## 1AC

### Advantage 1

#### Pyro-processing is key to stop climate change we’re close to the tipping point.

Steve Kirsch, 11-25-2009, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “Why We Should Build an Integral Fast Reactor Now,” <http://skirsch.wordpress.com/2009/11/25/ifr/>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

To prevent a climate disaster, we must eliminate virtually all coal plant emissions worldwide in 25 years. The best way and, for all practical purposes, the only way to get all countries off of coal is not with coercion; it is to make them want to replace their coal burners by giving them a plug-compatible technology that is less expensive. The IFR can do this. It is plug-compatible with the burners in a coal plant (see Nuclear Power: Going Fast). No other technology can upgrade a coal plant so it is greenhouse gas free while reducing operating costs at the same time. In fact, no other technology can achieve either of these goals. The IFR can achieve both. The bottom line is that without the IFR (or a yet-to-be-invented technology with similar ability to replace the coal burner with a cheaper alternative), it is unlikely that we’ll be able to keep CO2 under 450 ppm. Today, the IFR is the only technology with the potential to displace the coal burner. That is why restarting the IFR is so critical and why Jim Hansen has listed it as one of the top five things we must do to avert a climate disaster.[4] Without eliminating virtually all coal emissions by 2030, the sum total of all of our other climate mitigation efforts will be inconsequential. Hansen often refers to the near complete phase-out of carbon emissions from coal plants worldwide by 2030 as the sine qua non for climate stabilization (see for example, the top of page 6 in his August 4, 2008 trip report). To stay under 450ppm, we would have to install about 13,000 GWe of new carbon-free power over the next 25 years. That number was calculated by Nathan Lewis of Caltech for the Atlantic, but others such as Saul Griffith have independently derived a very similar number and White House Science Advisor John Holdren used 5,600 GWe to 7,200 GWe in his presentation to the Energy Bar Association Annual Meeting on April 23, 2009. That means that if we want to save the planet, we must install more than 1 GWe per day of clean power every single day for the next 25 years. That is a very, very tough goal. It is equivalent to building one large nuclear reactor per day, or 1,500 huge wind turbines per day, or 80,000 37 foot diameter solar dishes covering 100 square miles every day, or some linear combination of these or other carbon free power generation technologies. Note that the required rate is actually higher than this because Hansen and Rajendra Pachauri, the chair of the IPCC, now both agree that 350ppm is a more realistic “not to exceed” number (and we’ve already exceeded it). Today, we are nowhere close to that installation rate with renewables alone. For example, in 2008, the average power delivered by solar worldwide was only 2 GWe (which is to be distinguished from the peak solar capacity of 13.4GWe). That is why every renewable expert at the 2009 Aspen Institute Environment Forum agreed that nuclear must be part of the solution. Al Gore also acknowledges that nuclear must play an important role. Nuclear has always been the world’s largest source of carbon free power. In the US, for example, even though we haven’t built a new nuclear plant in the US for 30 years, nuclear still supplies 70% of our clean power!

#### Electricity demand is rising and solving electricity is the first step to solve climate change because without nuclear power warming is inevitable.

Barry Brook et. al, 2-21-2009, a leading environmental scientist, holding the Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change at the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, and is also Director of Climate Science at the University of Adelaide’s Environment Institute, published three books, over 200 refereed scientific papers, is a highly cited researcher, received a number of distinguished awards for his research excellence including the Australian Academy of Science Fenner Medal, is an International Award Committee member for the Global Energy Prize, Australian Research Council Future Fellow, ISI Researcher, Ph.D., Macquarie University in Environmental Engineering, Science Council for Global Initiatives, Edgeworth David Medal Royal Society of NSW, Cosmos Bright Sparks Award, Tom Blees is the author of Prescription for the Planet, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, George S. Stanford is a nuclear reactor physicist, part of the team that developed the Integral Fast Reactor, PhD from Stanford University in Physics, Masters from University of Virginia in Engineering, worked at Argonne National Laboratory, Graham R.L. Cowan, "Boron: A Better Energy Carrier than Hydrogen?" in 2001, published "How Fire Can Be Tamed," BraveNewClimate, “Response to an Integral Fast Reactor (IFR) critique,” <http://bravenewclimate.com/2009/02/21/response-to-an-integral-fast-reactor-ifr-critique/>

[TB] Almost 80% of greenhouse gas emissions come from nuclear-capable countries anyway, so even if we just deployed them there we could make tremendous strides, though it would still be wise to create some sort of international oversight organization as I propose in the book. [BWB] This is at best grossly disingenuous (not to mention insulting to call Kirsch stupid). You need to solve the electricity carbon problem to fix the vehicular fuels problem, space heating and embedded energy in building and manufactured goods, and Tom has a solution for MSW [municipal solid waste] also. About half of agricultural emissions can also be solved if you have a zero-carbon energy source. Then you just need to worry about the ruminant methane and carbon from deforestation. But the bottom line is, if you fix electricity, everything else will quicktly start to fall into place. If we don’t stop coal in places like China and India, we’re hosed, irrespective of what we might do in the US and Oz (and even if we could do with without advanced nuclear, which we very likely cannot). I do wonder, what is Jim Green’s plan is for replacing the 484 GW of coal-fired power stations already installed in China, and the further 200 or so plants in the planning or construction pipeline?

#### Nuclear power is the most economic source of base-load power it’s key to solve GHG emissions by displacing pollutants.

Alexander DeVolpi, 2-28-2010, been active in nuclear-arms policy and treaty-verification technology studies for over 25 years, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois (and other national laboratories) involved nearly 40 years of lab, field, and analytical activities in instrumentation, nuclear physics, nuclear engineering, reactor safety, radioisotopes, experiments, verification technology, and arms control, the Defense Nuclear Agency, On-Site Inspection Agency, all the Department of Energy weapons labs, with the Departments of Defense and State, author or coauthor of several books, Ph.D. in physics (and MS in nuclear engineering physics) from Virginia Polytechnic Institute, certificate from the Argonne International Institute of Nuclear Science and Engineering, managing nuclear diagnostics for the Reactor Analysis and Safety Division at Argonne, and becoming technical manager of the arms-control and nonproliferation program, Who’s Who in Frontiers of Science and Technology, American Men and Women of Science, fellow of the American Physical Society, technical consultant in the Federation of American Scientists/Natural Resources Defense Council joint project, ScienceTechnologyHistory, “NUCLEAR EXPERTISE: The Amory Lovins Charade,” <http://sciencetechnologyhistory.wordpress.com/article/nuclear-expertise-the-amory-lovins-1gsyt5k142kc5-20/>

Nuclear power is not only commercially competitive, but extremely safe (no coal miners dying), no air pollution at all, no greenhouse gas emissions (such as carbon-dioxide). Nuclear-plant lifetime is being doubled from 30 to 60 years (which utilities, investors, and ratepayers appreciate). If Lovins had his way 30 years ago, considerably more particulates and gases would have been vented to the local and regional atmosphere from coal-fired plants (aside from the greenhouse gases emitted). Moreover, if Lovins had his way, we would not have conserved the electricity-equivalent in domestic coal, imported and domestic oil, and domestic and imported natural-gas resources and reserves that we have for 30 years. A typical nuclear power plant each year avoids consumption of 3.4 million short tons of coal, or 65.8 billion cubic feet of natural gas, or 14 billion barrels of oil. (The United States has ample uranium resources.) So Lovins was wrong in implying that nuclear had no overriding societal or environmental benefits. Incidentally, it’s no accident that Illinois has the highest concentration of nuclear-power plants in the United States: Argonne National Laboratory can be proud of its half-century nuclear stewardship. (California, by the way, generates more electricity from geothermal, solar, and wind energy sources combined than any other State.) Lovins displayed complex viewgraphs that, he purports, show that nuclear is the costliest of “low-or-non-nuclear resources.” Yet, in the last 30 years, nuclear has displaced half the fossil-fuel combustion in Illinois while still being competitive. Inasmuch as nuclear-power plants emit no byproduct carbon-dioxide to the atmosphere, surely his claim that it is the costliest of low-carbon-emission sources fails the smell test. Most of Lovins’ pricing and cost/benefit comparisons are based on “new delivered electricity” which frames the cost of U.S. domestic nuclear construction in the least favorable light. He declares nuclear power an economic failure. Can someone explain that to my bank account which has benefitted from compounding competitive electric power savings for the past 30 years? His rimy claim certainly fails the ripeness test. On the issue of electrical-grid reliability, Lovins asserts that there is no such thing as a “outage-free” source of electrical power. He must think that nuclear power runs by government fiat. Nuclear is a fixture on the grid because it is more economical to operate as base-load supply, while sources less reliable, intermittent, and more costly (such as wind, solar, and gas) provide supplementary power. During the past 30 years in Illinois, I don’t recall having the electricity supply and cost problems that California has had after it prohibited nuclear-power plants from being built within its borders. By the way, average U.S. nuclear capacity factor was about 92% in 2007. That’s excellent. Lovins pitiful effort to undermine the reliability of nuclear power egregiously fails the smell test.

#### We could start building hundreds of IFR’s by 2015 – cost competitive option.

Steve Kirsch, 2011, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “The Integral Fast Reactor (IFR) project: Q&A,” <http://skirsch.com/politics/globalwarming/ifrQandA.htm>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

I do not agree that nuclear energy would be "a costly option," especially given a level playing field (external health and environmental costs considered, for instance). Nuclear power is now competitive in many countries, and there is no reason to think that fast reactors, in the long run, will be significantly more expensive. They will require no mining, no milling, no enrichment, and the waste-management expense will be negligible. The raw material for the fuel (used fuel already on hand) is essentially free. Virtually the entire cost will be in infrastructure and operations. It's likely if we made this a national priority, it could move a lot faster (like we did with the Manhattan Project). The argument that it might take a long time is an argument for starting immediately. Nobody, even the critics, have suggested that waiting around makes it happen faster when we finally need to do it. We need to get out from under a "let's just pursue the quick fixes" mentality we have now. The time to do these longer term projects is before they are needed. Are we going to wait for our existing nuclear material to be depleted before it is a crisis? And then, once again, we will be too late. We need forward, visionary thinking in this country. It seems to be in short supply. Here's what Blees wrote in response to my answer above: I couldn't agree more. That said, I'm certain it could be done expeditiously and we could start building these things by the hundreds by 2015 or so. Meanwhile we could start building ABWRs and the other Gen III+ reactors so we could start shutting down coal plants. Nuclear waste is simply not an issue. And in terms of building both Gen III and IFRs in nuclear-capable countries, neither is economics. Or safety. Or proliferation. Those who maintain that we don't have the technology are either ignorant of the facts or lying. Not to put too fine a point on it or anything. That's not something I'd just toss out there, but just between you and me that's the way I see it.

#### Nuclear power is needed before renewables, it’s the jumpstart for new clean energy leadership – scientific consensus.

Steve Kirsch, 11-25-2009, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “Why We Should Build an Integral Fast Reactor Now,” <http://skirsch.wordpress.com/2009/11/25/ifr/>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

Nuclear can be installed very rapidly; much more rapidly than renewables. For example, about two thirds of the currently operating 440 reactors around the world came online during a 10 year period between 1980 and 1990. So our best chance of meeting the required installation of new power goal and saving the planet is with an aggressive nuclear program. Unlike renewables, nuclear generates base load power, reliably, regardless of weather. Nuclear also uses very little land area. It does not require the installation of new power lines since it can be installed where the power is needed. However, even with a very aggressive plan involving nuclear, it will still be extremely difficult to install clean power fast enough. Unfortunately, even in the US, we have no plan to install the clean power we need fast enough to save the planet. Even if every country were to agree tomorrow to completely eliminate their coal plant emissions by 2030, how do we think they are actually going to achieve that? There is no White House plan that explains this. There is no DOE plan. There is no plan or strategy. The deadlines will come and go and most countries will profusely apologize for not meeting their goals, just like we have with most of the signers of the Kyoto Protocol today. Apologies are nice, but they will not restore the environment. We need a strategy that is believable, practical, and affordable for countries to adopt. The IFR offers our best hope of being a centerpiece in such a strategy because it is the only technology we know of that can provide an economically compelling reason to change. At a speech at MIT on October 23, 2009, President Obama said “And that’s why the world is now engaged in a peaceful competition to determine the technologies that will power the 21st century. … The nation that wins this competition will be the nation that leads the global economy. I am convinced of that. And I want America to be that nation, it’s that simple.” Nuclear is our best clean power technology and the IFR is our best nuclear technology. The Gen IV International Forum (GIF) did a study in 2001-2002 of 19 different reactor designs on 15 different criteria and 24 metrics. The IFR ranked #1 overall. Over 242 experts from around the world participated in the study. It was the most comprehensive evaluation of competitive nuclear designs ever done. Top DOE nuclear management ignored the study because it didn’t endorse the design the Bush administration wanted. The IFR has been sitting on the shelf for 15 years and the DOE currently has no plans to change that. How does the US expect to be a leader in clean energy by ignoring our best nuclear technology? Nobody I’ve talked to has been able to answer that question. We have the technology (it was running for 30 years before we were ordered to tear it down). And we have the money: The Recovery Act has $80 billion dollars.

#### Climate change is real and anthropogenic – fundamental science, atmospheric patterns, greenhouse gas fingerprints, and newest measurements all confirm.

