# ASU Round 5 vs. UNLV PS (Aff)

## 1AC

#### Same as Round 4.

## 2AC

### Uranium

#### They say reprocessing leads to more waste – we can reuse all the waste we currently store for energy.

Bastin 8 (Clinton, Former Chemical Engineer at the Atomic Energy Commission, 21st Century Science and Technology, “We Need to Reprocess Spent Nuclear Fuel, And Can Do It Safely, At Reasonable Cost”, 2008, [http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202008/ Summer\_2008/Reprocessing.pdf](http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202008/Summer_2008/Reprocessing.pdf), RSR)

The concept of used nuclear fuel as “nuclear waste” is a fiction created by the opponents of nuclear energy. Used nuclear fuel isn’t waste at all, but a renewable resource that can be reprocessed into new nuclear fuel and valuable isotopes. When we entered the nuclear age, the great promise of nuclear energy wasitsrenewability, making it an inexpensive and efficient way to produce electricity. It was assumed that the nations making use of nuclear energy would reprocess their spent fuel, completing the nuclear fuel cycle by recycling the nuclear fuel after it was burned in a reactor, to extract the 95 to 99 percent of unused uranium in it that can be turned into new fuel. This means that if the United States buries its 70,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel, we would be wasting 66,000 metric tons of uranium-28, which could be used to make new fuel. In addition, we would be wasting about 1,200 metric tons of fissile uranium-25 and plutonium-29, which can also be burned as fuel. Because of the high energy density in the nucleus, this relatively small amount of U.S. spent fuel (it would fit in one small house) is equivalent in energy to about 20 percent of the U.S. oil reserves. About 96 percent of the spent fuel the United States is now storing can be turned into new fuel. The 4 percent of the socalled waste that remains—2,500 metric tons—consists of highly radioactive materials, but these are also usable. There are about 80 tons each of cesium-17 and strontium-90 that could be separated out for use in medical applications, such as sterilization of medical supplies. Using isotope separation techniques, and fast-neutron bombardment for transmutation (technologies that the United States pioneered but now refuses to develop), we could separate out all sorts of isotopes, like americium, which is used in smoke detectors, or isotopes used in medical testing and treatment. Right now, the United Statesmust import 90 percent of its medical isotopes, used in 40,000 medical procedures daily. The diagram shows a closed nuclear fuel cycle. At present, the United States has no reprocessing, and stores spent fuel in pools or dry storage at nuclear plants. Existing nuclear reactors use only about 1 percent of the total energy value in uranium resources; fast reactors with fuel recycle would use essentially 100 percent, burning up all of the uranium and actinides, the long-lived fission products. In a properly managed and safeguarded system, the plutonium produced in fast reactors would remain in its spent fuel until needed for recycle.Thus, there need be no excess buildup of accessible plutonium. The plutonium could also be fabricated directly into new reactor fuel assemblies to be burned in nuclear plants.

#### They say prolif - No prolif concerns – new tech does not separate the plutonium preventing it from theft or usability.

Lagus, 2005 WISE Intern, ‘5

[Todd, University of Minnesota, WISE, “Reprocessing of Spent Nuclear Fuel: A Policy Analysis”

<http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2005/lagus.pdf>, RSR]

In the case of the newer UREX+ technology, the long-lived fission products create more steps in weapons deployment. The new technologies for reprocessing including transmutation would not involve separating pure plutonium, but rather a plutonium/ actinide mixture that would increase the toxicity of the material and protect it from theft and handling. The International Atomic Energy Agency’s (IAEA) standard for self protection requires 1 Sievert/hr (100 rems/hr) at one meter. Five Sieverts is a median lethal dose. 45 This technology again has been demonstrated in laboratories, but a great deal of research is still underway. The actinides also contaminate the plutonium such that it would not be usable as a weapon without sophisticated chemical separation technologies, which few countries, if any, possess. 46 Some argue that there are many other weapons options which are cheaper and easier to fabricate should an enemy decide to strike. 47

#### They say accidents - reprocessing facilities are safe – they’re designed to satisfy all relevant standards.

IAEA, ‘8

[International Atomic Energy Agency, “Spent Fuel Reprocessing Options”, August 2008, RSR]

Existing reprocessing facilities have been designed and constructed to satisfy all relevant national and international standards for the safekeeping of nuclear materials. The key to achieving safeguarding is accountability and transparency, resulting from communications and co-operation between the operator and safeguarding authorities. Today, specific approaches are implemented in reprocessing plants, tailored to take maximum benefit from the features of these plants, such as automation, computerised systems and remote monitoring. Based on the past experience at La Hague and Sellafield, new designs can incorporate smaller material balance zones and can utilize improved technology for the measurement of processes [24]. The new reprocessing plant at Rokkasho-Mura in Japan is an interesting case in point, with implementation of extensive safeguards measures largely automated to such extent that three-quarters of data collection are reported to be performed unattended [76].

