global-nuclear-trade/>, DOA: 3/5/25) LLO

Russia is not alone in surpassing the US. **China is also far ahead of the US in the nuclear energy industry. China’s nuclear power industry has retained its domestic focus, with** [**twenty-three power plants**](https://www.worldnuclearreport.org/IMG/pdf/wnisr2023-table02-reactors_under_construction.pdf) **under construction in China as of July 2023.** This is due to [increasing energy demand](https://www.iaea.org/bulletin/how-china-has-become-the-worlds-fastest-expanding-nuclear-power-producer), as China continues to develop its economy. The United States is constructing a [single nuclear power plant](https://www.statista.com/statistics/513671/number-of-under-construction-nuclear-reactors-worldwide/). **While China has refined its nuclear power production process, the last plant built in the** [**US arrived 7 years late and 17 billion dollars over budget**](https://apnews.com/article/georgia-nuclear-power-plant-vogtle-rates-costs-75c7a413cda3935dd551be9115e88a64)**, as a testament to America’s byzantine permitting and environmental review system.** **China has built upon this expertise also to begin supplying reactors abroad. The China National Nuclear Corporation and China General Nuclear Power Group have** [**developed**](https://www.cipe.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Nuclear-Dragon-Goes-Abroad.pdf) **a third-generation reactor called Hualong One.** This new reactor began operations in [2021](https://apnews.com/article/china-nuclear-power-7996f4ec51f0a70716da779eb8ff237f) in Fuqing**. In 2023,** [**China began construction**](https://www.voanews.com/a/china-begins-construction-of-pakistan-s-largest-nuclear-power-plant-/7181016.html) **on the Chashma-5 nuclear power plant in Pakistan, which will use Hualong One reactors. Such actions contribute to China’s capacity to construct infrastructure abroad and expand its influence.** The American nuclear power industry was once the world's envy, peaking with [112 operational reactors](https://www.statista.com/statistics/184981/number-of-nuclear-power-plants-in-the-us/) in 1990, with America on a path to carbon neutrality much earlier than current predictions. **34 years later, the United States has lost nearly a third of its operational nuclear reactors, has built almost no new ones, and its average reactor age is decades old. If nothing is done to rectify this, in the next 10-15 years, scores of nuclear reactors will have to be retired as their operational lifecycles end, and as a result, America will have to contend with** [**nearly 20% of its electricity capacity**](https://www.energy.gov/nuclear) **evaporating.**

**Cohen 24** (Dr. Ariel Cohen, Ph.D. is a Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council and the Founding Principal of International Market Analysis, a Washington, D.C.-based global risk advisory boutique. He is also Managing Director of the Energy, Growth, and Security Program (EGS) and a Senior Fellow with the International Tax and Investment Center (ITIC). 7 June 2024, “China And Russia Now Dominate The Global Nuclear Trade” Forbes,<https://www.forbes.com/sites/arielcohen/2024/06/07/china-and-russia-now-dominate-the-global-nuclear-trade/>, DOA: 3/5/25) LLO

