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## Case

### Waste

#### They say plan doesn’t solve waste – 100% of waste can be reused via new technologies. Also, we remove the heat carrying isotopes eliminating any need for large repositories. That’s Bastin.

#### No risk and their impact of radiation is academic garbage.

NEI, ‘12

[Nuclear Energy Institute, “Myths & Facts About Nuclear Energy”, June, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/reliableandaffordableenergy/factsheet/myths--facts-about-nuclear-energy-january-2012/]

Fact: If this claim were true, it would be dangerous to breathe air or eat food. Every human being is continuously exposed to different forms of radiation every moment of their life. In fact, the use of radiation in medicine, electricity generation and many other common applications has improved, extended and saved the lives of millions of Americans. Studies by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, the National Research Council’s BEIR VII study group and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements all show that the risk associated with low-dose radiation from natural and man-made sources, including nuclear power plants, is extremely small. Researchers with the U.S. Department of Energy’s Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, through a combination of state-of-the-art time-lapse live imaging and mathematical modeling of a special line of human breast cells, found evidence that for low-dose levels of ionizing radiation, cancer risks may not be directly proportional to dose. The data show that at lower doses of ionizing radiation, DNA repair mechanisms work much better than at higher doses. This contradicts the standard model for predicting biological damage from ionizing radiation—the linear-no-threshold hypothesis or LNT—which holds that risk is directly proportional to dose at all levels of irradiation. Dr. James Conca addressed LNT in a recent Forbes article. Conca is an international expert on the environmental effects of radiological and chemical contamination and the 9 determination of risk at low doses of radiation. Radiation is strictly controlled and monitored at all nuclear power plants to minimize plant emissions and worker exposure. Less than one-tenth of a percent of all radiation exposure is from nuclear facilities as confirmed by widespread radiation monitoring programs that ensure the safety of plant workers and neighbors. For more information about radiation, visit www.radiationanswers.org. Nuclear plants emit dangerous amounts of radiation. Fact: Nuclear power plants have controlled and monitored emissions of radiation, but the amount is extremely small and poses no threat to the public or the environment. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission reports that people living close to a nuclear power plant receive, at most, an additional one millirem of radiation exposure a year. To put this in perspective, one millirem is one thousandth of the radiation exposure from a single whole-body CAT scan. The average American is exposed to 620 millirem of radiation every year. Three hundred millirem comes from natural sources, such as cosmic rays, uranium in the Earth’s crust and radon gas in the atmosphere. Most of the rest comes from medical procedures such as CAT scans and consumer products. The radiation exposure from living near a nuclear power plant is insignificant and is no threat to the health of the public. After more than 3,600 reactor years of operation, there is no scientific or medical evidence that shows anyone has been harmed by the radiation from any of America’s commercial nuclear energy facilities, including the accident at Three Mile Island 32 years ago. The radiation from nuclear plants causes cancer and other harmful effects. Fact: After more than a half-century of radiological monitoring and medical research, there is no evidence linking U.S. nuclear energy plants to negative effects on the health of the public or workers. Claims that radioactivity from nuclear plants has caused negative health effects have been refuted by the United Nations Scientific Committee of the Effects of Atomic Radiation, National Research Council’s BEIR VII study group, the National Cancer Institute, the American Cancer Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, numerous state departments of health and other independent studies.

#### Waste reform will never successful absent reprocessing – only way to solve the entirety of the waste problem. That’s 1NC Bastin.

#### Reprocessing key to the effectiveness of waste storage – reduces the heat output and volume.

Dennis, et al., ‘9

[Kate; Jason Rugolo; Lee Murray; and Justin Parrella, Graduate Students at Harvard, “The case for reprocessing”, Bulletin for Atomic Scientists, November/December 2009, RSR]

For long-term geologic storage, reductions in waste volume are important. But it is not just the space that the waste would physically take up that is vital, the heat output of the waste also must be taken into consideration, as does the space between waste packages necessary to prevent overheating in the repository. While it is true that high-level waste from reprocessing is hotter than non-reprocessed spent fuel, this does not completely nullify the decrease in waste volume achieved by reprocessing. The heat emitted from post-reprocessing waste decreases by approximately 70 percent during its first 30 years. In other words, such waste initially can be stored either aboveground in well-ventilated storage buildings (as Areva does), or it can be stored in geologic repositories with space between packages left empty and then filled over the years as heat output decreases. In contrast, spent fuel rods that are directly disposed in repositories cool more slowly and require larger geologic repositories. One estimate, which appears in the book Megawatts and Megatons by Richard Garwin and Georges Charpak, suggests that even with the increased heat output of high-level wastes from reprocessing, the amount of space required for a geologic repository can be reduced by one-half if the waste is reprocessed. Overall, Garwin and Charpak argue against reprocessing but acknowledge several benefits that we believe outweigh the economic burdens, the most important being that reprocessing can effectively double the capacity of a Yucca Mountain-sized permanent repository.

#### Aff isn’t illegal ban was lifted in 1981 by Regan. Ust perceptual. That’s Saillan.

#### They say no impact to meltdowns – reactors contain radioactivity 100x that of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That’s Lendman. All their examples are not of full meltdowns.

#### Not going for terror.

#### They say Yucca’s not long term – NIMBY attitudes and political pressure prevents the feasibility of other options. Empirically proven with proposals in Wyoming. That’s Tollefson.

### Peak Oil

#### They say no peak oil – newest data says you’re wrong. Oil prices could soon reach $100 a barrel as data from the top 50 oil companies show costs increasing. That’s Worstall. All their claims are empirically denied.

#### They say no impact to econ collapse – econ collapse triggers nationalist sentiments in countries and pronounces divisions within countries triggering nuclear confrontation. That’s Lachman and Auslin. Best statistical studies prove that growth solves conflict. That’s Royal.

#### They say no impact to resource wars – resource wars inevitably drag in major powers which will result in escalatory conflicts that involve nukes. That’s Lendman.

### K

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus a competitive policy option.

#### This is key to ground and predictability – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Focusing on statism and security is key to real world change.

