Negative: Rosatom Sanctions - bad idea

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

Case Summary: The AFF plan sanctions the Russian state nuclear energy corporation ROSATOM for all the usual reasons. Their claim is US imports of Uranium from Rosatom fund the Ukraine war.
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Negative: Rosatom

INHERENCY

1. Already reducing

The US was already reducing imports of Russian uranium even before the Ukraine war

Paul M. Dabbar and Dr Matt Bowen 2022 (Paul M. Dabbar is a Distinguished Visiting Fellow at the Center on Global Energy Policy. Dr. Matt Bowen is a Research Scholar at the Center on Global Energy Policy) Reducing Russian Involvement in Western Nuclear Power Markets 23 May 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/research/commentary/reducing-russian-involvement-western-nuclear-power-markets

In the most recent amendment, the US Department of Commerce and the Russian state nuclear corporation Rosatom agreed to lower the amount of Russian uranium products allowed for export into the US market, and to limit the percentage of US enrichment demand met by Russia to 15 percent starting in 2028. In other words, even before the war in Ukraine began, the US government had been taking steps to reduce Russian involvement in US nuclear fuel markets, both for strategic and commercial reasons.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Not funding the war

Russian exports are not paying for the war - not physically possible because of where the money goes

Prof. Mark Harrison 2022. (Emeritus Professor, Univ. of Warwick) 13 June 2022 " Western sanctions on Russia are working, an energy embargo now is a costly distraction" <https://voxeu.org/article/western-sanctions-russia-are-working-energy-embargo-now-costly-distraction> (accessed 30 June 2022)

Two things follow. One, the fact that Russia is exporting one seventh of its national income to the rest of the world is weakening, not strengthening, its war effort. Two, Russia’s exports are not ‘paying for Putin’s war’. They are certainly paying for something, but not that. What they are paying for is the accumulation of idle balances of foreign currency. This currency may be held by the state (within Russia) or by private citizens abroad (in the case of capital flight). But, if they cannot be used to import resources into Russia, they are not paying for Putin’s war.

2. The need to "DO SOMETHING" doesn't justify sanctions.

Sanctions aren't justified - because they hurt the innocent and have no effect on the guilty

Murtaza Hussain 2022 (journalist) 28 Apr 2022 "AS SCREWS TIGHTEN ON RUSSIA, A WARNING ABOUT CIVILIAN HARM OF SANCTIONS" <https://theintercept.com/2022/04/28/russia-sanctions-civilian-harm-reform/> (accessed 25 June 2022)

Oftentimes, as in the case of Russia today, countries subject to broad sanctions truly are unsavory or engaged in behavior that needs to be stopped. The problem, though, is that untargeted sanctions that punish civilian populations have been a poor means of making foreign governments change their policies. While elites in sanctioned countries usually find a way to get what they need, ordinary people find themselves sent into poverty — victimized by economic blockades that U.S. politicians treat as open-ended.

SOLVENCY

1. A/T "Diplomatic Stand Against Russia"

Response 1: No Advocacy. Mary Glantz doesn't recommend their plan

If AFF is citing Mary Glantz for the harms of Russian capture of the Ukraine nuclear facility, there's one problem: She never mentions Rosatom anywhere in the entire article they quoted, and she does not advocate for any further sanctions against Russia. The impact is that this Advantage never happens because the Affirmative has no one saying that their plan creates this advantage. The part about the benefits of sanctioning Rosatom was in the 1AC's commentary after the text of the Glantz card was finished. If the Affirmative wants advocacy for their plan and their advantages, they need to get it from evidence, not their own opinion.

Response 2: No impact. So what if we take a "diplomatic stand"?

AFF never tells you 1) how this "diplomatic stand" benefits anyone; nor 2) how much this "diplomatic stand" adds to Status Quo diplomatic efforts against the Ukraine war. It's not like the US is favoring the war now and suddenly after an AFF ballot we'll start opposing it. We're already opposing it, so AFF has a duty to prove some significant impact occurs after their plan and that someone, somewhere, significantly benefits from it. None of their 1AC evidence ever said anything like that.

Response 3: Harder diplomatic stand makes things worse by making it harder for Putin to back down

Dr. William Ruger 2022 (Ph.D. in politics specializing in foreign policy, president of the American Institute for Economic Research) 5 May 2022 REASON magazine " William Ruger on Russia's Invasion of Ukraine" <https://reason.com/2022/05/05/william-ruger-on-russias-invasion-of-ukraine/> (accessed 23 June 2022)

The history of sanctions shouldn't leave anyone all that sanguine about their ability to effect the ultimate ends that you're trying to seek. Now, these sanctions may be extreme in many ways. If you impose essentially a financial blockade, they may have more bite. But the question is, do they actually cause what you're trying to achieve or do they make it much harder for Russia to stand down? You can imagine Putin and the Russian state not wanting to appear to cry uncle to this pressure. I think that's a real concern.