**Through Rosatom, Russia remains the global leader in nuclear reactor construction.** According to the World Nuclear Strategy Report, **as of July 2023, Russia had** [**twenty-four**](https://www.worldnuclearreport.org/IMG/pdf/wnisr2023-table02-reactors_under_construction.pdf)**. Nuclear reactors under** [**construction**](https://www.worldnuclearreport.org/IMG/pdf/wnisr2023-table02-reactors_under_construction.pdf) **in seven countries: China, India, Turkey, Egypt, Bangladesh, Iran, and Slovakia. For comparison, the US was constructing zero. Russia dominates the nuclear industry in more areas than just reactors. They also have the** [**largest**](https://www.rferl.org/a/russia-nuclear-power-industry-graphics/32014247.html) **uranium conversion and enrichment industries in the world, at 38% and 46% of international capacity**, respectively, in 2020. **This makes it a major fuel exporter as well. Russia exported** [**over $1 billion**](https://static.rusi.org/RUSI-Russian-Exports-final-web_0.pdf#:~:text=Russian%20customs%20data%2C%20sourced%20though%20a%20third-party%20commercial,exports%20to%20members%20of%20NATO%20and%20the%20EU.) **worth of nuclear energy-related products from February 2022-2024. Two of the countries in which Russia is constructing nuclear power plants, Turkey and Slovakia, are NATO members.** They are not alone amongst the collective West in enabling Russia’s nuclear dominance while ostensibly being committed to containing the Kremlin.As my colleague Wesley A. Hill wrote, Russian-enabled [geopolitical turmoil in Africa](https://nationalinterest.org/feature/russia%E2%80%99s-kitchen-chaos-west-africa-206681), which Russia is using to [try to acquire formerly French uranium assets](https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/russian-federation-wants-to-acquire-uranium-assets-in-niger-isw/ar-BB1nAkmN), helped force Europe to [double its import](https://bellona.org/news/nuclear-issues/2024-03-europe-russian-nuclear-fuel) of Russian uranium in 2023. The US was no better, remaining [dependent on Russian nuclear exports](https://www.ft.com/content/2c9c325e-e734-4a9f-b089-2f64deebc658) even after the war in Ukraine restarted in 2022. The US [imported Russian nuclear fuel](https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/ban-russian-uranium-aims-revive-american-supply-2024-06-04/) until May 14th, 2024, over two years after Russia’s invasion of Ukraine began, from the same entities that the White House sanctioned.

**And, America is losing influence**

**Policy Circle 24** (Policy Circle is a digital platform that offers in-depth coverage of public policy issues in governance, environment, and society. It was launched in 2020 by a group of policy experts who share a vision of promoting evidence-based policymaking and constructive policy dialogue. It also organises summits, roundtables, and online discussions to bring together policymakers, researchers, corporate executives, professionals, and other stakeholders to deliberate on policy issues. December 27, 2024 “End of American hegemony: Can the superpower reinvent power for the 21st century” Policy Circle,<https://www.policycircle.org/world/end-of-american-hegemony/>, DOA: 3/28/25) LLO

**In 2010, a** [**historian**](https://www.fairobserver.com/author/alfred-w-mccoy/) **predicted that the American hegemony might end by 2025 — not with a bang but with a whimper** **— as domestic divisions deepened and rival powers rose to challenge its authority. Today, that prediction appears prophetic** as America faces increasing pressures from within and outside. Even as the US retains military dominance and an economy capable of immense influence, **the structural underpinnings of its global power are eroding. This decline, though not necessarily terminal, signals a transition away from the so-called American Century. Historically, the US leveraged its unmatched economic strength, technological innovation, and cultural influence to dominate the post-World War II global order. However, the foundations of the American hegemony are crumbling. The US share of global GDP has steadily declined,** falling from 50% in the mid-20th century to approximately 15% today when adjusted for purchasing power parity. **The globalisation, initially championed by the US, has redistributed industrial power, with China emerging as a key beneficiary. China’s rise has reoriented global economic networks, particularly in the Global South.** In contrast to America’s interventionist foreign policy, **China has cultivated influence through infrastructure investments, soft power campaigns**, and state-sponsored media. The United States, while still a major player, has failed to present an alternative vision that resonates with developing nations, where perceptions of Chinese leadership are increasingly favourable.

**Affirming enables exports**

**Bowen et al 20** (Matt Bowen is a research scholar at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University School of International Public Affairs and a senior fellow at the Atlantic Council Global Energy Center. Jackie (Kempfer) Siebens is a senior policy adviser for the energy and climate program at Third Way and a senior fellow at the Atlantic Council Global Energy Center. Jennifer T. Gordon is the managing editor and senior fellow for nuclear energy at the Atlantic Council Global Energy Center. 10/7/20, “Strengthening cooperation with allies could help the United States lead in exporting carbon-free nuclear energy”, The Atlantic Council,<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/energysource/strengthening-cooperation-with-allies-could-help-the-united-states-lead-in-exporting-carbon-free-nuclear-energy/>   //.  DOA: 3/3/25)JDE

