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#### SMRs are competitive with natural gas

Skutnik, 11

[Skutnik, Steve. Assistant Professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Tennessee; regular contributor toThe Neutron Economy. His areas of research expertise include nuclear fuel cycles, waste management, and nuclear nonproliferation. “Small Modular Reactors and the Economics of Nuclear,” The Neutron Economy. Saturday, June 25, 2011. http://neutroneconomy.blogspot.com/2011/06/excellent-op-ed-on-small-modular.html]

SMRs have the potential to change the economics of the game by several means. First, many proposed SMR designs are engineered to be mass-produced and pre-fabricated in factories, rather than built on-site. This could tremendously push down prices while also shortening construction times, thus ameliorating what is currently one of nuclear's biggest weaknesses at the moment. Meanwhile, the "small" in SMRs also may have potentially positive implications for both cost and safety: SMRs can be potentially built into the ground, using the surrounding earth as containment, due to their relatively small size. Given the lower total power and nuclear material within the reactor, it can be said to have a lower overall "radiological footprint," meaning simplified safety planning. Finally, the "right-size" power of SMR capacity may allow them to be sold in a greater number of markets - places both where a new full-sized reactor is too big for the needs of a community (for example, Fort Calhoun, north of Omaha, is the smallest reactor in the U.S. nuclear fleet, clocking in at only 500 MW; compare this to currently proposed new reactor designs, which begin in the neighborhood of 1000-1100 MW). Likewise, the smaller size means that for utilities only looking to incrementally expand capacity, small reactors may prove to be competitive with alternatives such as natural gas turbines.

#### Natural gas prices rising – industrial and electricity demand

Lackey 12 (Mark, energy analyst with CHF Investor Relations, “This Is Your Energy Entry Point: Mark Lackey,” 8-30-12, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/14243>)

Natural gas has been somewhat weaker, but it bounced off the $2/thousand cubic feet (Mcf) price a few months ago up to the $2.85–3/Mcf range in North America. With more industrial demand coming back, particularly in the auto sector, and stronger demand from electric utilities, gas should move back up closer to $3.25–3.30/Mcf in the next year. By way of comparison, prices in Europe can be anywhere from $4–8/Mcf, and in China they're as high as $15/Mcf.

#### Fracking is unsustainable – the US doesn’t have much nat gas left and their cards cite the best opportunities and best possible scenarios which have been exhausted – prefer Berman, he’s a consultant for the American Association of Petroleum Geologists – his job revolves around unbiased studies

#### unique link turn – SMRs run on existing nuclear waste

Szondy 12, David, writes for charged and iQ magazine, award-winning journalist [“Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” February 16th, http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/]

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

## NRC

### IAEA Overstretch

#### SMRs use safeguards-by-design

Scherer et al 10 (C. Scherer, Los Alamos Natl Laboratory, et al. R. Bean, Idaho Natl Laboratory, M. Mullen, Los Alamos Natl Laboratory, and G. Pshakin, State Scientific Centre of the Russian Federation-Institute for Physics and Power Engineering, 2010 <http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/Symposium/2010/Documents/PapersRepository/164.pdf>)

This report is one of the initial efforts in the Russian and United States cooperative effort. Both the U.S. and Russia see the benefit in incorporating safeguards early in the design process. For the next phase of the joint effort, safeguards experts from the United States and the Russian Federation will use the SBD methodology for advanced nuclear energy systems. They will be specifically developing SBD\* guidance documents for the design of small modular reactors, such as the Russian SVBR (lead-bismuth fast reactor) and a yet-to-bedetermined U.S. small reactor. Both countries are investigating the application of both domestic and international safeguards in the SBD guidance documents. SBD guidance documents for these future nuclear facilities will need to cover many standard elements. These elements are the major requirements in nuclear material accountancy, additional safeguards measures, and design verification, as mentioned previously. Specific areas for design guidance in the design of nuclear reactors are potential nuclear material diversion pathways and the means to mitigate them, off-loading and onloading fuel into the reactor, safeguards needs specific to fuel containing direct-use material (e.g., Pu or highly enriched uranium), and supply of safeguards equipment and services. Functional areas for safeguards design are barriers for the containment and surveillance system, tamper-indicating seals, video surveillance, efficient fuel identification and verification, detection of irradiation of undeclared fertile material, fuel transfers to and from facility areas, safeguards needs specific to fuel containing plutonium (such as MOX), and to fuel shipping/receiving areas.

