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### 2AC fissile material – PRISM

#### Nuclear terrorism is extremely likely and is comparatively the largest threat to international stability.

Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, 2012, is Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan, is advisor on Non-Proliferation at the South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, London, Center of Excellence: Defense against Terrorism, Ankara, Turkey and Armed Forces War College, National Defense University, Islamabad, Command and Staff College Quetta, a Course Coordinator at the Foreign Services Academy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a Research Fellow at the Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad and Islamabad Policy Research Institute, Journal of Political Studies, Vol. 19 Issue 1, "Nuclear/Radiological Terrorism: Myth or Reality?,” Ebsco Host

The misperception, miscalculation and above all ignorance of the ruling elite about security puzzles are perilous for the national security of a state. Indeed, in an age of transnational terrorism and unprecedented dissemination of dual-use nuclear technology, ignoring nuclear terrorism threat is an imprudent policy choice. The incapability of terrorist organizations to engineer fissile material does not eliminate completely the possibility of nuclear terrorism. At the same time, the absence of an example or precedent of a nuclear/radiological terrorism does not qualify the assertion that the nuclear/radiological terrorism ought to be remained a myth. Farsighted rationality obligates that one should not miscalculate transnational terrorist groups — whose behavior suggests that they have a death wish — of acquiring nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological material producing capabilities. In addition, one could be sensible about the published information that huge amount of nuclear material is spread around the globe. According to estimate it is enough to build more than 120,000 Hiroshima-sized nuclear bombs (Fissile Material Working Group, 2010, April 1). The alarming fact is that a few storage sites of nuclear/radiological materials are inadequately secured and continue to be accumulated in unstable regions (Sambaiew, 2010, February). Attempts at stealing fissile material had already been discovered (Din & Zhiwei, 2003: 18).Numerous evidences confirm that terrorist groups had aspired to acquire fissile material for their terrorist acts. Late Osama bin Laden, the founder of AL Qaeda stated that acquiring nuclear weapons was a “religious duty” (Yusufzai, 1999, January 11). The IAEA also reported that “al-Qaeda was actively seeking an atomic bomb.” Jamal Ahmad al-Fadl, a dissenter of Al Qaeda, in his trial testimony had “revealed his extensive but unsuccessful efforts to acquire enriched uranium for al-Qaeda” (Allison, 2010, January: 11). On November 9, 2001, Osama bin Laden claimed that “we have chemical and nuclear weapons as a deterrent and if America used them against us we reserve the right to use them (Mir, 2001, November 10).” On May 28, 2010, Sultan Bashiruddin Mahmood, a Pakistani nuclear scientist confessed that he met Osama bin Laden. He claimed that “I met Osama bin Laden before 9/11not to give him nuclear know-how, but to seek funds for establishing a technical college in Kabul (Syed, 2010, May 29).” He was arrested in 2003 and after extensive interrogation by American and Pakistani intelligence agencies he was released (Syed, 2010, May 29). Agreed, Mr. Mahmood did not share nuclear know-how with Al Qaeda, but his meeting with Osama establishes the fact that the terrorist organization was in contact with nuclear scientists. Second, the terrorist group has sympathizers in the nuclear scientific bureaucracies. It also authenticates bin Laden’s Deputy Ayman Zawahiri’s claim which he made in December 2001: “If you have $30 million, go to the black market in the central Asia, contact any disgruntled Soviet scientist and a lot of dozens of smart briefcase bombs are available (Allison,2010, January: 2).”The covert meetings between nuclear scientists and al Qaeda members could not be interpreted as idle threats and thereby the threat of nuclear/radiological terrorism is real. The 33Defense Secretary Robert Gates admitted in 2008 that “what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear(Mueller, 2011, August 2).” Indeed, the nuclear deterrence strategy cannot deter the transnational terrorist syndicate from nuclear/radiological terrorist attacks. Daniel Whiteneck pointed out: “Evidence suggests, for example, that al Qaeda might not only use WMD simply to demonstrate the magnitude of its capability but that it might actually welcome the escalation of a strong U.S. response, especially if it included catalytic effects on governments and societies in the Muslim world. An adversary that prefers escalation regardless of the consequences cannot be deterred” (Whiteneck, 2005, summer: 187) since taking office, President Obama has been reiterating that “nuclear weapons represent the ‘gravest threat’ to United States and international security.” While realizing that the US could not prevent nuclear/radiological terrorist attacks singlehandedly, he launched 47an international campaign to convince the international community about the increasing threat of nuclear/radiological terrorism. He stated on April 5, 2009: “Black market trade in nuclear secrets and nuclear materials abound. The technology to build a bomb has spread. Terrorists are determined to buy, build or steal one. Our efforts to contain these dangers are centered on a global non-proliferation regime, but as more people and nations break the rules, we could reach the point where the center cannot hold (Remarks by President Barack Obama, 2009, April 5).” He added: “One terrorist with one nuclear weapon could unleash massive destruction. Al Qaeda has said it seeks a bomb and that it would have no problem with using it. And we know that there is unsecured nuclear material across the globe” (Remarks by President Barack Obama, 2009, April 5). In July 2009, at the G-8 Summit, President Obama announced the convening of a Nuclear Security Summit in 2010 to deliberate on the mechanism to “secure nuclear materials, combat nuclear smuggling, and prevent nuclear terrorism” (Luongo, 2009, November 10). President Obama’s nuclear/radiological threat perceptions were also accentuated by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1887 (2009). The UNSC expressed its grave concern regarding ‘the threat of nuclear terrorism.” It also recognized the need for all States “to take effective measures to prevent nuclear material or technical assistance becoming available to terrorists.” The UNSC Resolution called “for universal adherence to the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials and its 2005 Amendment, and the Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.” (UNSC Resolution, 2009)The United States Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) document revealed on April6, 2010 declared that “terrorism and proliferation are far greater threats to the United States and international stability.” (Security of Defense, 2010, April 6:i). The United States declared that it reserved the right to “hold fully accountable” any state or group “that supports or enables terrorist efforts to obtain or use weapons of mass destruction, whether by facilitating, financing, or providing expertise or safe haven for such efforts (Nuclear Posture Review Report, 2010, April: 12)”. This declaration underscores the possibility that terrorist groups could acquire fissile material from the rogue states.