Karl Braganza, 6-14-2011, received his PhD from the School of Mathematics at Monash University, work has centered on understanding and attributing climate variability and change, using numerical modeling, instrumental observations and past climate evidence, currently the Head of Climate Monitoring at the Bureau of Meteorology's National Climate Center, The Conversation, "The Greenhouse Effect is Real: Here’s Why," <http://theconversation.edu.au/the-greenhouse-effect-is-real-heres-why-1515>

The greenhouse effect is fundamental science It would be easy to form the opinion that everything we know about climate change is based upon the observed rise in global temperatures and observed increase in carbon dioxide emissions since the industrial revolution. In other words, one could have the mistaken impression that the entirety of climate science is based upon a single correlation study. In reality, the correlation between global mean temperature and carbon dioxide over the 20th century forms an important, but very small part of the evidence for a human role in climate change. Our assessment of the future risk from the continued buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is even less informed by 20th century changes in global mean temperature. For example, our understanding of the greenhouse effect – the link between greenhouse gas concentrations and global surface air temperature – is based primarily on our fundamental understanding of mathematics, physics, astronomy and chemistry. Much of this science is textbook material that is at least a century old and does not rely on the recent climate record. For example, it is a scientific fact that Venus, the planet most similar to Earth in our solar system, experiences surface temperatures of nearly 500 degrees Celsius due to its atmosphere being heavily laden with greenhouse gases. Back on Earth, that fundamental understanding of the physics of radiation, combined with our understanding of climate change from the geological record, clearly demonstrates that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations will inevitably drive global warming. Dusting for climate fingerprints The observations we have taken since the start of 20th century have confirmed our fundamental understanding of the climate system. While the climate system is very complex, observations have shown that our formulation of the physics of the atmosphere and oceans is largely correct, and ever improving. Most importantly, the observations have confirmed that human activities, in particular a 40% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations since the late 19th century, have had a discernible and significant impact on the climate system already. In the field known as detection and attribution of climate change, scientists use indicators known as fingerprints of climate change. These fingerprints show the entire climate system has changed in ways that are consistent with increasing greenhouse gases and an enhanced greenhouse effect. They also show that recent, long term changes are inconsistent with a range of natural causes. Is it getting hot in here? A warming world is obviously the most profound piece of evidence. Here in Australia, the decade ending in 2010 has easily been the warmest since record keeping began, and continues a trend of each decade being warmer than the previous, that extends back 70 years. Globally, significant warming and other changes have been observed across a range of different indicators and through a number of different recording instruments, and a consistent picture has now emerged. Scientists have observed increases in continental temperatures and increases in the temperature of the lower atmosphere. In the oceans, we have seen increases in sea-surface temperatures as well as increases in deep-ocean heat content. That increased heat has expanded the volume of the oceans and has been recorded as a rise in sea-level. Scientists have also observed decreases in sea-ice, a general retreat of glaciers and decreases in snow cover. Changes in atmospheric pressure and rainfall have also occurred in patterns that we would expect due to increased greenhouse gases. There is also emerging evidence that some, though not all, types of extreme weather have become more frequent around the planet. These changes are again consistent with our expectations for increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide. Patterns of temperature change that are uniquely associated with the enhanced greenhouse effect, and which have been observed in the real world include: greater warming in polar regions than tropical regions greater warming over the continents than the oceans greater warming of night time temperatures than daytime temperatures greater warming in winter compared with summer a pattern of cooling in the high atmosphere (stratosphere) with simultaneous warming in the lower atmosphere (troposphere).

#### Even if there is only a one percent chance fast reactors can work you vote aff because the planet is at stake.

Steve Kirsch, 11-25-2009, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “Why We Should Build an Integral Fast Reactor Now,” <http://skirsch.wordpress.com/2009/11/25/ifr/>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

Even if you believe all the arguments of the opposition and completely discount the arguments of the Argonne scientists who best know the technology, it doesn’t matter because we do not have an option: we have to make this work now. Renewables alone can’t kill coal in the time allotted. The point is:1) virtually every credible renewable expert agrees we cannot reduce our carbon emissions enough without nuclear, 2) the IFR is our best nuclear, 3) the IFR is the only technology we have with a realistic chance of replacing coal burners in a coal plant with a lower-cost carbon-free alternative. So objections noted, but our planet is at stake and we have got to make this work. We should be joining together and doing things that our most credible scientists tell us we have to do to save our planet, rather than arguing amongst ourselves and debating what the optimum solution is. The time for debate is over. We are so late on deploying clean energy technologies that any new technology that has a realistic potential to make a significant positive impact should be welcomed with open arms by every human being. Urgency “Within the next four decades, human civilization must eliminate its use of fossil fuels and replace them with 10,000 gigawatts of reliable, sustainable power. The only realistic way that this extraordinary challenge can be met is with the rapid and large-scale deployment of nuclear power, on a worldwide basis, led by countries like the US, Russia, the EU, China and India. Generation III nuclear plants will be critical to this expansion over the short term, Generation IV technology is the astoundingly attractive long-term prospect, with the IFR being the flagship Gen IV design. The urgency in getting the IFR commercialised and deployment on an industrial scale cannot be overstated”.

### Advantage 2

#### Decline in domestic nuclear infrastructure has spurred both a brain drain and an inability to attract the best and brightest

Martin, Chairman of the Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee, and Ahearne, Vice-Chairman, 8 (William F. and John, Nuclear Energy: Policies and Technology for the 21st Century, Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee, November 2008, http://www.ne.doe.gov/neac/neacPDFs/NEAC\_Final\_Report\_Web%20Version.pdf, da 9-1-12)

The consequences of a weakened nuclear infrastructure in the United States include reduced domestic capability to support the role of nuclear energy as well as the related problem of the reduced ability to attract and retain the talent at all levels—from technicians to engineers to Ph.D.’s—needed to develop and sustain active U.S. participation in the domestic and global nuclear marketplace. In that vein, NEAC recommends that both university and industry programs in nuclear R&D be strengthened, and that laboratories and facilities in the DOE complex be modernized and made more efficient. These programs should be developed in consultation with relevant government agencies and scientists, DOE national laboratories, private industry, and the academic community.

#### U.S. commitment to pyro-processing restarts the nuclear industry

Stephen Berry & George S. Tolley, 11-29-2010, James Franck Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus at the University of Chicago, Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, foreign Member, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, member and Home Secretary, National Academy of Sciences, J. Heyrovsky Honorary Medal for Merit in the Chemical Sciences, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Senior Scientist Award, Phi Beta Kappa National Lecturer, George S. Tolley is a professor emeritus in Economics at the University of Chicago, fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science, honorary editor, Resource and Energy Economics, honorary Ph.D., North Carolina State University, “Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Future Prospects and Viability,” p. 39, <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/orgs/institute/bigproblems/Team7-1210.pdf>

Increasing government support of advancements in reprocessing in the U.S. would encourage growth and investment in this technology. Therefore, continued government commitment to researching pyroprocessing and other advanced fuel cycle technologies is vital to the nuclear industry, especially if we envision this technology maturing internationally. As unsustainable as our current nuclear waste disposal strategies are, we believe in the current political climate, commercial reprocessing in the United States are not a viable option due to high environmental and technological costs, as well as having significant nuclear proliferation threats. However, in order for the U.S. to employ pyroprocessing in the future, the government must begin now to incentivize the technology for firms and investors. As uranium prices are expected to increase in the future, as well as an increasing concern regarding the management of nuclear waste worldwide, reprocessing may become a promising solution provided investments are made to address current challenges in the field.

#### Nuclear industry growth spurs talent transfer from developing countries – the link only goes one way: brain drain does not hurt developing countries industries

Jacques C. Hymans, January/March 2011, is associate professor of international relations at the University of Southern California, research focuses on nuclear proliferation, and more broadly, on international security affairs, an editorial board member of the Nonproliferation Review, Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University, Postdoctoral Fellow, Harvard University Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Vol. 20 Issue 1, “Proliferation Implications of Civil Nuclear Cooperation: Theory and a Case Study of Tito's Yugoslavia,” p. 79-80, Ebsco Host

One of the basic points made by the technology transfer literature, and whose importance for the case of nuclear proliferation has been stressed by Montgomery, is that the genuine diffusion of technical capacities is often quite limited. A first reason why is that supplier countries often do not or cannot transfer the crucial tacit knowledge that comes from hands-on expe-rience, and without which the technology’s potential will remain dormant. 24 The relevance of this point for nuclear proliferation has been shown by Liu Yanqiong and Liu Jifeng, whose detailed study of the 1950s Soviet assistance to China’s nuclear weapons project shows that because Soviet technicians were not very forthcoming with their knowledge, the assistance was not nearly as seminal as many have claimed. 25 A second reason why technology transfer is often less than meets the eye is that developing countries often lack sufficient “absorptive capacity”—for instance, their technical bureau-cracy may not be well-organized enough to learn to do anything more than run a turnkey facility. 26 A recent statistical analysis by Montgomery suggests 21 that this factor may be an important limitation on technology transfer in the nuclear weapons area as well. 27 But the technology transfer literature does not limit itself simply to identifying frictions, transaction costs, and other hindrances to the seamless operation of the “give-get” model. It has also stressed that international link-ages forged for the purpose of technology transfer actually create a decidedly two-way street. Beginning in the early 1970s, social scientists attached to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) developed the concept of “reverse transfer of technology.” 28 The clearest case of reverse transfer of technology can be seen in the serious and persistent “brain drain” of developing country scientists and other highly skilled workers to devel-oped countries. In other words, international technical “assistance” programs actually often morph into avenues for the poaching of developing country talent. The implication of these points for proliferation is that the greater the brain drain of nuclear scientific workers out of a developing country, the lower its nuclear weapons capacity becomes. Strangely, the proliferation literature has focused on brain drain only in its most sensationalist aspect—the possibility that a few former Soviet weapons scientists, for instance, might have gone to work for Kim Jong Il or Saddam Hussein. 29 But the brain drain’s most typical pattern is the movement of “brains” from developing countries, or more recently from the post-Soviet area, to the advanced industrialized states. And nuclear scientific workers are no exception to the rule.

#### Empirics prove: brain drain creates brain circulation

Jacques C. Hymans, January/March 2011, is associate professor of international relations at the University of Southern California, research focuses on nuclear proliferation, and more broadly, on international security affairs, an editorial board member of the Nonproliferation Review, Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University,Postdoctoral Fellow, Harvard University Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Vol. 20 Issue 1, “Proliferation Implications of Civil Nuclear Cooperation: Theory and a Case Study of Tito's Yugoslavia,” p. 100-3, Ebsco Host