Buzan 4 (Barry , December, Montague Burton Prof. of International Relations @ the London School of Economics and honorary prof. @ the University of Copenhagen, "Realism vs. Cosmopolitanism" <http://www.polity.co.uk/global/realism-vs-cosmopolitanism.asp>

**A.Mc.:** But would not a realist response be that the very issues David seeks to highlight are largely marginal to the central dilemmas of world politics: the critical issues of war and peace, life and death. **B.B.:** Again, that is a difficult question for realism because in traditional realism there was a rather clear distinction between 'high' and 'low' politics, high politics being about diplomacy and war, and low politics being about economics and society and many issues like the weather and disease. And because of the change in the importance of the different sectors that I mentioned earlier, this becomes problematic for realism. But the realists have been fairly agile. The realist line of defence would be that in most areas of world politics - again the emphasis on politics - states are still the principle authorities. And there is nothing that stops them from co-operating with each other. Thus, realists, or at least a good proportion of realists, can live quite comfortably with the idea of international regimes in which states, as the basic holders of political authority in the system, get together sometimes with other actors, sometimes just with other states, to discuss issues of joint concern, and sometimes they can hammer out of a set of policies, a set of rules of the game, which enable them to co-ordinate their behaviour. Now, this certainly does not feel like traditional power politics realism. You can think of it to some extent in terms of power politics by looking at issue power; who are the big players in relation to any big issue? Who are the people who have any kind of control? Who loses out?, etc.. There is, therefore, an element of power politics in this whole notion of regimes, and it does retain a strong element of state centrism. I think the realist would say: if you discount the state, where is politics? Where is it located? You cannot eliminate politics, as some liberals sometimes seem to do. To wish the state away, to wish politics away, is not going to generate results. The good dyed-in-the-wool realist would argue that power politics is a permanent condition of human existence. It will come in one form or another, in one domain or another, in relation to one issue or another, but it will always be there. It will be politics and it will be about relative power. And at the moment the state is still an important player in the game.

#### Case outweighs: by failing to solve the impending waste crisis, they allow waste on-site and Yucca Mountain to eventually blow up, leading to extinction. Rejecting securitization on the issue won’t resolve problems on-site or at Yucca.

#### Permutation do both.

#### Adding a policy focus ensures that the criticism affects the political sphere.

Tuathail, Department of Geography at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, ‘96

[Gearoid, Political Geography, 15(6-7), p. 664, science direct]

While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign-policy decision- makers are quite different, so different that they constitute a distinctive problem- solving, theory-averse, policy-making subculture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and post- structuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly self- interested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies ‘poststructuralism nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

#### Plan necessary to move away from the SQUO securitization of nuclear power by understanding the bad side of nuclear power.

Rawles, Lecturer at the University of Edinburgh, 2k

[Richard, “Coyote Learns to Glow”, Part of “Learning to Glow: A Nuclear Reader”, RSR]

Humans, having gathered uranium from the New Mexican desert not all that far from Yucca Mountain, have harnessed the energy within the atom, for commercial and security purposes, in effect by “tricking" nature out of its secret power. We are aided in our industry by this supposedly "free” energy source. As Martin Heidegger observed, we regard the natural world as a “standing reserve:’ there for the plundering-the military metaphor is more than apt in this case. Having stolen from nature its hidden fire, we delude ourselves into believing that there’s no reckoning, no balancing of accounts, despite even the scientific evidence, which tells us there are no free meals in nature’s unforgiving cycles. We are burdened by the waste from this virtual cornucopia, much as the Greeks of the early classical period projected into Pandora's box of woes the burdens of civilizing fire—its destructive aspects, along with the rituals needed to maintain the fire.

#### Plan necessary to understand reject the harms of the bad side of nuclear technology by recognizing and ending the violence on the fourth world..

Kato, Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, 1993

(Masahide "Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze," Alternatives: Global, Local, Political. Pages 352-354, MAG)

Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the interimperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of fantasy, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of "nuclear testing" since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth.28 The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192 times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times).29 The primary targets of warfare ("test site" to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times).30 Moreover, although I focus primarily on "nuclear tests" in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets.

#### Excluding environmentally securitizing discourse cedes its rhetorical power to militant elites, framing the environment as a security issues allows effective response and a formation of a non-militaristic concept of “security”

Liftin, prof of political science at Univ. of Washington, 98

(Karen T., “Constructing Environmental Security and Ecological Interdependence”, Global Governance 5 (1998)) NG

It may be tempting to jettison environmental security, but there are strong practical and epistemological reasons for not doing so. First, the two principal trends that have thrown the field of security studies into tumult-the declining utility of force and the growing salience of nonstate actors-are likely to persist. Alternative formulations of security will therefore continue to demand a hearing. Second, climate change, land degradation and desertification, the largest wave of species extinctions since the dinosaurs, and multifarious pollutants are real and growing sources of insecurity. Third, limiting security language to military threats cedes too much ground to the security traditionalists. If security is a discursive practice, then it can be constructed by a mulitiplicity of social actors. Security discourse can be rehabilitated to encompass environmental dangers, however, only if certain caveats are prudently observed. These have mostly to do with the twin dangers of bolstering a traditional state-centric threat-defense conception of security, and falling into an objectivism that ignores the socially constructed element of all security concerns. To claim that environmental problems are social constructions is not to deny their physical character; to believe otherwise would be ecologically and politically irresponsible. One of the pitfalls of security language is the presumption that security signifies some reality with a concrete external referent. As Ole Wrever argues, rather than being a sign for an objective referent, security is most aptly understood as a speech act: "The utterance itself is the act."19 Although his critique could provide the basis for a more reflective conception of security as a socially constructed set of concerns, Waever opposes an expanded notion of security, including the "securitization of the environment," on the grounds that "security is articulated only from aspecific prace, in an institutional voice, by elites."20 In other words, only those concerned with classic state-centric threat-defense dynamics are entitled to perform security speech acts. This reading not only ignores the fact that security speech acts are performed on a daily basis by an increasingly diffuse group of scholars and practitioners, but it also abdicates too much terrain to the security traditionalists. The state is not the sole subject of security, nor is coercive power the sole means of seeking it. If Cold War hawks could seize on the ambiguous symbol of national security, then contemporary analysts may also deploy the ambiguous symbol of environmental security. But to do so reflectively, without falling prey to the sorts of ideological excess that characterized Cold War security discourse, they must be conscious of how they construct their speech acts.