### Recommendation CP

#### Perm do both.

#### Yucca Mountain only option in long term – 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.

#### Yucca explosion likely and results in extinction – top geologists agree.

Broad, ‘90

[William, Staff, The New York Times, November 18]

One scientist, however, has quietly but persistently warned that this vision of a safe repository is little more than a delusion.¶ Jerry S. Szymanski (pronounced sha-MAN-ski) is a geologist who works on the Yucca Mountain project for the United States Department of Energy, which is in charge of evaluating the site and would run the repository. For years, he has argued that ground water under the mountain could eventually well up, flood the facility and prompt a calamity of vast proportions. The geological action is easy to visualize. Crustal stresses in the area slowly open fractures and faults under and within the mountain. Water seeps into them. An earthquake occurs, compressing the fractures and forcing the ground water upward into the dump. As the inrushing water comes into contact with the hot canisters of nuclear waste, the water is vaporized, threatening to cause explosions, ruptures and the release of radioactivity.¶ Szymanski has worked for the D.O.E. since 1983. He takes pains to distance himself from foes of nuclear power. "This report is not the act of a disgruntled employee or an antinuclear freak," he wrote in the preface of a study he made on Yucca Mountain. "Rather, it is the act of a deeply concerned scientist, a public servant and a pro-nuclear activist."¶ He chain-smokes Winstons and drinks Scotch, neither of which seems to impair his ability to take brisk hikes up the mountain with his dog Max, a fierce-looking but friendly creature that is half Labrador, half pit bull. Szymanski's eyes flash when he speaks of those who oppose his view of the evidence. "It's banality of thought," he growls, "absence of depth." That same kind of banality, he says, was responsible for the Holocaust, around which his earliest memories revolve, and for a brutal crackdown in his native Poland, which prompted him to flee that country two decades ago with his wife and 6-month-old son. Today, he says, banality is prompting the Federal Government to court disaster.¶ Squinting in the bright Nevada sunlight, a cigarette firmly in his mouth, Szymanski walks into Trench No. 8, a deep scar on the side of Yucca Mountain dug at the behest of the Energy Department. It runs across a fault. He bends down to examine a one-yard-wide vein of rock whose creamy color stands in contrast to the dark, surrounding earth tones. His fingers play over its surface. The vein was deposited, he says, by mineral-laden water that welled up and turned this desolate site into an oasis.¶ "This is above the repository level," he says with studied understatement. The implication is clear and troubling -- where water once flowed, it might flow again.¶ The repository would hold up to 70,000 metric tons of waste. A large release would have an environmental impact that, by some estimates, would exceed that of a nuclear war. For perspective, the explosion of the Chernobyl reactor in the Soviet Union shot into the atmosphere just a few dozen pounds of highly radioactive nuclear waste, one of the most dangerous components of which was cesium 137 (it would also be a significant part of the waste at Yucca Mountain). Various studies say the consequences of Chernobyl will eventually be somewhere between 17,000 and 475,000 deaths from cancer, as well as an alarming number of serious ailments.¶ For half a decade, Szymanski's was a lone voice. His grim appraisal was opposed by almost everyone else on the Yucca Mountain project, who let their displeasure be known in subtle and not-so-subtle ways. But recently, growing ranks of geologists have backed his view. The dispute is by no means resolved.¶ If Szymanski is right and his warnings are heeded, it could mark the end of the Yucca Mountain project. The retreat would be a stunning setback for the Government and the nuclear-power industry, which is poised for a revival. If he is right and his warnings go unheeded, some experts say it might be the beginning of the ultimate end.¶ "You flood that thing and you could blow the top off the mountain," says Charles B. Archambeau, a geophysicist at the University of Colorado who has reviewed Szymanski's work and found it persuasive. "At the very least, the radioactive material would go into the ground water and spread to Death Valley, where there are hot springs all over the place, constantly bringing water up from great depths. It would be picked up by the birds, the animals, the plant life. It would start creeping out of Death Valley. You couldn't stop it. That's the nightmare. It could slowly spread to the whole biosphere. If you want to envision the end of the world, that's it."

### Reg Neg

#### Perm do both. Pass both the plan and the counterplan. The result of passing both is that an investment is done but the plan is passed unconditionally. Fixes net benefit with doing negotiated rulemaking.

#### Perm do the CP.

#### a. This is legitimate because they’re not textually competitive.

#### b. This limits out abusive counterplans like the dollar PIC and the period PIC which are completely unpredictable – infinite number of processes that could be changed, coopt the entirety of the 1AC, which forces us to argue against ourselves. This CP is only legitimate as a normal means CP for which they must read evidence.