Many analysts have characterized aboveboard international civil nuclear cooperation—“Atoms for Peace”—as an unmitigated disaster for the cause of nonproliferation. Most of Atoms for Peace’s dwindling band of supporters themselves no longer contest the idea that it has given dozens of developing countries the technical capacity to build nuclear weapons at a time of their 114 Note that despite Tito’s 1974 decision, Gaukhar Mukhatzhanova finds that Solingen’s argument about the impact of liberalizing political coalition interests on regimes’ nuclear intentions generally fits the Yugoslav case pretty well. See Mukhatzhanova, “Nuclear Weapons in the Balkans,” esp. 213–15. choosing. Even such routine practices as the holding of international confer-ences and student exchange programs in the fields of nuclear science and engineering have come under fire. In contrast to these general trends in the literature, this article has offered a more nuanced assessment of the effects of Atoms for Peace. The literature needs to abandon its outdated, oversimplified, techno-centric approach to the supply side of the proliferation equation. When we recognize that “tech-nical” capacity has political foundations, the effects of Atoms for Peace on states’ nuclear weapons capacity appear much different than the literature suggests. In particular, by changing the career opportunities available to the most talented and energetic among the small pool of competent scientific workers in developing country contexts, Atoms for Peace makes their choice for loyalty more complicated, their choice for voice less dangerous, and their choice for exit more feasible. Thus, Atoms for Peace can substantially retard or even reverse the growth of technical capacity to build the bomb, despite the transfer of hardware and know-how that it promotes. The case study of Yugoslavia has substantiated the theorized nonproliferation-promoting effects of Atoms for Peace, even during the pol-icy’s most “na¨ıve” nuclear promotion days of the 1950s and 1960s. As Yu-goslavia represents a hard test for the theory presented here, the findings from this study should be given special heed. We should not be surprised that Atoms for Peace ended up undercutting the Tito regime’s nuclear ambi-tions through such mechanisms as brain drain, since similar findings abound in the broader literature on international technology transfer, with which the proliferation literature needs to engage deeply. This article is not claiming that Atoms for Peace was a silver bullet for nonproliferation in the case of Yugoslavia. Rather, the claim is that over the long run Atoms for Peace intensified and locked in the Yugoslav nuclear program’s poor organizational performance, and accelerated the program’s ultimate collapse. Some readers might be tempted to conclude that since poor organization and management were the root causes of Yugoslavia’s nuclear woes, therefore the effects of Atoms for Peace were superfluous to the outcome. However, it would be wrong to ignore the Atoms for Peace variable simply because it did not singlehandedly prevent a Yugoslav nuclear bomb from coming into being. Recall that up until now, the literature has generally contended that Atoms for Peace helps states leapfrog over their or-ganizational and resource limitations by handing them ready-made solutions to difficult technical problems. So it would already be a significant finding simply to show that Atoms for Peace, even in its heyday in the 1950s and 1960s, actually did not allow them to leapfrog those limitations. But in fact my finding is that Atoms for Peace greatly compounded those limitations, at least in the case of Yugoslavia. My finding turns standard thinking about this question on its head. This finding is not just interestingly counterintu-itive; it also has important implications for United States and international nonproliferation policy. Typical nonproliferation measures, such as export controls and technical safeguards, can hope to achieve little more than to re-strain nuclear programs from moving forward; but I have shown that Atoms for Peace, especially by stimulating the brain drain, ultimately caused the Yu-goslav nuclear program to stumble backward, and made it next to impossible for Belgrade to turn things around. I should also underscore that this article is not claiming that Yugoslavia’s experience with Atoms for Peace necessarily generalizes to every developing country. Some developing countries have been able to leverage civil nuclear cooperation to achieve nuclear weapons more quickly than they otherwise could have. India is often mentioned as a prime example of the danger that Atoms for Peace will unwittingly provide atoms for war. But this article’s focus on Yugoslavia represents a necessary corrective to the literature’s typ-ical focus on proliferation headline-makers like India. Moreover, there are good theoretical reasons to think that the Yugoslav nuclear experience with Atoms for Peace may have been much more typical for developing countries than the Indian experience. First, as noted earlier in the article, the brain drain literature has singled out India as one of the handful of developing countries where the size and quality of the science and technology com-munity are enough to allow it to absorb the hit of a substantial brain drain and yet still benefit through such compensating mechanisms as brain circu-lation, brain diaspora, and brain replacement. 121 Second, the literature on state capacity suggests that the bureaucratic “steel frame” inherited from the British colonial Indian Civil Service, though surely not problem-free, places India far above most other developing countries in terms of its level of state institutionalization. 122 Reflecting these general bureaucratic strengths of the Indian state, the Indian nuclear program was—despite some hiccups—quite well-organized and managed, and this substantially reduced the potential for India’s participation in Atoms for Peace to cause it serious damage. 123 In short, India appears deductively to be a much more exceptional case in the developing world than Yugoslavia, although more in-depth case studies will be necessary before we can say for sure if Yugoslavia’s experience with Atoms for Peace was truly typical or not. 124 121 An anonymous reviewer of this article suggested that we should consider whether, contrary to the general presumption of the proliferation literature, proliferant states often pare back their international civil nuclear cooperation efforts in order to avoid creating complications for their nuclear weapons Proliferation Implications of Civil Nuclear Cooperation 103 It might be that even if Yugoslavia’s experience was typical for its time period, a reenergized Atoms for Peace policy would not have the same nonproliferation-promoting consequences in today’s changed circumstances. But it is also possible to argue that an expanded commitment to overt interna-tional civil nuclear cooperation would have even stronger nonproliferation-promoting consequences in today’s world. After all, the brain drain from the developing world (and post-Communist states) continues to be a major social fact in the contemporary international system. Although the United States demand for the services of developing-world scientists and engineers was already quite high during the 1950s and 1960s, it has become absolutely voracious in recent years. Between 1978 and 2008, the number of U.S. PhD recipients holding temporary visas jumped from 3,475 (11 percent of the total number of doctorates granted by American universities) to 15,246 (31 percent of the total). In the physical sciences, the increase was from 653 (16 percent) to 3,678 (45 percent). In engineering, the increase was from 781 (32 percent) to 4,486 (57 percent). Of these newly minted temporary visa-holding PhDs, in 2008 73.5 percent reported the intention to remain in the United States; this number was generally much higher among those PhDs who had come from developing and post-Communist countries. Meanwhile, the out-migration of the highly skilled is having dramatic consequences on the resource base of sending countries: for instance, 41 percent of all tertiary-educated Caribbeans have emigrated to developed countries; for West Africa the figure is 27 percent; and for East Africa it is 18.4 percent. 125 This mas-sive brain drain is nothing to celebrate; it has caused major social ills in the developing world. But as an empirical matter brain drain is correlated with reduced technological potential, and when it comes to the narrow question of nuclear weapons development, reducing developing countries’ techno-logical potential is not necessarily a bad thing. One could try to turn this argument around and contend that since the brain drain has become so massive, state policies can do little to encourage or discourage it anymore. But in fact the brain drain still depends crucially on facilitative state policies, especially those of the United States and other receiving countries. 126 In the nuclear area in particular, there is no guarantee that those facilitative policies will continue. As noted at the outset of this article, nonproliferation concerns have led the United States to reduce sub-stantially the scope of its international civil nuclear cooperation programs over the past decades, and some nonproliferation advocates want to abolish them altogether.

#### The plan allows high skilled immigrants to vote with their feet, which ends repressive regimes abroad and at home

Ilya Somin, Professor of Law at George Mason University, 2008 (George Mason University School of Law, 73 Mo. L. Rev. 1247 Fall

From the standpoint of promoting foot voting, the distinction between victims of "persecution" and other potential migrants makes little sense. Even potential migrants who have not been personally targeted for persecution on the basis of race, religion or political beliefs may still suffer the ill effects of oppressive or misguided government policies. For example, repression of the right to freedom of speech and political organization affects not only would-be speakers, but also all other citizens of the society in question, who are forced to live under a political process that they have no power to influence. Similarly, "economic" migrants are in many cases fleeing poverty that is in large part caused by the flawed policies of the governments they live under. Development economists recognize that most poor countries could generate rapid economic growth by adopting appropriate policies. n51 In many  [\*1262]  cases, enormous advances in the economic status of the poor could be achieved simply by allowing them to acquire enforceable property rights n52 and by integrating the nation in question more closely with the world economy. n53 All too often, migrants who are fleeing generally adverse economic and political conditions are no less victims of their governments than those who have been targeted for individualized "persecution" of the sort currently recognized as grounds for asylum rights by international law .. Previous scholars have argued for stronger international migration rights on a variety of grounds. n54 This Article highlights an additional and generally ignored advantage of migration rights: the opportunity to strengthen democratic accountability by enabling more people to "vote with their feet" against repressive or dysfunctional governments in their home societies. As in the case of domestic federal systems, international foot voting allows citizens greater choice over the government policies they live under, and may force states to adopt better policies in order to prevent skilled migrants and valuable taxpayers from departing. Unlike many other types of international law, a right to free migration does not significantly undermine the ability of democratic states to adopt diverse approaches to various policy issues. n55 States with free entry and exit rights can still enact a wide range of different policies, so long as they do not inhibit freedom of movement. Indeed, as scholars of domestic federalism have emphasized, freedom of movement might stimulate policy innovation by governments, as they compete for economically valuable migrants. n56  [\*1263]

#### Globalization has produced a politics of diasporic identity. Circulation challenges state nationalism and produces interdependence and empowerment – challenges status quo economic hierarchies.

Chandler Professor of Law, 01

Anupam Chander\*, Professor of Law, University of California at Davis,Chandler, Presentation at the Stanford Yale Junior Faculty Forum, held in 2001, 76 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 1005 October 2001 Lexis

In a world that is increasingly diasporan, full of crisscrossing loyalties, transborder mobility, multinational political states, and transnational communities, neither the statist nor the cosmopolitan paradigm fits. n229 Diasporas require a reconceptualization of the nation-state and the international system. They challenge both the Westphalian cartography of territorially defined sovereigns and the cosmopolitan utopia of a united mankind. The diaspora model begins with the recognition that diasporas exemplify the contemporary condition. Corporations too have become increasingly multinational, with their ownership and operations dispersed through the world. n230 Labor and capital, seeking their highest  [\*1049]  valued use, move with fewer legal and technological barriers across states. Additionally, information has become widely disseminated, its passage sped through the Internet, resulting in the creation of virtual transnational communities. n231 The hallmarks of a globalized world are hybridity, intermingling, and multiple allegiances. But despite this intermingling, most people have not sloughed off their nationalist skin in favor of an evolved cosmopolitanism. Rather, the hybridity resulting from globalization often manifests itself in individuals who subscribe to multiple nationalisms [n232](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n232) or a transnationalism. Multiple nationalisms and transnationalism become possible because "the nationalist genie, never perfectly contained in the bottle of the territorial state, is now itself diasporic." n233 The diaspora model does not seek to dismantle the nation-state, but rather to rearticulate it as a multinational state permitting the voluntary transnational associations of its people. Furthermore, the model seeks to enfranchise diasporas as recognized legal subjects in the transnational legal process. n234 The lived experience of diasporas demonstrates the possibility of negotiating such divided feelings in a way that allows diasporas to contribute to their homelands and adopted lands simultaneously. n235 Moreover, it demonstrates the possibility of a transnational community built on individual voluntary commitments. Increasingly, we see the emergence of a transnational civic republicanism, with the diaspora taking an active part in shaping the future direction of its homeland. A globalized world requires a new paradigm of the relationship of the citizen to the state. The diaspora model proposes that we view that relationship as complicated and dynamic. The model would permit individuals to construct national and transnational communities of their own choosing. In this way, then, the diaspora model rejects the unitary ideology of statism in favor of an understanding of the state that respects the possibility of plural commitments and loyalties. And instead of requiring us to refashion ourselves, first and foremost, as world citizens, the diaspora model offers an internationalism that respects  [\*1050]  patriotic feelings and individual attachments to country and community - with the hope that such attachments might bind the world closer together. Thus, the diaspora model complicates the international system, replacing the clean demarcations of statism with an acceptance of overlapping sovereignties. n236 As the communitarian philosopher Michael Sandel observes, "the most promising alternative to the sovereign state is not a cosmopolitan community based on the solidarity of humankind but a multiplicity of communities and political bodies - some more extensive than nations and some less - among which sovereignty is diffused." n237 This approach does not mean doing away with states, but rather denying their claim to the exclusive allegiance of their residents. The diaspora model thus offers an intermediate point between the exclusivity of statism and the universality of cosmopolitanism. With some optimism, the model locates in diasporas the possibility of building bridges across the world, between rich and poor countries and between liberal and illiberal societies. Diasporas offer the possibility of uniting the world through a web of personal and community loyalties, while international capital flows and international trade create a web of international economic dependencies. This web of personal loyalties is spun through the dual loyalties of individuals in diaspora. The relationship of individual to state, conceived by Westphalians as a one-to-one relationship and by cosmopolitans as ethically irrelevant, can be reimagined to promote both the ideal of authenticity and the possibility of economic development.

#### Diasporic politics break down xenophobic us/them politics, it decreases conflict Chandler Professor of Law, 01

Anupam Chander\*, Professor of Law, University of California at Davis,Chandler, Presentation at the Stanford Yale Junior Faculty Forum, held in 2001, 76 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 1005 October 2001 Lexis

Finally, the intermingling of the people of the world … may well include our neighbors and friends. In a world characterized by ever-increasing globalization, not only of capital and goods but also of people, diasporas seek a link to a past that is removed not only in time but also in space. n465 At times, this link can manifest itself in an atavistic racialism. Diaspora Bonds, on the other hand, demonstrate one possibility where this link to the past may be put in the service of economic development in the present. People sustaining diaspora ties must do so critically, eschewing moral relativism yet respecting difference. In accordance with this critical project, we might ask: Why introduce diaspora as another category of individual identity relevant to the law?  [\*1096]  In a globalized world, mutation, hybridity, and intermixture represent the prevailing norm. Thus, the diaspora model, which allows people to maintain hybridized and hybridizing bonds to homeland and hostland, better approximates how people now imagine their relationship to the state than either the statist or cosmopolitan models. Moreover, while it rejects the statist demand that all persons pledge fealty to one state or the cosmopolitan desire that we forswear any primary fealty to country, the diaspora model is broad enough to accommodate persons who register support only for one state or for no state at all. Rather than seeking to change people, the diaspora model suggests that we revisit our conception of the international order. By recognizing the possibility of a wide array of allegiances, especially to homeland and transnational community, the diaspora model promotes authenticity and allows people to flourish. Second, the diaspora model offers a view of citizenship that reconciles globalization with the desire for a sense of rootedness. It understands the traveling nature of contemporary culture. [n466](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n466) The diaspora approach embraces globalization, but does not mistake it for a renunciation of nation or state. The diaspora model embraces the multiculturalism of cosmopolitanism while still respecting the very thing that animates such multiculturalism - the individual's search for belonging. Third, accepting diaspora as a legitimate basis for community affirms a connection between rich and poor nations that can support economic development. We find exactly this dynamic in the case of Diaspora Bonds, which enable homeland governments to tap the wealth of their expatriates to fund economic development in the homeland. [n467](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n467) Admittedly, cosmopolitanism offers a distributive justice approach [n468](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n468) that is more demanding and systematic than the voluntary homeland-regarding actions of the diaspora. However, the diaspora model is more likely to harness existing forces for economic development than cosmopolitanism is likely to find the altruistic, enlightened persons who embrace its nondiscriminatory principles. [n469](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n469) Fourth, recognizing diasporan relationships allows us to better understand the contemporary world order. It allows us to grasp the connections between distant events and to place these events into a broader global framework. Recognizing the diaspora helps locate individual  [\*1097]  events in a broader narrative. [n470](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n470) Of course, we must still bear in mind that diasporan events will differ from each other in important ways. Finally, the intermingling of the people of the world across states and nations may reduce interstate violence and human rights abuse. Diasporas blur the distinction between "us" and "them." It will be harder to demonize another people when one's own compatriots hail from that same place and maintain strong bonds to it. Because diasporas muddy the purity of nations, they offer a possible escape from what Samuel Huntington describes as a post-Cold War "clash of civilizations." n471 While it would be Panglossian to suggest that the diaspora's adopted land will be unlikely to declare war on the diaspora's home country or vice versa, [n472](http://www.lexisnexis.com.floyd.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296151495155&returnToKey=20_T11102761817&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.144948.34542102285" \l "n472) it may be the case that the diaspora will help the two countries understand each other better, thereby potentially reducing the likelihood of hostilities. Additionally, should war in fact break out, it would be more likely targeted at the foreign government, not its people, since its people may well include our neighbors and friends.