### 2AC CP

#### Trading’s complexity specifically to bank against future credits means no transition to nuclear and decrease in emissions.

Tom Blees, 2008, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Prescription for the Planet, p. 44-5

The seller might guarantee that a certain stand of mature trees won’t be logged, for instance, though the loggers will just go down the road to the next stand. Who’s to say they won’t come back and log the “saved trees” once the transaction is completed—or that any trees were ever saved at all? Billions of dollars are changing hands, with little recognition of the fact that carbon dioxide emissions are still pouring into the atmosphere. The myriad ways in which such systems can be gamed are limited only by the imagination of the shysters. Carbon trading is little more than an unconscionable scam to further fossil fuel business as usual, and should not be considered to be any sort of real solution to the environmental problems we face. As Tom Burke, visiting professor at Imperial College London, has observed: "The reality is that applying cost-benefit analysis to questions such as [climate change] is junk economics... It is a vanity of economists to believe that all choices can be boiled down to calculations of monetary value."31 Another commentator pointed out that carbon trading’s “inherent complexity leaves it open to exploitation by special interests, not to mention perverse incentives to ‘bank’ pollution now against future credits.”32 This obscene ploy doesn’t even deserve four paragraphs, but there you go. It’s easy to find more information33 on carbon trading if you’d care to explore it further, though on its face I trust that you, dear reader, can recognize a travesty when you see one. We have more serious ideas to discuss here.

#### Cap-and-trade will be too slow in transitioning away from coal to IFR – cost comparisons, and base load investment.

Gene Preston, 8-20-2009, CEO at Transmission Adequacy Consulting, Manager System Planning at Austin Energy, Ph.D. and P.E. from the University of Texas in Electrical Engineering and physics, BraveNewClimate, “Classifying ‘belief systems’ in sustainable energy and climate change,” <http://bravenewclimate.com/2009/08/20/classifying-belief-systems-in-sustainable-energy-and-climate-change/>

How effective will the cap and trade be at eliminating coal plants? I recently attended the Bureau of Economic Geology seminar at the University of Texas. A handout (that was in a handbag labeled as Clean Coal Technology Information by American Electric Power) stated that cap and trade in Europe had seen market values of 30 $/ton of CO2. A 1000 MW coal plant will produce about 3 million lbs per hour of CO2. I verified that this rate of CO2 production is correct when one of my friends said it couldn’t possibly be that much. It is a good average taking all coal plants into account, new and old, small and large. Newer plants might have slightly less CO2 production. You also have to be careful about some CCS reports that show smaller amounts of CO2 capture. They are probably capturing only a part of their CO2 emissions. Multiplying (30$/ton)(3e6lbs/h)/(2000lbs/ton) = 45000 $/hr …. then ($45000)/(1000MWh) = 45 $/MWh = 4.5 cents/kWh, which is a very high cost, higher than the bus bar cost of a new coal plant. The cap and trade will show that coal is not the lowest cost base load generation. Nuclear will win that battle. However, power companies move slowly. It will take several decades for existing coal plants to be retired and new nuclear plants to be constructed if we follow the traditional utility planning practices. I do not think this will work if the type C beliefs are correct. Because there are many different beliefs, the IFR will develop slowly unless we can eliminate the beliefs of the categories A, B and D by showing they are in error and will ultimately lead to failure.

#### Cap and trade won’t result in the plan – permits will just change hands to cleaner nations.

Tom Blees, 2008, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Prescription for the Planet, p. 43

This concept is so unutterably bogus that we should toss it on the slagheap right off the bat. In essence it is a deadly international43shell game that allows corporations to buy the right to pollute in a great game of Environmental Risk. The futility of carbon trading can be inferred simply by observing that it’s the one climate change amelioration scheme that seems agreeable to politicians and industrialists. An underdeveloped nation with a lot of trees but very little industry, for example, would rate as a carbon sink because of the carbon dioxide that its trees consume during photosynthesis. So that country could sell its unused polluting rights to some business in, oh, Dallas, Texas, for example. This unscrupulous hypothetical Texas utility company could then blithely belch out massive amounts of pollution from its coal-fired power plants via the simple expedient of buying the unused pollution rights from the poor yet tree-filled nation. Naturally its customers (and their neighbors downwind) foot the bill and reap the dire consequences. It gets even more obscene than that, though. Developing nations like India and China, whose coal-fired plants just on the drawing board promise to vastly increase the blanket of global warming gases, are exempt from having to meet even the modest emissions targets under the terms of the Kyoto Accords. They can even sell polluting rights to the developed nations for every emission-reduction project they undertake. So, for instance, if China builds a hydro project, they can sell carbon credits thus earned to that imaginary(?) Texas company, in utter disregard of the fact that China’s own ever-increasing fleet of dirty coal-fired plants is smoking away without a care in the world.29 Now Texans too can have a little taste of Chinese air.

#### Doesn’t solve prolif - IAEA verification lacks capacity detecting dual-use - fuel cycle is key.

CFR (Council on Foreign Relations), 7-25-2012, “The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime,” http://www.cfr.org/proliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984#p2

Some analysts note that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), which guarantees states' rights to develop civilian nuclear technology, enables a peaceful path to proliferation through fuel cycle activities. Many of the processes used to produce civilian nuclear power can be converted to military ends. As noted, the International Atomic Energy Agency does not have the capacity to adequately monitor every nuclear site. Iran has almost certainly used its civilian program as a cover for illicit weapons activities. The challenge of monitoring and verifying NPT safeguards will likely only increase as more countries look to nuclear power to offset volatile energy prices and reduce reliance on carbon-based fuels.In particular, several Middle Eastern countries that currently lack robust civilian nuclear programs have increasingly looked to diversify their economies through nuclear power. Other than safety risks commonly linked with the development of civilian nuclear programs, other countries may also fear that such programs will be used in the future to develop nuclear weapons. The latter concern is most commonly discussed in reference to Iran potentially developing nuclear weapons—regardless of that country's repeated assertions that its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes--and how such a development could affect regional security dynamics in the Middle East.