#### c. Process PICs are artificially competitive because they overinflate the value of a contrived net benefit.

#### d. Process PICs are illegitimate because they add to the plan and are plan plus. They haven’t read any evidence which would indicate that specification of the process that would make the CP competitive is topical.

#### Lack of reprocessing permissions killing US-South Korea relations now - viewed by SK as a matter of national sovereignty.

Manyin, et al., ‘12

[Mark (Coordinator and Specialist in Asian Affairs at CRS); Emma Chanlett-Avery (Acting Section Research Manager at CRS); and Mary Nitkin (Specialist in Nonproliferation at CRS), “U.S.-South Korea Relations”, Congressional Research Service, 5-15-12, RSR]

The current U.S.-Korea nuclear cooperation agreement, as with other standard agreements, 66 requires U.S. permission before South Korea can reprocess U.S.-origin spent fuel, including spent fuel from South Korea’s U.S.-designed reactors. 67 This is because reprocessing can create new fuel or plutonium for weapons use. The issue has become a sensitive one for many South Korean officials and politicians, who see it as a matter of national sovereignty. The United States has been reluctant to grant such permission due to concerns over the proliferation potential of this technology, the potential impact on negotiations with North Korea, and the possible contradiction with global nonproliferation policy to prevent enrichment and reprocessing plants in new states.

#### Alliance credibility key to deterring NK conflict

McDevitt ’11 **–** vice president and director of the CNA Strategic Studies

(Michael McDevitt, “Deterring North Korean Provocations”, Brookings Institution, February 2011, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2011/02/north-korea-mcdevitt)

Since the Armistice that ended the fighting in Korea in 1953, the U.S.-ROK alliance has been **successful** in preventing another North Korean invasion. The basic approach has been to present such a formidable defensive posture that the North would **never believe it had an opportunity** to forcefully reunify the country under its leadership. In other words, North Korea has successfully been deterred. Alliance strategy has worked so well that today the prospect of an attempt by North Korea to militarily reunite the peninsula is judged by many to be incredible. Setting aside the question of whether Pyongyang still has the desire to solve the Korean civil war by force of arms, some argue that North Korea no longer has the capability to invade successfully, even if it wanted to. Still, both the U.S. and ROK armed forces take the possibility of another invasion, however remote, seriously. The alliance’s Combined Forces Command (CFC) worries about the possibility of a surprise, or short warning attack, because North Korea has positioned much of its Korean People’s Army (KPA) close to the DMZ where it could undertake offensive operations in short order. Deterrence as Practiced Today in Korea “Broadly defined, deterrence is the threat of force intended to convince a potential aggressor not to undertake a particular action because the costs will be unacceptable or the probability of success extremely low.”[1] In other words, deterrence comes in two forms—deterrence by punishment and deterrence by denial. In the first instance, potential aggressors are deterred by the prospect of having to endure unacceptable punishment in response to an aggressive act. In the second case, deterrence by denial, the potential aggressor is deterred because defenses are so good that the aggressor concludes that it could not achieve its political and military objectives through use of force. In Korea, the U.S.-ROK alliance combines both of these approaches—a strong defense that can deny success, buttressed with the promise of overwhelming retaliation in the event of an invasion from the north. For either of these forms of deterrence to be successful what is threatened in response to aggression or a hostile act must be believable, or as it is commonly cast, must be credible. Credibility in turn, derives from a combination of military capability and a belief in the minds of North Korean leaders that the alliance has the political will to act. There is no doubt that the U.S.-ROK allies have the political will to respond to an invasion; hence the conditions necessary for a credible deterrent, capability and political will, are met.

#### The chance for escalation is high—North Korea will provoke South Korea to test its new leadership

Cha ‘12- professor at Georgetown University; senior advisor and Korea chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies

