THW expand the use of civilian nuclear energy

Main Clashes

1. Climate urgency vs Nuclear risk

Government:
The climate crisis is immediate and existential. Nuclear energy provides stable, low- carbon energy now.

Opposition:
Even with low probability, nuclear accidents have catastrophic and long- lasting consequences.

Clash:
Which is more dangerous: certain climate damage or low- probability, high- impact nuclear risk?

2. Energy security vs Long-term environmental harm

Government:
Nuclear energy reduces dependence on imported fossil fuels and strengthens energy security.

Opposition:
Nuclear waste remains dangerous for thousands of years, burdening future generations.

Clash:
Present energy independence or future environmental safety?

3. Technological progress vs Human error

Government:
Modern nuclear technology is far safer and better regulated.

Opposition:
Human error, corruption, and natural disasters can never be fully eliminated.

Clash:
Do we trust technological progress or acknowledge permanent human limitations?

4. Cost- effectiveness vs Opportunity cost

Government:
Despite high initial costs, nuclear energy is stable and efficient in the long run.

Opposition:
The same investment could yield better results in renewable energy.

Clash:
One expensive stable solution or multiple flexible alternatives?

5. Realism vs Idealism

Government:
Renewable energy alone is not yet sufficient to meet global demand.

Opposition:
With serious investment, renewables could replace nuclear without the risks.

Clash:
What is realistic today versus what is ideally possible tomorrow?

Meta- Clash (for adjudicators)

Necessity vs Acceptable Risk

Government wins if it proves the risk is acceptable due to necessity.
Opposition wins if it proves the risk is morally or practically unacceptable.