#### The fuel bank causes a massive backlash.

NPR Review, 2009, affiliated scholar at Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation, “reliable energy supply and nonproliferation”, Nonproliferation Review, Vol. 16, No. 2

The problem of global warming has fostered much talk of a ‘‘nuclear renaissance’’ as a response to the need to reduce carbon emissions. But it is a virtual certainty that increasing the spread of nuclear energy technology will result in an increased risk of nuclear weapons proliferation and nuclear terrorism. Schemes to mitigate this increased risk include internationalized nuclear fuel assurances for countries that forego national fuel cycle facilities, but fears of cartelization as well as states’ natural desire to control their energy destiny have made proposals such as those of Acheson-Lilienthal, INFA in the NNPA, and the more recent ones from ElBaradei and NTI\*even with President Obama’s endorsement\*difficult to implement and perhaps ineffective if implemented. Thus, NPT Article IV remains a problem and a vehicle for raising the risk of proliferation as long as it is cast as giving the right of full access to nuclear technologies to NPT state parties. That is not to say that nuclear fuel assurances cannot be successful under certain special conditions and circumstances. But the acceptability of these conditions is problematic for any country sensitive to its sovereignty or for any potential proliferators. Any system creating tiers of limited suppliers and recipients is likely to engender complaints of discrimination and a class system for recipients that will be resented.

### 2AC nano-tech add-on

#### Restarting PRISM at Argonne spurs R&D in all sectors – key to effective programs.

Tom Blees, 2008, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Prescription for the Planet, p. 391

Restart nuclear power development research at national labs like Argonne, concentrating on small reactor designs like the nuclear battery ideas discussed earlier. Given the cost and difficulty of extending power grids over millions of square miles of developing countries, the advantages of distributed generation in transforming the energy environment of such countries can hardly be exaggerated. It is a great pity that many of the physicists and engineers who were scattered when the Argonne IFR project was peremptorily terminated chose to retire. Rebuilding that brain trust should be, well, a no-brainer. If one but looks at the incredible challenges those391talented people were able to meet, it seems perfectly reasonable to suppose that a focus on small sealed reactor development could likewise result in similar success. Some of those working on the AHTR and other seemingly unneeded projects could well transition to R&D that fits into the new paradigm. Japanese companies are already eager to build nuclear batteries, and there should be every effort to work in concert with them and other researchers as we develop these new technologies. The options this sort of collaborative research would open up for the many varied types of energy needs around the world would be incalculable.

#### Argonne’s nanoscale materials solves all consequences associated with nanotech.

Evelyn Brown, 5-2-2005, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), “The nano-revolution continues at Argonne,” <http://m.phys.org/materials-cnm-nanoscale_news3944.html>

Federal and state officials will visit Argonne National Laboratory May 6 to participate in a cornerstone-laying ceremony for the Center for Nanoscale Materials (CNM).The CNM, which is currently under construction, is a joint DOE-State of Illinois project to provide basic nanoscale research that will lead to industrial and commercial applications that can benefit Illinois and the country. Image: Artist's conception of the Center for Nanoscale Materials now under construction at Argonne. "Nano" refers to the scale used to measure these materials – a nanometer is 1 billionth of a meter, or about 70,000 times smaller than the width of a human hair. Materials at the nanoscale differ from conventional materials because traditional physics does not apply at this scale. “Intentionally building materials at the nanoscale,” said CNM Director Eric Isaacs, “allows us to explore and develop entirely new ways to tailor a material's response to temperature, electrical or magnetic fields, or chemical environments. The basic research to be conducted at the CNM is critical so that novel, environmentally safe products and applications can be effectively developed based on nanomaterials.” Industry will be able to use research revealed by CNM researchers to understand what can be expected from nanoscale materials. They will be able to create new products that will impact the fields of energy, medicine, information technology and homeland security, and to maintain the United States' leading role in science. The center's mission includes supporting basic research and development of advanced instrumentation for creating novel materials that provide new insights at the nanoscale level. The challenges involve fabricating and exploring novel nanoscale materials and, ultimately, employing unique synthesis and characterization methods to control and tailor nanoscale phenomena. The CNM will be open to academia, industry and other government laboratories through a peer-reviewed process. CNM's research facilities The facility is being built adjacent to the Advanced Photon Source, the most brilliant source of research X-rays in the Western Hemisphere. The 85,000-square foot CNM building will house research instruments, laboratories, clean rooms and work space to assist in fabricating and understanding these tiny materials. CNM's first dedicated instrument will be the pioneering nanoprobe beam line now under construction. The nanoprobe will be a hard X-ray microscopy beam line with the highest spatial resolution in the world. With its combination of fluorescence, diffraction and transmission imaging at a spatial resolution of 30 nanometers or better in a single tool, the nanoprobe will be able to penetrate samples in situ and provide information about their internal structures. An electron-beam lithography facility will provide fabrication support to CNM users, including a 100-kilovolt electron-beam lithography tool – one of a handful of such devices in the country. The center will also feature an Argonne-developed nanopositioning system for precision motion and measurement. The CNM is a joint partnership between the Department of Energy and the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois is providing $36 million to construct the building, and DOE is providing an additional $36 million to develop and build the facility's advanced instrumentation. Argonne's CNM is one of five centers being built at national laboratories across the country as part of DOE's Nanoscale Science Research Center program under the Office of Basic Energy Sciences. The basic scientific research to be conducted at the CNM is predicted to lead to novel, environmentally safe products and applications that can be effectively developed based on nanomaterials. Research includes:-- Nanomaterials that could lead to 400 percent improvement in the efficiency of direct conversion of heat to electricity, and conversely in thermoelectric cooling.-- New materials to efficiently harvest light for energy generation, and for novel purposes such as selective chemical reactivity.-- The means to synthesize and understand new nanostructured materials that are potentially stronger, lighter, harder, safer and self-repairing such as nanocarbon, which has led to coatings for implantable biomedical devices such as an artificial retina.-- Developing advanced, adaptive biosensors, for instance, to monitor blood sugar levels and inject insulin directly into the blood stream.-- Fundamental understanding and design of novel nanoscale materials and chemical processes capable of capturing, converting and storing energy as electrical or chemical equivalents. These developments could lead to using energy to manipulate biological materials in processes such as gene surgery or cell repair, and facilitating conversion of light energy into therapeutic processes.-- New ways to manipulate photons and electrons, making possible a whole new class of devices, including those based on the spin of the electron.-- Nanomagnetic and nanostructured ferroelectric materials for semiconductors will provide a path that goes beyond current technology for information processing and storage. New materials and devices will be developed at the CNM that are capable of much higher storage densities that use less power and dissipate less heat. -- Nanophotonics research is poised to manipulate light at length scales much smaller than is possible using traditional optical elements, firmly placing light within the realm of the integrated circuit.-- Sensors to detect the presence of biowarfare agents, such as anthrax, in real time.

