Arjun and I affirm: "Resolved: The United States should increase its use of nuclear energy for commercial energy production."

One observation: Because the profitability of large-scale nuclear power plants is diminishing due to cost overruns and delayed construction, ***Hulac 20*** finds, US nuclear production will diminish 75 percent in the next decade.

Contention One is A Greener Future

The World Nuclear Association writes, thirty developing nations are aiming to implement nuclear energy for electricity production. Historically, ***DiChristopher of CNBC 19*** recounts, the United States owned 90 percent of the nuclear export market during the 70-80s nuclear boom, exporting reactors across the globe. ***Kee of Nuclear Economics 19*** finds, the lack of new nuclear power projects domestically has harmed the credibility of the US export market, making companies unable to compete. ***Thoburn of Reuters*** warrants, foreign buyers often want to see how reactor models are running in a company's domestic industry before they choose to purchase them. Without any increase in production, ***Holgate of the Washington Quarterly 18*** writes, the US's share of the nuclear export market will be reduced to zero. Developing nations are looking elsewhere as ***DiChristopher*** writes, countries like Russia are aggressively pursuing deals with developing nations to develop their nuclear power industries. Unfortunately, as the Russian regime suffers from economic woes, nuclear reactors cannot be built in a timely fashion due to cost overruns. Thus, ***Burke of the Guardian 19*** finds, despite the fact that Russia has been contracted to provide nuclear exports in two developing nations, no nuclear plants have actually been built.

Fortunately, *Gorden 19* writes, many countries wish to build diplomatic ties with the United States to become geopolitical players on the world stage. For these developing nations, any short-term benefit of financing from Russia is outweighed by the deep trade relationships that can be formed with the US

through nuclear exports. **Thus, *Gorden*** concludes, developing nations will purchase US nuclear exports over Russia given its diplomatic might.

Therefore, US nuclear energy production domestically makes the dream of nuclear energy for developing nations reality, ***Maitra of the EIR*** contextualizes, implementing nuclear energy in developing nations will lift 1.2 billion people out of energy poverty.

Contention Two is Protecting the Troops

Deign of Greentech Media 18 reports, future nuclear production will only be achieved with new innovations called small modular reactors or SMRs, which are miniaturized reactors that are quicker and cheaper to produce than large-scale nuclear plants. However, these reactors are currently being barred from mass implementation, as ***Ford of Arizona State University 18*** finds, the lack of government investment in SMRs have stagnated their progress in making headway in the market. **Fortunately, affirming would increase investment,** as ***Plumer of Vox 17*** writes, the only way to sustainably revive nuclear production is with massive flows of government investment into SMRs. **Thus, *Rock of the Department of Energy 18*** finds, small modular reactors will come online in the next decade but will need government investment to ensure its capacity for decades to come.

This will protect US service members abroad.

Currently, ***Lieutenant General Dan Christman*** explains, US military operations abroad currently rely on a diesel-based fuel system to deliver electricity, delivered by pipelines, trucks, and ships. Because fuel is often located away from military bases, the military must go on fuel convoys to receive it.

Unfortunately, enemies of the US government have learned to exploit this operation. *Thompson of the Center for Defense Information 19* finds, terrorists often use IEDs and roadside bombs to disrupt these convoys and the supply of energy for the military.

Fortunately, ***Christman*** explains, small modular reactors could revolutionize military logistics by providing portable energy for the military that leaves no footprint. ***Christman*** elaborates, the reactors are built already fueled, ensuring that the military does not have to rely on fuel shipped in from vulnerable convoys passing through warzones. However, ***Baker of the American Security Project 12*** finds, a surge in commercial SMR production is necessary in order for the military to use it, as the current lack of government investment in SMRs holds back its potential benefits. **Thus, *Baker*** finds, over 90 percent of the military needs can be fulfilled by these new nuclear reactors. ***Christman*** finds, fuel convoys would no longer be necessary with SMRs, as energy would be supplied right from military bases. SMRs can save tens of thousands of lives, as ***Helman of Forbes*** quantifies, fuel convoys have accounted for 50 percent of annual military deaths in the War on Terror.

Thus, we affirm.