# 2AC

### T

**We meet—plan remove a ban not a regulation – that probs restrains, that’s the ANS evidence**

**More ev—it’s a ban**

**Weinstein ’10**

(Dr. Bernard L., “Fueling America’s nuclear renaissance by reprocessing nuclear fuel”, The Hill, 12-21-2010, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/134665-fueling-americas-nuclear-renaissance-by-reprocessing-nuclear-fuel)

The Obama administration now says it supports the temporary storage of spent fuel at power plants while technology paves the way for an alternative solution. In fact, that technology already exists — nuclear fuel reprocessing. Given the uncertainty over the future of Yucca Mountain, and the potential explosion of litigation that will only increase taxpayer exposure, **why not rethink the decades-old ban on this technology**? The ban was first imposed by President Jimmy Carter in the mid-1970s on the grounds it could lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. But that hasn’t stopped France, Britain, Russia, China and South Korea from pursuing fuel reprocessing; and no plutonium has ever been diverted from recycling facilities for weapons production in these countries.

**Counter-interpretation—restrictions are also statutory or regulatory limitations**

**A restriction is a limitation by statute or regulation**

**Burton’s Legal Thesaurus ‘7**

(Burton's Legal Thesaurus, 4E. Copyright © 2007 by William C. Burton. Used with permission of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.)

restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision.

**In energy policy, regulations refer to controlling economic entities through rulemaking**

**Energy Information Administration ’12**

(Glossary of Terms, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm)

Regulation: The governmental function of controlling or directing economic entities through the process of rulemaking and adjudication.

**And, rulemaking refers to agency policies that have the force of law**

**Energy Information Administration ’12**

(Glossary of Terms, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm)

Rulemaking (regulations): The authority delegated to administrative agencies by Congress or State legislative bodies to make rules that have the force of law. Frequently, statutory laws that express broad terms of a policy are implemented more specifically by administrative rules, regulations, and practices.

### AT: No spread

#### Prolif domino theory is true- all empirics prove

**Kroenig 5-26**-12 [Matthew, assistant professor in the Department of Government at Georgetown University and a research affiliate with The Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University, he served as a strategist on the policy planning staff in the Office of the Secretary of Defense where he received the Office of the Secretary of Defense’s Award for Outstanding Achievement. He is a term member of the Council on Foreign Relations and has held academic fellowships from the National Science Foundation, the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, and the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation at the University of California, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have A Future?” <http://www.npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1182&rtid=2>]

Further proliferation. **Nuclear proliferation poses an additional threat to international peace and security because it causes further proliferation**. As former Secretary of State George Schultz once said, “**proliferation begets proliferation**.”[69] **When one country acquires nuclear weapons, its regional adversaries, feeling threatened by its neighbor’s new nuclear capabilities, are more likely to attempt to acquire nuclear weapons in response. Indeed, the history of nuclear proliferation can be read as a chain reaction of proliferation**. The United States acquired nuclear weapons in response to Nazi Germany’s crash nuclear program. **The Soviet Union and China acquired nuclear weapons to counter the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The United Kingdom and France went nuclear to protect themselves from the Soviet Union. India’s bomb was meant to counter China and it, in turn, spurred Pakistan to join the nuclear club**. Today, we worry that, if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, other Middle Eastern countries, such as Egypt, Iraq, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, might desire nuclear capabilities, triggering an arms race in a strategically important and volatile region. Of course, reactive proliferation does not always occur. In the early 1960s, for example, U.S. officials worried that a nuclear-armed China would cause Taiwan, Japan, India, Pakistan, and other states to acquire nuclear weapons.[70] In hindsight, we now know that they were correct in some cases, but wrong in others. Using statistical analysis, Philipp Bleek has shown that reactive proliferation is not automatic, but that rather, states are more likely to proliferate in response to neighbors when three conditions are met 1) there is an intense security rivalry between the two countries, 2) the potential proliferant state does not have a security guarantee from a nuclear-armed patron 3) and the potential proliferant state has the industrial and technical capacity to launch an indigenous nuclear program.[71] In other words, reactive proliferation is real, but it is also conditional. If Iran enters the nuclear club, therefore, it is likely that some, but not all, of the countries that we currently worry about will eventually follow suit and become nuclear powers. **We should worry about the spread of nuclear weapons in every case**, therefore, because the problem will likely extend beyond that specific case. As Wohlstetter cautioned decades ago, proliferation is not an N problem, but an N+1 problem. Further nuclear proliferation is not necessarily a problem, of course, if the spread of nuclear weapons is irrelevant or even good for international politics as obsessionists and optimists protest. But, as the above discussion makes clear, nuclear proliferation, and the further nuclear proliferation it causes, increases the risk of nuclear war and nuclear terrorism, emboldens nuclear-armed states to be more aggressive, threatens regional stability, constrains U.S. freedom of action, and weakens America’s alliance relationships, giving us all good reason to fear the spread of nuclear weapons.