\*SBD = safeguards-by-design

#### Solves IAEA overstretch

Scherer et al 10 (C. Scherer, Los Alamos Natl Laboratory, et al. R. Bean, Idaho Natl Laboratory, M. Mullen, Los Alamos Natl Laboratory, and G. Pshakin, State Scientific Centre of the Russian Federation-Institute for Physics and Power Engineering, 2010 <http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/Symposium/2010/Documents/PapersRepository/164.pdf>)

Abstract: Incorporating safeguards early in the design process can enhance the safeguardability of a nuclear facility by influencing and becoming part of the intrinsic design. This concept is transformational because historically safeguarding nuclear facilities was often considered after completion of the facility design or even construction of the facility. Safeguards concepts and applications were therefore retrofit to the design. By designing safeguards into the facility practical solutions from best practices and lessons learned can be implemented, thus improving the safeguardability of the facility and making safeguards more efficient and cost effective for both the plant operator and international inspectors. A methodology for integrating Safeguards-by-Design early into the facility design process is proposed. The architecture field uses the following design phases: Planning, Schematic, Design Development, and Construction Documents. During the Planning phase defining functions and listing requirements for the facility is essential; at this time safeguards requirements should be documented and become part of the facility functions and requirements list. The schematic phase is the beginning of early design drawings; the design addresses the functions and requirements needs, space utilization begins and the facility design begins taking on volume and shape. Early planning allows evaluation and incorporation of improved solutions from best practices and lessons learned. The safeguardability of the facility could become part of the intrinsic design. It is during the planning and into the schematic design phases that the customer or facility operator has the most influence on the design. Considering International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards verification requirements at this design stage, allows for inclusion of concepts that maximize efficiency and minimize inspection impact. Design changes during the Design Development, and later design phases tend to be very costly; at later stages of the design process, design changes are retrofit into the existing space envelope and are generally much less efficient and economical. Planning for safeguards early in the design process therefore has benefit to both the facility operator and IAEA inspectors. With the emerging nuclear renaissance IAEA inspections will need to be more efficient and economical. Safeguards-by-Design offers a process to design in this efficiency for both the facility operator and the IAEA inspectors. Safeguards experts from the United States and the Russian Federation are cooperating to jointly develop and demonstrate this safeguards-by-design concept for advanced nuclear energy systems

#### Can’t make weapons from SMRs

**Szondy, 12** – freelance writer based in Monroe, Washington (David, 2/16. “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

**SMR’s are prolif resistant**

**Kuznetsov 8** – former Lead Researcher at the Kurchatov Institute (Russia) (Vladimir, March-August. “Options for small and medium sized reactors (SMRs) to overcome loss of economies of scale and incorporate increased proliferation resistance and energy security” Progress in Nuclear Energ Vol 50 issues 2-6, p 248. ScienceDirect)