#### Nanotech is inevitable – safe stewardship prevents extinction.

John R. Marlow, 2004, Nanotech Columnist, nominated for the Foresight Institute Prize in Communication, NANOVEAU #002, “The Sound of Inevitability—Why Nanotech Will Happen,” <http://www.nanotech-now.com/Nanoveau/Sound-of-Inevitability.htm>

Unlike previous advances, however, nanotech has the capability to swiftly and irrevocably tip the scales one way or the other. "Nanotechnology could be our salvation or our destruction," Cameron confirms, and goes on to make what is perhaps the best argument of all for nanodevelopment: "But it's absolutely necessary as our salvation. We've put ourselves in a role of stewardship of a biosphere which is already compromised by our technology and the only solution to that will be a technology solution because of the burden of six billion, probably going on ten billion people by the end of this decade. So the only real salvation for the biosphere, to that kind of burden and to the things we've done to it already, will be a technological solution. We're already committed; we have to play the hand technologically. There's no going back to the Garden." Indeed, though it has not yet been released, it is already too late to put the nanogenie back in the bottle.

### 2AC capitalism

#### Weighing consequences is inevitable even in a deontological frameworks.

Joshua Green, November 2002, Assistant Professor Department of Psychology Harvard University, The Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Truth About Morality And What To Do About It, p. 314

Some people who talk of balancing rights may think there is an algorithm for deciding which rights take priority over which. If that’s what we mean by 302 “balancing rights,” then we are wise to shun this sort of talk. Attempting to solve moral problems using a complex deontological algorithm is dogmatism at its most esoteric, but dogmatism all the same. However, it’s likely that when some people talk about “balancing competing rights and obligations” they are already thinking like consequentialists in spite of their use of deontological language. Once again, what deontological language does best is express the thoughts of people struck by strong, emotional moral intuitions: “It doesn’t matter that you can save five people by pushing him to his death. To do this would be a violation of his rights!”19 That is why angry protesters say things like, “Animals Have Rights, Too!” rather than, “Animal Testing: The Harms Outweigh the Benefits!” Once again, rights talk captures the apparent clarity of the issue and absoluteness of the answer. But sometimes rights talk persists long after the sense of clarity and absoluteness has faded. One thinks, for example, of the thousands of children whose lives are saved by drugs that were tested on animals and the “rights” of those children. One finds oneself balancing the “rights” on both sides by asking how many rabbit lives one is willing to sacrifice in order to save one human life, and so on, and at the end of the day one’s underlying thought is as thoroughly consequentialist as can be, despite the deontological gloss. And what’s wrong with that? Nothing, except for the fact that the deontological gloss adds nothing and furthers the myth that there really are “rights,” etc. Best to drop it. When deontological talk gets sophisticated, the thought it represents is either dogmatic in an esoteric sort of way or covertly consequentialist.

#### No collapse - capitalism is self-correcting in terms of energy – responsibility and regulations limits plundering.

Jeffrey Hollender & Bill Breen, 2010, Founder of the American Sustainable Business Council, a progressive alternative to the Chamber of Commerce, Editorial Director of the Fast Company, The Responsibility Revolution: How the Next Generation of Businesses will Win, p. xix

The responsibility revolution is about more than cutting carbon, reducing energy use, monitoring factories, or donating to charities. It’s about reimagining companies from within: innovating new ways of working, instilling a new logic of competing, identifying new possibilities for leading, and redefining the very purpose of business. Consequently, we’ve drawn on the best thinking not only from the corporate responsibility arena, but also from the realms of strategy, leadership, and management. Others, to whom we are indebted, have developed some of this book’s core principles. (We will acknowledge them as we present their ideas.) Our intent is to show how an emerging breed of business revolutionaries is turning theory into practice and building organizations that grow revenue by contributing to the greater good. This is a book about change, but it seeks to help companies change on the inside—change their priorities, the way they organize, how they compete, and the way they interact with the world. We fully concede that many companies, perhaps even most companies, won’t willingly alter their behavior. But they will change nonetheless, and it won’t be because they’ve suddenly seen the light. It will be because massive numbers of consumers, a spreading swarm of competitors, values-driven employees, and even that laggard indicator, the federal government, makes them change. Change is under way. The responsibility revolution spreads. Perhaps you’ve seen the insurrection begin to roil your industry, and you’re determined to get out in front of it. If so, welcome to the cause.