### Plan

Plan: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase commercial loan guarantees for purposes of energy production by development for Integral Fast Reactors in the United States.

### Solvency

#### Loan guarantees are key to establishing pyro-processing.

Stephen Berry & George S. Tolley, 11-29-2010, James Franck Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus at the University of Chicago, Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, foreign Member, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, member and Home Secretary, National Academy of Sciences, J. Heyrovsky Honorary Medal for Merit in the Chemical Sciences, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Senior Scientist Award, Phi Beta Kappa National Lecturer, George S. Tolley is a professor emeritus in Economics at the University of Chicago, fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science, honorary editor, Resource and Energy Economics, honorary Ph.D., North Carolina State University, “Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Future Prospects and Viability,” p. 38, <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/orgs/institute/bigproblems/Team7-1210.pdf>

The construction of an aqueous solvent extraction plant would be out of date, especially when the more promising option of pyroprocessing is on the horizon. In comparison, to current available methods, pyroprocessing produces virtually no waste, can be done on-site, and offers the option of fabricating proliferation resistant fuel from plutonium as well as uranium. The second question in regard to domestic reprocessing is, “how much direct involvement should the government have in the reprocessing business?” Government involvement could be justified on the grounds of the externalities present in nuclear waste disposal. This could take on a variety of forms - government research efforts, subsidizing reprocessing (or offering tax credits and loan guarantees), or even operating a reprocessing center on its own. Through its actions, the government will be able to influence the development and growth of the nuclear reprocessing industry in the United States. These efforts in support of pyroprocessing and other advanced fuel cycle technologies represent a small portion of the Department of Energy budget - only $142,652,000 out of a total of $33,856,453,000 in discretionary funding in FY 2009, or less than half of one percent98. Furthermore, private companies do not have sufficient independent incentives to reduce the long-term health and environmental consequences of nuclear waste disposal. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to present a formal costbenefit analysis of R&D efforts, given the minimal costs and the large potential benefits, the chances of success do not need to be very high to justify continued government expenditures in this area.

#### U.S. commitment to pyro-processing sustains the nuclear industry – prices and management.

Stephen Berry & George S. Tolley, 11-29-2010, James Franck Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus at the University of Chicago, Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, foreign Member, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, member and Home Secretary, National Academy of Sciences, J. Heyrovsky Honorary Medal for Merit in the Chemical Sciences, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Senior Scientist Award, Phi Beta Kappa National Lecturer, George S. Tolley is a professor emeritus in Economics at the University of Chicago, fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science, honorary editor, Resource and Energy Economics, honorary Ph.D., North Carolina State University, “Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Future Prospects and Viability,” p. 39, <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/orgs/institute/bigproblems/Team7-1210.pdf>

Increasing government support of advancements in reprocessing in the U.S. would encourage growth and investment in this technology. Therefore, continued government commitment to researching pyroprocessing and other advanced fuel cycle technologies is vital to the nuclear industry, especially if we envision this technology maturing internationally. As unsustainable as our current nuclear waste disposal strategies are, we believe in the current political climate, commercial reprocessing in the United States are not a viable option due to high environmental and technological costs, as well as having significant nuclear proliferation threats. However, in order for the U.S. to employ pyroprocessing in the future, the government must begin now to incentivize the technology for firms and investors. As uranium prices are expected to increase in the future, as well as an increasing concern regarding the management of nuclear waste worldwide, reprocessing may become a promising solution provided investments are made to address current challenges in the field.

#### Fast reactors are 100% safe – multiple redundancies eliminating human error and impregnable\*\*

Barry Brook et. al, 2-21-2009, a leading environmental scientist, holding the Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change at the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, and is also Director of Climate Science at the University of Adelaide’s Environment Institute, published three books, over 200 refereed scientific papers, is a highly cited researcher, received a number of distinguished awards for his research excellence including the Australian Academy of Science Fenner Medal, is an International Award Committee member for the Global Energy Prize, Australian Research Council Future Fellow, ISI Researcher, Ph.D., Macquarie University in Environmental Engineering, Science Council for Global Initiatives, Edgeworth David Medal Royal Society of NSW, Cosmos Bright Sparks Award, Tom Blees is the author of Prescription for the Planet, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, George S. Stanford is a nuclear reactor physicist, part of the team that developed the Integral Fast Reactor, PhD from Stanford University in Physics, Masters from University of Virginia in Engineering, worked at Argonne National Laboratory, Graham R.L. Cowan, "Boron: A Better Energy Carrier than Hydrogen?" in 2001, published "How Fire Can Be Tamed," BraveNewClimate, “Response to an Integral Fast Reactor (IFR) critique,” <http://bravenewclimate.com/2009/02/21/response-to-an-integral-fast-reactor-ifr-critique/>

[BWB] The laws of physics say that this is not nonsense. For instance, the metal fuel pins’ composition is such that if they begin to overheat, the resulting expansion decreases their density to the point where the fission reaction simply shuts down. This is not speculation — it’s been tested and verified. I quote: “The IFR gains safety advantages through a combination of metal fuel (an alloy of uranium, plutonium, and zirconium), and sodium cooling. By providing a fuel which readily conducts heat from the fuel to the coolant, and which operates at relatively low temperatures, the IFR takes maximum advantage of expansion of the coolant, fuel, and structure during off-normal events which increase temperatures. The expansion of the fuel and structure in an off-normal situation causes the system to shut down even without human operator intervention. In April of 1986, two special tests were performed on the Experimental Breeder Reactor II (EBR-II), in which the main primary cooling pumps were shut off with the reactor at full power (62.5 Megawatts, thermal) – By not allowing the normal shutdown systems to interfere, the reactor power dropped to near zero within about 300 seconds. No damage to the fuel or the reactor resulted. This test demonstrated that even with a loss of all electrical power and the capability to shut down the reactor using the normal systems, the reactor will simply shut down without danger or damage. The same day, this demonstration was followed by another important test. With the reactor again at full power, flow in the secondary cooling system was stopped. This test caused the temperature to increase, since there was nowhere for the reactor heat to go. As the primary (reactor) cooling system became hotter, the fuel, sodium coolant, and structure expanded, and the reactor shut down. This test showed that an IFR type reactor will shut down using inherent features such as thermal expansion, even if the ability to remove heat from the primary cooling system is lost. Events such as the loss of water to the steam system would cause a condition such as the test demonstrated. Another major feature of the IFR concept is that the reactor uses a coolant, sodium, which does not boil during normal operation nor even in overpower transients such as described above. This means that the coolant is not under significant pressure. When coolant is not under pressure, the reactor can be placed in a “pool” of coolant, contained in a double tank, so that there is no real possibility for a loss of coolant. Even if the normal pumps are lost, some coolant flow through the reactor occurs due to natural convection. The features described above allow for greater simplification of a nuclear plant, resulting in cost savings, greater ease in operation, and a safety system that relies on natural phenomenon that cannot be defeated by human error. “ [TB] Arguing that these reactors cannot be safe from meltdowns flies in the face of the laws of physics, which assure that very feature. Regarding terrorist attack, we can secure our airports chemical plants, etc, with not a lot of work, you can design these plants to be virtually impregnable by terrorists (e.g., burying the reactor building). The new Gen III LWRs, though, are so far advanced as to merit their designation as a different generation. The probabilistic risk assessment of the ESBWR is astronomical, one core melt accident every 29 million reactor-years. Since we don’t have enough nuclear waste to load new IFRs quickly enough to meet the 2050 goal of zero emissions, the newest LWRs could be built to fill any gap that renewables and IFRs couldn’t fill and can be expected to perform safely. Their safety features are far beyond our current reactors by orders of magnitude.

#### Ontology focus at the expense of action causes paralysis

McClean 2001 David McClean (philosopher, writer and business consultant, conducted graduate work in philosophy at NYU) 2001 “The cultural left and the limits of social hope” http://www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm

There is a lot of philosophical prose on the general subject of social justice. Some of this is quite good, and some of it is quite bad. What distinguishes the good from the bad is not merely the level of erudition. Displays of high erudition are gratuitously reflected in much of the writing by those, for example, still clinging to Marxian ontology and is often just a useful smokescreen which shrouds a near total disconnect from empirical reality. This kind of political writing likes to make a lot of references to other obscure, jargon-laden essays and tedious books written by other true believers - the crowd that takes the fusion of Marxian and Freudian private fantasies seriously. Nor is it the lack of scholarship that makes this prose bad. Much of it is well "supported" by footnotes referencing a lode of other works, some of which are actually quite good. Rather, what makes this prose bad is its utter lack of relevance to extant and critical policy debates, the passage of actual laws, and the amendment of existing regulations that might actually do some good for someone else. The writers of this bad prose are too interested in our arrival at some social place wherein we will finally emerge from our "inauthentic" state into something called "reality." Most of this stuff, of course, comes from those steeped in the Continental tradition (particularly post-Kant). While that tradition has much to offer and has helped shape my own philosophical sensibilities, it is anything but useful when it comes to truly relevant philosophical analysis, and no self-respecting Pragmatist can really take seriously the strong poetry of formations like "authenticity looming on the ever remote horizons of fetishization." What Pragmatists see instead is the hope that we can fix some of the social ills that face us if we treat policy and reform as more important than Spirit and Utopia.

#### No root cause of war – decades of research votes aff

Cashman 2000 (Greg Cashman, Professor of Political Science at Salisbury State University, 2000 “What Causes war?: An introduction to theories of international conflict” pg. 9)

Two warnings need to be issued at this point. First, while we have been using a single variable explanation of war merely for the sake of simplicity, multivariate explanations of war are likely to be much more powerful. Since social and political behaviors are extremely complex, they are almost never explainable through a single factor. Decades of research have led most analysts to reject monocausal explanations of war. For instance, international relations theorist J. David Singer suggests that we ought to move away from the concept of “causality” since it has become associated with the search for a single cause of war; we should instead redirect our activities toward discovering “explanations”—a term that implies multiple causes of war, but also a certain element of randomness or chance in their occurrence.

#### Extinction outweighs – as long as there is some life there’s only a risk they retain ontological capacity

Hans Jonas (Former Alvin Johnson Prof. Phil. – New School for Social Research and Former Eric Voegelin Visiting Prof. – U. Munich) 1996 “Morality and Mortality: A Search for the Good After Auschwitz”, p. 111-112)

With this look ahead at an ethics for the future, we are touching at the same time upon the question of the future of freedom. The unavoidable discussion of this question seems to give rise to misunderstandings. My dire prognosis that not only our material standard of living but also our democratic freedoms would fall victim to the growing pressure of a worldwide ecological crisis, until finally there would remain only some form of tyranny that would try to save the situation, has led to the accusation that I am defending dictatorship as a solution to our problems. I shall ignore here what is a confusion between warning and recommendation. But I have indeed said that such a tyranny would still be better than total ruin; thus, I have ethically accepted it as an alternative. I must now defend this standpoint, which I continue to support, before the court that I myself have created with the main argument of this essay. For are we not contradicting ourselves in prizing physical survival at the price of freedom? Did we not say that freedom was the condition of our capacity for responsibility—and that this capacity was a reason for the survival of humankind?; By tolerating tyranny as an alternative to physical annihilation are we not violating the principle we established: that the How of existence must not take precedence over its Why? Yet we can make a terrible concession to the primacy of physical survival in the conviction that the ontological capacity for freedom, inseparable as it is from man's being, cannot really be extinguished, only temporarily banished from the public realm. This conviction can be supported by experience we are all familiar with. We have seen that even in the most totalitarian societies the urge for freedom on the part of some individuals cannot be extinguished, and this renews our faith in human beings. Given this faith, we have reason to hope that, as long as there are human beings who survive, the image of God will continue to exist along with them and will wait in concealment for its new hour. With that hope—which in this particular case takes precedence over fear—it is permissible, for the sake of physical survival, to accept if need be a temporary absence of freedom in the external affairs of humanity. This is, I want to emphasize, a worst-case scenario, and it is the foremost task of responsibility at this particular moment in world history to prevent it from happening. This is in fact one of the noblest of duties (and at the same time one concerning self-preservation), on the part of the imperative of responsibility to avert future coercion that would lead to lack of freedom by acting freely in the present, thus preserving as much as possible the ability of future generations to assume responsibility. But more than that is involved. At stake is the preservation of Earth's entire miracle of creation, of which our human existence is a part and before which man reverently bows, even without philosophical "grounding." Here too faith may precede and reason follow; it is faith that longs for this preservation of the Earth (fides quaerens intellectum), and reason comes as best it can to faith's aid with arguments, not knowing or even asking how much depends on its success or failure in determining what action to take. With this confession of faith we come to the end of our essay on ontology.