For many less developed countries, these are the features of enhanced proliferation resistance and increased robustness of barriers for sabotage protection that may ensure the progress of nuclear power. All NPPs with innovative SMRs will provide for the implementation of the established safeguards veriﬁcation procedures under the agreements of member states with the IAEA. In addition to this, many innovative **SMRs offer** certain **intrinsic proliferation resistance features to prevent the misuse, diversion or undeclared production of ﬁssile materials and/or to facilitate the implementation of safeguards** (IAEA, 2006b). For example, many of **water-cooled SMRs employ low enrichment uranium and once-through fuel cycle as basic options**. Therefore, **the features contributing to proliferation resistance of such SMRs are essentially similar to that of presently operated PWRs and BWRs. They also include an unattractive isotopic composition of the plutonium in the discharged fuel, and radiation barriers provided by the spent fuel. The intrinsic proliferation resistance features** common to all HTGRs **include high fuel burn-up** (low residual inventory of plutonium, high content of 240 Pu); a **difﬁcult to process fuel matrix; radiation barriers; and a low ratio of ﬁssile to fuelblock/fuel-pebble** mass. Although several HTGRs make a provision for reprocessing of the TRISO fuel, the corresponding technology has not been established yet and, until such time as when the technology becomes readily available, the lack of the technology is assumed to provide an enhanced proliferation resistance. All liquid metal cooled SMRs are fast reactors that can ensure a self-sustainable operation on ﬁssile materials or realize fuel breeding to feed other reactors present in nuclear energy systems. In both cases, and **if the fuel cycle is closed, the need of fuel enrichment and relevant uranium enrichment facilities would be eliminated, which is a factor contributing to enhanced proliferation resistance. Other features to enhance proliferation resistance of fast reactors are** the following: **No separation of plutonium and uranium at any fuel cycle stage and leaving a small** (1e2% by weight) fr**action of ﬁssion products permanently in the fuel; Denaturing of the ﬁssile materials,** e.g., through the optimization of the core design to achieve a higher content of 238 Pu in the plutonium, to preclude the possibility of weapon production via securing an inadmissibly high level of residual heat of the plutonium fuel e the 238 Pu/Pu ratio needed to achieve this still needs to be deﬁned adequately.

## Off

### States CP 2ac

#### Perm do both –

#### states are acting now to provide incentives but it won’t work without a sustained federal commitment

Bowman 8 (President and Chief Executive Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Frank, CQ Congressional Testimony, “Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction”, 6/19, lexis)

In terms of new nuclear plant construction, one of the most significant financing challenges is the cost of these projects relative to the size, market value and financing capability of the companies that will build them. New nuclear power plants are expected to cost at least $6 to 7 billion. U.S. electric power companies do not have the size, financing capability or financial strength to finance new nuclear power projects on balance sheet, on their own-particularly at a time when they are investing heavily in other generating capacity, transmission and distribution infrastructure, and environmental controls. These first projects must have financing support-either loan guarantees from the federal government or assurance of investment recovery from state governments, or both. The states are doing their part. Throughout the South and Southeast, state governments have enacted legislation or implemented new regulations to encourage new nuclear plant construction. Comparable federal government commitment is essential. The modest loan guarantee program authorized by the 2005 Energy Policy Act was a small step in the right direction, but it does not represent a sufficient response to the urgent need to rebuild our critical electric power infrastructure. We believe the United States will need something similar to the Clean Energy Bank concept now under consideration by a number of members of Congress-a government corporation, modeled on the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, to provide loan guarantees and other forms of financing support to ensure that capital flows to clean technology deployment in the electric sector. Creation of such a financing entity should be an integral component of any climate change legislation. Such a concept serves at least two national imperatives. First, it addresses the challenge mentioned earlier-the disparity between the size of these projects relative to the size of the companies that will build them. In the absence of a concept like a Clean Energy Bank, new nuclear plants and other clean energy projects will certainly be built, but in smaller numbers over a longer period of time. Second, federal loan guarantees provide a substantial consumer benefit. A loan guarantee allows more leverage in a project's capital structure, which reduces the cost of capital, in turn reducing the cost of electricity from the project. Electricity consumers-residential, commercial and industrial-are already struggling with increases in oil, natural gas and electricity prices. The high cost of energy and fuel price volatility has already compromised the competitive position of American industry. We know that the next generation of clean energy technologies will be more costly than the capital stock in place today. In this environment, we see a compelling case for federal financing support that would reduce consumer costs. If it is structured like the loan guarantee program authorized by Title XVII of the 2005 Energy Policy Act, in which project sponsors are expected to pay the cost of the loan guarantee, such a program would be revenue-neutral and would not represent a subsidy. The public benefits associated with a robust energy loan guarantee program-lower cost electricity, deployment of clean energy technologies at the scale necessary to reduce carbon emissions-are significant. That is why the U.S. government routinely uses loan guarantee programs to support activities that serve the public good and the national interest-including shipbuilding, steelmaking, student loans, rural electrification, affordable housing, construction of critical transportation infrastructure, and for many other purposes. Achieving significant expansion of nuclear power in the United States will require stable and sustained federal and state government policies relating to nuclear energy.