2. A/T "No longer funding the war in Ukraine"

Response 1: Not funding it now, so no advantage happens.

Cross apply Significance response #1 about Russia export revenues can't be used to fund the war because of the way the banking system is set up.

Response 2: Not in their Advantage 2 evidence

Nothing in their Advantage 2 evidence from Mehdiyeva in 2019 says that Rosatom makes any profits that are supporting the war in Ukraine. The fact that Rosatom is a government-owned entity doesn't mean that it makes a profit - it could be losing money for all we know and actually harming Russia financially. Look at the US Postal Service for a good example of a government corporation that loses money. If the US were at war, no one would say the US Postal Service was funding it.

3. No replacement plan

Link: AFF doesn't tell you where the US will get its nuclear fuel from post-plan

There's nothing in their mandates about it. That's probably because it would take an extra-topical additional US federal program to replace it, as we see in:

Failure: Multi-billion dollar domestic program would be needed to replace Russian uranium (but not in AFF Plan)

William Freebairn 2022. (journalist) 7 July 2022 "'Disentangling' the global nuclear fuel supply chain after Russia's invasion of Ukraine["](https://www.spglobal.com/commodityinsights/en/market-insights/blogs/electric-power/070722-global-nuclear-fuel-supply-chain-uranium-russia-ukraine-war) (accessed 25 Oct 2022) https://www.spglobal.com/commodityinsights/en/market-insights/blogs/electric-power/070722-global-nuclear-fuel-supply-chain-uranium-russia-ukraine-war

However, there is a growing chorus of legislators in the US and Europe calling for bans on the use of Russian nuclear fuel components – mined uranium, converted uranium hexafluoride and enriched uranium. The US Department of Energy established a "tiger team" to study the impact of such a ban and develop a plan to ensure security of supply. In early June, DOE started briefing Congressional staff on a plan that could cost between $3.5 billion and $4 billion to secure a domestic nuclear fuel supply chain to replace Russian vendors.

Impact: Plan fails in multiple ways

Either 1) AFF has to let the lights go out, since they don't have a plan to replace the Uranium we won't be getting from Russia, and the DOE study says you have to have a plan in place before you can do sanctions. OR
2) AFF will have some kind of extra-topical mandate to build a domestic supply chain, which is not within the bounds of international trade, since it's entirely domestic, and would have to be dropped from the round anyway.

 Either way, the plan fails and the lights go out if you vote Affirmative.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Global energy crisis

Link: Sanctioning Rosatom is a bad idea because it can trigger a global energy crisis

Richard Nephew 2022 (*senior research scholar at Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia Univ. Most recently served as the deputy special envoy for Iran in the Biden administration; previously was principal deputy coordinator for sanctions policy at the Dept of State*) 17 Mar 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) " THE WISDOM OF NUCLEAR CARVE-OUTS FROM THE RUSSIAN SANCTIONS REGIME" https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/the-wisdom-of-nuclear-carve-outs-from-the-russian-sanctions-regime/

As others have observed, it is critical to avoid creating an [uncontrolled escalatory spiral](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/03/08/fact-sheet-united-states-bans-imports-of-russian-oil-liquefied-natural-gas-and-coal/) that could have dangerous and damaging consequences, from a general war to damage to other important interests. Imposing blanket sanctions on Rosatom and Russian civil nuclear energy trade presents such a risk. Rosatom is a central part of the global nuclear industry and its provision of services — including nuclear fuel — to existing reactors should be exempt from any such sanctions that might be imposed so as to avoid deepening what could become a global energy crisis.

Link: Global reliance on Russian nuclear energy technology

Richard Nephew 2022 (*senior research scholar at Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia Univ. Most recently served as the deputy special envoy for Iran in the Biden administration; previously was principal deputy coordinator for sanctions policy at the Dept of State*) 17 Mar 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) " THE WISDOM OF NUCLEAR CARVE-OUTS FROM THE RUSSIAN SANCTIONS REGIME" https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/the-wisdom-of-nuclear-carve-outs-from-the-russian-sanctions-regime/

Russian-built and supported reactors are also [operational worldwide](https://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-o-s/russia-nuclear-power.aspx), including in China, India, and Iran. Fuel for most of these reactors is provided by Russia, even in China and India, given the proprietary nature of fuel design and the way in which the reactor supply contracts are typically structured. Iran is wholly dependent on Russian nuclear fuel supply for its Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant for at least the next several years.