(Cha, Victor D. “Kim Jong Un Is No Reformer”. August 21, 2012. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/21/kim\_jong\_un\_is\_no\_reformer)Let me be blunt: The North Korean regime will not change because Little Kim studied in Switzerland, likes Mickey Mouse, and has a hot wife. If anything, another crisis could be looming: The death of Kim Jong Il and the politics of an unstable leadership transition, a new "get-tough" attitude in Seoul, and U.S. and South Korean electoral cycles constitute a unique confluence of escalation that has not been seen on the peninsula since the 1990s. This could spell another nuclear crisis with North Korea, or even worse, military hostilities that could threaten the peace and prosperity of the region. The Obama administration stopped trying to engage Pyongyang after its April 2012 missile launch, which North Korea announced just 16 days after a food-for-nuclear-and-missile-freeze deal with the United States. Stung by the launch, the Obama administration immediately called off the deal and gave up on its last chance to get IAEA inspectors into North Korea's nuclear facilities at Yongbyon. The launch, which North Korea claimed was for a weather satellite but tested ballistic missile technology banned by the U.N. Security Council, exploded an embarrassing 81 seconds after liftoff. The spectacular failure of Kim's first major public act almost ensures that another provocation is in the offing. He lacks the revolutionary credentials his grandfather earned as a guerrilla fighter against the Japanese. Unlike his father, he does not have a decade of training and preparation for the job. Without serving a day of military service, in September 2010 the junior Kim was made a four-star general and foisted to the top of the power structure at the age of 26 or 27. Even for North Koreans, who expect their leaders to start young so that they can rule for decades, this is a stretch. So **Kim must prove himself** -- be it **through** another missile launch, a nuclear test, or **a military provocation** against Seoul. But South Koreans are fed up. Since North Korea torpedoed a South Korean navy ship in March 2010 and shelled an island a few months later in attacks that killed sailors and civilians, the government and public no longer preach patience and stability so as not to rattle the South Korean stock market. South Korean military leaders have re-written their military rules of engagement. They are now prepared to retaliate for the next military act, possibly even going after command structures in North Korea, which could ignite a full-scale war on the peninsula. The South Korean conservative political contender for the presidential election in December, moreover, is in no mood to look weak on North Korea. Even if the long-shot liberal candidates who preach engagement with the North were to win, Pyongyang has a history of provoking a newly elected leader in the South to show who is the alpha dog on the peninsula, in which case, public pressure for a strong response would be difficult to ignore. Based on my research of U.S.-North Korea negotiations since 1984, within an average of five months after a provocation Washington is usually back at the bargaining table, often because it wants to de-escalate a crisis. The Obama administration, facing a tough election, is not interested in offering exit ramps to North Korea, for fearing of being denounced as weak by Republicans. Optimists often cite China as the answer to avoiding another crisis. The mid-August meetings between the Chinese and Kim's uncle, Jang Song-taek, may be a prelude to more economic deals and even a visit by the new leader to Beijing. But China cannot restrain Pyongyang from belligerence; and it cannot reform North Korea's family-run regime, no matter how many bureaucrats it offers to train. It can only bribe them to return temporarily to a negotiating table that is now empty of other willing partners. The only thing missing right now is a spark. Perhaps North Korea's new leader is busy amusing himself with Disney and his new lovely wife instead of dealing with problems like the flooding that has ravaged the countryside. NGOs report that the food shortage situation is worsening. And the rogue nuclear and missile programs continue to expand. Infighting within the regime is likely intensifying, manifested in the surprise sacking in July of the country's top military general, Ri Yong-ho. Some interpret Ri's departure as evidence of the young reform-minded Kim trying to usurp power from the hard-line military.

#### 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**."

#### The CP kills investor certainty – can’t create new tech, and doesn’t promote innovation.

Coglianese, Associate Professor of Public Policy at Harvard University, ‘1

[Cary, Chair of the¶ Regulatory Policy Program, Center for Business and Government; and Affiliated Scholar, Harvard Law School, 2001, “Assessing The Advocacy Of Negotiated Rulemaking:¶ A Response To Philip Harter”

http://www.hks.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/research/c.coglianese\_new.york\_assessing.advocacy.pdf]

In addition to giving priority to tractable issues, negotiated rulemaking may encourage imprecision or ambiguity.273 Since it is usually easier to achieve consensus at higher levels of abstraction, the potential always exists that negotiators will adopt abstract or vague language.274 As¶ Neil Kerwin has observed, when an agency commits itself to obtaining consensus, that is, “to¶ producing a rule with which everyone with a recognized interest can agree, the only way to break certain deadlocks is to produce a rule that ignores unresolved (or unresolvable) issues or deals with¶ them through vague language whose meaning will be disputed during the implementation¶ process.”275 Adopting vague language may Negotiated rulemaking’s emphasis on unanimity also makes it more likely that the final¶ outcome will succumb to the lowest-common-denominator problem. The outcome that is minimally¶ acceptable to all the members of a negotiated rulemaking committee will not necessarily be optimal¶ or effective in terms of achieving social goals. A recent study of negotiated rulemaking conducted¶ by Charles Caldart and Nicholas Ashford shows that in industries that are not likely to innovate in¶ the absence of strong governmental regulation, the lowest-common-denominator problem keeps negotiated rules from promoting the technological innovation needed to improve environmental and¶ safety performance.276 They conclude that because industry representatives in these types of¶ industries will be reluctant to agree to regulations that would compel firms to make dramatic investments in new technologies, “negotiated rulemaking’s focus on consensus can effectively¶ remove the potential to spur innovation.”277

#### Certainty is essential – only effective method of catalyzing investment.

Trembath, policy associate in the Energy and Climate Program at Breakthrough, ‘11