First, **the federal government should establish a more comprehensive and coordinated interagency system focused on the development and deployment of civilian nuclear technologies**, which would **support bringing advanced nuclear power to the global market.** This would involve establishing a collaborative network of nuclear-specific staff positions embedded in the collection of government agencies that **play a meaningful role in safely and securely developing**, deploying, and exporting US energy **technologies**. Similar to the “Team USA” whole-of-government approach first initiated under the Obama Administration, a network of nuclear-specific staff positions could be located across different US agencies including: the Department of Energy, Department of State, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, National Security Council (NSC), Department of Commerce, and any future Climate Office. While the Obama Administration created an NSC role to coordinate interagency nuclear policy, and the DOE report released earlier this year, [Restoring America’s Competitive Nuclear Advantage](https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2020/04/f74/Restoring%20America%27s%20Competitive%20Nuclear%20Advantage_1.pdf), recommended reinstating that role, there is currently no high-level mechanism for interagency coordination on US nuclear exports. And, **since it is difficult to export a product that lacks a domestic market, continued policy support for constructing advanced reactors here in the United States is imperative.**

**Exports secure positive global relationships**

**Graham 19** (Thomas Graham is a retired diplomat who helped negotiate every international arms control and nonproliferation agreement from 1970 to 1977, co-chair of the Nuclear Energy and National Security Coalition, 5/29/19, “National security stakes of US nuclear energy” The Hill,<https://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/445550-national-security-stakes-of-us-nuclear-energy/>, DOA: 3/4/25) ST

We have dedicated our careers to controlling the destructive potential of nuclear weapons. But since the Atoms for Peace era, **U.S. leadership in supplying peaceful nuclear energy technology, equipment, and fuel to the world has been important for world development and therefore critical for the United States to establish and enforce standards for nuclear safety, security and nonproliferation**. But in recent decades, the U.S. share of international commercial nuclear energy markets has diminished, and so with it has the United States’ ability to influence global standards in peaceful nuclear energy. The critical moment for U.S. leadership in nuclear energy is when a country is developing nuclear energy for the first time. **The supplier country and the developing country typically forge a relationship that endures for the 80- to 100-year** life of the nuclear program. Unlike a coal or gas plant**, nuclear reactors need specialized fuel and maintenance. Once established, the bilateral commercial relationship is not easily dislodged by a rival nation, providing the supplier profound and lasting influence on the partner’s nuclear policies and practices.** **Russia and China have identified nuclear energy as a strategic export, to be leveraged for geopolitical influence as well as for economic gain.** According to a recent analysis, **Russia is the supplier of more nuclear technology than the next four largest suppliers combined, and China is quickly emerging as a rival. If the United States fails to compete in commercial markets, it will cede leadership to these countries on nuclear safety, security and nonproliferation, as well as foreign policy influence.** As the competition intensifies to deliver **the next generation of nuclear power technologies**, U.S. nuclear leadership is approaching a watershed opportunity. Simpler, scalable, and less expensive, small and advanced reactors **are commercially attractive to an expanded range of markets** — particularly in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. The United States has the world’s best training and development programs, unmatched regulatory experience, and multiple small and advanced reactor designs; we should be the easy choice for the next generation of nuclear technology. But early U.S. engagement in these important geopolitical regions is critical. Without it, **Russia and China will lock up future nuclear markets through MOUs and other bilateral agreements.** And for addressing the national security risks of climate change, nuclear energy is not just an option but a necessity. Developing nations that are planning to meet power and water needs for large and growing populations must have reliable, demonstrated, zero-emission nuclear power in order to meet global climate goals as well. Advanced reactors are integral to these goals. In the United States, nuclear energy is responsible for a fifth of the United States’ total electricity and more than 55 percent of our emissions-free energy, but the pace of domestic construction of new natural gas plants far exceeds the few nuclear plants under development, and the existing fleet is retiring prematurely at an alarming rate. Which brings us back to the domestic nuclear industry**. U.S. global competitiveness and leadership are inextricably linked to a strong domestic nuclear program. Without a healthy domestic fleet of plants, the U.S. supply chain will weaken against international rivals. Russia has brought six new plants online in the past five years and has six more plants currently under construction. In the same period, China has brought 28 new plants online and has 11 others under construction. These domestic projects provide Russia and China with a robust supply chain, an experienced workforce, and economies of scale that make them more competitive in bidding on international projects. Unless we continue to innovate and build new plants, we will cease to be relevant elsewhere.** Even our own domestic energy security is supported by nuclear power. The nuclear plants operating today are the most robust elements of U.S. critical infrastructure, offering a level of protection against natural and adversarial threats that is unmatched by other plants. Because the nation’s grid supplies power to 99 percent of U.S. military installations, large scale disruptions affect the nation’s ability to defend itself. **We can regain U.S. leadership in nuclear energy. The key steps are to maintain the domestic reactor fleet, with its reservoir of know-how, and to assist American entrepreneurs in developing the next generation of the technology**.