### AT: No Impact

#### Prolif causes nuclear wars, global pre-emption, accidents, and terrorist theft

**Lynn-Jones ’10** [Sean, Editor of *International Security*, the International Security Program's quarterly journal, series editor of the Belfer Center Studies in International Security, the Program's book series that is published by MIT Press, “Going Nuclear: Nuclear Proliferation and International Security in the 21st Century,” <http://mitpress.mit.edu/books/chapters/026252466Xpref2.pdf>]

The spread of nuclear weapons is an important issue in the theory and practice of international relations. The most fundamental reason why scholars and analysts study nuclear proliferation is that the spread of **nuclear weapons may increase the likelihood of nuclear war**. Although there has been a vigorous debate between nuclear optimists and nuclear pessimists over whether nuclear proliferation increases the risk of war, 1 **most analysts and policymakers have worried that** war— including **nuclear war**—**will become more likely as more states go nuclear**. There are many reasons to think that **the spread of nuclear weapons will make it more likely that such weapons will be used. If more states have nuclear weapons, the probability that one leader will decide to use them may increase. Even if rational decisionmakers are likely to be deterred by the threat of nuclear retaliation, the possibility of inadvertent or accidental use remains**. The spread of nuclear weapons also increases the probability of theft of nuclear materials. **Even if nuclear weapons have a stabilizing effect on relations between states, terrorist groups may be able to steal nuclear materials or nuclear bombs and then detonate a nuclear weapon in a major city**, killing hundreds of thousands. Such concerns existed before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, but have become more acute since. **As more states acquire nuclear weapons, there will probably be more opportunities for theft by terrorists. A state’s quest for nuclear weapons can be a source of conflict even when such efforts are terminated, unsuccessful, or incomplete. A state that fears that an adversary is developing nuclear weapons may launch preventive attacks against its adversary’s nuclear facilities. Israel bombed the nuclear reactor at** Osirak, **Iraq**, in 1981 **and attacked an apparent nuclear facility in Syria in 2007. The United States made plans to strike North Korean nuclear facilities in 1994**. Many analysts believe that Israel or the United States might attack sites related to Iran’s nuclear program. 2 In extreme cases, **a state may respond to concern over the nuclear program of a hostile state by launching a full-scale war. The 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq was at least partially motivated by U.S. fears that Iraq was developing nuclear weapons**.

### Kritik

**Our approach to the 1AC is valid**

**Owen ‘2**

(David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, **rational choice theory may provide the best account** available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that **because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes** theory-construction from **philosophical first principles,** **it cultivates a theory-driven** rather than problem-driven **approach** to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a **plurality of** possible **true descriptions** of a given action, event or phenomenon, **the challenge is** **to decide** **which is the most apt** in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a **reductionist** program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the **mistaken belief** that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘**whether there are general explanations** for classes of phenomena **is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’**.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially **vicious circle arises**.