Brink: Sanctions would make Rosatom's activities stop.

Richard Nephew 2022 (*senior research scholar at Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia Univ. Most recently served as the deputy special envoy for Iran in the Biden administration; previously was principal deputy coordinator for sanctions policy at the Dept of State*) 17 Mar 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) " THE WISDOM OF NUCLEAR CARVE-OUTS FROM THE RUSSIAN SANCTIONS REGIME" https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/the-wisdom-of-nuclear-carve-outs-from-the-russian-sanctions-regime/

Were sanctions to be imposed on Rosatom tomorrow, the United States and its partners could bring all of these activities to a grinding halt. Acting unilaterally, the Biden administration could announce sanctions that block the company’s U.S. assets and thereby prohibit it from engaging in any business in the United States. These sanctions would also have a negative effect on Rosatom’s ability to operate internationally, as banks around the world use U.S. sanctions lists to administer their own compliance programs.

Link: Global energy supply disruptions occur if Rosatom goes away

Richard Nephew 2022 (*senior research scholar at Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia Univ. Most recently served as the deputy special envoy for Iran in the Biden administration; previously was principal deputy coordinator for sanctions policy at the Dept of State*) 17 Mar 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) " THE WISDOM OF NUCLEAR CARVE-OUTS FROM THE RUSSIAN SANCTIONS REGIME" https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/the-wisdom-of-nuclear-carve-outs-from-the-russian-sanctions-regime/

There are other potential suppliers of nuclear fuel to Russia’s existing customers, but — unlike oil or natural gas — it is not as straightforward to replace Russian-designed and built nuclear fuel with substitutes. An [international nuclear fuel bank](https://www.iaea.org/topics/iaea-low-enriched-uranium-bank) also exists and was intended to help manage disruptions, but Russia is one of the world’s largest suppliers: Taking it offline altogether was not envisioned as a real possibility when the bank was created. The result could be a significant energy-supply disruption when global prices are already high, and there are uncertainties about future supplies.

Impact: Poverty and suffering. Global energy crisis = poverty and economic losses

International Energy Agency 2022 (intergovernmental agency; the main international forum for energy co-operation on a variety of issues such as security of supply, long-term policy, information transparency, energy efficiency, sustainability, research and development, technology collaboration, and international energy relations) article is undated but references events in October 2022; (accessed 25 Oct 2022) " Record prices, fuel shortages, rising poverty, slowing economies: the first energy crisis that's truly global" http://www.iea.org/topics/global-energy-crisis

Higher energy prices have contributed to painfully high inflation, pushed families into poverty, forced some factories to curtail output or even shut down, and slowed economic growth to the point that some countries are heading towards severe recession. Europe, whose gas supply is uniquely vulnerable because of its historic reliance on Russia, could face gas rationing this winter, while many emerging economies are seeing sharply higher energy import bills and fuel shortages.

2. Nuclear proliferation [= spread of nuclear materials + risk of more countries getting nuclear weapons]

Link: Rosatom's activities go away with AFF ballot

Cross-apply DA-1 Brink card.

Link: Without Rosatom, lots more countries will start making their own nuclear fuel and increase nuclear proliferation risk

Richard Nephew 2022 (*senior research scholar at Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia Univ.*) 17 Mar 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) "THE WISDOM OF NUCLEAR CARVE-OUTS FROM THE RUSSIAN SANCTIONS REGIME" https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/the-wisdom-of-nuclear-carve-outs-from-the-russian-sanctions-regime/

Beyond the immediate effects of such a supply disruption, there is a larger nonproliferation problem of undermining the idea that countries can rely on the global market for their nuclear fuel. One of Iran’s long-running arguments in defense of its own nuclear fuel cycle — the same fuel cycle that could be used to produce nuclear materials for weapons — has been that [it cannot rely on markets](https://www.foxnews.com/story/ahmadinejad-says-iran-needs-ability-to-produce-nuclear-fuel) for its supplies and that it must instead rely on indigenous production. The aforementioned fuel bank is only one part of a general effort on the part of nuclear suppliers to disprove this contention. Cutting off Russian supply [would undermine these efforts](https://thediplomat.com/2010/08/how-bad-is-bushehr/), perhaps fatally in light of Russia’s overall significance to the market, and could mean a lot more centrifuges in a lot more places. It is also unclear how targeting Rosatom will influence future relations between the nuclear supplier states. For the last 50 years, the global nuclear suppliers have worked together to try to manage the spread of the technologies and materials that are central to this industry. Russia will retain a national security interest in nonproliferation whatever happens with respect to this present crisis. But, it is also true that [Russia does not always see eye to eye with the United States and its partners](https://carnegieendowment.org/2017/12/14/more-geopoliticized-nuclear-suppliers-group-pub-75027) on what is necessary in this regard. For example, [Russia already does not agree](https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2019-02/eunpdc_no_61_final.pdf) with the United States and its partners that states [should accept enhanced international inspection authorities](https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/research/commentary/stronger-international-safeguards-condition-supply-nuclear-energy-programs-coming-consensus-nuclear) as a condition of supply and has [reluctantly supported other](https://www.brookings.edu/research/revitalizing-nonproliferation-cooperation-with-russia-and-china/) enhancements to nuclear supply guidelines and inspection authorities. Sanctioning Rosatom and complicating its business model will almost certainly complicate efforts to improve nonproliferation standards, but could even result in Russia relaxing its approach, particularly if its nuclear supply arrangements inevitably focus on those prepared to also breach U.S., European, and other sanctions regimes.