#### Death is the ultimate form of ontological destruction – its destroys all human possibility – reject it regardless of their value to life arguments

Craig Paterson (Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island) 2003 “A Life Not Worth Living?”,Studies in Christian Ethics, http://sce.sagepub.com

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alternative of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes. 80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life. 81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility

#### Vote aff to preserve the capacity of individuals to choose

Craig Paterson (Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island) 2003 “A Life Not Worth Living?”,Studies in Christian Ethics, http://sce.sagepub.com

In determining whether a life is worth living or not, attention should be focused upon an array of ‘interests’ of the person, and these, for the competent patient at least, are going to vary considerably, since they will be informed by the patient’s underlying dispositions, and, for the incompetent, by a minimal quality threshold. It follows that for competent patients, a broad-ranging assessment of quality of life concerns is the trump card as to whether or not life continues to be worthwhile. Different patients may well decide differently. That is the prerogative of the patient, for the only unpalatable alternative is to force a patient to stay alive. For Harris, life can be judged valuable or not when the person assessing his or her own life determines it to be so. If a person values his or her own life, then that life is valuable, precisely to the extent that he or she values it. Without any real capacity to value, there can be no value. As Harris states, ‘. . . the value of our lives is the value we give to our lives’. It follows that the primary injustice done to a person is to deprive the person of a life he or she may think valuable. Objectivity in the value of human life, for Harris, essentially becomes one of negative classification (ruling certain people out of consideration for value), allied positively to a broad range of ‘critical interests’; interests worthy of pursuing — friendships, family, life goals, etc. — which are subjected to de facto self-assessment for the further determination of meaningful value. Suicide, assisted suicide, and voluntary euthanasia, can therefore be justified, on the grounds that once the competent nature of the person making the decision has been established, the thoroughgoing commensuration between different values, in the form of interests or preferences, is essentially left up to the individual to determine for himself or herself.

#### Calculation is good and doesn’t devalue life

Revesz 2008 Richard L. Revesz (Dean and Lawrence King Professor of Law at New York University School of Law, JD Yale Law School) and Michael A Livermore. (JD NYU School of Law, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Integrity, and Managing director of the NYU Law Review). Retaking Rationality How Cots-Benefit Analysis Can Better protect the Environment and Our Health. 2008. P. 1-4.

Governmental decisions are also fundamentally different from personal decisions in that they often affect people in the aggregate. In our individual lives, we come into contact with at least some of the consequences of our decisions. If we fail to consult a map, we pay the price: losing valuable time driving around in circles and listening to the complaints of our passengers. We are constantly confronted with the consequences of the choices that we have made. Not so for governments, however, which exercise authority by making decisions at a distance. Perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of governmental decisions is that they require a special kind of compassion—one that can seem, at first glance, cold and calculating, the antithesis of empathy. The aggregate and complex nature of governmental decisions does not address people as human beings, with concerns and interests, families and emotional relationships, secrets and sorrows. Rather, people are numbers stacked in a column or points on a graph, described not through their individual stories of triumph and despair, but by equations, functions, and dose-response curves. The language of governmental decisionmaking can seem to—and to a certain extent does—ignore what makes individuals unique and morally important. But, although the language of bureaucratic decisionmaking can be dehumanizing, it is also a prerequisite for the kind of compassion that is needed in contemporary society. Elaine Scarry has developed a comparison between individual compassion and statistical compassion.' Individual compassion is familiar—when we see a person suffering, or hear the story of some terrible tragedy, we are moved to take action. Statistical compassion seems foreign—we hear only a string of numbers but must comprehend "the concrete realities embedded there."' Individual compassion derives from our social nature, and may be hardwired directly into the human brain.' Statistical compassion calls on us to use our higher reasoning power to extend our natural compassion to the task of solving more abstract—but no less real—problems. Because compassion is not just about making us feel better—which we could do as easily by forgetting about a problem as by addressing it—we have a responsibility to make the best decisions that we can. This book argues that cost-benefit analysis, properly conducted, can improve environmental and public health policy. Cost-benefit analysis—the translation of human lives and acres of forest into the language of dollars and cents—can seem harsh and impersonal. But such an approach is also necessary to improve the quality of decisions that regulators make. Saving the most lives, and best protecting the quality of our environment and our health—in short, exercising our compassion most effectively—requires us to step back and use our best analytic tools. Sometimes, in order to save a life, we need to treat a person like a number. This is the challenge of statistical compassion. This book is about making good decisions. It focuses on the area of environmental, health and safety regulation. These regulations have been the source of numerous and hard-fought controversies over the past several decades, particularly at the federal level. Reaching the right decisions in the areas of environmental protection, increasing safety, and improving public health is clearly of high importance. Although it is admirable (and fashionable) for people to buy green or avoid products made in sweatshops, efforts taken at the individual level are not enough to address the pressing problems we face—there is a vital role for government in tackling these issues, and sound collective decisions concerning regulation are needed. There is a temptation to rely on gut-level decisionmaking in order to avoid economic analysis, which, to many, is a foreign language on top of seeming cold and unsympathetic. For government to make good decisions, however, it cannot abandon reasoned analysis. Because of the complex nature of governmental decisions, we have no choice but to deploy complex analytic tools in order to make the best choices possible. Failing to use these tools, which amounts to abandoning our duties to one another, is not a legitimate response. Rather, we must exercise statistical compassion by recognizing what numbers of lives saved represent: living and breathing human beings, unique, with rich inner lives and an interlocking web of emotional relationships. The acres of a forest can be tallied up in a chart, but that should not blind us to the beauty of a single stand of trees. We need to use complex tools to make good decisions while simultaneously remembering that we are not engaging in abstract exercises, but that we are having real effects on people and the environment. In our personal lives, it would be unwise not to shop around for the best price when making a major purchase, or to fail to think through our options when making a major life decision. It is equally foolish for government to fail to fully examine alternative policies when making regulatory decisions with life-or-death consequences. This reality has been recognized by four successive presidential administrations. Since 1981, the cost-benefit analysis of major regulations has been required by presidential order. Over the past twenty-five years, however, environmental and other progressive groups have declined to participate in the key governmental proceedings concerning the cost-benefit analysis of federal regulations, instead preferring to criticize the technique from the outside. The resulting asymmetry in political participation has had profound negative consequences, both for the state of federal regulation and for the technique of cost-benefit analysis itself. Ironically, this state of affairs has left progressives open to the charge of rejecting reason, when in fact strong environmental and public health pro-grams are often justified by cost-benefit analysis. It is time for progressive groups, as well as ordinary citizens, to retake the high ground by embracing and reforming cost-benefit analysis. The difference between being unthinking—failing to use the best tools to analyze policy—and unfeeling—making decisions without compassion—is unimportant: Both lead to bad policy. Calamities can result from the failure to use either emotion or reason. Our emotions provide us with the grounding for our principles, our innate interconnectedness, and our sense of obligation to others. We use our powers of reason to build on that emotional foundation, and act effectively to bring about a better world.

#### Uranium mining is a well-documented form of nuclear colonialism – Pyro-processing solves

Danielle Endres, November 2009, research and teaching interests lie in argumentation, rhetorical criticism, environmental communication, social movements, and Native American cultures, directing an oral history project: Nuclear Technology in the American West that is collecting and archiving the stories of people involved in nuclear issues, particularly nuclear waste, in the American West. Third, Danielle is a co-director of a national research project on climate change activism, “From wasteland to waste site: the role of discourse in nuclear power’s environmental injustices,” Local Environment, Ebsco Host

As mentioned above, nuclear colonialism describes how the nuclear production process – including both nuclear weapons production and nuclear power – disproportionately harms indigenous people worldwide.3 The Indigenous Environmental Network (2002) wrote: The nuclear industry has waged an undeclared war against our Indigenous peoples and Pacific Islanders that has poisoned our communities worldwide. For more than 50 years, the legacy of the nuclear chain, from exploration to the dumping of radioactive waste has been proven, through documentation, to be genocide and ethnocide and a deadly enemy of Indigenous peoples. . . United States federal law and nuclear policy has not protected Indigenous peoples, and in fact has been created to allow the nuclear industry to continue operations at the expense of our land, territory, health and traditional ways of life. . . . This disproportionate toxic burden – called environmental racism – has culminated in the current attempts to dump much of the nation’s nuclear waste in the homelands of the Indigenous peoples of the Great Basin region of the United States. Examples of nuclear colonialism in the United States include Uranium mining and milling on reservation lands in the Black Hills and Four Corners regions, nuclear testing on land claimed under the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley by theWestern Shoshone, and HLWstorage sites considered on Western Shoshone, Southern Paiute, and Skull Valley Band of Goshute lands (Nelkin 1981, Grinde and Johansen 1995, Kuletz 1998, La Duke 1999, Hoffman 2001). The phenomenon of nuclear colonialism is empirically documented. The book Nuclear Wastelands, edited by Makhijani et al. (1995), reveals that indigenous people in the USA and globally are disproportionately burdened by the production of nuclear weapons. Further, Hooks and Smith (2004, p. 572) demonstrate that US military sites are disproportionately located on or near Native American lands. While these studies focus primarily on military applications of nuclear technologies, there is also evidence to suggest that Uranium mining for nuclear power production and HLW storage also fall within the pattern of nuclear colonialism (Nelkin 1981, Hoffman 2001). Hoffman (2001, p. 462) details the “extraordinary unequal distribution of benefits and burdens at each stage of the [nuclear fuel] cycle” imposed upon Native American nations in the USA, particularly by Uranium mining and HLW disposal. Nuclear colonialism is a type of environmental injustice. In part, nuclear colonialism is environmental racism. According to Bullard (1999, p. 6), “environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for whites while shifting costs to people of color”. Yet, nuclear colonialism is also a form of colonialism. Native Americans, unlike other marginalised racial groups in the USA, are members of over 150 distinct sovereign tribal nations and each holds a unique legal relationship with the federal government. As Suagee (2002, p. 227) notes, “Although Indian people have suffered much discriminatory treatment from people who apparently define Indian identity in primarily racial–ethnic terms, the fact that Native American governments are sovereign governments is a significant distinction between them and other kinds of minorities”. Although Native Americans in the USA are sovereign governments, they are still faced with a system of colonialism. Gedicks (1993, p. 13) argues that Native Americans are embedded within a system of resource colonialism under which “native peoples are under assault on every continent because their lands contain a wide variety of valuable resources needed for industrial development”. Nuclear colonialism is a form of resource colonialism that faces Native Americans in the USA and other indigenous peoples worldwide.4

#### Nuclear energy is essential to quality of life issues that disproportionately affect minority communities. Public transportation, water treatment, hospitals, .

American Association of Blacks in Energy 2002 May, 1 pg. 1 “American Association of Blacks in Energy Supports Yucca Mountain Storage Repository” <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/nuclearwastedisposal/regulatoryinformation/aabenewsrelease5102 >

At its quarterly meeting last month, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Blacks in Energy announced its support for Congressional ratification of Yucca Mountain, Nevada as the logical site for nuclear waste storage. “Careful and diligent monitoring is key to ensuring public health and safety, but that can be better accomplished at one site instead of continuing the current practice of on-site storage. The Yucca Mountain project is an important component in a solid energy policy which ensures energy and environmental equity for all Americans,” said Frank Johnson, chairman of the association. In related action, the organization reaffirmed its support for re-licensing of nuclear facilities. “Nuclear is America’s largest base-load, emission-free electricity. Minority communities are commonly found in urban areas that require large amounts of electricity for public transportation, hospitals, water treatment facilities and other necessities. We believe that nuclear energy provides important benefits”, said Johnson. “Our quality of life depends upon electricity that is reliable and affordable – and nuclear is an important part of the mix,” he said. AABE is a national association of energy professionals founded and dedicated to ensure the input of African Americans and other minorities into the discussion and development of energy policies, regulations, R&D technologies and environmental issues.

#### You should adopt an ontology of pragmatism- we must work with the system that we are handed and cannot simply wish it away

HNSG (Harvard Nuclear Study Group – Albert Carnesale, UCLA Chancellor Emeritus and holds professorial appointments in UCLA’s School of Public Affairs and Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science, twenty-three year tenure at Harvard University , Pauly Doty, Founder and Director Emeritus of the Center for Science and International Affairs and Mallinckrodt Professor of Biochemistry, and an emeritus member of the BCSIA Board of Directors, Stanley Hoffmann, the Paul and Catherine Buttenweiser University Professor at Harvard University, Samuel Huntington, was an associate professor of government at Columbia University where he was also Deputy Director of The Institute for War and Peace Studies, Joseph Nye, University Distinguished Service Professor, and former Dean of the Kennedy School at Harvard, and Scott Sagan, Caroline S.G. Munro Professor of Political Science at Stanford, co-director of Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation, and a Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute) 1983 “Living With Nuclear Weapons” p. 18-9

In the nuclear age, the dangers the United States faces are both numerous and enormous. It would be best if all these dangers could be eliminated, but in international relations as in politics, the goal is to relate the desirable to the possible. The impossibility of achieving perfect solutions should not, however, breed discouragement. It should only strengthen determination to persevere. When facing enormous problems, there is a special attraction to the assumption that only radical answers can suffice. Hence, the strong pull of utopian visions of both the extreme left and the extreme right: the ideas that only a world government can solve all our problems or that sheer military muscle is all that America needs. Both prescribe all-purpose solutions, but each ignores the real world. In the real world, packed with huge nuclear arsenals, mere military muscle, unless built and exercised with restraint and skill, will not ensure American security. In the real world of sovereign states, a world government is a dream for the distant future, not a practical goal for current policymakers. The danger of focusing on utopian objectives is that they can take attention away from practical and positive steps that can be taken now. Such actions may only produce incremental progress to war the goal of national security. But incremental steps matter. It would be a tragedy if opportunities for practical progress toward nuclear peace were missed because our goals were set too high, beyond the reach of what is possible. In his book The Fate of the Earth, Jonathan Schell has reminded people about the dangers of nuclear war, but his “solution” is precisely such an impossible goal. “The task,” he wrote, “is nothing less than to reinvent politics: to reinvent the world.” In reality, however, neither politics nor the world were invented by men, nor can either politics or the world be reinvented. Rather, these arrangements evolved through trial and error, through sacrifice and occasional gifted leadership, to an organization of life on earth that has reached unprecedented attainments. The nature of humanity, the complex mosaic of civilizations, the web of relations that unites so many nations cannot be taken apart and reinvented in the future. They can, we hope, continue to evolve. We are left, therefore, with our imperfect selves, imperfect nations, and imperfect realtions among them. And it is upon this imperfect structure that the capability of waging infinitely destructive nuclear war has descended. Humanity has no alternative but to hold this threat at bay and to learn to live with politics, to live in a world we know: a world of nuclear weapons, international rivalries, recurring conflicts, and at least some risk of nuclear crisis. The challenge we face is not to escape to a fictional utopia where such problems do not exist. It is to learn how to live with nuclear weapons in ways that are successively safer and in which the freedoms won by men and women are kept secure and can grow.
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#### Loan guarantees are necessary to offset transmission subsidies for electricity projects – otherwise no new reactor financing.