[Alex, co-author of several Breakthrough publications, including the 2012 report "Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence" and "Where the Shale Gas Revolution Came From.", 4/11, [Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy](http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/),

<http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/>]

If there is one field of the energy sector for which certainty of political will and government policy is essential, it is nuclear power. High up front costs for the private industry, extreme regulatory oversight and public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology. In a new [**report**](http://www.thirdway.org/publications/370) on the potential for a “nuclear renaissance,” Third Way references the failed cap-and-trade bill, delaying tactics in the House vis-a-vis EPA regulations on CO₂, and the recent election results to emphasize the difficult current political environment for advancing new nuclear policy. The report, “The Future of Nuclear Energy,” makes the case for political certainty: “It is difficult for energy producers and users to estimate the relative price for nuclear-generated energy compared to fossil fuel alternatives (e.g. natural gas)–an essential consideration in making the major capital investment decision necessary for new energy production that will be in place for decades.” Are our politicians willing to match the level of certainty that the nuclear industry demands? Lacking a suitable price on carbon that may have been achieved by a cap-and-trade bill removes one primary policy instrument for making nuclear power more cost-competitive with fossil fuels. The impetus on Congress, therefore, will be to shift from demand-side “pull” energy policies (that increase demand for clean tech by raising the price of dirty energy) to [**supply-side “push” policies**](http://leadenergy.org/2010/09/supply-demand-energy-innovation/), or industrial and innovation policies. Fortunately, there are signals from political and thought leaders that a package of policies may emerge to incentivize alternative energy sources that include nuclear power. One place to start is the recently deceased American Power Act, addressed above, authored originally by Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman. Before its final and disappointing incarnation, the bill [**included**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/american-power-act-photos_n_573643.html#s90041&title=undefined) provisions to increase loan guarantees for nuclear power plant construction in addition to other tax incentives. Loan guarantees are probably the most important method of government involvement in new plant construction, given the high capital costs of development. One wonders what the fate of the bill, or a less ambitious set of its provisions, would have been had Republican Senator Graham not abdicated and removed any hope of Republican co-sponsorship. But that was last year. The changing of the guard in Congress makes this a whole different game, and the once feasible support for nuclear technology on either side of the aisle must be reevaluated. A New York Times [**piece**](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/business/energy-environment/17NUCLEAR.html) in the aftermath of the elections forecast a difficult road ahead for nuclear energy policy, but did note Republican support for programs like a waste disposal site and loan guarantees. Republican support for nuclear energy has roots in the most significant recent energy legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which passed provisions for nuclear power with wide bipartisan support. Reaching out to Republicans on policies they have supported in the past should be a goal of Democrats who wish to form a foundational debate on moving the policy forward. There are also signals that key Republicans, notably [**Lindsey Graham**](http://washingtonindependent.com/99171/graham-circulating-clean-energy-standard) and [**Richard Lugar**](http://www.plattsenergyweektv.com/story.aspx?storyid=132784&catid=293), would throw their support behind a clean energy standard that includes nuclear and CCS. Republicans in Congress will find intellectual support from a group that AEL’s Teryn Norris coined [**“innovation hawks,”**](http://leadenergy.org/2011/01/the-rise-of-innovation-hawks/) among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been [**particularly outspoken**](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/04/08/this-nuclear-option-is-nuclear.html) in support of nuclear energy, writing in 2010 that “it is a travesty that the nation that first harnessed nuclear energy has neglected it so long because fads about supposed ‘green energy’ and superstitions about nuclear power’s dangers.” The extreme reluctance of Republicans to cooperate with Democrats over the last two years is only the first step, as any legislation will have to overcome Democrats’ traditional opposition to nuclear energy. However, here again there is reason for optimism. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry bucked their party’s long-time aversion to nuclear in a precursor bill to APA, and Kerry continued working on the issue during 2010. Jeff Bingaman, in a speech earlier this week, reversed his position on the issue by calling for the inclusion of nuclear energy provisions in a clean energy standard. The Huffington Post [**reports**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/01/sen-jeff-bingaman-backs-n_n_816864.html) that “the White House reached out to his committee [Senate Energy] to help develop the clean energy plan through legislation.” This development in itself potentially mitigates two of the largest obstacle standing in the way of progress on comprehensive energy legislation: lack of a bill, and lack of high profile sponsors. Democrats can also direct [**Section 48C**](http://leadenergy.org/2010/12/clean-energy-financing-first-steps-towards-post-partisan-effort/#more-3320) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 towards nuclear technology, which provides a tax credit for companies that engage in clean tech manufacturing. Democrats should not give up on their policy goals simply because they no longer enjoy broad majorities in both Houses, and Republicans should not spend all their time holding symbolic repeal votes on the Obama Administration’s accomplishments. The lame-duck votes in December on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the tax cut deal and START indicate that at least a few Republicans are willing to work together with Democrats in a divided Congress, and that is precisely what nuclear energy needs moving forward. It will require an agressive push from the White House, and a concerted effort from both parties’ leadership, but the road for forging bipartisan legislation is not an impassable one. The politician with perhaps the single greatest leverage over the future of nuclear energy is President Obama, and his rhetoric matches the challenge posed by our aging and poisonous energy infrastructure. “This is our generation’s Sputnik moment,” announced Obama recently. Echoing the calls of presidents past, the President used his [**State of the Union**](http://www.slate.com/id/2281847/) podium to signal a newly invigorated industrialism in the United States. He advocated broadly for renewed investment in infrastructure, education, and technological innovation. And he did so in a room with many more members of the opposition party than at any point during the first half of his term. The eagerness of the President to combine left and right agendas can hopefully match the hyper-partisan bitterness that dominates our political culture, and nuclear power maybe one sector of our economy to benefit from his political leadership.