Impact: Nuclear proliferation = increased risk of nuclear war

Dr. Louis R. Beres 2022. (PhD; professor emeritus of international law at Purdue) " Nuclear War Avoidance Why It Is Time to Start Worrying, Again" AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS REVIEW, Spring 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASOR/Journals/Volume-1\_Issue-1/Beres\_Nuclear\_War\_Avoidance.pdf

For decades, competent nuclear strategists have dealt with nuclear proliferation, including authentic thinkers who clearly understood that the variously staggering costs would outweigh any alleged benefits of nuclear proliferation. Seventeenth-century English philosopher Thomas Hobbes instructs that although international relations are conducted in a “state of nature,” it is nonetheless a more benign condition than the condition of individual man in nature. With individual human beings, Hobbes reflects, “the weakest has strength enough to kill the strongest.” With the advent and probable spread of nuclear weapons, however, there is no longer any reason to believe the international state of nature to be more tolerable. Most obvious in this connection are the proliferation-associated risks of inadvertent nuclear war, accidental nuclear war, nuclear war by irrationality or coup d’état, and nuclear war by miscalculation.

Ballot weighing mechanism: Even though it sounds cool to sanction Russia some more, nuclear proliferation risk outweighs benefits of Rosatom sanctions

Richard Nephew 2022 (*senior research scholar at Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia Univ.*) 17 Mar 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) "THE WISDOM OF NUCLEAR CARVE-OUTS FROM THE RUSSIAN SANCTIONS REGIME" https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/the-wisdom-of-nuclear-carve-outs-from-the-russian-sanctions-regime/

There will continue to be criticism of this approach, particularly good-faith expressions of frustration from Ukraine as it seeks to maximize attention and support for its cause. Although it will be difficult to maintain this stance, the risk of overindulging in the pressure campaign is potentially as great as leaving some leverage on the table if the consequence is an undermined global nonproliferation regime.

Ballot voting impact: Nuclear war avoidance outweighs all other considerations

Dr. Louis R. Beres 2022. (PhD; professor emeritus of international law at Purdue) " Nuclear War Avoidance Why It Is Time to Start Worrying, Again" AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS REVIEW, Spring 2022 (accessed 25 Oct 2022) https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASOR/Journals/Volume-1\_Issue-1/Beres\_Nuclear\_War\_Avoidance.pdf

Immediately, to whatever extent possible, national leaders should make all appropriate intellectual and analytic preparations for nuclear war avoidance. In carrying out this responsibility, especially careful attention should be directed to the scenarios of inadvertent nuclear war, as well as narratives pertaining both to accidental nuclear conflict and to a nuclear war resulting from miscalculation. All the while, prospects for a deliberate nuclear war should never be downplayed; preparations for credible nuclear deterrence must be continuously maintained at the highest possible levels. To meet this urgent requirement, leaders of nuclear and near-nuclear states must first acknowledge the recurrent seriousness of a global atomic threat. This is not a time for any leadership complacence. Instead, it is an optimal time to “start worrying again.”

3. Becoming Russia ourselves

Taking away people's rights (example: the right to trade) in the name of fighting authoritarianism is hypocritical and wrong

J.D. Tuccille 2022 (contributing editor) 13 May 2022 REASON magazine "Don't Oppose Russian Authoritarianism With More Authoritarianism" <https://reason.com/2022/05/13/dont-oppose-russian-authoritarianism-with-more-authoritarianism/> (accessed 23 June 2022)

Restrictions on freedom are authoritarian, even if government officials try to justify them with hollow claims of being on the side of peace and liberty. Just as you've gained nothing if battling monsters turns you into a monster, you need to rethink just what you hope to win if fighting authoritarians pushes your own society towards authoritarianism. If we want support for Ukraine to equate to defense of freedom, we have to actually respect that value instead of becoming what our political leaders pretend to oppose.