#### No root cause – war causes their impacts

Goldstein ‘1—Professor of International Relations at American University, 2001 (Joshua S., War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, pp.411-412)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice”. Then if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influences wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.  So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gener and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes toward war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression/” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

#### No impact - Neoliberalism not oppressive or exploitive – empirically proven

**Bhagvati ‘4** (University Professor at Columbia University and Senior Fellow in International Economics at the Council on Foreign Relations [JagdishBhagwati, “In Defense of Globalization”. 2004. Overview, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/6769/in_defense_of_globalization.html>]

JagdishBhagwati takes conventional wisdom—that globalization is the cause of several social ills—and turns it on its head. Properly regulated, globalization, he says, is the most powerful force for social good in the world. Drawing on his unparalleled knowledge of international economics, Bhagwati dismantles the antiglobalization case. He persuasively argues that globalization often leads to greater general prosperity in an underdeveloped nation: it can reduce child labor, increase literacy, and enhance the economic and social standing of women.And to counter charges that globalization leads to cultural hegemony, to a bland “McWorld,” Bhagwati points to several examples, from literature to movies, in which globalization has led to a spicy hybrid of cultures. Often controversial and always compelling, Bhagwati cuts through the noise on this most contentious issue, showing that globalization is part of the solution, not part of the problem. Anyone who wants to understand what’s at stake in the globalization wars will want to read *In Defense of Globalization*. The first edition of *In Defense of Globalization* addressed the critiques that concerned the social implications of economic globalization.Thus, it addressed questions such as the impact on women’s rights and equality, child labor, poverty in the poor countries, democracy, mainstream and indigenous culture, and the environment. Professor Bhagwati concluded that globalization was, on balance, a force for advancing these agendas as well.Thus, whereas the critics assumed thatglobalizationlacked a human face, itactually had a human face. He also examined in depth the ways in which policy and institutional design could further advance these social agendas, adding more glow to the human face.

#### State politics is key to transform dominant social organizations – this is key to sustainable environmental politics

**Eckersly** **4** (Robyn, professor of political science at the School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia, the green state: rethinking democracy and sovereignty, p.5-6)

While acknowledging the basis for this antipathy toward the nation-state, and the limitations of state-centric analyses of global ecological degradation, I seek to draw attention to the positive role that states have played, and might increasingly play, in global and domestic politics. Writing more than twenty years ago, Hedley Bull (a proto-constructivist and leading writer in the English school) outlined the state’s positive role in world affairs, and his argument continue to provide a powerful challenge to those who somehow seek to “get beyond the state,” as if such a move would provide a more lasting solution to the threat of armed conflict or nuclear war, social and economic injustice, or environmental degradation.10 As Bull argued, given that **the state is here to stay whether we like it or not**, then the call to “get beyond the state a counsel of despair, at all events if it means that we have to begin by abolishing or subverting the state, rather than that there is a need to build upon it.”11 In any event, rejecting the “statist frame” of world politics **ought not prohibit an inquiry into the emancipatory potential of the state** as a **crucial “node”** in any future network of global ecological governance. This is especially so, given that one can expect states to persist as **major sites of social and political power** for at least the foreseeable future and that any green transformations of the present political order will, short of revolution, necessarily be **state-dependent**. Thus, like it or not, those concerned about ecological destruction must contend with **existing institutions** and, where possible, seek to “**rebuild the ship while still at sea**.” And if states are so implicated in ecological destruction, than an inquiry into the potential for their transformation or even their modest reform into something that is at least more conducive to ecological sustainability would be compelling. Of course, it would be unhelpful to become singularly fixated on the redesign of the state at the expense of other institutions of governance. States are not the only institutions that limit, condition, shape, and direct political power, and it is necessary to keep in view the broader spectrum of formal and informal institutions of governance (e.g., local, national, regional, and international) that are implicated in global environmental change. Nonetheless, while the state constitutes only one modality of political power, it is an **especially significant** one because its historical claims to exclusive rule over territory and peoples – as expressed in the principle of state sovereignty. As Gianfranco Poggi explains, the political power concentrated in the state “is a momentous, pervasive, critical phenomenon. Together with other forms of social power, it constitutes an **indispensable medium for constructing and shaping larger social realities**, for establishing, shaping and maintaining all broader and more **durable collectivities**”12 States play, in varying degrees, **significant roles in structuring life** **chances**, in distributing wealth, privilege, information, and risks, in upholding civil and political rights, and in securing private property rights and providing the legal/regulatory framework for capitalism. Every one of these dimensions of state activity has, for good or ill, a significant bearing on the global environmental crisis. Given that the green political project is one that demands far-reaching chances to both economies and societies, it is difficult to imagine how such changes might occur on the kind of scale that is needed **without the active support of states**. While it is often observed that stats are too big to deal with local ecological problems and too small to deal with global ones, the state nonetheless holds, as Lennart Lundqvist puts it, “**a unique position in the constitutive hierarchy from individuals through** villages, regions and **nations** all the way to **global organizations**. The state is inclusive of lower political and administrative levels, and exclusive in speaking for its whole territory and population in relation to the outside world.”13 In short, it seems to me **inconceivable** to advance ecological emancipation without also **engaging** with and seeking to transform **state power.**