#### Totalistic anti-nuclear criticism destroys coalitions and the possibility of progressive social change.

Krishna, Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, ‘93

[Sankaran, Alternatives, Summer, p. 400-401, “The Importance of Being Ironic: A Postcolonial View on Critical International Relations Theory”]

The dichotomous choice presented in this excerpt is straightforward: one either indulges in total critique, delegitimizing all sovereign truths, or one is committed to "nostalgic," essentialist unities that have become obsolete and have been the grounds for all our oppressions. In offering this dichotomous choice, Der Derian replicates a move made by Chaloupka in his equally dismissive critique of the move mainstream nuclear opposition, the Nuclear Freeze movement of the early 1980s, that, according to him, was operating along obsolete lines, emphasizing "facts" and "realities," while a "postmodern"President Reagan easily outflanked them through an illusory Star Wars program (See KN: chapter 4) Chaloupka centers this difference between his own supposedly total critique of all sovereign truths (which he describes as nuclear criticism in an echo of literary criticism) and the more partial (and issue based) criticism of what he calls "nuclear opposition" or "antinuclearists" at the very outset of his book. (Kn: xvi) Once again, the unhappy choice forced upon the reader is to join Chaloupka in his total critique of all sovereign truths or be trapped in obsolete essentialisms. This leads to a disastrous politics pitting groups that have the most in common (and need to unite on some basis to be effective) against each other.Both Chaloupka and Der Derian thus reserve their most trenchant critique for political groups that should, in any analysis, be regarded as the closest to them in terms of an oppositional politics and their desired futures. Instead of finding ways to live with these differences and to (if fleetingly) coalesce against the New Right, this fratricidal critique is politically suicidal.It obliterates the space for a political activism based on provisional and contingent coalitions, for uniting behind a common cause even as one recognizes that the coalition is comprised of groups that have very differing (and possibly unresolvable) views of reality. Moreover, it fails to consider the possibility that there may have been other, more compelling reasons for the "failure" of the Nuclear Freeze movement or anti‑Gulf War movement.Like many a worthwhile cause in our times, they failed to garner sufficient support to influence state policy. The response to that need not be a totalizing critique that delegitimizes all narratives.The blackmail inherent in the choice offered by Der Derian and Chaloupka, between total critique and "ineffective" partial critique, ought to be transparent. Among other things, it effectively militates against the construction of provisional on strategic essentialisms our attempts to create space for activist politics. In the next section, I focus more widely on the genre of critical international theory and its impact on such an activist politics.

#### Policy framework before reps – coalitions, anti-politics, and zero impact.

Churchill, Professor of American Indian Studies at the University of Colorado, ‘96

[Ward, “Semantic Masturbation on the Left: A Barrier to Unity and Action,” From A Native Son: Selected Essays in Indigenism, 1985-1995, Published by South End Press, ISBN 0896085538, p. 460]

There can be little doubt that matters of linguistic appropriateness and precision are of serious and legitimate concern. By the same token, however, it must be conceded that such preoccupations arrive at a point of diminishing return. After that, they degenerate rapidly into liabilities rather than benefits to comprehension. By now, it should be evident that much of what is mentioned in this article falls under the latter category; it is, by and large, inept, esoteric, and semantically silly, bearing no more relevance in the real world than the question of how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. Ultimately, it is a means to stultify and divide people rather than stimulate, and unite them. Nonetheless, such "issues" of word choice have come to dominate dialogue in a significant and apparently growing segment of the Left. Speakers, writers, and organizers of all persuasions are drawn, with increasing vociferousness and persistence, into heated confrontations, not about what they've said, but about how they've said it. Decisions on whether to enter into alliances, or even to work with other parties, seem more and more contingent not upon the prospect of a common agenda but upon mutual adherence to certain elements of a prescribed vernacular. Mounting quantities of progressive time, energy, and attention are squandered in perversions of Mao's principle of criticism/self-criticism—now variously called “process,” “line sharpening," or even "struggle"—in which there occurs a virtually endless stream of talk about how to talk about "the issues." All of this happens at the direct expense of actually understanding the issues themselves, much less doing something about them. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the dynamic at hand adds up to a pronounced avoidance syndrome, a masturbatory ritual through which an opposition nearly paralyzed by its own deeply felt sense of impotence pretends to be engaged in something "meaningful." In the end, it reduces to tragic delusion at best, cynical game playing or intentional disruption at worst. With this said, it is only fair to observe that it's high time to get off this nonsense, and on with the real work of effecting positive social change.

### Politics

#### Lame duck session will not do anything – it will be an extension of the regular session.

Binder, Senior Fellow of Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, 10-3

[Sarah, “Will Congress Heed the Voters in the Lame Duck Session?”, The Brookings Institution,

<http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/10/03-fiscal-cliff-binder>, RSR]

First, reaching a deal in the lame duck session requires partisans to behave differently in lame duck and regular sessions: Freed of constituency ties (or reading the electoral tea leaves after a Romney loss), the House GOP would be expected to have a change of heart to agree to Democrats’ demands for new revenues. But recent studies of voting in lame duck sessions (here and here) cast doubt on such expectations. Modern lame-duck sessions, Jeff Jenkins and Tim Nokken have argued, “are more accurately characterized as extensions of regular sessions, with party leaders’ ability to pressure members and exercise negative agenda control remaining virtually constant across sessions.” Jenkins and Nokken attribute this consistency to the low levels of turnout in the contemporary era, which “enables party leaders to carry over regular legislative strategies into the lame-duck sessions.” Recall, for example, the Republican filibuster in the lame duck session in 2008 that killed an auto bailout deal that Democrats and the Bush White House had negotiated. Obama’s impending move into the White House did not signal to the GOP that they should support a plan they viewed as too lenient on the automakers (and autoworkers’ benefits). In short, legislators—even those losing their seats—tend to be guided by a mix of constituency and ideological influences across both lame duck and regular sessions.