**US hegemony deters multiple revisionists**

**Ignatieff 24** (Michael Ignatieff is Professor of History at Central European University and the author of On Consolation: Finding Solace in Dark Times (Metropolitan Books, 2021)., , “The Threat to American Hegemony is Real,” 3-15-2024, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/us-western-hegemony-vulnerable-to-russian-chinese-coordinated-challenge-by-michael-ignatieff-2024-03, // accessed 10-29-2024)ops

**The post-1945 world order** – written into international law, ratified by the United Nations, and kept in place by the balance of nuclear terror among major powers – **is hanging by a thread**. The United States is divided against itself and stretched to the limits of its capabilities. Europe is waking up to the possibility that, come November, America may no longer fulfill its collective-defense obligations under Article 5 of the NATO treaty. Faced with this new uncertainty, Europe is cranking up its defense production, and European politicians are screwing up the courage to persuade their electorates that they will need to ante up 2% of their GDP to guarantee their own safety. **The Western alliance** doesn’t just face the challenge of doubling down on defense while maintaining unity across the Atlantic. It also now **faces an “axis of resistance” that might be tempted to threaten Western hegemony with a simultaneous, coordinated challenge**. The lynchpin of this axis is the Russia-China “no-limits” partnership. While the Chinese supply the Russians with advanced circuitry for their weapons systems, Russian President Vladimir Putin ships them cheap oil. **Together they have imposed autocratic rule over most of Eurasia**. If **Ukraine’s exhausted defenders are forced to concede Russian sovereignty over Crimea and the Donbas region, the Eurasian axis of dictators will have succeeded in changing a European land frontier by force**. **Achieving this will threaten every state on the edge of Eurasia: Taiwan, the Baltic countries, and even Poland**. Both **dictatorial regimes will use their vetoes on the UN Security Council to ratify conquest, effectively consigning the UN Charter to history’s dustbin**. **This partnership of dictators works in tandem with a cluster of rights-abusing renegades**, led by Iran and North Korea. The **North Koreans provide Putin with artillery shells while plotting to invade the rest of their peninsula.** The Iranians manufacture the drones that terrorize Ukrainians in their trenches. Meanwhile, **Iran’s proxies – Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis – are helping Russia and China by tying down America and Israel**. Unless the US can force Israel into a long-term ceasefire, **it will find itself struggling to control conflicts on three fronts (Asia, Europe, and the Middle East)**. Not even a country that outspends its rivals on defense by two to one can maintain a war footing simultaneously across so many theaters. The idea that democracies around the world will join up with America and Europe against the authoritarian threat seems like an illusion. **Instead of joining with the embattled democracies of the Global North, the rising democracies of the Global South – Brazil, India, and South Africa – seem unembarrassed to be aligning with regimes that rely on mass repression**, the cantonment of entire populations (the Uighurs in China), and shameless murder (Navalny being only the most recent example). To be sure, **the authoritarian axis currently is united only by what it opposes: American power**. It is otherwise divided by its ultimate interests. The Chinese, for example, cannot be overjoyed that the Houthis are blocking freight traffic through the Red Sea. The world’s second most powerful economy doesn’t have all that much in common with an impoverished Muslim resistance army or with theocratic Iran. Moreover, **both Russia and China remain parasitic beneficiaries of a global economy that is sustained by US alliances and deterrence**. That is why they still hesitate to challenge the hegemon too directly. However, like sharks, they smell blood in the water. **They have not only survived US sanctions but continued to prosper, replacing their dependence on embargoed markets with new markets in Latin America, Asia, and India**. Both Russia and China have discovered that American control of the global economy is not what it once was. **This discovery of American weakness might tempt them to risk a joint military challenge**. As matters stand, **US diplomacy and deterrence have successfully kept the axis divided**. CIA Director William Burns and National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan are keeping the channels open to China. Blowback American strikes against Iran have apparently convinced the theocrats to rein in Hezbollah and the militias in Iraq – though not the Houthis, whom nobody seems able to control. It doesn’t take strategic genius to see the opportunity China and Russia might be contemplating. **If they decided to mount an overt challenge to the American order** – for example, with a coordinated, **simultaneous offensive against Ukraine and Taiwan – the US would struggle to rush weapons and technology into the breach**. **Nuclear weapons would not** necessarily **deter China and Russia from risking a coordinated attempt to take Taiwan and the rest of Ukraine**. All parties would pay a horrendous price, but **Russia has shown what it is willing to expend in Ukraine, and both China and Russia may believe that there will never be a more opportune moment to overthrow American hegemony. If they were to combine forces, we would face the most serious challenge to the global economic and strategic order since 1945**. Nobody has any idea what the world would be like on the other side of such a confrontation. We cannot even assume, as we have always done, that America would prevail if faced with a simultaneous challenge from two formidable powers. If a pessimist is someone who imagines the worst in order to forestall it, we should all be pessimists. **Keeping the authoritarian axis from becoming a full-fledged alliance should be America’s first-order priority**.