#### Capitalism is key to peace - makes war unprofitable

**Bandow 5** (Doug, Senior Fellow @ CATO, “Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace,” November 10th, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5193>)

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: **What causes peace?** Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets. The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism. But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets. An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems. Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq. But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states. Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace."**Capitalism is by far the more important factor. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict**. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends. Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other. Contends Gartzke, "liberal political systems, in and of themselves, have no impact on whether states fight." In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. He explains: "Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels." Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences.**Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains.**

### AD- On Waste

#### Reprocessing reduces toxicity and quantity of nuclear waste

Lee 10

[Nathan R. Lee, WISE Intern and B.S.E. in Materials Science & Engineering from UPenn, Sustainability Of U.S. Nuclear Energy: Waste Management And The Question Of Reprocessing American Nuclear Society, 2010, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2010/NathanLeeWISE2010.pdf]

In the long term, one begins to see the true benefits of the recycling options. The total relative radiotoxicity of the waste—the most important indicator in the long-term—exponentially improves with degree of recycling (Fig. 9). Although engineers attempted to design Yucca Mountain to minimize radiation release for a million years into the future, the confidence with which they, or even we as a society, can plan for scenarios on that timescale is low. Under the plutonium recycling scheme, the radiotoxicity of the waste falls to the level of natural uranium after 10,000 years—a more reasonable but still daunting number. Only under the full actinide recycle does the timeframe of concern drop below a millennium, where finally our predictive capacity becomes adequately reliable. With this fuel cycle, the long-term burden our society is placing on the future can be measured and mitigated. With regard to the long-term consequences to siting and engineering HLW repositories, there is certainly a net benefit in implementing either recycling scheme. Both separate the uranium from the used fuel, significantly reducing the HLW volume being sent to the repository. Moreover, the reduction in total fuel consumption from recycling, which is modest for one-pass Pu and dramatic for the full recycle, reduces total HLW production. As a result, fewer repositories would need to be sited in the future, lessening political controversy. The full recycle has the added benefit of removing the actinides that are the dominant long-term heat sources, increasing the allowed packing density of waste by a factor of 4.3 to 5.4 and thereby further reducing repository demand. 36

#### Environmental impact of nuclear war

Ayala 03

(Leah Ayala, “Nuclear Power Companies the Department of Energy: A Legal Remedy Magnifying Nuclear Ends”, Nevada Law Journal, Winter 2002, LexisNexis)

A very small amount of nuclear waste can be disastrous. If an amount of plutonium about the same size as a beach ball was properly dispersed, it could cause lung cancer in everyone on earth. R. Routley & V. Routley, Nuclear Energy and Obligations to the Future, 21 INQUIRY 133, 136 (1978). See generally Robin Dusek, Lost in Space?: The Legal Feasibility of Nuclear Waste Disposal in Outer Space, 22 WM. & MARY ENVTL. L. & POL'Y REV. 181 (1997). Some estimate that a large release of nuclear waste from Yucca Mountain, which has a capacity to hold 77,000 metric tons of waste, **would exceed the environmental impact of a nuclear war**. This is a huge amount of waste compared to the "few dozen pounds" of waste released in the Chernobyl explosion that is estimated will result in between 17,000 to 475,000 human deaths from cancer. Broad, supra note 132. Each of the spent fuel assemblies that will be stored in the repository contains a similar amount of radioactivity as ten Hiroshima bombs. Lazarus, supra note 1 (citing Klaus Schumann, a Green Party activist and member of the San Luis Obispo County Nuclear Waste Management Committee).