Mark Holt, 6-20-2012, has been a Congressional Research Service policy analyst specializing in nuclear energy, head of the CRS Energy and Minerals Section in the Resources, Science, and Industry Division, covered energy issues with the Environmental and Energy Study Conference, Congressional Research Service (CRS), “Nuclear Energy Policy,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33558.pdf>

Under such loan guarantee agreements, the federal government would repay all covered loans if the borrower defaulted. This would reduce the risk to lenders and allow them to provide financing at low interest rates. The Title XVII loan guarantees are widely considered crucial by the nuclear industry to obtain financing for new reactors. However, opponents contend that nuclear loan guarantees would provide an unjustifiable subsidy to a mature industry and shift investment away from environmentally preferable energy technologies.81 The total amount of Title XVII loan guarantees to be made available for nuclear power has been the subject of considerable congressional debate. President Obama’s FY2011 budget request would have nearly tripled the current ceiling on federal loan guarantees for nuclear power plants, from $18.5 billion to $54.5 billion. A $36 billion increase would increase the number of reactors that could receive loan guarantees from about three or four to about a dozen, depending on their size. The Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act for FY2011 (P.L.112-10) did not provide the requested increase, leaving the nuclear power loan guarantee ceiling at $18.5 billion. The Administration again requested a $36 billion nuclear loan guarantee increase for FY2012, but none of the increase was included in the FY2012 Consolidated Appropriations Act. No increase was requested for FY2013.The Administration announced the first conditional nuclear power plant loan guarantee on February 16, 2010, totaling $8.33 billion for two proposed new reactors at Georgia’s Vogtle nuclear plant site. Owners of the Vogtle project have reportedly estimated that the loan guarantee could reduce their financing costs by as much as $2 billion.82 Other finalists for the first round of nuclear reactor loan guarantees were Calvert Cliffs 3 in Maryland, South Texas Plant 3 and 4, and Summer 2 and 3.83 However, as noted earlier, the future of the proposed units at Calvert Cliffs and the South Texas Plant is currently uncertain, leaving only Summer 2 and 3 as clearly viable candidates. DOE issued final rules for the program October 4, 2007, 84 and finalized the first loan guarantee on September 4, 2009, totaling $535 million to Solyndra Inc. for a photovoltaic panel manufacturing plant, which subsequently defaulted.85 DOE’s proposed loan guarantee rules, published May 16, 2007, had been sharply criticized by the nuclear industry for limiting the guarantees to 90% of a project’s debt. The industry contended that EPACT05 allows all of a project’s debt to be covered, as long as debt does not exceed 80% of total construction costs. In its explanation of the proposed rules, DOE expressed concern that guaranteeing 100% of a project’s debt could reduce lenders’ incentive to perform adequate due diligence and therefore increase default risks. In the final rule, however, DOE agreed to guarantee up to 100% of a project’s debt, but in that case the loans had to be issued by the Federal Financing Bank. Subsidy Costs Title XVII requires the estimated future government costs resulting from defaults on guaranteed loans to be covered up-front by appropriations or by payments from project sponsors, such as the utility planning to build a plant. These “subsidy costs” are calculated as the present value of the average possible future net costs to the government for each loan guarantee. If those calculations are accurate, the subsidy cost payments for all the guaranteed projects together should cover the future costs of the program, including default-related losses. However, the Congressional Budget Office has predicted that the up-front subsidy cost payments will prove too low by at least 1%and is scoring bills accordingly.86 For example; appropriations bills that provide loan guarantee authorizations include an adjustment equal to 1% of the loan guarantee ceiling. (For more information on loan guarantee subsidy costs, see CRS Report R42152, Loan Guarantees for Clean Energy Technologies: Goals, Concerns, and Policy Options, by Phillip Brown.) DOE loan guarantees for renewable energy and electricity transmission projects under EPACT05section 1705, added by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5), do not require subsidy cost payments by project sponsors, because potential losses are covered by advance appropriations in the act. No such appropriations are currently available for nuclear power projects, so it is anticipated that nuclear loan guarantee subsidy costs would be paid by the project sponsors. As a result, the level of the subsidy costs could have a powerful effect on the viability of nuclear power projects, which are currently expected to cost between $5 billion and$10 billion per reactor. For example, a 10% subsidy cost for a $7 billion loan guarantee would require an up-front payment of $700 million. No subsidy cost amount has yet been established for any nuclear loan guarantee, including the lead Vogtle project in Georgia. The Administration’s continuing internal deliberations over that question may reflect its importance and the amount of controversy being generated. Internal DOE documents released May 23, 2012, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act show that Southern Company, the lead partner in the Vogtle project, has been offered a subsidy cost of0.5%-1.5%, subject to other conditions that are still under negotiation. Higher subsidy costs are being offered to two other partners in the project.87The nuclear industry contends that historical experience indicates defaults

### Politics- Immigration

#### Non-Unique- DC appeals court will force Congress to revisit nuclear waste this week

Court should order US NRC to resume Yucca review: petition Washington (Platts)—1-4-2013/453 pm EST/2153 GMT http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6989382

Petitioners seeking to force US Nuclear Regulatory Commission to resume its review of the Department of Energy's application for a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, on Friday said Congress' failure to act on the matter means a federal court should immediately order resumption of the work. The US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit had ordered parties to submit an update to their positions by Friday to take into account any action by the 112th Congress, which ended Tuesday. A new Congress began its session Wednesday. The last Congress did not pass any legislation to modify the requirements in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act that NRC complete its review of DOE's application, petitioners Aiken County, South Carolina, Nye County, Nevada, South Carolina and Washington states, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners and three individuals said in their update to the court. The parties sued NRC in 2011 seeking to force it to resume the review, which the agency said it stopped because of a lack of funds. "The NRC's obligations to move forward on the license application ... should be enforced," the joint petitioner's update said. The court had extended an earlier December 14 deadline for the updates on congressional action, acting on an NRC request. NRC had said that "ongoing negotiations" between the executive branch and Congress might address the funding issue. DOE abandoned the project in 2010, citing opposition from the state of Nevada. Neither NRC nor DOE requested funds for Yucca Mountain licensing work in fiscal 2013, which started October 1. NRC said in its court filing Friday afternoon that Congress' failure to add funds for the Yucca Mountain review during negotiations to avoid the so-called fiscal cliff at year-end, President Barack Obama's re-election and the fact that neither chamber of Congress has changed party control means there is no reason to force it to resume the review. "The election returned to office an Executive Branch administration that has stated that it does not intend to seek a license for Yucca Mountain," NRC said. "And the election left the political balance of power unchanged in the Legislative Branch, which has repeatedly indicated through its recent funding decisions that it does not intend to appropriate additional Nuclear Waste Fund money for this project," it added. The agency has $10.5 million remaining in funds available for the Yucca Mountain review, an amount that would be insufficient for any long-term restart of its staff efforts, NRC said in the filing. The state of Nevada, which opposes the Yucca Mountain facility, said in its update, also filed Friday, that Congress failed to provide additional funding for NRC to continue the review. No such money was made available in a continuing resolution in September that funded government activities until the end of March, Nevada said. "Congress rejected, for the second straight fiscal year, the chance to provide the [NRC] with any money to continue the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding," Nevada said. Congress also did not provide DOE with additional money for advancing the license application, the state said. It is not clear when the court will make a final ruling. Two members of the three-judge panel have indicated in previous opinions they support ordering NRC to resume the review, even if Congress were not to act on the matter.

#### Opposition and other issues

Gonzalez 1/5 (Daniel González, “'Cliff' fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight,” The Town Talk, http://www.thetowntalk.com/article/20130105/NEWS/130105020?nclick\_check=1)

Although Obama says he wants to jump right into immigration reform, he and Congress will have to focus their attention for months on several unresolved issues left over from the New Year’s Day deal to avert the “fiscal cliff,” including a March1 deadline to avoid billions of dollars in across-the-board spending cuts and a late February/early March deadline to raise the debt ceiling.¶ “That is problem Number 1 for immigration reform. That will dominate the agenda for the time being,” said Louis DeSipio, a political-science professor at the University of California-Irvine.¶ Immigration reform also will have to compete with gun-control legislation. After the shooting in Newtown, Obama appointed Vice President Joe Biden to head an anti-violence commission to come up with new gun-control measures by the end of this month.¶ “That is going to put more pressure on Congress,” DeSipio said.¶ Gun control, plus the divisive atmosphere demonstrated by the Republican-controlled House and the Democrat-run Senate during the fiscal-cliff debate, “makes it more and more unlikely that Congress will actually be able to debate a comprehensive immigration-reform bill,” he said.

#### Republicans fear getting voted out of office

Donald S. Dobkin January 2013 “Why No One Wants Immigration Reform” http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=donald\_dobkin

Major immigration reform is incredibly difficult to achieve. A large core group of ¶ the Republican party is opposed to amnesty. And because of politics one can ¶ understand their reluctance to support amnesty. After all, with approximately 70% of the ¶ Hispanic vote going for the Democrats, why would the Republicans be interested in ¶ legalizing 12 million undocumented immigrants, most of whom will wind up voting for ¶ ¶ Democrats? Republicans would, in effect, be voting themselves out of office ¶ permanently!

#### Hagel thumps the DA

Wong 1/6 (Scott Wong and Manu Raju, “Chuck Hagel takes fire from Capitol Hill,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/chuck-hagel-takes-fire-from-capitol-hill-85805.html)

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama’s expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense.¶ In fact, Obama’s decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling.¶ Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon.¶ The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he’s firmly against Hagel’s nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the “most antagonistic” views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history.¶ And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be “tough questions” ahead.¶ Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they‘re not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line.¶ The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration — just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots — especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious.¶ Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya.¶ Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice’s remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel’s past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he’s grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record.¶ “It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice,” one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. “Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it’s even possible.”¶ Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn’t a natural base for him.¶ “I can’t imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel,” one senior GOP aide said. “Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this.”

#### Debt ceiling- top of the agenda

Nelson 1-2 [Colleen McCain Nelson 1-2-2013 Wall Street Journal “The Fiscal Cliff: Lack of Grand Bargain Complicates Obama's Priorities” ProQuest]

For President Barack Obama, the new year was supposed to bring an end to fiscal-cliff negotiations and the opportunity to begin work on a second-term agenda.¶ But the failure to craft a grand bargain to address the country's fiscal woes means that contentious discussions about spending cuts and the debt ceiling will continue in 2013 -- potentially diminishing the time and goodwill Mr. Obama needs to pursue his policy priorities.¶ Critics of the budget compromise already are signaling that hard feelings about this protracted process could linger, creating an uncertain path for the president as he tries to build support for proposals including an immigration-law overhaul, tax-code changes, energy legislation and other issues.¶ Still, the White House deal with Congress appears to have bolstered Mr. Obama's position in some ways. The president won a concession from Republicans in Congress on a central tenet of GOP ideology, which holds that tax rates should never rise. Moreover, Mr. Obama's success on that point came with a flourish -- a show of overwhelming support in the Senate, on a vote of 89-8.¶ Conservative opposition in the House failed to stop the deal, and that chamber approved the package late Tuesday.¶ Speaking minutes after the House vote, Mr. Obama said: "Thanks to the votes of Democrats and Republicans in Congress I will sign a law that raises taxes on the wealthiest 2% of Americans while preventing a middle-class tax hike that could have sent the economy back into recession."¶ Mr. Obama said he would like to take additional steps to reduce the nation's deficit, "with a little bit less drama, a little less brinksmanship." After his speech, Mr. Obama planned to fly to Hawaii to rejoin his family on vacation. Tuesday's developments not only suggest that the White House can strike deals with congressional Republicans in what has seemed like an ossified Washington political culture, but also that Mr. Obama has momentum in pursuing his goals. Mr. Obama appears to have a channel to negotiate with the GOP, by having Vice President Joe Biden work with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.).¶ The cost to Mr. Obama is some complaining from the political left, which among other things notes that he has abandoned his campaign pledge to raise tax rates on household incomes above $250,000 in favor of the negotiated level of $450,000 for couples.¶ The White House believes the compromise is a victory for the president.¶ A person familiar with the discussions noted that Mr. Obama faced determined Republican opposition and still managed to forge an agreement that raises tax rates for the first time in a generation.¶ "The president has delivered on a major campaign promise and broken Republicans' backs on a 20-year pledge" to oppose tax rate increases, a White House official said.¶ But some Republicans have said that Mr. Obama fouled the water during the fiscal-cliff talks with combative, cajoling tactics. The president drew Republican ire Monday when he held a campaign-style event as the fiscal-cliff deadline loomed and passage of a deal remained uncertain.¶ Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.) called the gathering a "cheerleading rally." Sen. Bob Corker, a Tennessee Republican, accused the president of heckling Congress.¶ The White House said the appearance had been long in the works and was meant to highlight the real-world consequences of going over the fiscal cliff.¶ Rep. Mike Rogers (R., Mich.) said the president has focused his efforts during the past few weeks on railing against Congress and Republicans in particular instead of launching a dialogue.¶ "The president just doesn't play well with others," he said. "I do think he's up for a bumpy road, given his tactics."¶ Historically, second-term presidents have had a limited window to roll out major policy proposals before lame-duck status sets in and passing significant legislation becomes a steeper challenge. With that in mind, Mr. Obama has said he would roll out proposals aimed at reducing gun violence and overhauling immigration laws early this year.¶ The White House view is that Mr. Obama would have been ill-positioned to pass policy priorities if the country was still preoccupied with the effects of having gone over the fiscal cliff.¶ But now, because lawmakers postponed for two months the spending cuts that were set to take effect Wednesday, fiscal issues will continue to consume much of the political oxygen in the near future. So will talks about whether to raise the nation's statutory borrowing limit.