**Great power war would be detrimental**

**Clare 21** (Stephen Clare: Research Fellow at the Forethought Foundation for Global Priorities Research Fellow, November 2021, “Great Power Conflict,”<https://dkqj4hmn5mktp.cloudfront.net/Great_Power_Conflict_report_Founders_Pledge_e4124df2ac.pdf> , Founders Pledge .//. DOA: 12/11/24) TZL

This report explores issues at the intersection of international relations, conflict studies, and longtermism.l In it, we draw extensively on the mainstream international relations literature but focus specifically on understanding the potential effects of war on the long-term future. Taking **a lng-term view focuses our attention on the risk a Great Power war poses to humanity's future potential. Extinction, an unrecoverable collapse of civilization, or a permanent end to humanity's growth** and progress **would** all **destroy the long-term potential of our species**. We call events that could lead to one of **these** scenarios **existential risks** .2 Such an event, if it occurred, would be unprecedented in human history. It **would cause unimaginable suffering for everyone alive today and extinguish any possibility for trillions of our would-be descendants to live happy lives**. **Some** of these global catastrophic risks, like an asteroid impact, **are direct risks. By contrast, Great Power conflict is a risk factor**: it is **connected to multiple other risks**, and **raising or lowering the amount of conflict affects the seriousness of** the **threats** we face **in** these **other areas**. In section 4 of this report we consider several concrete pathways through which **Great Power conflict poses a global catastrophic risk**. We will sort these pathways into three broad categories. First, we consider ways in which Great Power conflict poses a risk **even without a full-blown war breaking out**. For example, **a new Cold War could hasten the development of dangerous technologies or cause a breakdown in cooperation that precludes international agreements to mitigate other existential risks**. Second, **a Great Power war could itself be a global catastrophic risk**. In an all-out war between Great Power nations, **weapons with the potential to kill everyone on earth or irreparably damage civilization could be used**. Or, **in the aftermath** of a major war, **the victorious side could** emerge as a global hegemon that is able to **use advanced technologies to lock in** its **sub-optimal values**. 3 Third, **a Great Power war could weaken humanity and leave us more vulnerable to subsequent disasters**, like a serious pandemic.

**Contention 2: Nuclear energy boosts desalination**

**Droughts are becoming more common and stronger**

**According to UN 22**

The report reveals that **from 1970 to 2019, weather, climate and water hazards, accounted for 50 per cent of disasters and 45 per cent of disaster-related deaths,** mostly in developing countries.