### 2AC Oil

#### Oil and nuclear power do not compete with each other—irrelevant markets

Toph and Rogner ‘6

(Ferenc L. Toth\*, Hans-Holger Rogner Planning and Economic Studies Section, Department of Nuclear Energy, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Oil and nuclear power: Past, present, and future, Energy Economics, 2006)

The current relationship between nuclear power and oil has become distinctly different than it was a few decades ago. At the onset of the 21st century, nuclear and oil for electricity generation are targeting different electricity market segments with little overlap in the longer run. Oil for electricity generation in most industrialized countries serves, where not barred for environmental reasons, more the function of the disposal of residual oil for which no other applications can be found. However, advanced refineries converting larger portions of the barrel into premium products and stringent environmental regulation F.L. Toth, H.-H. Rogner / Energy Economics 28 (2006) 1–25 5constrain the use of residual oil for power generation. Other uses of oil products include peak supply, back-up fuel, and dispersed non-grid generation. These markets have been relative captive for oil but this may change in the future with the advent of fuel cells. Since nuclear power has no role to play in these captive markets, growth prospects for oil are unaffected by a nuclear presence in the electricity generating market.

#### Oil hurts their economy

**The economist 2/9/13** (<http://www.economist.com/news/americas/21571445-cost-postponing-inevitable-devaluation-out-stock> “The cost of postponing an inevitable devaluation”)

The underlying problem is a shortage of cash at the state oil monopoly, Petróleos de Venezuela (PDVSA), which provides 94% of the country’s foreign earnings. Under a plan announced in 2005, Venezuela should have produced 5.8m barrels a day by 2012. Even by the government’s reckoning, it pumped little more than 3m; private sources suggest the number was around 2.8m. Local consumption has risen sharply, partly because petrol is provided almost free to Venezuelans but also because power plants have switched to fuel oil because PDVSA is unable to supply them with gas. Around 270,000 b/d of oil goes to China, to repay loans to the government, and almost 400,000 b/d at a big discount to Cuba and other allies. Refinery and production snags have even forced the company to import crude and oil products.

#### Chavez dying – won’t attack Columbia

**Fox News Latino, 2/22/13** (<http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/02/23/venezuelans-hold-candlelight-vigil-for-hugo-chavez-health/> “Venezuelans Hold Candlelight Vigil for Hugo Chavez's Health)

Caracas, Venezuela – Hundreds of Venezuelans gathered in the capital of Caracas on Friday night to hold a candlelight vigil for President Hugo Chávez while he remains abroad battling cancer. Chávez's supporters gathered on a wide stairway in a hillside park near the presidential palace. They lit candles at sunset and sang along with a recording of a healthy Chávez belting out the national anthem. Some wiped away tears. Others closed their eyes and prayed. Some said they felt sad, yet still hopeful that Chávez might be able to survive. "We're praying for the president, for him to get through all of this," said Ana Perez, a seamstress holding a candle and shielding her flame from the breeze with a piece of paper. SUMMARY The government has not given details about the treatment President Hugo Chávez is undergoing, and hasn't identified the type or exact location of the tumors that have been removed from his pelvic region. Her eyes filled with tears as she talked about Chávez. "There is no other president like this one. He's unique," she said, wiping a wet cheek. "He's going to come out of all of this, and he's going to get better," Perez said. "He's survived many hard things. He's strong." A group of indigenous people wearing colorful dresses, beads and feathers danced around a bonfire at the base of the stairs. One man blew on a conch shell, while others shook maracas as they danced around the flames. Chávez hasn't been seen since he returned to Venezuela on Monday from Cuba, where for 10 weeks he was recovering and fighting complications following his latest cancer surgery Dec. 11. Vice President Nicolás Maduro said Friday night that he and other officials had met with Chávez at the military hospital. Maduro said Chávez is continuing to undergo treatment for "respiratory insufficiency" and is breathing through a tracheal tube, which hinders speech.

#### DA’s inevitable—

#### Nuclear power’s expanding in the U.S. now

Ferguson ’12

(Charles D., Federation of the American Scientists, Public Interest Report, “Making the Case for

Nuclear Power in the United States”, Summer 2012, <http://www.fas.org/pubs/pir/2012summer/Summer2012_PresidentMessage.pdf>)

Will nuclear power in the United States flourish or fade away? To paraphrase Mark Twain, “The news of nuclear power’s demise has been greatly exaggerated.” The United States still has the largest number of nuclear reactors in the world with 104 and almost 20 percent of its electricity is generated from nuclear power. Moreover, four new reactors are under construction: two at the Vogtle plant in Georgia and two at the Summer plant in South Carolina. One big reason these plants are moving forward is because the utilities can recoup some of the costs during construction. The regional regulatory authorities in the Southeastern United States have allowed such cost recovery. Four new reactors, however, will not be enough to keep nuclear power on pace to continue to generate about 20 percent of the nation’s electricity.