#### Prefer our evidence – they conflate bad human decision making with capitalism.

Jay Richards, 2009, PhD with honors in Philosophy and Theology from Princeton, Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism Is the Solution and Not the Problem, p. 164

Too many critics confuse the free market with the bad choices free people make. Rod Dreher, for instance, chastises fellow conservatives, saying, “We look down on the liberal libertine who asserts the moral primacy of sexual free choice, but some- how miss that the free market we so uncritically accepts exalts personal fulfillment through individual choice as the summit of human existence.”9 Perhaps they miss that fact because it’s not a fact. The free market doesn’t exalt anything. Human beings exalt and denounce things like sexual free choice. Human beings might exalt “individual choice as the summit of human exis- tence,” but a system of free exchange doesn’t do that. In a free economy, sinful entrepreneurs may entice customers with pornography, and sinful customers may buy it. But having free choices in the market doesn’t dictate what people will choose. That’s the whole point of freedom: it always involves costs—that is, trade-offs. To choose one path is to foreclose the opposite path. Even God accepted trade-offs. He chose to create a world with free beings, one that allowed those beings to turn against him. And they did. But their freedom didn’t cause them to choose the bad. It just allowed them to. So, too, with a free economy. Critics notice all the vice present in free societies. But it is only in free societies that we can fully exercise our virtue. Charity is charity, for instance, only if it’s not coerced. Besides, there’s no evidence that state control of the economy makes a citizenry more virtuous. Every social ill in modern- day America, from widespread abortion and alcoholism to family breakdown, was much worse in statist and communist countries.

#### The move to IFR is necessary to solve the root causes of exploitation - ends want and war – great divide is based on mis-understanding.

David Walters, 6-14-2011, worked as a union power plant operator for 24 years in California, currently a member of Socialist Organizer, US Section of the Fourth International, Permanent Revolution, “FUKUSHIMA, NUCLEAR ENERGY AND A SOCIALIST PROGRAM,” <http://climateandcapitalism.com/2011/06/14/socialist-arguments-for-nuclear-power/>

We have serious issues facing our class, our planet. From economic development of the productive forces in the oppressed neo-colonial world to raise their standard of living, to the phasing out of climate-changing fossil fuel use, we are going to require more, not, less energy, specifically electricity. Most on the left are at best confused by this and at worse, seek a return to some sort of pastoral green, “democratic” pre-industrial utopia. As Marxists we should reject this “we use too much” scenario that has infected the left across the world. We certainly should use energy more wisely, more efficiently and with a sense of conservation. This can happen only when the profit motive is removed and scarcity in basic necessities is a thing of the past. No one should object to this. But these things do not produce one watt of power, especially if you consider what we have to do. These include: Switching off from fossil fuels completely (they should be used only as chemical feedstock, i.e. as the basic material to make chemicals and lubricants) Increasing the development of the productive forces especially in the developing world. This means developing whole electrical grids, new, primarily non-fossil fuel, forms of generation and the infrastructure to support this, for the billions without any electrical usage at all Freeing up the productive forces to eliminate all forms of want as the material basis for a true socialist mode of production. Using nuclear energy is both the cheapest and safest way to do this. George Monbiot in his latest entry on his blog\* challenges the renewable energy advocates with some hard questions. No socialist by any means, Monbiot has brought attention to the issue of energy and what it will take to reduce carbon emissions. He notes, writing on Britain, among other things: “1. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions means increasing electricity production. It is hard to see a way around this. Because low-carbon electricity is the best means of replacing the fossil fuels used for heating and transport, electricity generation will rise, even if we manage to engineer a massive reduction in overall energy consumption. The Zero Carbon Britain report published by the Centre for Alternative Technology envisages a 55% cut in overall energy demand by 2030 – and a near-doubling of electricity production.” How is this electricity going to be produced in a sustained and regular way? We know wind generated power is erratic and variable, a problem only partially solvable by new continental wide electricity grids. We know other forms of low carbon power – tidal, coal with carbon capture and storage, large scale solar – are experimental and even if viable are likely to turn out more expensive than nuclear. We get no answer from so-called socialist Greens on this problem, at least not yet. They simply have not considered the real issues. Monbiot goes on: “3. The only viable low-carbon alternative we have at the moment is nuclear power. This has the advantage of being confined to compact industrial sites, rather than sprawling over the countryside, and of requiring fewer new grid connections (especially if new plants are built next to the old ones). It has the following disadvantages: “a. The current generation of power stations require uranium mining, which destroys habitats and pollutes land and water. Though its global impacts are much smaller than the global impacts of coal, the damage it causes cannot be overlooked. “b. The waste it produces must be stored for long enough to be rendered safe. It is not technically difficult to do this, with vitrification, encasement and deep burial, but governments keep delaying their decisions as a result of public opposition. “Both these issues (as well as concerns about proliferation and security) could be addressed through the replacement of conventional nuclear power with thorium or integral fast reactors but, partly as a result of public resistance to atomic energy, neither technology has yet been developed. (I’ll explore the potential of both approaches in a later column).” I want to address this last point. Monbiot is slowly seeing his way to something that has taken a long time: that nuclear energy is really the only way to go, even in light of the “big three” accidents: Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima. These new technologies he mentions, the Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (which doesn’t require any uranium mining, enrichment or long term disposal of spent fuel) and the Integral Fast Reactor, provide the material basis for eliminating all fossil fuels and for a future society without want, wars or exploitation that is a socialist one. Where Monbiot and I come together is not, obviously, the socialist requirement to get rid of capitalism. It is over the need for more energy, not less. It is over the realization that renewables cannot do it except in the most utopian of fantasies. The real “Great Divide” is between those among the Greens who run on fear and fantasy, and those socialists that have a materialist understanding of the need to move toward a society based not just on current human needs alone, but on expanding humanity’s ability to power such a society. Only nuclear can do this.

#### This means the plan is a pre-requisite - criticizing the current economic system is insufficient without a specific and workable alternative – a moral stand is not enough to start a revolution.

Lawrence Grossburg, 1992, Professor of COMS at UNC, Communication Studies Professor at UNC, We Gotta Get Out of This Place, p. 388-89

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be tempered by the realities of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnaotion of the evil of capitalism is sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression) is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, the “masses” are not waiting to be led into revolution, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide—rather undemocratically, I might add—to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain “civility” in the world. The working system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is simply too weak in the current context to effectively organize people, and too vague to provide any direction. Instead, the Left must think of ways to rearticulate capitalism without either giving up the critique or naively assuming that it can create capitalism with a human heart.”