#### Winners win- Second term depends on bold legislative moves

Ignatius 11/7 (David Ignatius, longtime writer and reporter, studied political theory at Harvard College and economics at Kings College, Cambridge, November 7, 2012, “A time for Obama to be bold,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/president-obama-go-big/2012/11/07/dbf545f8-28fc-11e2-bab2-eda299503684\_story.html?hpid=z4)

Barack Obama will be getting advice by the boatload over the next few weeks, but the best guidance may be what emerges from Caro’s biography “The Passage of Power”: Think big. Find strategies and pressure points that can break the gridlock in Congress, which was as rigid in 1963 as it is today. Surprise your adversaries with bold moves and concessions that create new space on which to govern.¶ As I watched Tuesday’s triumph, it seemed obvious that Obama needs the policy equivalent of David Plouffe, his senior campaign adviser. Plouffe’s genius was to decide early on that the race depended on nine battleground states; if he could deliver those states by a relentless and sometimes ruthless assault, he would win the larger victory. He was like a general who concentrates his forces at the points of greatest vulnerability and then prevails through sheer force of will.¶ Obama’s performance as president has often lacked this decisive, strategic quality. The notes are there but not the policy “music.” In both foreign and domestic policy, the impression of Obama, after his blunderbuss, first-year battles on health care and the Israeli-Palestinian issue, has been of a careful president who reacts to events, waits for others to make the first moves and plays to avoid losing rather than to win.¶ Well, Mr. President, what the hell’s the presidency for?¶ A strategic second term would begin by identifying a list of necessary and achievable goals, and then pursuing them with the unyielding manipulative skill of a Lyndon Johnson. On the top of everybody’s list would be a budget deal. Everybody knows, more or less, what it will require: changes in Social Security and Medicare that slow the growth of entitlement spending; reform of the tax code that produces a fairer and simpler system that raises revenue without limiting growth.¶ A road map is there in the Simpson-Bowles deficit-reduction plan, and Obama administration officials have been thinking privately for months about how to tweak the plan so it’s better and fairer. Mitt Romney’s generous concession speech Tuesday night opened a possible door, and the president should follow up his statement that he will “look forward to sitting down with Governor Romney to talk about where we can work together to move this country forward.” The president and his new Treasury secretary (Jack Lew?) should take the next step and ask Romney to help close the budget deal the country needs.¶ In foreign policy, Obama will need to be equally strategic. What does he want to accomplish? My list: a deal with Iran that verifiably limits its nuclear program and avoids war; a deal in Afghanistan that averts civil war when U.S. forces leave in 2014; a deal for a political transition in Syria (a shorthand Syria summary would be to organize the opposition so that it’s strong enough to bargain, then help win a Nobel Peace Prize for Vladimir Putin). And, finally, a deal to create a Palestinian state so that Israel has secure borders and the Arab world can get on with the process of becoming modern and democratic.¶ All these primary foreign policy goals are “deals,” and it follows that the president needs a dealmaker as secretary of state. Who could do that, after Hillary Clinton leaves, probably at the end of January? John Kerry is an experienced man who thinks outside the box and is willing to take risks. Even if the president is said to have found him somewhat windy as the stand-in for Romney during debate preparation, Kerry has shown over the past four years a willingness to negotiate with adversaries, in secret, to achieve results.¶ A longtime Democratic adviser argues that Obama needs the “Bolten Plan,” as in Josh Bolten, the White House chief of staff who mobilized the machinery of government to get it moving in the same direction in George W. Bush’s second term. This will never be a happy model for Democrats, but it captures an important point: A successful second term is less about ideology than about results.¶ Think big. Take risks. Get it done. Maybe someone should slip a note in Obama’s desk drawer that asks: What would Lyndon Johnson have done to make it happen?

#### Fast reactors developed and popular with the public – waste management.

Tom Blees, 5-31-2011, is the author of Prescription for the Planet, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Idaho Samizdat: Nuke Notes, “Critique of MIT Nuclear Fuel Cycle Report,” <http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2011/05/critique-of-mit-nuclear-fuel-cycle.html>

The public views adequate nuclear waste management as a critical linchpin in further development of nuclear energy. The technical community, therefore, needs to provide a practical approach to deal with the waste issue. The Fukushima accidents call attention to the importance of managing spent fuel safely. It appears the best technical approach is extracting the actinides from spent fuel, which reduces the effective lifetime of nuclear wastes from ~300,000 years to ~300 years. Extracting actinides (and using them to generate power) is by far the best technical approach to dealing with nuclear wastes. The MIT Study fails to mention this important possibility. If actinide extraction is chosen as a pathway for waste “disposal,” the recovered actinides still must be transmuted to fissile material or fissioned directly. This can be done only in fast reactors. Actinides can be burned in fast reactors, generating energy and at the same time creating more fissile material for the future. A key advantage of fast reactors is that they can be utilized as “burners” when excess plutonium inventories exist, and then converted to “breeders” whenever needed. Only fast reactors can satisfy the waste-disposal mission simply and effectively while extending utilization of the uranium resources by more than two orders of magnitude. Thermal reactors—such as LWRs and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors—utilize less than 1% of uranium resources, even with recycling of plutonium and some of the uranium. Thermal-spectrum reactors, even optimized, can extend the resource utilization only marginally, and they cannot burn actinides effectively. Actinide recycling also requires an efficient processing technology, with improved economics and nonproliferation characteristics. The pyroprocessing technique based on electrorefining, developed in the IFR program, has the potential to recover the actinides from LWR spent fuel as well as to fully recycle fuel in fast reactors. The fundamentals of pyroprocessing have already been demonstrated – this is not new science. The technology is now ready for pilot-scale demonstration, and it should be given the highest priority. We do not need decades of R&D to pursue all esoteric ideas. We already have in our hands on the most advanced technology, technology that no other countries possess. The MIT Study also talks about the inter-generational equity considerations. We believe that our generation should demonstrate the technologies that will solve the energy supply and waste management problems, rather than proposing a century-long interim storage of the spent nuclear fuel.

#### Advocates of nuclear energy swamp unpopularity – strong media campaign.

Sharon Squassoni, November 2009, is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in the nonprolifera-tion program. Prior to joining Carnegie, she held various positions in the US government, including at the Congressional research Service, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the US State Department, is a frequent contributor to journals, magazines and books on nuclear proliferation and defense, The Centre for International Governance Innovation, No. 7, “The US Nuclear Industry: Current Status and Prospects under the Obama Administration,” p. 7-8, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Nuclear_Energy_7_0.pdf>

Advocates of nuclear energy have embarked on strong marketing campaigns. For example, the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) has run advertisements describing nuclear energy as “clean air” energy. The Clean and Safe Energy Todd Whitman and former Greenpeace activist Patrick Moore, has been funded by the nuclear industry. One industry slogan is “Know new nukes.” The slogan appears over a field of yellow soybean flowers. “Clean” energy appears to be a euphemism for renewables plus nuclear power, which is why anti-nuclear advocates were heart-ened by President Obama’s February address to Congress in which he spoke only of renewable energy, rather than clean energy (Wasserman, 2009). Opponents of nuclear energy generally have less money to spend on media campaigns, and their message is less pithy. They stress that nuclear power is not the solution to climate change and that it is dangerous, polluting, unsafe, and expensive. Only a few planned nuclear plants are in states that do not already have power plants, such as Utah, Missouri and Idaho. Most of the expected plants will be constructed on existing reactor sites, which make them more acceptable to the local public.**Nuke leadership key to influence rogue states**

**UIB 2010** (Unistar Issue Brief, Publication of Constellation Energy and EDF Group, “The Global Nuclear Marketplace: A Case for Engagement,” http://www.unistarnuclear.com/IB/global\_marketplace.pdf)

The Consequences of Inaction

A significant global expansion of nuclear energy occurred while the United States sat on the sidelines, having last ordered a new nuclear energy facility in the late 1970s. As a result, America¶ lost much of its nuclear energy supply-chain capacity and manufacturing infrastructure and continues to fall behind other nations that have complete nuclear fuel cycles.¶ The United States needs to aggressively pursue advanced nuclear technologies to maintain leadership on international nuclear energy and security issues.¶ By hesitating to join the global nuclear energy renaissance, the United States puts itself at risk of losing influence over wider nuclear issues, such as preventing the proliferation of nuclear¶ weapons. Rogue states and unstable governments are trying to acquire such weapons. If we have nothing to offer, we lose a great deal of leverage on this and other international nuclear issues, increasing our own national security risks.¶ Moving Forward By CoMMitting to nuClear energy¶ At UniStar Nuclear Energy, we are doing our part to spur on the rebuilding of America. Our investments in new nuclear facilities have fueled the U.S. expansion plans of Alstom, AREVA and Northrup Grumman, among others. And we have already created almost 600 new jobs!¶ UniStar Nuclear Energy believes that the United States needs to become a full partner in the nuclear energy renaissance that is underway worldwide. This requires engagement not only on proliferation issues, but also in the supply chain and commercial nuclear energy development. Reviving the nation’s commercial nuclear energy manufacturing capacity will allow us to export materials and knowledge. It will provide us with economic benefits, and present an opportunity to support the expansion of emissions-free nuclear energy and strengthen our influence on nuclear energy issues worldwide.

#### **Aggressive foreign policy fails to deter or coerce- multiple crises prove**

Mearsheimer, 2011, January, John J., Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. He is on the Advisory Council of The National Interest, “Imperial by Design,”http://nationalinterest.org/article/imperial-by-design-4576

One year later, Charles Krauthammer emphasized in "The Unipolar Moment" that the United States had emerged from the Cold War as by far the most powerful country on the planet.2 He urged American leaders not to be reticent about using that power "to lead a unipolar world, unashamedly laying down the rules of world order and being prepared to enforce them." Krauthammer's advice fit neatly with Fukuyama's vision of the future: the United States should take the lead in bringing democracy to less developed countries the world over. After all, that shouldn't be an especially difficult task given that America had awesome power and the cunning of history on its side. U.S. grand strategy has followed this basic prescription for the past twenty years, mainly because most policy makers inside the Beltway have agreed with the thrust of Fukuyama's and Krauthammer's early analyses. The results, however, have been disastrous. The United States has been at war for a startling two out of every three years since 1989, and there is no end in sight. As anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of world events knows, countries that continuously fight wars invariably build powerful national-security bureaucracies that undermine civil liberties and make it difficult to hold leaders accountable for their behavior; and they invariably end up adopting ruthless policies normally associated with brutal dictators. The Founding Fathers understood this problem, as is clear from James Madison's observation that "no nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare." Washington's pursuit of policies like assassination, rendition and torture over the past decade, not to mention the weakening of the rule of law at home, shows that their fears were justified. To make matters worse, the United States is now engaged in protracted wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that have so far cost well over a trillion dollars and resulted in around forty-seven thousand American casualties. The pain and suffering inflicted on Iraq has been enormous. Since the war began in March 2003, more than one hundred thousand Iraqi civilians have been killed, roughly 2 million Iraqis have left the country and 1.7 million more have been internally displaced. Moreover, the American military is not going to win either one of these conflicts, despite all the phony talk about how the "surge" has worked in Iraq and how a similar strategy can produce another miracle in Afghanistan. We may well be stuck in both quagmires for years to come, in fruitless pursuit of victory. The United States has also been unable to solve three other major foreign-policy problems. Washington has worked overtime-with no success-to shut down Iran's uranium-enrichment capability for fear that it might lead to Tehran acquiring nuclear weapons. And the United States, unable to prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons in the first place, now seems incapable of compelling Pyongyang to give them up. Finally, every post-Cold War administration has tried and failed to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; all indicators are that this problem will deteriorate further as the West Bank and Gaza are incorporated into a Greater Israel. The unpleasant truth is that the United States is in a world of trouble today on the foreign-policy front, and this state of affairs is only likely to get worse in the next few years, as Afghanistan and Iraq unravel and the blame game escalates to poisonous levels. Thus, it is hardly surprising that a recent Chicago Council on Global Affairs survey found that "looking forward 50 years, only 33 percent of Americans think the United States will continue to be the world's leading power." Clearly, the heady days of the early 1990s have given way to a pronounced pessimism.