#### Zero link to the Aff—all of their evidence is about new nuclear power plant construction, Reprocessing marginally affects investor calculations about nuclear power

Lee 10

[Nathan R. Lee, WISE Intern and B.S.E. in Materials Science & Engineering from UPenn, Sustainability Of U.S. Nuclear Energy: Waste Management And The Question Of Reprocessing American Nuclear Society, 2010, <http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2010/NathanLeeWISE2010.pdf>]

Even if breakeven prices are never reached, there is still an economic argument that supports reprocessing. In some countries, there is a high cost associated with being dependent on a foreign supplier of fuel. For those risk-averse countries that demand energy security, there might be an economic advantage to reprocessing used nuclear fuel domestically even if it entails more direct costs. Conventional one-pass Pu recycling reduces uranium demand by 11%; a full recycle would do so by more than two orders of magnitude. 47 However, despite the fact that the United States is dependent on foreign sources of uranium, its close relationships with supplier states reduce the relevance of this argument. Finally, it is important to note that the economic ramifications of changing the fuel cycle are quite small compared to other parts of the nuclear energy industry. Capital, operations, and maintenance account for 80-90% of total generation costs, dwarfing the significance of fuel cycle economics. Although fuel cycle costs are not immaterial, they should not be the principal driving factor in a policy decision. 48

#### Reprocessing plants are NOT nuclear power plants—waste from plants gets sent there to be created into new fuel

Feiveson et al ’11

(Harold, Zia Mian, M.V. Ramana and Frank von Hippel, “Managing Spent Fuel from Nuclear Power Reactors: Experience and Lessons from Around the World”, International Panel on Fissile Materials, September 2011, <http://www.princeton.edu/sgs/publications/ipfm/Managing-Spent-Fuel-Sept-2011.pdf>)

Nuclear power reactors today are fueled mostly with uranium, which undergoes a fission chain reaction releasing heat and creating radioactive fission products and plutonium and other transuranic elements. After a time, the concentration of chain-reacting isotopes drops to the point where the fuel is considered “spent” and has to be replaced with fresh fuel. Spent nuclear fuel from power reactors is unloaded into a water-filled pool immediately adjacent to the reactor to allow its heat and radiation levels to decrease. It is held in these pools for periods ranging from a few years to decades. After cooling, the fuel may be transferred to massive air-cooled dry casks for storage on site or in a centralized facility. 1 OverviewManaging Spent Fuel from Nuclear Power Reactors 3 In a few countries, the fuel is sent to a reprocessing plant, where the fuel is dissolved and the plutonium and uranium recovered for potential use in reactor fuel. These processes also produce high-level wastes that contain much of the radioactive content of the spent fuel as well as other streams of radioactive waste, including plutonium waste from the manufacture of plutonium-containing fuel.

#### Nuclear doesn’t displace oil

**IM No date**

International Mundi, “United States - electricity production from oil sources

Electricity production from oil sources (kWh),” <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/electricity-production-from-oil-sources>, AM\*Cites the IEA

Electricity production from oil sources (% of total) in United States was 1.11 as of 2010. Its highest value over the past 50 years was 17.17 in 1977, while its lowest value was 1.11 in 2010. Definition: Sources of electricity refer to the inputs used to generate electricity. Oil refers to crude oil and petroleum products. Source: International Energy Agency (IEA Statistics © OECD/IEA, http://www.iea.org/stats/index.asp), Energy Statistics and Balances of Non-OECD Countries, Energy Statistics of OECD Countries, and Energy Balances of OECD Countries.

**No link – OPEC will try to maintain high prices**

**LEVI ’12** - David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Levi, Michael. “Think Again: The American Energy Boom”. August, 2012. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom)

"We Can Drill Our Way Out of High Prices."