#### **Lame duck session will not resolve the fiscal cliff and even if it did, the impact would be triggered anyway.**

Lauricella, Staff Writer, 10-3

[Tom, “Will Election Finally Bring Clarity to Investors?”, The Wall Street Journal,

<http://blogs.wsj.com/marketbeat/2012/10/03/will-election-finally-bring-clarity-to-investors/>, RSR]

But Washington Update’s Andy Friedman, a former tax attorney who now looks at Washington politics for the investors point of view, argues that the consensus outcome may not turn out to be good news from the short-term certainty standpoint. He sees this potential outcome: During the lame duck session of Congress, the Republicans, sticking to their pledges, refuse to go along with voting for higher taxes. As a result, automatic spending cuts kick in and the tax breaks roll off at the end of the year. Then, after the new Congress is seated in January, Republicans push for a deal that ends up reducing some (but not all) taxes, while backing down as part of a broader fiscal retrenchment agreeable to the Democrats. Ultimately that gets to the same place as investors currently expect. But in the meantime, that would mean months of uncertainty and heightened fears of recession. “The markets could go ballistic with the uncertainty of this going over year end,” says Friedman.

#### Funding now. Worthington ev. says subsidies now. Even if no new reactors, there’s already the perception of Obama pushing.

#### Logical policymaker can do both.

#### Plan popular in Congress - bipartisan.

Ling 2009 (“Is the solution to the U.S. nuclear waste problem in France?” By KATHERINE LING, ClimateWire <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/05/18/18climatewire-is-the-solution-to-the-us-nuclear-waste-prob-12208.html?pagewanted=all> Published: May 18, 2009) RCM

South Carolina Sen. Lindsey Graham (R) earlier this month said he would like to bring such an "energy park" to the Savannah River Site -- where Areva is building the MOX facility -- and plans to speak to House leadership and President Obama on the matter. Reprocessing is moving elsewhere on the congressional front, including in draft legislation from Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.), chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, that would study the feasibility of a reprocessing facility as a part of comprehensive energy legislation. Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), the committee's ranking member, said she will propose an alternative nuclear provision to provide cost-sharing incentives for two reprocessing facilities and other new nuclear reactor incentives.

#### Plan popular with Congress, reduces our energy dependence.

Kitisch, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Justin, “Business and Military Leaders Back Bipartisan Plan to Reduce Oil Dependence, Deploy More Alternative Fuel Vehicles”, Securing America’s Energy Future, 3-7-12, RSR]

WASHINGTON – Top business officials and former military leaders on the Energy Security Leadership Council (ESLC), a group that supports aggressive, long-term policies to reduce U.S. oil dependence, said the proposals announced by President Obama today to promote alternatives to oil in the transportation sector will improve the nation’s energy security and should be part of a comprehensive energy policy. “There has never been a short-term, easy fix to the nation’s dependence on petroleum, but the key to any policy to end our dependence is found in our transportation sector, which accounts for more than 70 percent of our oil consumption and is 94 percent reliant on oil-based fuels,” said ESLC Co-Chairman Frederick W. Smith, Chairman, President and CEO of FedEx Corp. “In a perfect world, free market dynamics would allow for the transportation sector to quickly reduce its utter reliance on oil, but the global oil market is not a free one. More than 90 percent of proved conventional global oil reserves are held by national oil companies either fully or partially controlled by foreign governments, and their interests often have as much or more to do with geopolitical considerations than free market principles.”

#### Obama won’t get the credit – will not be seen as involved in the plan.

#### Obama is not key – Republicans have little incentive to cooperate.

Binder, Senior Fellow of Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, 10-3

[Sarah, “Will Congress Heed the Voters in the Lame Duck Session?”, The Brookings Institution,

<http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/10/03-fiscal-cliff-binder>, RSR]

Finally, if Romney wins the White House, the chance that Obama can seal a deal in the lame duck seems even lower. Republicans would have little incentive to cooperate with Democrats on a deal, given their impending control of the White House. Their priority in the lame duck would likely be to buy time by pushing to extend the tax cuts and to defer the sequester. Nor would I expect Democrats to push to lead the country off the cliff, assuming Democrats would still be reluctant to raise taxes during the holiday season.

#### Winners win – capital is perpetually renewable.

**Pascal**, Independent Business and Management Consultant in Phoenix, **‘9**

[Marc, “Obama’s Only Priority: Get Re-Elected”, 10-5-9, The Moderate Voice,

http://themoderatevoice.com/48571/obama%E2%80%99s-only-priority-get-re-elected/]

Many political leaders incorrectly confuse political capital with financial capital. The first is a perpetually renewable commodity if used correctly and the latter is always finite no matter how much is amassed. One cannot hoard political capital for some future battle that may or may not come. It grows and shrinks directly as one uses it, and it directly mirrors political fights taken and avoided. Actually winning on certain core issues and major legislative battles helps increase political capital for future use. But not using political capital causes it to dissolve rapidly. Talking too much and never getting anything accomplished is a good recipe to dissipate valuable political capital.

#### Nuclear leadership in reprocessing is key to overall technical leadership – brain drain.

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. NEAC makes the following recommendations: • The DOE lead the establishment and implementation of a nuclear energy R&D roadmap, in consultation with appropriate parties. • 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. • The DOE review existing nuclear fuel cycle research and development to assure that it is meeting U.S. needs in the nuclear fuel cycle.

#### Technological leadership necessary to maintain US heg – our IL explains the past five centuries of global hegemons.

Drezner 1 (Daniel Drezner (professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University) 2001 “State structure, technological leadership and the maintenance of hegemony” http://www.danieldrezner.com/research/tech.pdf)

In this decade, proponents of globalization argue that because information and capital are mobile, the location of innovation has been rendered unimportant.6 While this notion has some popular appeal, the globalization thesis lacks theoretical or empirical support. Theoretically, even in a world of perfect information and perfect capital mobility, economists have shown that the location of technological innovation matters.7 Empirically, the claims of globalization proponents have been far-fetched. Capital is not perfectly mobile, and increased economic exchange does not lead to a seamless transfer of technology from one country to another.8 The location of innovation still matters. Long-cycle theorists have paid the most attention to the link between technological innovation, economic growth, and the rise and fall of hegemons.9 They argue that the past five hundred years of the global political economy can be explained by the waxing and waning of hegemonic powers. Countries acquire hegemonic status because they are the first to develop a cluster of technologies in leading sectors. These innovations generate spillover effects to the rest of the lead economy, and then to the global economy. Over time, these ‘technological hegemons’ fail to maintain the rate of innovations, leading to a period of strife until a new hegemonic power is found.