Moreover, while **droughts represented 15 per cent of natural disasters, they accounted for approximately 650,000 deaths** throughout that period.

And from 1998 to 2017, **droughts triggered global economic losses of roughly $124 billion** – **a number** and duration of **which [has]** have **risen 29 per cent since 2000.**

Meanwhile in 2022, more than 2.3 billion people are facing water stress and almost 160 million children are exposed to severe and prolonged droughts.

**Droughts have deep, widespread and underestimated impacts on societies, ecosystems, and economies, having impacted some 1.4 billion people between 2000 and 2019.** Second only to flooding, droughts inflict the greatest suffering on women and girls in developing countries, in terms of education, nutrition, health, sanitation, and safety. The publication explains that 72 per cent of women and nine per cent of girls are burdened with collecting water, in some cases spending as much as 40 per cent of their calorific intake carrying it. *Drought in Numbers* paints a grim picture surrounding ecosystems as well, noting that the percentage of plants affected by drought has more than doubled in the last 40 years – with about 12 million hectares of land lost each year to drought and desertification. Meanwhile, they are becoming increasingly common in the vast Amazon region, which has suffered three widespread droughts that triggered massive forest fires throughout the first two decades of this century. If Amazonian deforestation continues unabated, 16 per cent of the region’s remaining forests will likely burn by 2050, warned the report. And in Europe, photosynthesis was reduced by 30 per cent during a 2003 summer drought there.

In the past century, more than 10 million people died due to major drought events, which also generated several hundred billion dollars in economic losses worldwide. And the numbers are rising. While severe drought affects Africa more than any other continent – accounting for 44 per cent of the global total – over the past century, 45 major drought events have also affected millions of people in Europe – affecting an average of 15 per cent of that continent’s land and 17 per cent of its population.

**In the United States, drought-induced crop failures and other economic losses have totalled $249 billion since 1980 alone**, and over the past century, Asia was the continent with the highest total number of humans affected by drought.

**US trade linkages mean that if America reduces production of food, food shocks go global --- climate change means they’re reliant on imports. Win 20 writes,**

[Thin Lei Win, 3-19-2020, Climate shocks in just one country could disrupt global food supply, Reuters,[<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climate-change-usa-food/climate-shocks-in-just-one-country-could> disrupt-global-food-supply-idUSKBN2170GZ/ //SJID]

ROME (Thomson Reuters Foundation) - Catastrophic crop failures caused by extreme weather in just one country could disrupt global food supplies and drive price spikes in an interconnected world, exposing how climate change threatens global stability, researchers said on Friday. They examined how the global trade and supplies of wheat, a crop used for food staples like bread and pasta, would be affected by four years of severe drought in the United States, one of the world’s top exporters of the grain. Based on two models of how countries could try to meet their needs, an international research team found the United States would deplete nearly all its wheat reserves after four years in both scenarios, while global stocks could drop by 31%. **The 174 countries** to which **America exports wheat would see their reserves decrease**, even though they did not themselves suffer failed harvests, according to a study published in the journal Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems. “It affects almost every country in the world because the U.S. has **so many trade links**,” said lead author Alison Heslin, a researcher at Columbia University’s Center for Climate Systems Research and NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies. **Those links mean there is a cascading effect,** either directly **from the United States or via one of its trading partners**, which could reduce the amount of wheat available and increase prices, she told the Thomson Reuters Foundation. As reserves are depleted, changes in production would have a bigger impact on the price of food, Heslin added. Reduced global reserves would also mean a **smaller buffer** against future shocks such as a drought in other wheat-producing nations like Russia or France, she said. Scientists have warned hotter temperatures and more erratic rainfall could increase the frequency and intensity of droughts, with multi-year droughts already **wreaking havoc in many nations**. Five years of recurring droughts have destroyed maize and bean harvests in Central America’s Dry Corridor, for example, leaving poor farmers struggling to feed their families and pushing them to migrate, the United Nations said in 2019. The wheat study was based on data from the 1930s American Dust Bowl disaster when maize and wheat production plummeted due to intense drought, higher temperatures and strong winds, causing thousands of deaths. Heslin said globalfood security was key to people’s health and safety, with international food price spikesin 2008 and 2011 curtailing families’ ability to purchase food and rattling **political stability** as people protested on the streets. Maintaining strategic food reserves and a diverse set of trading partners could help countries reduce risks, she added.