Don't bet on it. Some people claim that unleashing U.S. oil and gas resources would slash the price of crude. Who can forget the cries of "Drill, Baby, Drill!" that saturated airwaves during the 2008 presidential campaign? Others insist that, because oil is priced on a global market, increased U.S. output wouldn't move the needle. Even Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the top economist for John McCain's 2008 presidential campaign, has written, "Domestic action to increase production will not lower gas prices set on a global market."

The precise truth lies somewhere in between. If U.S. producers were able to massively ramp up output, the ultimate impact would mostly boil down to one big question: How would other big oil producers (mainly the Saudis and the rest of OPEC) respond to a surge in U.S. supplies?

To stop prices from falling, they could cut back their output in response to new U.S. production, much as they've tried to in the past. That's essentially what happens in the much-cited projections by the Energy Information Administration. In one recent exercise, for example, it looked at what would happen to gasoline prices if U.S. oil production grew by about a million barrels a day. The net impact was a mere 4 cents a gallon fall. Why? All but a sliver of the increase in U.S. output was matched by cutbacks in the Middle East, leaving oil prices barely changed.

### China DA

#### Chinese soft power down now- expansionism

Ackerman, 1-31 – Signal magazine editor-in-chief

[Robert, "China Behavior Increasingly Troublesome to Neighbors," Signal Online, 1-31-13, www.afcea.org/content/?q=node/10625, accessed 2-2-13, mss]

As the People’s Republic of China grows in economic and military stature, it is **generating ill will** among neighbors who increasingly fear an expansionist budding superpower. Ironically, the greatest effect this is having on the Asia-Pacific region is that it is driving many nations into the arms of the United States. This was just one of many observations offered by a panel on China at AFCEA/USNI West 2013 in San Diego. A mix of academics and military officers offered different perspectives on where China might be headed in the coming years. Capt. Jim Fanell, USN, deputy chief of staff for intelligence and information operations, U.S. Pacific Fleet, said that China has taken control of areas outside its borders that never have been administered to, or controlled by, any government of China in recent history. China’s coastal cutters seem to have **no other mission than to harass others** to submit to its territorial claims. The result is that the countries of East Asia “now remember why they like the United States,” he said. Dr. Jacqueline Deal, president and chief executive officer, Long-Term Strategy Group, related how China’s foreign minister told then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that, “there are great powers, and there are small powers—and that’s a fact.” This statement amounted to tacit approval for the Middle Kingdom to push its neighbors around, Deal said. Maj. Christopher I. Johnson, USMC, Olmsted scholar, Hong Kong University, and logistics officer, Marine Barracks Washington, D.C., observed that China’s leaders believe in hard power—“you cannot export soft power.” Yet, Johnson believes that China currently is a competitor, not an enemy.

### China ad-on

#### Plan solves U.S.-China reprocessing cooperation

Lyons et al ‘9

(Blythe J. Lyons, John R. Lyman, Mihaela Carstei, and General Richard L. Lawson (USAF), “United States-China Cooperation On Nuclear Power: An Opportunity for Fostering Sustainable Energy Security”, Atlantic Council, 3-4/3-6 2009, <http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/65/AtlanticCouncil-USChinaNuclearPower.pdf>)