### Lacan 2ac

#### Psychoanalysis is a non-falsifiable – prefer predictions and explanations based on empiricism and evidence\*\*\*

Jerry A. **Coyne**, reviewing FOLLIES OF THE WISE by Frederick Crews, September 6, **2006**. http://tls.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,25347-2345445,00.html

Laid out in the first four essays, Crews’s brief against Freud is hard to refute. Through Freud’s letters and documents, Crews reveals him to be not the compassionate healer of legend, but a cold and calculating megalomaniac, determined to go down in history as the Darwin of the psyche. Not only did he not care about patients (he sometimes napped or wrote letters while they were free-associating): there is no historical evidence that he effectively cured any of them. And the propositions of psychoanalysis have proven to be either untestable or falsified. How can we disprove the idea, for example, that we have a death drive? Or that dreams always represent wish fulfilments? When faced with counter-examples, Freudianism always proves malleable enough to incorporate them as evidence for the theory. Other key elements of Freudian theory have never been corroborated. There are no scientifically convincing experiments, for example, demonstrating the repression of traumatic memories. As Crews points out, work with survivors of the Holocaust and other traumatic episodes has shown not a single case in which such memories are quashed and then recovered. In four further essays, Crews documents the continuing pernicious influence of Freud in the “recovered memory” movement. The idea that childhood sexual abuse can be repressed and then recalled originated with Freud, and has been used by therapists to evoke false memories which have traumatized patients and shattered families. Realizing the scientific weaknesses of Freud, many diehards have taken the fall-back position that he was nevertheless a thinker of the first rank. Didn’t Freud give us the idea of the unconscious, they argue? Well, not really, for there was a whole history of pre-Freudian thought about people’s buried motives, including the writings of Shakespeare and Nietzsche. The “unconscious” was a commonplace of Romantic psychology and philosophy. And those who champion Freud as a philosopher must realize that his package also includes less savoury items like penis envy, the amorality of women, and our Lamarckian inheritance of “racial memory”. The quality of Crews’s prose is particularly evident in his two chapters on evolution versus creationism. In the first, he takes on creationists in their new guise as intelligent-design advocates, chastising them for pushing not only bad science, but contorted faith: “Intelligent design awkwardly embraces two clashing deities – one a glutton for praise and a dispenser of wrath, absolution, and grace, the other a curiously inept cobbler of species that need to be periodically revised and that keep getting snuffed out by the very conditions he provided for them. Why, we must wonder, would the shaper of the universe have frittered away some fourteen billion years, turning out quadrillions of useless stars, before getting around to the one thing he really cared about, seeing to it that a minuscule minority of earthling vertebrates are washed clean of sin and guaranteed an eternal place in his company?” But after demolishing creationists, Crews gives peacemaking scientists their own hiding, reproving them for trying to show that there is no contradiction between science and theology. Regardless of what they say to placate the faithful, most scientists probably know in their hearts that science and religion are incompatible ways of viewing the world. Supernatural forces and events, essential aspects of most religions, play no role in science, not because we exclude them deliberately, but because they have never been a useful way to understand nature. Scientific “truths” are empirically supported observations agreed on by different observers. Religious “truths,” on the other hand, are personal, unverifiable and contested by those of different faiths. Science is nonsectarian: those who disagree on scientific issues do not blow each other up. Science encourages doubt; most religions quash it. But religion is not completely separable from science. Virtually all religions make improbable claims that are in principle empirically testable, and thus within the domain of science: Mary, in Catholic teaching, was bodily taken to heaven, while Muhammad rode up on a white horse; and Jesus (born of a virgin) came back from the dead. None of these claims has been corroborated, and while science would never accept them as true without evidence, religion does. A mind that accepts both science and religion is thus a mind in conflict.Yet scientists, especially beleaguered American evolutionists, need the support of the many faithful who respect science. It is not politically or tactically useful to point out the fundamental and unbreachable gaps between science and theology. Indeed, scientists and philosophers have written many books (equivalents of Leibnizian theodicy) desperately trying to show how these areas can happily cohabit. In his essay, “Darwin goes to Sunday School”, Crews reviews several of these works, pointing out with brio the intellectual contortions and dishonesties involved in harmonizing religion and science. Assessing work by the evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould, the philosopher Michael Ruse, the theologian John Haught and others, Crews concludes, “When coldly examined . . . these productions invariably prove to have adulterated scientific doctrine or to have emptied religious dogma of its commonly accepted meaning”. Rather than suggesting any solution (indeed, there is none save adopting a form of “religion” that makes no untenable empirical claims), Crews points out the dangers to the survival of our planet arising from a rejection of Darwinism. Such rejection promotes apathy towards overpopulation, pollution, deforestation and other environmental crimes: “So long as we regard ourselves as creatures apart who need only repent of our personal sins to retain heaven’s blessing, we won’t take the full measure of our species-wise responsibility for these calamities”. Crews includes three final essays on deconstruction and other misguided movements in literary theory. These also show “follies of the wise” in that they involve interpretations of texts that are unanchored by evidence. Fortunately, the harm inflicted by Lacan and his epigones is limited to the good judgement of professors of literature. Follies of the Wise is one of the most refreshing and edifying collections of essays in recent years. Much like Christopher Hitchens in the UK, Crews serves a vital function as National Sceptic. He ends on a ringing note: “The human race has produced only one successfully validated epistemology, characterizing all scrupulous inquiry into the real world, from quarks to poems. It is, simply, empiricism, or the submitting of propositions to the arbitration of evidence that is acknowledged to be such by all of the contending parties. Ideas that claim immunity from such review, whether because of mystical faith or privileged “clinical insight” or the say-so of eminent authorities, are not to be countenanced until they can pass the same skeptical ordeal to which all other contenders are subjected.” As science in America becomes ever more harried and debased by politics and religion, we desperately need to heed Crews’s plea for empiricism.

#### This is a reason to ignore their arguments in the context of policy.

Andrew **Robinson 2004** “The Politics of Lack” Blackwell Synergy

As should by now be clear, the central claims of Lacanian theory are ontological rather than political. Indeed, since Lacan’s work deals with politics only very occasionally, the entire project of using Lacan politically is fraught with hazards. With rare exceptions, Lacanian theorists put ontology in the driving seat, allowing it to guide their political theorizing. Political discourse and events are subsumed into a prior theoretical framework in a manner more reminiscent of an attempt to confirm already accepted assumptions than of an attempt to assess the theory itself. Among the authors discussed here, Zizek takes this furthest: the stuff of theory is ‘notions, which have a reality above and beyond any referent, so that, if reality dows not conform to the notions, it is “so much the worse for reality’ (in Butler, Laclau, and Zizek 2000, 244). The selection and interpretation of examples, whether in concrete analysis of political discourse or in theoretical exegesis, is often selective in a way which appears to confirm the general theory only because inconvenient counterexamples are ignored. The entire edifice often appears wholly a priori and non-falsifiable, and the case for its acceptance is extremely vague. Most often, the imperative to adopt a Lacanian as opposed to (say) a Rawlsian or an orthodox Marxist approach is couched in terms of dogmatically-posited demands that one accept the idea of constitutive lack. A failure to do so is simply denounced as ‘shirking’, ‘blindness’, inability to accept’ and so on. In this way, Lacanian theory renders itself almost immune to analytical critique on terms it would find acceptable. Furtehrmore, a slippage frequently emerges between the external ‘acceptance’ of antagonism and its subjective encouragement. For instance, Ernesto Laclau calls for a ‘symbolisation of impossibility as such as a positive value’ (in Butler, Laclau, and Zizek 2000, 1999, original emphasis).

#### The alternative’s view of wiping the psychological slate clean causes mass murder and global holocausts

Geoff **Boucher,** (research fellow for the Centre for Pyschoanalytic Studies at Deakin University) **2005** “The Law as a Thing: Zizek and the Graph of Desire, Traversing the Fantasy: critical responses to slavoj zizek”, Pg. 44

Based on his conceptualisation of the "Lacanian Thing" as secretly identical to the Cartesian ego, then, Zizek can only lurch between the poles of an antinomy. For the early, postmarxian Zizek, the death drive (the Thing) represents the dimension of radical negativity that is not an expression of alienated social conditions. Therefore: it is not only that the aim is no longer to abolish this antagonism, but that the aspiration to abolish it is precisely the source of totalitarian temptation; the greatest mass murders and holocausts have always been perpetrated in the name of man as a harmonious being, of a New Man without antagonistic tension (Zizek, 1989: 5).Indeed, this fantasy of the absolute crime that opens a New Beginning is sadistic. It is the fantasy that "it is possible to create new forms of life ex nihilo, from the zero-point". From the vantage of Zizek's early period, it is "not difficult to see how all radical revolutionary projects, Khmer Rouge included, rely on this same fantasy of ... the creation ex nihilo of a new (sublime) Man, delivered from the corruptions of previous history" (Zizek, 1991a: 261). But, on the other hand, prohibition eroticises, and so there's an irresistible fascination in the "lethal/suicidal immersion in the Thing" and "creation ex nihilo" – at least for the hyper-Marxist Zizek of the recent advocacy of "Pauline Materialism". Hence, in the "unplugging" from the New World Order by the "authentic psychoanalytic and revolutionary political collectives" that Zizek now urges (Zizek, 2000e: 160), "there is a terrifying violence at work in this `uncoupling,' that of the death drive, of the radical 'wiping the slate clean' as the condition of the New Beginning" (Zizek, 2000e: 127). This sort of "Year Zero" rhetoric may be meant as a provocation to the relativists, as a gesture of defiance towards the contemporary prohibition on thinking about revolution (Zizek, 2001a). Nonetheless, I suggest that this combination of Leninist voluntarism and "irrational" Pauline materialism does not resist the postmodern couplet of cynical distance and irrational fundamentalism,but repeats its terms.

#### We’ll make a distinction – the plans representations are aimed at leaders not the public - instilling fear in leader’s minds is key to prevent global nuclear conflict.

Stephen Lee, 3-1-1996, Cambridge University Press, “Morality, Prudence, and Nuclear Weapons,” p. 327

The prospects for the delegitimation of nuclear weapons depends on the clarity of the crystal ball – that is, on the keenness and the immediacy with which the horrors of nuclear war are present in the minds of those who make decisions about military matters. When the vision is sharp, the mental connection between a possible act of aggression, whether nuclear or nonnuclear, and the potential for societal destruction is clear, and when that connection is clear, the aggression will likely be unthinkable. When each side believes that this connection is clear and strong fo the other, it comes to expect nonaggression from the other, and this allows its own inclination against aggression to become habitual. The problem is that time clouds the crystal ball, and an expectation that nuclear weapons would not be used y the other side in response to nonnuclear aggression clouds it further, and this weakens the connection. To promote the habits, one must counteract this obscuration. One way to do this is constantly remind people in general, and leaders in particular, of the horrors of nuclear war. Leaders must be continually scared straight. There must be an ongoing educational campaign to keep the potential destructivness of nuclear war ever-present in their minds. Those engaged in this campaign should not be deterred by critics who claim that the danger of nuclear war is something everyone knows about already and that talking about it succeeds only in frightening people

#### Fear of nuclear war is inevitable – it is the only thing preventing it from occurring.

HNS (Harvard Nuclear Study Group), 1983, “Living with nuclear weapons,” p. 5

Why not abolish nuclear weapons? Why not cleanse this small plane tof these deadly poisons? Because we cannot. Mankind’s nuclear innocents, once lost, cannot be regained. The discovery of nuclear weapons, like the discovery of fire itself, lies behind us on the trajectory of history: it cannot be undone. Even if all nuclear arsenals were destroyed, the knowledge of how to reinvent them would remain and could be put ot use in any of a dozen or more nations. The atomic fire cannot be extinguished. The fear of its use will remain part of the human psyche for the rest of human history. This fear is realistic and must not be forgotten. It can prevent complacency and produce prudence. It is almost certain that such fears have served as the major restrain against the use of nuclear weapons since 1945. American and Soviet leaders, even in the midst of confrontation, have been careful not to use the weapons at their command. Indeed, they have seen to it that American and Soviet troops have not met in direct combat for fear that fighting might escalate to nuclear war. The longer this situation continues, the more firmly the tradition of non-use is established.

### 1AR

#### Loan guarantees specifically for nuclear is popular with congress – lower tax liability.

Sharon Squassoni, November 2009, is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in the nonprolifera-tion program. Prior to joining Carnegie, she held various positions in the US government, including at the Congressional research Service, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the US State Department, is a frequent contributor to journals, magazines and books on nuclear proliferation and defense, The Centre for International Governance Innovation, No. 7, “The US Nuclear Industry: Current Status and Prospects under the Obama Administration,” p. 8, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Nuclear_Energy_7_0.pdf>

The single most important spur to build new reactors in the United States is loan guarantees. In fact, industry sources indicate they are so critical that new plants may not be built without them. These guarantees are attractive to the US Congress because they offer a way to influence markets and incentivize specific projects, and because they are “scored” as a lower liability for the taxpayer than the actual amount. Thus, a potential US$50 billion in loan guarantees could be scored by the Congressional Budget Office as only costing the taxpayer US$500 million. As originally proposed in the Energy Policy Act (EPACT) of 2005, loan guarantees would only have applied to nuclear power, but this was broadened to apply to a wide range of “innovative energy technologies,” including renewable energy technologies, which further extends their attractiveness within Congress