#### Specifically Congress is key

Fertel 5 [Marvin Fertel - Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute “Nuclear Power's Place In A National Energy Policy,” April 28th, 2005, Lexis (CQ Congressional Testimony), Chetan]

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the **federal** government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation.

#### AND - Federal government key to uniformity for climate mitigation

Byrne 7 (Center for Energy and Environmental Policy (CEEP) (John, with Kristen Hughes, Lado Kurdgelashvili, Wilson Rickerson, 2/19. “American policy conflict in the greenhouse: Divergent trends in federal, regional, state, and local green energy and climate change policy.”)

Effective global mitigation of climate change will require strong leadership by national governments, including that of the US. More specifically, national governments remain vital in mandating and enforcing compliance among diverse actors within their jurisdiction. Only national governments can promote uniform standards for compliance and related programs, thus ensuring achievement of policy goals with maximum fairness and minimal costs (Rabe, 2002). National funding also remains vital to underwrite long-term commitments needed to meet ever more challenging climate action targets (Rabe, 2002).

#### -- States fiat is a voter --- steals all the Aff, uniformity circumvents the best literature, its contrived and unpredictable because there isn’t a single solvency advocate for the counterplan, and illogical because no policy-maker can choose between all 50 states doing the plan vs. the federal government doing it.

### Heidegger 2AC

#### -- Perm do both – Alt alone fails – ‘letting be’ and waiting for metaphysical transformation dooms us to extinction

**Santoni 85** (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to **omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we **simultaneously act** to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about our disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be **too permissive** in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

#### -- Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being

**Zimmerman 93** (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

#### Consumption good

Glover and Economides 11 (– http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/12/12/energy-climate-wars-energy-consumption-is-good/