**The British Ecology Society adds that**

We found that **the likelihood of extreme drought events increased from an average of one event every 20 years** in the baseline period, **to one event every 3 years by 2040.** Typical **events were projected to be up to 2–3 months longer, with an average of 11 extra drought months per decade.** Increases were projected throughout the country, but the effect was most severe in the east, and during autumn. Ombrotrophic wetlands have some level of adaptive resilience to drought, but are considered at high risk as several key sites are in drought hotspot areas.zsd

**Nuclear energy provides a new source of water**

**Science Direct 25 proves that**

**Nuclear** [**desalination**](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/desalination) **has** been defined as the use of both electricity and heat generated by [nuclear power plant](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/nuclear-power-plant) to remove salt and minerals from seawater. It has **accumulated a couple of hundred of reactor-years of successful operations around the globe**. A combination of a variety of **desalination techniques** (thermal or membrane in single or hybrid mode) **have been** shown to be **successfully coupled with different types of** [**nuclear power plants**](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/nuclear-power-plant) **to produce water and electricity at different scales**. The economics of nuclear desalination has been found to be competitive with other desalination techniques driven by other sources of energy. Nuclear desalination doesn’t require additional [safety measures](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/safety-measure) than those already existing for the nuclear power plant. Special consideration for potential water radiation contamination is achieved through insertion of additional physical barrier between the nuclear island and pathways of final water product. Marine, coastal, atmospheric, siting, and socioeconomic **impacts of nuclear desalination have been shown to be either equivalent or** (in some cases) **better than those when other energy sources are used.** Finally, efforts are under way to improve existing desalination techniques and invent new ones to increase the efficiency of nuclear desalination. Integrated solutions and systems have also been proposed to use multiple energy sources, including nuclear and renewable energies to meet multiple needs, including water desalination, industrial process steam, [hydrogen production](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/hydrogen-production), [electricity generation](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/power-generation), and district heating. This will allow for resource optimization while minimizing the overall environmental impact of the proposed integrated solution.

**Making agriculture drought resistant is essential to avoiding food price fluctuations**

**Boise State, 25 points out that**

Because of these measures of effectiveness and legitimacy, H2 posits that **the change in food prices is a statistically significant determinant in the shift in state fragility.** This demonstrates that the government is failing to provide essential services to their people. H2 reflects an argument for how **food prices** may **act as a threat multiplier for civil unrest, violent civil conflict, and eventual state collapse. This is especially likely in countries where the Human Development Index is lower. When a country is less developed, it is far more susceptible to shocks to its system.** In this case, the exogenous shock would be an increase in food prices that it is unable to deal with and that will lead to issues from the individuals within the state.

**But right now droughts cause changes to food pricing**

**ABC 25 proves that**

**"These** catastrophic weather **events will lead to temperature and rain variations,** increasing the risk for the farmer and in turn, **affecting food availability and ultimately food prices**," she said. "We've seen this in the past before, so the trend is still the same, if not getting worse."

**Food prices cause unrest**

**Todd, 25 reinstates that**

**Results from the second stage of the model provide the answer to the central research question. The estimates are presented as marginal percentage changes in the odds of unrest (see Figure 5a). Each additional percentage point increase in the domestic consumer food price index leads to a 24.1 percent increase in the odds of unrest. Not surprisingly, the occurrence of unrest in the previous month is also a strong predictor of unrest. The odds of unrest in the current month are 35.3 percent higher if there was unrest in the previous month. The occurrence of national elections is a strong predictor of unrest as well. The odds of unrest in an election month are 61.9 percent higher than in a month without elections. Rainfall abundance, although leading to lower consumer food prices, leads to a statistically significant increase in the odds of unrest.**

**Thus to ensure a stable future or even a future at all, Carrollton urges you to vote Aff**