### Renewables

#### Reprocessing solves peak oil.

Szabo 10 (Aaron, J.D., George Washington University Law School; Financial Analyst, United States

Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), 2010, “Reprocessing: The Future Of Nuclear Waste”, Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, Vol. 29, No. 2, RSR)

Energy independence has been a longstanding concern for the United States. Beginning with President Nixon's promise to make the United States energy independent by the end of the 1970s,1'5 every subsequent president has sought to move the country away from dependence on foreign countries for energy.' 52 Although the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 took a step toward energy independence and increased national security, the United States is currently more dependent on other countries for energy than ever before. Last year, the United States imported about half of its oil and 40.7 million pounds of uranium.15 3 According to President Obama, America's dependence on oil is one of the most serious threats that our nation has faced. It bankrolls dictators, pays for nuclear proliferation and funds both sides of our struggle against terrorism. It puts the American people at the mercy of shifting gas prices, stifles innovation, and sets back our ability to compete. Increasing the United States nuclear supply by creating a closed-loop fuel cycle can significantly decrease the United States' dependence on oil and fuel from other countries and provide the United States with more stability and independence from possible hostile countries.

#### No shift towards renewable – venture capitalists are not interested.

Jacobius, Staff Writer, 9-17

[Arleen, “Clean-tech investing littered with mines”, Pensions and Investments,

http://www.pionline.com/article/20120917/PRINTSUB/309179992/clean-tech-investing-littered-with-mines]

Clean technology managers are redoubling their efforts to attract capital, but investors will have to pick through a landscape of failed offerings to find the managers with winning strategies.¶ Six years ago, institutional investors began making large commitments to the sector. They bet that rising fuel costs and dwindling natural resources would create a huge investment opportunity in alternative energy.¶ The California Public Employees' Retirement System has made $1.1 billion in private equity commitments to the sector, including $480 million through its CalPERS Clean Energy and Technology Fund, $500 million in clean energy and technology funds and $200 million in its environmental technology program; the California State Teachers' Retirement System has about $667.5 million invested in clean tech; and the New York State Common Retirement Fund has more than $500 million committed to the sector.¶ So far, not all investments have worked out as planned, industry insiders said. Investors are still waiting for their clean-tech portfolios to produce expected returns. The reason is that many clean-tech investments are still sitting in managers' portfolios waiting for an exit.¶ Some venture capital managers will not be able to continue supporting these companies, sending executives at these firms off in search of other sources of capital, said Tracy Lefteroff, global managing partner of the venture capital practice at PricewaterhouseCoopers U.S. who is based in the firm's San Jose, Calif., office.¶ “I think there is a lot of interest in clean technology but not enough of profitable liquidity events to maintain a high level of investment or to attract new money,” Mr. Lefteroff said.

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

#### **Global nuclear expansion now.** Over 200 reactors are going to be constructed in the next five years. That’s 1AC Marketwire.

#### Renewables fail – even massive government investment cannot overcome intermittency, Germany proves.

Gue, Energy Markets Analyst, ‘10

[Elliot, “Nuclear Power: A Better Investment than Alternative Energy,” Investing Daily, 10-11-10, http://www.investingdaily.com/13512/nuclear-power-a-better-investment-than-alternative-energy]