Without modern energy Western civilization would grind to a halt, literally. Your refrigerator would no longer keep cheap food chilled for weeks and months; you would need fresh food daily, with all the extra costs and the journeys that entails. Private cars would be obsolete. You would have to read by candlelight. Your home would have to be heated by burning wood or, if you had a local source of hydrocarbon fuels—what we call primary—burning oil, gas, or coal. In short, you would be subject to the technology of the mid-nineteenth century. At this point, an extreme idealist may naively insist that life was better in former generations than today. A less extreme idealist may claim that hydrocarbon fuels are no longer necessary and that we could switch, with the right social and political will, to alternative energy sources. The argument runs that, if only we could divest ourselves of our “addiction” to oil, gas, and coal (“fossil” fuels) we could, at a stroke, clean up our environment by making a wholehearted commitment to renewable, clean and “free” energy, wind, wave, hydro, solar, and geothermal power to solve our future energy needs. Only one problem with that: there’s more chance of Donald Duck becoming president of the United States. Just try to make that particular energy switchover and stand back and watch the lights go out all over the world. True, some radicals want it that way. They think it would be “quaint” to return to dark ages lifestyle, the same “quaint,” often poverty-stricken, lifestyles to which they would doom other societies who today are desperate to industrialize, as the West has. This is an easy pastime, of course, when you are an armchair eco-liberal enjoying the fruits of a post-industrial society. The reality of doing that which today’s anti-hydrocarbon eco-warriors demand in their relentless, ultimately pointless, war on carbon is that the developed nations would simply find themselves among the ranks of those nations whose low energy consumption meant that they never came out of the “dark ages” in the first place. While some environmental activists may perceive the “old ways” as simple, something to hanker after, they conveniently forget the high infant mortality rates, sickness, pollution, and shortness of life that went with that “quaint” lifestyle, a lifestyle that for many even today is an all too unpleasant, even deadly, daily reality. Ironic, is it not, that in an age when we live longer, healthier, more pollution-free lives than countless previous generations, we should have become even more angst-ridden and obsessive about our health and our environment? Yet such concerns, suffused with an unhealthy self-injected dose of idealism, are not only driving some modern Western governments to make mostly unnecessary and uneconomic social changes, but are also powerfully influencing global and national policies as they affect the world’s most important commodity: energy. The truth is, we owe our longer, greater, healthier life, indeed our economic prosperity in the West generally, to the Industrial Revolution and the economic development that resulted from it. And that prosperity is a direct consequence of our growing energy consumption of energy. Like it or not, the great energy-driven reality of our age is, whatever idealistic social engineers may desire, that modern civilization (and those societies currently undergoing their own industrialization) remain wholly dependent upon the per capita consumption of primary energy of oil, gas, and coal. What is more, they will continue to do so for decades to come…. In the modern world, there is a direct correlation between the level of energy consumption and national wealth creation. Indeed the relative wealth and poverty of nations is entirely definable by its per capita energy consumption. It is equally axiomatic that demand for energy is connected to wealth; the corollary is also true: use of energy promotes and generates wealth. Thus the perennial vilification of the US as the world’s largest consumer of energy (25 percent of global use) is wholly misguided, in that it is largely based on the fallacy that US energy demand is only the result of its wealth. Rather, energy demand is the cause of US wealth, as it is elsewhere. This is vital to understand. Especially in the light of the constant assertions made about the need to cut energy consumption when the right and proper aspiration of any modernizing country and government is to promote and sponsor the wealth, welfare, and prosperity of its constituent peoples. To achieve this, nations clearly have to increase their energy consumption. After all, isn’t an ever-improving standard of living and greater prosperity the goal to which every caring family and nation aspires?

**Complexity theory leads to paralysis**  
**Hendrick 9** (Diane; Department of Peace Studies – University of Bradford, “Complexity Theory and Conflict Transformation: An Exploration of Potential and Implications,” June, [http://143.53.238.22/acad/confres/papers/pdfs/CCR17.pdf)](http://143.53.238.22/acad/confres/papers/pdfs/CCR17.pdf%29)  
It is still **relatively early days in the application of complexity theory** to social sciences and there are doubts and criticisms, either about the applicability of the ideas or about the expectations generated for them. It is true that the translation of terms from natural science to social science is sometimes contested due to the significant differences in these domains, and that there are concerns that the meanings of terms may be distorted, thus making their use arbitrary or even misleading. Developing new, relevant definitions for the new domain applications, where the terms indicate a new idea or a new synthesis that takes our understanding forward, are required. In some cases, particular aspects of complexity theory are seen as of **only limited applicability**, for example, self-organisation (see Rosenau‘s argument above that it is only relevant in systems in which authority does not play a role). There are those who argue that much that is being touted as new is actually already known, whether from systems theory or from experience, and so **complexity theory cannot be seen as adding value in that way**. There are also concerns that the theory has not been worked out in sufficient detail,or with sufficient rigour, to make itself useful yet. Even that **it encourages woolly thinking and imprecision.** In terms of application in the field, it could be argued that it may **lead to paralysis**, in fear of all the unexpected things that could happen, and all the unintended consequences that could result, from a particular intervention. The proposed adaptability and sensitivity to emerging new situations may lead to difficulties in planning or, better expressed, must lead to a different conception of what constitutes planning, which is, in itself, **challenging (or even threatening) for many fields.** The criteria for funding projects or research may not fit comfortably with a complexity approach, and evaluation, already difficult especially in the field of conflict transformation, would require a re-conceptualisation. Pressure for results could act as a disincentive to change project design in the light of emergent processes. There may be the desire to maintain the illusion of control in order to retain the confidence of funders. On the other hand, there are fears that complexity may be used as **an excuse for poor planning, and implementation**, which is a valid concern for funders. In addition, there may be scepticism that the co-operation and co-ordination between different researchers or interveners, (let alone transdisciplinary undertakings) appropriate to working on complex problem domains, will not work due to differing mental models, competing interests and aims, competition for funding, prestige, etc. Such attempts appear, therefore, unrealistic or unfeasible.