### Oil

#### Oil price volatility now – futures look bleak.

Powell, Staff Writer, 10-3

[Barbara, “Oil Options Volatility Jumps as Crude Sinks to Two-Month Low”, 10-3-12, Businessweek,

http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-03/oil-options-volatility-jumps-as-crude-sinks-to-two-month-low, RSR]

Crude oil options volatility jumped to a 10-day high as the underlying futures sank to the lowest level in two months in the biggest retreat since June. Implied volatility for options expiring in November, a measure of expected price swings in futures and a gauge of options prices, was 31.9 percent as of 2:40 p.m. in New York, up from 28.7 percent yesterday. “The lower we go, the firmer volatility becomes,” said Ray Carbone, president of Paramount Options Inc. in New York.

#### Global movement to renewables now should have triggered the link.

Bapna, Interim President at the World Resources Institute, ‘12

[Manish, “2012: A Breakthrough for Renewable Energy?,” Huffington Post, February 12, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/manish-bapna/2012-a-breakthrough-for-r\_b\_1263543.html]

Despite conventional wisdom, there is a growing body of evidence showing that renewables are no longer decades away from being a viable and affordable alternative to fossil fuels. Instead, onshore wind and solar photovoltaics are close to a tipping point to compete head-to-head with coal and natural gas in many countries. In fact, it’s likely that 2012 could be the year when investment in renewable energy (not counting hydropower) will surpass fossil fuels, signaling a profound shift toward a global clean energy economy. Investors are leading the charge toward a clean energy future, betting heavily on renewable energy. Global investment in clean energy generation capacity reached a record high of $260 billion in 2011, Bloomberg New Energy Finance announced last month. That was up 5 percent above 2010 levels and almost five times the 2004 total. The United States, surprisingly, led the world in renewable energy investment at nearly $56 billion, and China was second with more than $47 billion. Wind farms in China and solar panels on rooftops in Europe are the biggest signs of growth. But the renewables boom is a global phenomenon. In South and Central America, investments rose 39 percent to $13 billion. In India, they rose by 25 percent to almost $4 billion; and in the Middle East and Africa, by 104 percent to $5 billion. So what is getting investors– from asset financiers to venture capitalists— so excited? The answer is simple: wind and solar energy is becoming increasingly cost competitive with coal and natural gas. In the past few years, the costs of PV modules and wind turbines have tumbled, driven mainly by technology innovations and a maturing supply chain. The results are evident in falling clean energy prices around the world. Take just a few examples: In the United States, the authoritative National Renewable Energy Laboratory forecasts that solar PV residential electricity prices could be cost competitive by 2015 across two-thirds of the country. In Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal, and Japan, solar PV is on course to match retail electricity fossil fuel prices next year, without the benefit of subsidies, according to Pike Research. In Brazil, wind power plants undercut natural gas competitors in bidding for government power contract tenders last summer. And in China, wind power prices are expected to be competitive with coal within two years. But before rushing to invest your entire pension in clean energy, there are some important caveats. Renewable power is not yet a mainstream global industry. It made up only a little over 3 percent of total world electricity generation, as of 2009. While its future seems bright, the outcome may hang on how two key issues play out: First is the unpredictable effect of the shale gas boom. In countries, like the United States, where low electricity prices already make it tough for renewables to become cost competitive, abundant and cheap shale gas may drive energy prices down even further and divert investment from wind and solar power. Low-priced natural gas is good for consumers, but it could slow the growth of renewable. This could have additional negative environmental consequences, including on greenhouse gas emissions. The second key issue is whether governments will keep up their investor-friendly commitments to clean energy policy and incentives. The BNEF report, Global Trends in Renewable Energy Investment 2011, showed significant progress on that front. By early 2011, some 119 countries had policies or targets in place to support renewables, more than half of them in the developing world. But given the turbulent global economy, it is likely that fiscal and political constraints will continue to bite across much of the globe in 2012. Governments may see support for wind and solar as tempting for budget cuts. In the United States, for example, wind power developers are nervous about the potential expiration of the Production Tax Credit in December 2012. If Congress fails to renew or replace it, the industry’s robust growth will likely falter. President Obama acknowledged as much during State of the Union, when he called on Congress to extend support for wind power and solar power. So the outlook for the year is still sunny, but not cloudless for renewables. Given the significant strides the industry has made, it would be unfortunate if governments and investors turned their backs now. If they forge ahead, 2012 could indeed see global investment surpass that for fossil fuels, crossing an important threshold toward a clean energy future.

#### Nuclear renaissance now. Worthington says nuclear is already receiving subsidies and building plants.

#### Nuclear power is globally expanding and is catching on in the U.S.

WNA 11 (World Nuclear Association, The Nuclear Renaissance , August 2011, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf104.html>) JD

Since about 2001 there has been much talk about an imminent nuclear revival or "renaissance" which implies that the nuclear industry has been dormant or in decline for some time. Whereas this may generally be the case for the Western world, nuclear capacity has been expanding in Eastern Europe and Asia. Globally, the share of nuclear in world electricity has showed slight decline from about 17% to 13.5% since the mid 1980s, though output from nuclear reactors actually increased to match the growth in global electricity consumption. Today nuclear energy is back on the policy agendas of many countries, with projections for new build similar to or exceeding those of the early years of nuclear power. This signals a revival in support for nuclear power in the West that was diminished by the accidents at Three Mile Island and Chernobyl and also by nuclear power plant construction cost overruns in the 1970s and 1980s, coupled with years of cheap natural gas. The March 2011 Fukushima accident has set back public perception of nuclear safety, despite there being no deaths or serious radiation exposure from it (while the direct death toll from the tsunami which caused it is some 25,000). Also the advent of shale gas has adversely changed the economics of nuclear power in places such as North America.