Cooperation on the development of advanced fuel cycle technologies, already underway in U.S.-China working groups, will provide significant opportunities to share rather than duplicate knowledge and funding. Generation IV (Gen IV) international collaboration on R&D is necessary and beneficial for all participants to share costs, facilities and experience. Specific fuel cycle R&D opportunities proposed by the State Nuclear Power Technology corporation (SNPTC) include the following: Advanced fuel, such as mixed oxide (MOX) fuel, and metal fuel; Transmutation technology, such as fast reactor and accelerator driven systems; Reprocessing technologies, such as MOX spent fuel reprocessing, dry processing, on-site recycle; and, Repository design technology. 14 . The Generation IV International Forum (GIF) will provide a good framework to deal with intellectual property issues. If prototype or demonstration plants were to be built under the aegis of the GIF, it could also provide experience in dealing with legal and regulatory issues. Issues such as design ownership, who would build the facility, cost sharing would have to be addressed. As countries have vested interests in certain types of technologies, resolution of such issues may be difficult. • • • 15 . The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP): The U.S., which led the way in establishing the international collaborative effort to develop proliferation-resistant technologies and institutions, should take advantage of its leadership position to nurture and expand GNEP’s international activities. As in GIF, there are advantages to sharing technical expertise and pooling financial resources. GNEP is already in place and the Obama Administration can take advantage of the years of effort it took to set up the framework for international collaboration while adapting GNEP goals to current realities and domestic nuclear development policies. Consistency in U.S. nuclear energy policies, especially in relation to international efforts, is crucial to foster global acceptance of a safe, secure and sustainable nuclear power. The Chinese participants signaled their desire to improve both government-to-government cooperation and commercial sector ties. It appears that the U.S. government is equally interested in working with China to tackle the overarching challenges of developing a safe and secure commercial nuclear fuel cycle. By supporting and participating in this Dialogue, U.S. industry and government participants have demonstrated their commitment to dealing with the challenges to realize the burgeoning nuclear trade between the two countries.

#### Solves U.S.-China relations

Gardner and Rascoe 11

(Timothy Gardner and Ayesha Rascoe, “Clean energy seen as ‘bright spot’ in U.S.-China relations”, Reuters, 1-19-2011, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/01/19/us-usa-china-energy-idUSTRE70H5WB20110119>)

Cooperation on clean energy could be a high point in U.S.-China relations leading to benefits for both countries, government and business officials said ahead of a summit between Chinese President Hu Jintao and President Barack Obama. Disputes between the world's two largest economies and energy consumers over China's wind power subsidies and its slowdown in exports of rare earths minerals, used in everything from wind turbines to cell phones, have dominated headlines in recent months. The countries are also having wider arguments. The United States says China's currency, the yuan, is undervalued and Washington is pushing Beijing for help in persuading North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons. But with rising concerns about oil prices, now above $90 a barrel, energy security, and global warming, officials said the world's biggest developed country and the biggest developing country have much to learn from each other. Progress can be made on sharing technologies on efficiency, cleaner coal, and development of renewables like wind and solar power, they said. As China tries to transform its economy from the manufacturing of cheap goods into one developing and distributing sophisticated technologies, such as clean energy, spats over intellectual property rights have already troubled trade relations between the two countries. But pressure on both countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reel in fossil fuel demand may push them to overcome these differences. Still, China's Minister of Science and Technology Wan Gang said at a forum on U.S-China clean energy cooperation hosted by the Brookings Institution that common interests between the two countries make clean energy an issue ripe for nurturing close ties. "I'm sure that this is one of the best points of convergence and cooperation between our two countries, and will be one of the bright spots in our future cooperation," Wan said on Tuesday.

#### Prevents extinction

Wittner 11 – professor of history emeritus at SUNY Albany

(Lawrence Wittner, Huffington Post World, 11-30-2011, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lawrence-wittner/nuclear-war-china_b_1116556.html>)

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries international conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China's growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China's claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was "asserting our own position as a Pacific power." But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during their conflict over the future of China's offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would "be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else." Of course, China didn't have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven't been very many -- at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan's foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use "any weapon" in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don't nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn't feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO's strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing "Star Wars" and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive -- and probably unworkable -- military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over 5,000 nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly 300 . Moreover, only about 40 of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would "win" any nuclear war with China. But what would that "victory" entail? An attack with these Chinese nuclear weapons would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a "nuclear winter" around the globe -- destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction. Moreover, in another decade the extent of this catastrophe would be far worse. The Chinese government is currently expanding its nuclear arsenal, and by the year 2020 it is expected to more than double its number of nuclear weapons that can hit the United States. The U.S. government, in turn, has plans to spend hundreds of billions of dollars "modernizing" its nuclear weapons and nuclear production facilities over the next decade. To avert the enormous disaster of a U.S.-China nuclear war, there are two obvious actions that can be taken. The first is to get rid of nuclear weapons, as the nuclear powers have agreed to do but thus far have resisted doing. The second, conducted while the nuclear disarmament process is occurring, is to improve U.S.-China relations. If the American and Chinese people are interested in ensuring their survival and that of the world, they should be working to encourage these policies.