#### No prior questions

**Owen 02** David Owen, 2 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.**

### Accidents

#### A strong domestic industry prevents global accidents – that’s 1ac Wallace and Williams

#### Accidents are getting worse and risk extinction – Fukushima proves

Chossudovsky 12 (1/25 Professor of Economics at University of Ottawa, Fukushima: A Nuclear War without a War: The Unspoken Crisis of Worldwide Nuclear Radiation, www.globalresearch.ca/fukushima-a-nuclear-war-without-a-war-the-unspoken-crisis-of-worldwide-nuclear-radiation/)

The World is at a critical crossroads. The Fukushima disaster in Japan has brought to the forefront the dangers of Worldwide nuclear radiation. The crisis in Japan has been described as “a nuclear war without a war”. In the words of renowned novelist Haruki Murakami: “This time no one dropped a bomb on us … We set the stage, we committed the crime with our own hands, we are destroying our own lands, and we are destroying our own lives.” Nuclear radiation –which threatens life on planet earth– is not front page news in comparison to the most insignificant issues of public concern, including the local level crime scene or the tabloid gossip reports on Hollywood celebrities. While the long-term repercussions of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster are yet to be fully assessed, they are far more serious than those pertaining to the 1986 Chernobyl disaster in the Ukraine, which resulted in almost one million deaths (New Book Concludes – Chernobyl death toll: 985,000, mostly from cancer Global Research, September 10, 2010, See also Matthew Penney and Mark Selden The Severity of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Disaster: Comparing Chernobyl and Fukushima, Global Research, May 25, 2011) Moreover, while all eyes were riveted on the Fukushima Daiichi plant, news coverage both in Japan and internationally failed to fully acknowledge the impacts of a second catastrophe at TEPCO’s (Tokyo Electric Power Co Inc) Fukushima Daini nuclear power plant. The shaky political consensus both in Japan, the U.S. and Western Europe is that the crisis at Fukushima has been contained. The realties, however, are otherwise. Fukushima 3 was leaking unconfirmed amounts of plutonium. According to Dr. Helen Caldicott, “one millionth of a gram of plutonium, if inhaled can cause cancer”. An opinion poll in May 2011 confirmed that more than 80 per cent of the Japanese population do not believe the government’s information regarding the nuclear crisis. (quoted in Sherwood Ross, Fukushima: Japan’s Second Nuclear Disaster, Global Research, November 10, 2011) The Impacts in Japan The Japanese government has been obliged to acknowledge that “the severity rating of its nuclear crisis … matches that of the 1986 Chernobyl disaster”. In a bitter irony, however, this tacit admission by the Japanese authorities has proven to been part of the cover-up of a significantly larger catastrophe, resulting in a process of global nuclear radiation and contamination: “While Chernobyl was an enormous unprecedented disaster, it only occurred at one reactor and rapidly melted down. Once cooled, it was able to be covered with a concrete sarcophagus that was constructed with 100,000 workers. There are a staggering 4400 tons of nuclear fuel rods at Fukushima, which greatly dwarfs the total size of radiation sources at Chernobyl.” ( Extremely High Radiation Levels in Japan: University Researchers Challenge Official Data, Global Research, April 11, 2011)

### Immigration Reform 2AC

#### No impact

Tellis 2 (Ashley, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Orbis, Winter, p. 19)