#### **Saudi Arabia lacks both incentive and ability to flood the oil market.**

Levi and McNally, ‘12

[Robert (President of the Rapidan Group, served as Special Assistant to the President at the U.S. National Economic Council and Senior Director for International Energy at the U.S. National Security Council under President George W. Bush) and Michael (David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations), “A crude predicament: the era of volatile oil prices." Foreign Affairs 90.4 (2011): 100. Academic OneFile]

A repeat of the boom-bust pattern is now more likely than not. The International Energy Agency, the U.S. Department of Energy, and many experts estimate that Saudi Arabia and its OPEC partners are not investing enough in production capacity today to meet both increasing demand and the five percent threshold for reserves. This is largely because Saudi Arabia, historically the main holder of OPEC's spare capacity, is both less able and less willing to play the part. Saudi officials say they plan to keep as spare capacity only 1.5-2.0 million barrels of oil a day, or less than two percent of global demand. As they regularly note, holding extra capacity is expensive. For example, the Manifa oil field, Saudi Arabia's next big project to shore up production capacity and prevent its spare capacity from dropping even further, will cost about $16 billion just to build and will add only 0.9 million barrels per day of capacity. Despite such efforts to expand production, Saudi Arabia remains worried about oversupplying the market and thus depressing prices, and so it is likely to aim low in its planning for spare capacity. It worries that if demand grows more slowly than anticipated--demand growth in Asia is much tougher to predict than it used to be--or other countries' supplies turn out to be larger than expected, it will be saddled with low prices or massive amounts of unused investment. Just as Saudi Arabia's ability to hold spare capacity is declining, its incentives to do so are waning, too. With U.S.-Saudi ties having frayed over the last decade, Riyadh's motivation to continue contributing to its security partnership with the United States by maintaining spare crude capacity has diminished. In the past, Saudi Arabia held spare capacity partly as a way of disciplining OPEC: spare capacity allowed it to threaten to punish cartel members by flooding the market if they cheated on their quotas. It also allowed Saudi Arabia to align itself with the United States by countering calls for higher oil prices by price hawks such as Iran and Venezuela. But today, Riyadh is less certain about the strength of its alliance with Washington and may thus be less willing to incur the costs and risks involved in contributing to the U.S.-Saudi partnership in these ways. To be sure, Saudi Arabia and OPEC will maintain some influence over oil prices in the future. They can prop them up in the short term by capping production and in the long term by limiting investment in new supplies. But they will not be able to consistently put a lid on prices. U.S. officials have forecast low spare capacity through 2012 (their projections do not extend any further), and the International Energy Agency anticipates that between 2013 and 2016, OPEC's spare capacity will be below the five percent threshold. Some developments could ease the pressure on supplies: a slowdown of economic growth in Asia; improved security in Iraq, leading to increased production there; political change in Iran or Venezuela that allowed international capital and technology to flow into those countries' oil sectors. Yet any of these changes would take many years to translate into large increases in supplies. The development of alternative technologies for transportation, the faster adoption of fuel-efficient vehicles, and the greater use of natural gas in the transportation sector could also change the picture. But such transitions would also take many years, if not decades.

#### High oil prices bad for Russian econ

#### A.) Oil drives inflationary growth

Aris 12 (Ben Aris - Ben is the editor/publisher of[bne](http://www.bne.eu/) and an Eastern Europe specialist. He has worked as Moscow bureau chief for the Daily Telegraph, contributing editor at The Banker and Euromoney - Russian Economy Showing Signs of Overheating http://www.themoscowtimes.com//article/russian-economy-showing-signs-of-overheating/461657.html#ixzz1zttKtz9A)

Russia's external debt is up slightly to $585 billion, slightly more than the gross international reserves of $513 billion as of the end of June, but this still means that Russia can cover its debt nearly dollar-for-dollar with cash, unlike most Western economies that have national debts of about 100 percent of gross domestic product these days. And even capital outflow is finally slowing and is expected to drop to $9.5 billion in the second quarter, following a $43 billion outflow in the first quarter. All this means that economists are starting to ask whether the economy is overheating. Alexei Ulyukayev, first deputy chairman of the Central Bank, says that when consumer-lending growth rises above 28 percent, the economy is in danger of overheating — and Russia is well beyond that point now. The danger in this lending is that some analysts are suggesting that the quality of loans is falling, which opens banks up to problems if there is another bad external shock from Europe. However, nearly everyone agrees that if this does happen, the Central Bank has more than enough cash in reserve to prop up the banks and avoid a systemic financial crisis. The black spot is in the corporate sector, where companies have already started to destock. One of the reasons the 2008 crisis was so painful was that companies were carrying a lot of inventory to meet the burgeoning demand of a booming market. However, when the crisis struck, these companies basically switched off their machines to save money and sold their inventory instead. The result was that the economy came to a stand still literally overnight, resulting in a 7 percent contraction. The process took about six months to complete, after which companies had to turn their machines on again after stocks ran out to meet new orders and the economy began to recover. This time round, fearing another (and possibility worse) meltdown in Europe, companies have already started destocking before the crisis has even appeared. "As opposed to 2008, when strong consumption was accompanied by overheated industrial production growth, this year we see producers taking a much more cautious approach. In 2010-2011 the recovery in economic growth was at 70 percent, driven by stock building," said Natalya Orlova, chief economist at Alfa Bank. "However, starting in the fourth quarter of 2011, the Russian economy entered a destocking process. According to our estimates, in that quarter inventories contributed minus 0.2 percent to GDP growth and minus 0.4 percent in the first quarter of this year. This was the first sign that the producer started to be cautious earlier than expected." Russia finds itself in a very weird place now. Kolya's experience and the robust consumer demand mean that the economy is getting hot to the point where inflation is starting to rise. Russia's inflation overshot the Central Bank target last month and left it struggling to keep consumer-price growth below last year's record low as a weaker ruble stokes food costs and utility tariffs rise, economists said. "What is surprising is how quickly headline inflation has reversed its deceleration," wrote Alexander Morozov, chief economist at HSBC Holdings Plc. in Moscow in a note to clients. "The Central Bank's job of keeping inflation in the range is seen as 'Mission Impossible.'" But on the other hand, the behavior of companies suggests that the economy is slowing down. Industrial production took a nose dive in March — as it did in the rest of the world as growth collapsed for psychological reasons as much as anything else. This means that the Central Bank should move to bolster confidence and encourage growth. Put in simple terms, the dilemma is: the Central Bank should increase interest rates to curb inflation and cool the economy, and at the same time it should cut rates to encourage more investment and growth. The upshot of this confusion is that economists are forecasting a wide spread of growth rates this year, from at least 3 percent to 5 percent. When spreads on forecasts get this wide, it always means that the experts are basically clueless about what will happen next. To be fair, Russia's strong growth is fragile because it is partly connected to the recovery of the oil price, which is currently back at about $100 a barrel. Because of the lack of reforms and investment, high oil prices are pumping money into the economy, which is feeding through to consumer demand. If oil prices fall — an event the government is preparing for by adding a $60 scenario to its budget planning despite assuming an average price of $115 for this year — then that would quickly take the wind out of Russia's sails. But that has always been Russia's problem. Strong consumer demand has encouraged real progress and investment, but it is still nowhere near what is needed.