Renewable and alternative energies are the centerpiece of many governments’ energy policies. Germany has been a market leader in wind and solar. Generous feed-in tariffs effectively guarantee attractive returns for new alternative energy projects for 20 years. Despite relatively modest wind and solar resources, Germany is among the fastest-growing markets in the world for both technologies.¶ Although alternative energies hold some longer-term promise, blind and seemingly unwavering confidence in these solutions near-term benefits is misplaced.¶ By their very nature, wind and solar power are intermittent energy sources; when the wind isn’t blowing or the sun isn’t shining, natural gas-fired plants provide for much of the shadow capacity that keeps the electricity flowing. This pie graph breaks down Germany’s electricity mix from 1998 to 2008.¶ As you can see, thermal sources–primarily gas and coal–have lost share in Germany’s electricity grid over the past decade, though they still accounts for more than half of the nation’s net power generation. Natural gas consumption is up roughly 8 percent over this period, but coal use has flattened or declined.¶ Although Germany’s generous subsidies have increased its wind-power capacity significantly, this renewable energy accounts for just 6 percent of total generation. The country’s investments have produced a relatively small increase in electricity generated from wind power.¶ Wishful thinking aside, current wind- and solar-power technologies don’t offer a real alternative to fossil fuels.

#### Nuclear and renewables don’t compete—they’re complimentary

Scandurra and Romano ‘11

(Giuseppe and Antonio Angelo, Department of Statistical Mathematics and Economics at the University of Napoli, “The investments in renewable energy sources: do low carbon economies better invest in green technologies?”, Munich Personal RePEc Archive, 2011, http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/34216/2/MPRA\_paper\_34216.pdf)

If it can have some statistical significance, the estimates in the low carbon economies are generally higher, in absolute value, than in the high carbon sample, except the autoregressive parameters. In fact, the influence of investments in renewable energy source is stronger in the high carbon countries than to the other countries (low carbon). The former try to invest mostly in renewable sources in order to reduce their footprint and respect the international agreement that they ratified. Significant is the inverse relationship between renewable investments and share of nuclear consumption. Probably, the continuous base load electricity ensured by nuclear power plants and the absence of greenhouse gas emission allow these countries to invest in additional renewable energy in a complementary way, in order to reach an optimal energy mix and to ensure the subsidies for investment in renewable energy.

### Politics

#### Econ strong now.

Business Review 1/14 (http://www.bizjournals.com/albany/morning\_call/2013/01/national-economy-projected-to-grow-by.html)

The U.S. economy is projected to grow by 2.5 percent in 2013 and 3.5 percent the following year, according to a forecast by Chicago Fed President Charles Evans.¶ Reuters reported that Evans announced the projection during the Asian Financial Forum in Kong Kong. The Fed president also expects that U.S. unemployment will be 7.4 percent in 2013 and improve slightly to 7 percent next year.

#### Obama is not key – bipartisan coalition being formed right now to formulate a bill

#### No comprehensive reform – House Republicans remain too divided on the issue.

NYT, 2-6

[The New York Times, “Immigration and the Middle Ground”, 2-6-13,

http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/07/opinion/immigration-reform-and-the-false-middle-ground.html?\_r=0]

But House Republicans aren’t there yet. The tone at the hearing was set when the committee chairman, Representative Robert Goodlatte of Virginia, asked a witness: “Are there options that we should consider between the extremes of mass deportation and a pathway to citizenship for those not lawfully present in the United States?” The false middle ground he and others on the committee seemed to be seeking was limbo: legal status without hope of citizenship. Or, second-class noncitizens.¶ The witness, Mayor Julián Castro of San Antonio, responded that there was nothing extreme about turning immigrants into Americans. “If we look at our history,” he said, “Congress over time has chosen that option, that path to citizenship.”¶ Republicans have been so estranged from a reasonable immigration discussion that it’s not surprising they don’t know what one looks like. Since the last big bipartisan reform died in 2007, Republicans have dug into a trench on the far right, declaring that legalization in any form is anathema. The re-election of Mr. Obama and the dismal performance by Republicans among Hispanic voters rattled the party deeply and dislodged some Republicans from that noxious orthodoxy.¶ Judging from Tuesday’s hearing, many in the party still see immigrants as problems to be separated and contained. Republican committee members seemed willing only to discuss making Americans of small subsets, like “highly skilled” immigrants in technical fields, leaving aside most everyone else. Representative Spencer Bachus of Alabama and some like-minded witnesses dismissed citizenship as too “toxic” to discuss. Their defeatism was yet more evidence of a party deeply out of step with public opinion and American history, in which waves of newcomers have been absorbed into the republic without being forced into a permanent underclass.

#### Cantor and House Republicans support nuclear power

Politico 11 (Cantor: nuclear power 'essential' for U.S. energy needs, http://www.politico.com/blogs/glennthrush/0311/Cantor\_nuclear\_power\_essential\_for\_US\_energy\_needs.html)

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor defended nuclear energy production Monday, after a series of explosions at a nuclear reactor in Japan, calling it “essential” to meeting American energy needs. The problems at the Fukushima plant 150 miles north of Tokyo have reignited the debate over the safety of nuclear energy production. Cantor told reporters Monday that the tsunami that ravaged Japan last week is to blame, not the reactor itself. “As far as we know, this is the result of a tsunami,” he said. “Nuclear power is an essential mix of the energy economy in this country.” The tsunami caused technical problems at the Japanese plant, which left nuclear rods exposed, raising the specter of Chernobyl-style meltdown. The timing couldn’t have been worse for House Republican leaders, who demanded last week that President Barack Obama speed up approval of new nuclear energy facilities.