In any event, the saving grace that mutes the potential for exacerbated competition between both countries remains their relatively strong economic constraints. At the Pakistani end, these constraints are structural: Islamabad simply has no discretionary resources to fritter away on an open-ended arms race, and it could not acquire resources for this purpose without fundamentally transforming the nature of the Pakistani state itself—which transformation, if it occurs successfully, would actually mitigate many of the corrosive forces that currently drive Islamabad’s security competition with India. [21](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808#fn22#fn22) At the Indian end, these constraints may be more self-imposed. New Delhi commands a large pool of national resources that could be siphoned off and reallocated to security instruments, but the current weaknesses of the central government’s public finances and its reform program, coupled with its desire to complete the technological modernization programs that have been underway for many decades, prevents it from enlarging the budgetary allocations for strategic acquisitions at will. [22](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808#fn23#fn23) With these constraints on both sides, future nuclearization in India and Pakistan is more likely to resemble an "arms crawl" than a genuine Richardson-type "arms race." The strategic capabilities on both sides will increase incrementally but slowly—and in India will have further to go because of its inferior capabilities compared to China’s. This slowness may be the best outcome from the viewpoint both of the two South Asian competitors and the United States.

#### Their ev says that no one will ever compromise and their link author is a self-procliamed conspiracy theorist – raise the threshold on their ev

#### PC not key and Obama’s PC fails - he has no leverage, and Hagel trumps

#### Gun control and budget battles sidelines immigration reform.

**Bennett**, **12/30**/2012 (Brian, Immigration reform could get overshadowed in Congress, Los Angeles Times, p. <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/dec/30/nation/la-na-immigration-20121230>)

The window to pass immigration laws next year is narrowing as the effort competes with a renewed debate over gun laws and the lingering fight over taxes and the budget, according to congressional staffers and outside advocates. Key congressional committees are preparing for a package of gun control laws to be negotiated and possibly introduced in Congress during the first few months of next year. The shift would push the debate in Congress over immigration reform into the spring. But as budget negotiations continue to stir tensions between Republicans and Democrats, and as lobbyists take to their corners over gun laws, some are concerned that the heated atmosphere could spoil the early signs of bipartisan cooperation on immigration that emerged after the election.

#### Link is non-unique – Obama has already pushed and taken credit for incentives towards SMRs – that’s Koch

#### SMRs have bipartisan support

Sullivan 10 (Mary Anne Sullivan – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Daniel F. Stenger – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Amy C. Roma – Senior associate in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Are Small Reactors the Next Big Thing in Nuclear?, November 2010, Electric Light & Power, Nov/Dec2010, Vol. 88 Issue 6, p46)

Congress SMRs have enjoyed **bipartisan support** in Congress. The House Committee on Science and Technology and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have approved similar legislation designed to promote the development and deployment of SMRs along the lines the DOE has proposed. Promoting SMR development in legislation has its price. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the Senate bill would cost $407 million over the next five years to support cost-sharing programs with private companies for the development of two standard SMR designs. Costs for the out-years were not included in the estimate, but the bill would require the DOE to obtain NRC design certifications for the reactors by 2018 and to secure combined construction and operating licenses by Jan. 1, 2021. If Congress can pass an energy bill, it seems likely the bill **will support SMRs**. Even in the absence of new authorizing legislation, however, **appropriations bills** that must be passed to **keep the government running** almost certainly will contain strong support for the DOE's research and development program for SMRs. SMRs respond to a critical suite of power needs: reliable, low-carbon, baseload generation at a manageable capital cost for even small utilities. But as with many other power solutions, much still needs to happen to realize the promise

#### Not intrinsic – a logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform

#### Fiscal cliff kills immigration reform.

Wall Street Journal, **1/1**/2013 (Lack of Grand Bargain Complicates Obama’s Priorities, p. ht**t**p://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323635504578216253683816078.html)