### 2AC SK 123 agreement (ENR bad)

#### No cascade of proliferation - their lit base is all lobbyist scaremongering

Steve Kidd, June 2010, Director of Strategy & Research at the World Nuclear Association, where he has worked since 1995, when it was the Uranium Institute, “Nuclear proliferation risk – is it vastly overrated?,” http://www.waterpowermagazine.com/story.asp?sc=2056931

The real problem is that nuclear non-proliferation and security have powerful lobby groups behind them, largely claiming to have nothing against nuclear power as such, apart from the dangers of misuse of nuclear technology. In fact in Washington DC, home of the US federal government, there is a cottage industry of lobby groups dedicated to this. Those who oppose their scaremongering (and it essentially amounts to no more than this) are castigated as being in the industry’s pocket or acting unresponsively to allegedly genuinely expressed public fears. Pointing out that very few new countries will acquire nuclear power by even 2030, and that very few of these will likely express any interest in acquiring enrichment or reprocessing facilities, seems to go completely over their heads. In any case, nuclear fuel cycle technologies are very expensive to acquire and it makes perfect sense to buy nuclear fuel from the existing commercial international supply chain. This already guarantees security of supply, so moves towards international fuel banks are essentially irrelevant, while measures supposedly to increase the proliferation resistance of the fuel cycle are unwarranted, particularly if they impose additional costs on the industry

#### South Korea will reprocess anyway.

Chad O’Carroll, 11-9-2012, “U.S.-Korea Relations after Obama’s Reelection,” Korea Economic Institute, <http://blog.keia.org/2012/11/u-s-korea-relations-after-obamas-reelection/>, accessed 11-11-2012.

An additional hurdle that could set back U.S. – Korea relations relates to Seoul’s domestic nuclear power infrastructure. The current U.S.-ROK nuclear energy agreement is due to expire in March 2014 and South Korea is now increasingly eager to make use of the spent fuel from its nuclear reactors. Having outlined a goal of processing the spent fuel through a capability known as pyroprocessing, South Korea hopes to potentially recycle fuel by using the transuranic elements in fast reactors. As the world’s sixth biggest exporter of nuclear power plants, South Korea has an understandable desire to close the nuclear fuel cycle – doing so will put it in an even better position to offer full range of nuclear services worldwide and attract additional contracts. However, if the ROK were to be allowed to develop a reprocessing facility there would be consequences for global non-proliferation regime and implications for the dismantling of the DPRK nuclear program. As such, it is a delicate issue that will require thoughtful diplomacy to resolve.

#### South Korea will look for a way to recycle inevitably – U.S. pyro-processing would alleviate these risks.

Choe Sang-Hun, 7-13-2010, staff writer, The New York Times, “U.S. Wary of South Korea’s Plan to Reuse Nuclear Fuel,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/14/world/asia/14seoul.html>

“The Americans say no to recycling, but don’t offer an alternative,” said Lee Un-chul, a nuclear scientist at Seoul National University. “They think we might change our minds and build nuclear weapons, depending on the situation with North Korea. In short, they don’t trust us. This is frustrating. We have to fight.” That tug of war begins later this year when the two allies start renegotiating their nuclear treaty, which expires in 2014. South Korea is the site of the next nuclear security summit meeting, in 2012. Analysts here say that any new deal that would permit Washington to continue blocking South Korea from recycling its fuel — even though it has agreed to let India, which is not even a member of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, do so — would hurt the national pride of the South Koreans, who have been loyal allies. According to local news reports, the South Korean government also wants to acquire a uranium enrichment capacity to make the traditional fuel for reactors — another activity banned by the 1974 accord because enriched uranium can also be used for weapons. South Korea’s ambition is tied to its drive to become a major exporter of nuclear reactors. In December, it won a $20 billion contract to build four nuclear plants in the United Arab Emirates. Possible options, according to analysts in the United States and South Korea, include sending South Korea’s spent nuclear fuel to another country, for instance to France, for reprocessing, or constructing a recycling plant in South Korea and placing it under multinational control for security. “It’s really our responsibility to work cooperatively with other governments to find ways that the benefits of the peaceful use of nuclear power can be obtained without leading to dangerous fuel-cycle activities proliferating,” said Daniel B. Poneman, the United States deputy secretary of energy, in Seoul last month. South Korean engineers are championing a new technology called pyroprocessing, which the Bush administration endorsed. They call it “proliferation-resistant” because the plutonium produced through pyroprocessing is not pure and cannot be used directly for nuclear weapons.

#### The plan can serve as a separate test case for the alliance instead – cooperation without approval.

Seongho Sheen, June 2011, is an assistant professor at the Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University, previously, he was an assistant research professor at Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (APCSS), Honolulu, Hawaii, and a research fellow at Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA), Cambridge, United States, The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis, Vol. 23 No. 2, “Nuclear Sovereignty versus Nuclear Security: Renewing the ROK-U.S. Atomic Energy Agreement,” p. 12, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2011/08_nuclear_korea_sheen/08_nuclear_korea_sheen.pdf>

In addition, Korean scientists have collaborated with both IAEA and Los Alamos National Laboratory scientists on safeguards for pyroprocessing since 2002. ROK-U.S. joint-research on pyroprocessing and its safeguards would address Seoul’s aspirations to become a leader in next-generation nuclear technology, without giving South Korea long-term consent for outright reprocessing of its own. In an interview with the Korean media, the American ambassador to Seoul, Kathleen Stevens, said that the United States and South Korea could find a solution to take into consideration both South Korea’s reprocessing aspirations and international concerns over nuclear non-proliferation.44 After the first official meeting between delegations from both sides, the two governments announced that they had discussed a proposed joint study on nuclear power reactor spent fuel disposition options, including pyroprocessing.45

#### Without the plan and a de facto re-arrangement of the 2014 agreement the ROK alliance will collapse and it will empower nationalists.