#### Obama needs to rally Democrats for immigration reform.

Feldmann, 2-7

[Linda, “Why Obama is on charm offensive with Democrats”, The Christian Monitor,

<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0207/Why-Obama-is-on-charm-offensive-with-Democrats>, RSR]

By making these visits, Obama was reinforcing a truism about the presidency: Rallying your own troops can be just as important as reaching out to the other side, particularly when at least one chamber is in the other party’s hands. And you can’t always count on members of your own party to be there for you.¶ During his first term, Obama faced criticism for being aloof and not reaching out to either side of the aisle, at times hurting his own cause. In his first two years in office, with Democratic majorities in both houses of Congress, Obama won significant legislative victories – including the biggest economic stimulus package in history, health-care reform, and financial reform. But the conservative backlash was fierce, and in the 2010 midterms, the Republicans swept into power in the House. Gridlock has stymied action since, exacerbated by Obama’s lack of close relationships on Capitol Hill, analysts say.¶ “Wooing of caucuses is something he didn’t do much in his first term, and it hurt him,” says Jennifer Duffy, a political analyst at the nonpartisan Cook Political Report. “Members of his own party felt very disconnected from him. I think in the second term, with some big agenda items, the White House has decided it’s time to engage and actively work those groups.”¶ One first-term example, she says, where some more schmoozing with Capitol Hill allies could have helped him avoid political and economic damage: the messy debt-ceiling negotiations in the summer of 2011, which led to the downgrading of the nation’s credit rating.

#### Senate democrats love nuclear power – perceived safer than alternatives, public backs it and Fukushima doesn’t matter.

Bartash, ‘11

[Jeffry, “Democrats warm to nuclear, domestic drilling”, 4-15-11, Marketwatch

<http://articles.marketwatch.com/2011-04-15/economy/30789692_1_nuclear-power-nuclear-plants-nuclear-energy>, RSR]

WASHINGTON (MarketWatch) — At a hearing this week, Democratic Sen. Tom Carper of Delaware asked one of the nation’s top regulators how many Americans have been killed by nuclear power. ”There are no known fatalities in the U.S. from the use of nuclear energy,” replied Gregory Jaczko, chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Carper then turned to Lisa Jackson, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. He asked her how many people have been killed or had their lives shortened by the use of pollution-emitting fossil fuels. Tens of thousands, she said. The senator sat back in his chair and nodded. “All sources of energy involve risks,” he said. Carper, a longtime supporter of nuclear power, is not the only Democrat who’s weighing every option available on how to fuel the massive U.S. economy. Many other members of his party are as well — no doubt egged on by soaring gas prices and public discontent. And while Democrats aren’t chanting “drill, baby, drill,” they appear to be concluding that nuclear power and more domestic drilling, once anathema, are vital to America’s energy future. At several hearings this week, nary a word was said about abolishing nuclear power despite the recent disaster in Japan. And Democrats say the are open to drilling for more natural gas in the continental U.S. despite growing concerns over an extraction practice called “fracking.”

#### **PC isn’t real —butterfly effect – only winners win.**

Hirsh 2/9 (Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, 2/9/2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, NP)

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through.¶ Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and § Marked 07:40 § stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”
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#### Immigration reform won’t pass – no compromise on pathway to citizenship.

Foley, 2-5

[Elise, “House Republicans: Immigration Reform With Pathway To Citizenship 'Toxic,' 'Extreme'”, The Huffington Post

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/05/house-republicans-immigration\_n\_2625107.html, RSR]

WASHINGTON -- House Republicans insisted on Tuesday that Democrats are showing a lack of willingness to compromise on immigration reform by calling for a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, arguing that they should be more open to legislation without it.¶ "Are there options that we should consider between the extremes of mass deportation and the pathway to citizenship for those not lawfully present in the United States?" Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), who chairs the House Judiciary Committee, asked San Antonio Mayor Julián Castro (D) at a hearing on immigration reform, the first on the issue for the 113th Congress.¶ Another top Republican, immigration subcommittee chairman Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.), accused Democrats of refusing to come toward the center.¶ "I think you earlier referenced that [a pathway to citizenship] as compromise, and I'm curious, a compromise between what?" he said to Castro. "I don't see anyone advocating for full-fledged citizenship without background checks, for full-fledged citizenship without taxes, for full-fledged citizenship without fines. So It's a compromise between what?"