#### Inflation outweighs oil price decline

Investment Innovation Business 12 (http://eng.spb-venchur.ru/news/14616.htm)

The major risks for Russia in the near future are likely to come from an overheated economy, rather than falling oil prices, as accelerating consumption and lagging output might fuel inflation, Goldman Sachs warned Friday.¶ The drop in unemployment together with the rise in people's incomes are boosting consumption, while output has yet to catch up to meet growing demand, the company said in a presentation.¶ The trend is unlikely to change in the near future, said Clemens Grafe, Goldman Sachs' chief economist for Russia and CIS.¶ "The risk in Russia now is overheating, as consumption will accelerate further rather than slowing down to a sustainable path," he told a news conference in the company's Moscow office.

#### B.) High oil prices cause corruption which collapses the economy.

Brooke2011— journalist, VOA Russia Bureau Chief, previously Moscow Bureau Chief for Bloomberg and New York Times reporter (James, March 18, 2011, “Russia Gets Giant Boost from Rising Oil Prices” http://www.voanews.com/english/news/economy-and-business/Russia-Gets-Giant-Boost-from-Rising-Oil-Prices-118258659.html)

In one decade, the oil price gyrated wildly - from a low of $8 a barrel in 1998 to a peak of $147 in 2008. Looking at the long term, analysts say Japan's nuclear crisis may benefit Russia by pushing the world energy pendulum away from nuclear toward natural gas. Germany imports almost half of its gas from Russia. Even before the crisis, Russia was investing to increase gas production by 50 percent over the next 20 years.The downside is that high prices ease pressures to cut corruption, to diversify the economy and to lighten the hand of government on business**.** Chris Weafer, chief strategist with Uralsib Capital, fears that the new flood of oil earnings is leading the Kremlin to slow its privatization program. “We have seen it in the Gulf Arab countries. and we saw it in Russia in the last 10 years that as the oil price is rising governments talk about the need for reform and using the money wisely, but as the price goes up too high, the whole process slows down, people become complacent**,** they become lazy, they live the good life as it were, until the collapse comes**,”** he said. “And then then whole process starts again.” In public opinion polls, corruption rivals food prices as the number one public complaint for Russians. According to Transparency International, Russia is the most corrupt of the Group of 20 major economies. Last week in a speech in Moscow, U.S. Vice President Joe Biden clearly warned Russia that corruption scares away investors. “No amount of government cheerleading or public relations or U.S. support or rebranding will bring wronged or nervous investors back to a market they perceive to have these shortcomings**,**” he said. “Only bold and genuine change.“

#### Low oil prices usher necessary economic and political reforms.

[Andrew E. Kramer, New York Times, “Rise in Oil Price Eases Push for Reform in Russia”, 6/3/2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/04/business/global/04ruble.html>]

The two previous major oil price slumps in the last quarter-century were followed by significant economic and political changes in Moscow that paved the way for future growth. For a time, it seemed the current oil shock would follow the same path. Indeed, the mood was so glum last winter, when oil dipped below $40 a barrel, that some advisers close to the government suggested that the country might be compelled to open up politically to spur development. At the least, policies encouraging Russia to diversify beyond oil were seen as imminent. What is needed to diversify the economy and stabilize the financial system, critics of the Russian government say, is an overhaul of the courts and a crackdown on corruption to improve property rights and separate the bureaucracy from the economy. But with oil prices now above $60 a barrel, the pressure on the government of Prime Minister Vladimir V. Putin to change has eased, even though the stock market remains 44 percent off its high in December 2007. Instead, an economic strategy that amounts to essentially waiting out the downturn is beginning to take shape.

#### No impact to Russian economy – recession proves.

Blackwill, Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning, ‘9

[Robert, Former Associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession – A Caution”,

http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf]

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

### CP

#### Perm do both. < Explanation for why it doesn’t link to the net benefit>

#### Can’t solve the aff:

#### a.) Can’t solve advantage one. Banning Yucca mountain only exacerbates the need for on-site waste storage. This magnifies the impacts of meltdowns and nuclear terrorism off spent fuel.

#### b.) Can’t solve advantage two. Nuclear needed to solve peak oil a.) Reprocessing increases nuclear’s share in the market. That’s Szabo. b.) Necessary for hydrogen economy which is only way to displace oil from the transportation sector. That’s Choppin.

#### Reforming spent fuels cannot solve dry casks:

#### **Dry casks are vulnerable to accident – corrosion + poor technical design.**

Kamps, specializes in high-level waste management and transportation at Beyond Nuclear, ‘4

[Kevin, “Get the Facts on High-Level Atomic Waste Storage Casks!”, Beyond Nuclear, 7-15-2004, RSR]

A May 28, 1996 explosion at the Point Beach reactor in Wisconsin jolted public confidence in the dry cask storage program. While sealing shut a VSC-24 (a Ventilated Storage Cask built by Sierra Nuclear Corporation (SNC) holding 24 irradiated fuel assemblies; this cask design has now been taken over by British Nuclear Fuels, Ltd.), a welding torch ignited pent up hydrogen gas with enough force to dislodge the cask’s 4,000 pound shield lid several inches in the air and tilt it ajar on top of the cask. After allowing SNC to manufacture several VSC-24 units even before its CoC, NRC certified the cask design in May, 1993. The explosion was later determined to result from an electro-chemical reaction between an anti-corrosion zinc liner within the cask and the borated “spent” fuel pool water. The chemical reaction between zinc and boric acid to generate explosive hydrogen gas -- familiar to many high school chemistry students – somehow escaped the notice of all the “experts” at NRC, the cask manufacturer, and the nuclear utility company. Over a dozen VSC-24 casks had already been loaded around the country before the explosion. Utility employees had observed bubbles in the “spent” fuel pools during these loadings, yet had failed to understand that they were flammable hydrogen gas and did not report them to the NRC. In fact, a blue flame was observed burning within another VSC-24 loaded at Point Beach previous to the explosion, but had been shrugged off by employees as resulting from excess cleaning solvents and went unreported. The explosion led to NRC inspecting SNC’s cask manufacturing facility, revealing confusion, inadequate testing, and poor quality control.