Seongho Sheen, June 2011, assistant professor at Seoul National University, was an assistant research professor at Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (APCSS), Honolulu, Hawaii, and a research fellow at Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA), “Nuclear Sovereignty versus Nuclear Security: Renewing the ROK-U.S. Atomic Energy Agreement,” The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis Vol. 23 No. 2, p. 273–88, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2011/08/nuclear-korea-sheen>

The most important challenge for Washington and Seoul is to prevent the issue from becoming a test-case for the alliance. During their summit meeting in June 2009, President Obama and President Lee promised close cooperation regarding the peace-282 Seongho Sheen Nuclear Sovereignty versus Nuclear Security 283ful use of nuclear energy, among others.35 Yet, any hint of U.S. objections to South Korea’s demand for “peaceful” nuclear sovereignty could send the current amicable alliance relationship into turmoil, as shown during the fierce anti-American rallies in Seoul over the U.S. beef import issue in 2008. Many South Koreans often compare the ROK-U.S. revision of the atomic agreement with the U.S.-Japan revision in the1980s. In its renegotiation in the late 1980s of its nuclear agreement with the United States, Japan acquired an advanced agreement on full-scale spent fuel reprocessing and uranium enrichment. Japan has become the only non-nuclear weapons state with a full reprocessing capability.36 Washington believed that Japan posed no proliferation risk given its excellent nonproliferation credentials; however, many in South Korea think that they deserve the same right. Washington seems to have difficulty in giving the same benefit of doubt to South Korea when it comes to sensitive nuclear technology. They may say South Korea is different from Japan, which already had reprocessing and enrichment plants under the existing agreement that was agreed to before North Korea’s nuclear program was revealed. Yet, it will be difficult for the United States to simply ignore South Korea’s demand and its growing nuclear capacity because South Korea, along with Japan, is one of the most important U.S. allies in Asia. It will be a challenge for the United States to balance its bilateral alliance management with Seoul and its commitment to global nonproliferation efforts. An editorial in the Chosun Ilbo, a prominent Korean newspaper, warned the ROK-U.S. alliance could, “come under strain if Washington stubbornly insists on blocking South Korea from reprocessing.”37 For many Koreans the negotiation could be another test case for the U.S. commitment to the alliance after the very controversial KORUS FTA negotiations. The U.S. attitude could be regarded as another referendum on America’s sincerity and respect for South Korea’s status as a key ally. The comparison with Japan would provide a compelling case for both critics and supporters of the alliance in Korea. In addition, the 2008Bush administration’s decision to award another long-term consent to India for reprocessing nuclear waste will make it more difficult for U.S. negotiators to persuade Seoul to forgo the same right.38 How minor they might be, some strong nationalists may even argue for the need for South Korea to have its own nuclear weapons program. Recently, Kim Dae-Joong, a prominent Korean conservative journalist called for a South Korean nuclear weapons program.39 In addition, some members of the National Assembly argued for having a “conditional” nuclear option until the complete resolution of North Korea’s nuclear issue.40

### Agenda Politics

#### Farm bill not key – no impact.

Vince Smith, 9-14-2012, an American Enterprise Institute visiting fellow, a professor at Montana State University, “Commentary: What if there is no new farm bill?” http://www.cattlenetwork.com/cattle-news/Commentary-What-if-there-is-no-new-farm-bill-169791146.html

The short answer: The sky won’t fall. The longer and more nuanced answer: Heck no, the sky won’t fall. To put pressure on the House Republican leadership, some farm lobby groups are arguing that the agricultural sector will face severe problems if a new farm bill is not in place by Sept. 30, two weeks from now. The truth is that very little would happen, either in agricultural commodity markets or on the farm, at least over the next eight months. The reason: many important farm subsidy programs are authorized by other legislation, have their own appropriated funds or involve long term contracts that would be unaffected by the fact that the authorizing legislation, the 2008 farm bill, expires at the end of this month. Such programs include the federal crop insurance program, through which the largest amount of federal subsidies (estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to be about $9 billion annually) are currently channeled to farmers, and most of the annual outlays under the Conservation Reserve Program (currently about $1.6 billion) which are typically dispersed through 10- or 15-year contracts with individual farmers. In addition, in October, farmers will still receive their 2012 crop-year welfare checks worth $5 billion through the Direct Payments program. This program will expire in 2013 if there is no new farm bill, but funds this year have already been appropriated to make those payments. An extremely useful report by Congressional Research Service staff, published on July 25 of this year, lays out what would happen to each of the major farm subsidy programs if Congress took no action to extend the provisions of the 2008 farm bill for either a few weeks, a few months or up to a year. While programs that authorize for mandatory funding under the 2008 farm bill could be subject to suspension, the CRS report points out that many of those programs, including nutrition programs, have their own appropriated funds. The General Accounting Office has determined that programs with appropriated funds, which include many farm programs, do not have to be authorized by current legislation. In fact, the problems created by an expiring farm bill have been easily addressed by Congress in the past. The 2008 farm bill should have been the 2007 farm bill (as its predecessor, the 2002 farm bill, expired on Sept. 30, 2007). However, while the House passed a farm bill in July 2007, the Senate did not get its “act” together until May 2008. The solution to the potential “hiatus” problem was simple; to get from Oct. 1, 2007, to late May 2008, Congress passed six very short-term extensions of the 2002 farm bill provisions. Congress can, and as recently suggested by the ranking member on the Senate Agricultural Committee, Senator Pat Roberts, R-Kan., almost surely in the end will adopt a similar strategy now. So the sky won’t fall, Chicken Little will mend the bump on his head from the acorn, and U.S. agricultural, which the USDA predicts will earn record revenues and profits from its 2012 crops, livestock sales and government subsidies, will continue to enjoy a banner year.

