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### 1AR No Pass

#### Immigration won’t pass-atmosphere

CQ Weekly 12-31

“To the Cliff and Beyond,”

Obama’s partner in a deal was to have been Boehner, who would have cemented his grip on his fractious conference and laid claim to a remarkable legislative achievement. Instead, he emerges weaker than ever. While he is likely to be re-elected speaker on Jan. 3, it comes at a high price, with the problems he has herding his caucus laid bare and the clout that comes with deal-making further diminished.¶ Public's View of the Cliff: Click Here to View Chart¶ As Obama and Boehner traded proposals after the election, it looked as if the two figures were approaching a historic deal that would reduce the government’s expectations for accumulated red ink by roughly $2 trillion over 10 years.¶ “It could be a huge victory for the speaker,” says Ron Bonjean — a GOP strategist and aide to former House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert of Illinois and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott of Mississippi — during the midst of negotiations. “If there’s a deal that can get done, it will show that Boehner’s clearly in charge of his conference.”¶ But Bonjean also cautions, “He will not move forward unless his conference stands behind him. The speaker knows that the strength lies with his members.”¶ Those members, Boehner found, were also the source of his biggest weakness and biggest loss. When he realized his latest offer to Obama, which would have raised $1 trillion in revenue, couldn’t win support from his conference, Boehner ended negotiations with the president and sought to pass what he called Plan B, which would raise tax rates on incomes of more than $1 million a year.¶ But Boehner had still misread his members. His backup plan backfired when a sufficient number of Republican lawmakers refused to vote for it. Boehner pulled the bill from the floor in a stunning reversal that only strengthened Obama’s position.¶ Having refrained from making his caucus compromise ahead of the cliff, Boehner limps away still the nominal leader of the House but having shown little ability to advance his policy priorities or corral his members when it counts. It also suggests he will struggle to make any deal with the president in the 113th Congress, meaning the confrontation and lack of legislative productivity of the last two years will continue, much to the public’s dismay.¶ “The Plan B debacle suggests a very tough terrain for policy compromise in the 113th on other big issues — immigration, gun control, et al,” says Binder. “It’s hard to see how bipartisan compromises will make it to the House floor on these contentious issues.”

### 1AR Plan Popular

#### Pop within nuclear lobby--that

#### SMR incentives are bipartisan---recent bills prove

King et al 11

Marcus, Associate Director of Research at The George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs, with a concurrent appointment as Associate Research Professor of International Affairs, LaVar Huntzinger and Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear Power on Military Installations D0023932 A5.pdf

Favorable public perception has contributed to bipartisan congressional interest in building new nuclear capacity. Congress has introduced several bills that provide funding for new nuclear research and incentives for the nuclear industry. The Enabling the Nuclear Renaissance Act (ENRA) under consideration by the Senate contains many of the nuclear provisions found in previously introduced bills. In the area of small reactor technology, the legislation directs the Department of Energy (DOE) to develop a 50 percent cost-sharing program with industry, and it provides government funding at the rate of $100 million per year for 10 years. The bill also calls for the establishment of a program office within DOE to manage community led initiatives to develop “energy parks” on former DOE sites. The energy parks may include nuclear power plants [11

#### Labor unions support nuclear power -- that shields political backlash.

Kosterlitz, 08

(Julie, National Journal, 5/3, “Yes to Nukes,” lexis)

As it plots a comeback in the United States, the nuclear power industry is cultivating a critical ally: organized labor.The reasons are both practical and political. The industry's plan to build dozens of power plants requires thousands of workers, many of them with special skills that have become scarce during a more than 20-year hiatus in major construction. Good relations with unions could pave the way to steady labor supplies, smooth relations with workers, and more training programs to provide skilled labor. Perhaps more important, the industry could use labor's clout with Democrats to help ensure support in Congress--and in a White House that could soon be home to a Democrat--for the substantial federal backing needed to help get plant construction rolling again.

#### SMRs popular—their generic links don’t apply

Covert 12 Adrian is the Editorial Assistant at Gizmodo Magazine, “The US Government Is Banking on Small Nuclear Reactors for Future Energy”, March 12, 2012, http://gizmodo.com/5890394/the-us-government-is-banking-on-small-nuclear-reactors-for-future-energy

Ever since Fukushima, nuclear power has not been a warmly-received concept when it comes to energy solutions. But still, small modular reactors have remained one iteration of nuclear power that people are optimistic about due to their relative safety and manageability. That's why the US Department of Energy has entered into partnerships with the top SMR makers to help nurture the tiny wonders.¶ According to Ars Technica, the governement is going to offer up land at the Savannah River Nuclear Lab to work on research and build test sites for development. In addition to their size and relative stability, SMRs are popular because reactors are never opened on site, and are sent back to a central facility for refueling, which eases concerns about security. Sure they may not generate Gigawatts, but Megawatts aren't so bad either.

#### Bipart support for SMR’s in Congress

E&E News 9-24

“DOE Funding for Small Reactors Languishes as Parties Clash on Debt,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3>

Some of the nation's largest nuclear power companies are anxious to hear whether they will get a share of a $452 million pot from the Department of Energy for a new breed of reactors that the industry has labeled as a way to lessen the safety risks and construction costs of new nuclear power plants.¶ The grant program for these "small modular reactors," which was announced in January, would mark the official start of a major U.S. foray into the technology even as rising construction costs -- especially when compared to natural-gas-burning plants -- cause many power companies to shy away from nuclear plants.¶ DOE received four bids before the May 21 deadline from veteran reactor designers Westinghouse Electric Co. and Babcock & Wilcox Co., as well as relative newcomers Holtec International Inc. and NuScale Power LLC. Now the summer has ended with no announcement from DOE, even though the agency said it would name the winners two months ago.¶ As the self-imposed deadline passed, companies started hearing murmurs that a decision could come in September, or perhaps at the end of the year. To observers within the industry, it seems that election-year calculations may have sidelined the contest.¶ "The rumors are a'flying," said Paul Genoa, director of policy development at the Nuclear Energy Institute, in an interview last week. "All we can imagine is that this is now caught up in politics, and the campaign has to decide whether these things are good for them to announce, and how."¶ Small modular reactors do not seem to be lacking in political support. The nuclear lobby has historically courted both Democrats and Republicans and still sees itself as being in a strong position with key appropriators on both sides of the aisle.¶ Likewise, top energy officials in the Obama administration have hailed the promise of the new reactors, and they haven't shown any signs of a change of heart. DOE spokeswoman Jen Stutsman said last week that the department is still reviewing applications, but she did not say when a decision will be made.¶ "This is an important multiyear research and development effort, and we want to make sure we take the time during the review process to get the decision right," she wrote in an email.¶ That the grants haven't been given out during a taut campaign season, even as President Obama announces agency actions ranging from trade cases to creating new national monuments to make the case for his re-election, may be a sign that the reactors are ensnared in a broader feud over energy spending.¶ Grant recipients would develop reactor designs with an eye toward eventually turning those into pilot projects -- and the loan guarantees that these first-of-a-kind nuclear plants are using today to get financing would be blocked under the "No More Solyndras" bill that passed the House last week (Greenwire, Sept. 14).
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#### Existence precedes the ability to ascribe value [and respect the other]

Paul Wapner. 2003. Associate Prof. and Dir. Global Env’t. Policy Prog. – American U., Dissent, “Leftist criticism of “nature””, Winter, 50:1.

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions--except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and nonexistence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean Francois Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.