#### Dry cask storage still vulnerable to attack – would release radiation 200x that of an atom bomb.

Kamps, specializes in high-level waste management and transportation at Beyond Nuclear, ‘11

[Kevin, “Irradiated Nuclear Fuel Risks at New Nuclear Darlington Neglected in OPG’s EIS”, Beyond Nuclear, 2-21-2011, RSR]

At least as early as June 1998, it was known that dry casks were vulnerable to attacks, such as by TOW anti-tank missiles. This was revealed by a test conducted upon a German CASTOR storage/transport cask at the U.S. Army’s Aberdeen Proving Ground in Aberdeen, Maryland, U.S.A. 65 This revelation was of deep security significance, for each and every fully loaded irradiated nuclear fuel dry cask in the United States contains over 200 times the longlasting radioactivity released by the Hiroshima atomic bomb. Thus, dry casks containing 24 pressurized water reactor (PWR) irradiated nuclear fuel assemblies contain about 240 times the long-lasting radioactivity released at Hiroshima. Casks containing 32 PWR assemblies hold 320 times the long-lasting radioactivity released at Hiroshima. 66 Thus, a successful explosive and incendiary attack upon fully loaded dry casks could unleash a disastrous amount of radioactivity onto the winds and waters, to harm humans and the environment downwind and downstream out to great distances, depending on how far it is blown by the wind or carried by the water. In considering the security risks associated with irradiated nuclear fuel – including in this NND proceeding -- adequate attention must be paid to the risks posed by remotely fired weaponry, especially high explosives and shaped charges designed to penetrate much thicker armor than is present on irradiated nuclear fuel storage containers.

#### Links to politics.

#### Yucca Mountain is politically bipartisan.

Kasperowicz, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Pete, The Hill, 5-31-12, “House members slam Obama on closing Yucca Mountain nuclear waste site”,

<http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/230397-house-members-slam-obama-on-yucca-mountain-policy>, RSR]

Republicans and Democrats in the House slammed the Obama administration's plan to close the nuclear waste disposal site at Yucca Mountain in Nevada, as both praised a bill that would keep that site open, and indicated they would try to add more money to keep the site active. Members were debating the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act late Thursday. The bill, H.R. 5325, includes $25 million for Yucca Mountain, which Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.) said would keep the site useable in the future. "Research and development activities to support Yucca are permitted," he said. "This will ensure that we keep Congress in the driver's seat for nuclear waste policy." House Appropriations Committee ranking member Norm Dicks (D-Wash.) added that he supports that language, and would try to add more money to send a signal that Congress opposes efforts to close the site. "I want to applaud the chairman and ranking member for continuing the funding for the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste storage facility," Dicks said. He said adding money in an amendment would "underscore the strong bipartisan support in the House for moving ahead with a plan to open the nation's high-level waste storage facility." "I believe as many do in the House that administration's position to close the Yucca Mountain site runs counter to the letter and spirit of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act passed by the Congress," he said.

#### Lack of federal reprocessing hurts relations with South Korea – cornerstone of relations.

Yurman, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Dan, “Revisiting Reprocessing in South Korea”, ANS Nuclear Café, 8-2-12,

<http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/08/02/revisiting-reprocessing-in-south-korea/>, RSR]

Comes now the request by the South Korean government, first aired in October 2010, to revise the bilateral cooperation treaty with the U.S. It has been in place for more than 40 years and it is a cornerstone of U.S./South Korean diplomatic relations. Many specialists in the field of nonproliferation see a “hard and fast” policy against any expansion of uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing as a key to stopping states like North Korea from pursuing these activities. That strategy hasn’t worked and, as a result, South Korea wants relief from the restriction in the now-decades-old treaty. Negotiations over changes to the treaty have been going on since last December, but appear to be stalemated around a key set of issues. It is a delicate dance, as diplomats like to say, because if the U.S. leans too heavily on South Korea, it could sour relations between the two countries and spawn nationalist sentiment that might lead to a nuclear weapons program. Since the 1950s, South Korea has depended on the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a shield against aggression from its neighbor to the north.

#### US-SoKo relations k2 regional stability and global security

Clinton 10 [Hillary Rodham Clinton, “America’s Engagement in the Asia-Pacific”, October 28, 2010, http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/10/150141.htm]

This year also marked a milestone with another ally: the 60th anniversary of the start of the Korean War, which Secretary Gates and I commemorated in Seoul this past summer. And in two weeks, our presidents will meet in Seoul when President Obama travels there for the G-20 summit. Our two countries have stood together in the face of threats and provocative acts from North Korea, including the tragic sinking of the Cheonan by a North Korean torpedo. We will continue to coordinate closely with both Seoul and Tokyo in our efforts to make clear to North Korea there is only one path that promises the full benefits of engagement with the outside world – a full, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization.The alliance between South Korea and the United States is a lynchpin of stability and security in the region and now even far beyond. We are working together in Afghanistan, where a South Korean reconstruction team is at work in Parwan Province; in the Gulf of Aden, where Korean and U.S. forces are coordinating anti-piracy missions. And of course, beyond our military cooperation, our countries enjoy a vibrant economic relationship, which is why our two Presidents have called for resolving the outstanding issues related to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement by the time of the G-20 meeting in Seoul.

#### East Asian instability leads to World War III

Knight Ridder 2k

(Jonathon S. Landay, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts”, 3-11, L/N)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But **even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war**. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. **Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile**," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "**We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster**."