#### No food price spillover.

Robert Paarlberg, 6-27-2008, professor of political science at Wellesley College and a visiting professor of government at Harvard University, “The Real Food Crisis,” Chronicle of Higher Education, Lexis Nexis

Ironically, it was only when the so-called food crisis of the 1970s came to an end, during the slow-growth decade of the 1980s, that food circumstances in poor countries significantly worsened. In Latin America, even though world food prices were falling sharply, the number of hungry people increased from 46 million to more than 60 million. The reason was a regional "debt crisis" triggered by higher U.S. interest rates after 1979. The number of hungry people also increased sharply in Africa during the 1980s. The reason was faltering farm production, exacerbated in some regions by severe drought and civil conflict. The price for imported food was down, but hunger was up. Most real food crises are local rather than global.

#### Congress will punt the farm bill to next year – cites experts.

KRVN, 11-8-2012, “Analyst Says with Other Pressing Issues, Farm Bill May Not Happen until April 2013,” <http://krvn.com/news/agricultural/index.php?more=xv3bafyb>

Top Farm Policy Expert Barry Flinchbaugh - Kansas State University Ag Economist - predicts a new five-year farm bill won't be passed until April 2013 - with the many pieces of legislation Congress needs to take care of now that the election is over. Flinchbaugh also predicts that bill will look a lot like the Senate's version. But with the re-election of President Barack Obama - Flinchbaugh says chances are better for getting a farm bill passed during the lame duck session. Most farm policy analysts expect Congress will extend the 2008 Farm Bill if a new bill can't get passed by December 31st. Flinchbaugh says he doesn't know where Congress will get the money for a one-year extension - so they may do a 30-day extension or 60-day extension until a new one is passed - but he notes the farm bill is a minor issue compared to the fiscal cliff. That cliff came from Republicans and Democrats in 2011 locking themselves into mandatory budget cuts and tax increases in January 2013 to avoid raising the U.S. debt ceiling. Flinchbaugh says if Congress attempts to kick the can down the road one more time - by spring - federal Treasury bonds will be rated BB instead of the AA rating they have now.

#### Farm bill won’t pass – fiscal cliff comes first and even if it were to pass it is ineffective.

Steve Ellis & Scott Faber, 11-8-2012, is vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense and Scott Faber is vice president of government affairs at Environmental Working Group, “Pass a fiscally responsible Farm Bill extension,” The Hill, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/266935-pass-a-fiscally-responsible-farm-bill-extension>

It’s too late for Congress to pass a good farm bill this year. The upcoming lame duck session of the 112th Congress will have its hands full dealing with the “fiscal cliff” and should focus on issues that simply cannot wait. Spending what little legislative time remains on a nearly trillion-dollar, multi-year bill that would boost taxpayer subsidies for agriculture – a sector that booked record profits of $122 billion this year – would be irresponsible. Congress must instead pass a one-year farm bill extension, fully paid for with modest cuts to subsidies for those who don’t need taxpayer support, while concentrating on the truly pressing issues facing the nation. Far more important problems must be resolved during the waning days of this Congress. Unless lawmakers act, the imminent expiration of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts and the Alternative Minimum Tax “patch” will hit hard at the family budgets of millions of Americans, and on Jan. 2 across-the-board cuts will lop more than $100 billion from both defense and non-defense spending. The indiscriminate cuts will come just as states devastated by Superstorm Sandy come looking for additional disaster relief and federal flood insurance must be expanded to cover claims. The 112th Congress will need to accomplish more in its last two months than it has managed to do in two years. It had 22 months to pass a farm bill. The House never even debated one. Lawmakers should pass the baton to the 113th Congress and instead approve a responsible one-year farm bill extension that does not ignore the country’s fiscal crisis or the realities of a 21st century economy. This will allow the new Congress time to address important and unresolved agriculture policy issues in an open, transparent and fiscally responsible way.

#### Loan guarantees for nuclear specifically popular – 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.

## 1AR

### 1AR SK 123 (ENR bad)

#### Obama reversing stand now.

Rajaram Panda, 11-11- 2012, Obama-II And The Korean Peninsula: The Road Ahead – Analysis, Eurasia Review, http://www.eurasiareview.com/11112012-obama-ii-and-the-korean-peninsula-the-road-ahead-analysis/

Handling the issue of a bilateral civilian nuclear energy cooperation pact that is set to expire in early 2014 is another tricky one. Seoul is seeking more non-military nuclear activities, including the enrichment of uranium and reprocessing of spent fuel rods. According to Bruce Klinger at the Heritage Foundation, if Obama in his second term will be “willing to make adjustments in his non-proliferation policies to accommodate Korean interests, or whether UN non-proliferation interests ultimately serve as constraints that will limit the development of South Korea’s nuclear program” remains to be seen. With no burden of re-election, Obama is expected to be more active on the Korean peninsula policy.

#### No impact to South Korean proliferation from reprocessing.

Scott A. Snyder, 11-9-2012, is a project manager for the Partnership for Nuclear Security at CRDF Global, council on foreign relations, <http://blogs.cfr.org/asia/2012/11/09/counterproliferation-and-global-korea/>

On export controls, the ROK is an example of a state that has worked to prevent proliferation by developing a robust set of export controls, while not slowing its export driven economy. As recently as 2005, a poll by the Korea International Trade Association found that, while most Koreans supported the idea of export controls, two-thirds of export companies did not understand the export control system. Eleven percent had “never heard of the export control system” at all. Less than 40 percent of these firms regularly secured authorization from the government before they exported materials abroad or checked to see if their exports were prohibited. The ROK has worked to address these issues by creating training on export controls, enforcing the law more rigorously, and installing an effective online system for businesses to consult export control guidelines and apply for licenses. Having made these changes in the recent past, and having good relations with its neighbors in East Asia, South Korea can provide training programs on export controls to other states in East Asia. As a nuclear technology exporter, Seoul has an opportunity to establish nuclear standards that can support nonproliferation efforts globally. As it works to export nuclear technology, South Korea can also provide training to ensure that there is an effective security culture at plants and facilities, and that those facilities are effectively audited. South Korea could also work with the nuclear suppliers groups to restrict the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technology, and require adoption of the IAEA Additional Protocol for all states to which it supplies nuclear technology.