Historically, second-term presidents have had a limited window to roll out major policy proposals before lame-duck status sets in and passing significant legislation becomes a steeper challenge. With that in mind, Mr. Obama has said he would roll out proposals aimed at reducing gun violence and overhauling immigration laws early this year. The White House view is that Mr. Obama would have been ill-positioned to pass policy priorities if the country was still preoccupied with the effects of having gone over the fiscal cliff. But now, because lawmakers postponed for two months the spending cuts that were set to take effect Wednesday, fiscal issues will continue to consume much of the political oxygen in the near future. So will talks about whether to raise the nation's statutory borrowing limit. Even in the best of times, issues such as immigration and gun control are flash points for the political parties, said William Galston, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a former policy adviser to President Bill Clinton. The past couple of months suggest that these aren't the best of times in Washington, he said. "Whatever hope [Mr. Obama] may have had of changing the tone in Washington must have disappeared by now," he said. "It's an unpleasant discovery that the election appears to have changed much less and settled much less than he at least hoped."

#### Relations don’t solve

**Tellis 5** (Ashley, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues. 11/16/05 “The U.S.-India ''Global Partnership'': How Significant for American Interests? ““<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17693>)

Several practical implications, which ought to be of significance to the Congress as it ponders the U.S.-Indian civilian nuclear agreement, flow from these realities. To begin with, the strengthening U.S.-Indian relationship does not imply that New Delhi will become a formal alliance partner of Washington at some point in the future. It also does not imply that India will invariably be an uncritical partner of the United States in its global endeavors. India’s large size, its proud history, and its great ambitions, ensure that it will likely march to the beat of its own drummer, at least most of the time. The first question, for the Congress in particular and for the United States more generally, therefore, ought not to be, “What will India do for us?”—as critics of the civilian nuclear agreement often assert. Rather, the real question ought to be, “Is a strong, democratic, (even if perpetually) independent, India in American national interest?” If, as I believe, this is the fundamental question and if, as I further believe, the answer to this question is “Yes,” then the real discussion about the evolution of the U.S.-Indian relationship ought to focus on how the United States can assist the growth of Indian power, and how it can do so at minimal cost (if that is relevant) to any other competing national security objectives.

#### The GOP won’t support CIR --- momentum hasn’t changed.

San Francisco **Chronicle**, **12/31**/2012 (Congress Dysfunction as Deadline Arrives Poses 2013 Risks, p. http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Congress-Dysfunction-as-Deadline-Arrives-Poses-4157560.php#page-3)

“Boehner and his Republican conference will have leverage over the Democrats on raising the debt ceiling,” Bonjean said. “You will see the first quarter of the year being dominated by spending cuts and entitlement reform as a permission slip for the Democrats to raise the debt ceiling.” That suggests more roadblocks for Obama’s agenda even after his decisive re-election in November. “Immigration is going to be a very tough issue for Republicans to tackle,” Bonjean said. “Coming off a very bruising fiscal cliff fight, pivoting to immigration is going to be more troublesome for Republicans to coalesce around the plan.” Obama’s re-election “doesn’t mean he should get everything he wants” yet “it certainly means that everything he reasonably proposes should get a fair hearing,” said Representative Rob Andrews, a New Jersey Democrat.

#### Obama pushing SMRs now

Ervin 12-28 [Dan Ervin is a professor of finance at Salisbury University, “Dan Ervin: Modular reactors are the future of nuclear energy”, December 28th, 2012, <http://www.delmarvanow.com/article/20121230/OPINION03/312300005>, Chetan]

The Obama administration’s decision to kick-start commercial use of small modular reactors has made one thing clear: The notion that nuclear power is slipping away is wrong. Although nuclear power faces difficult challenges, industry and government are working together to forge a new path. The Department of Energy has earmarked funds for a new public-private partnership to help develop innovative small reactors that are about one-third the size of those in large conventional nuclear plants. These small reactors are modular, meaning they will be built in factories before they are shipped and installed at nuclear sites. This production method has the potential to reduce the cost of nuclear power significantly.

#### Double bind – no PC now because Obama just used it on the fiscal cliff, and if he does it proves winners win

**Green 10** 6/11/10 – professor of political science at Hofstra University (David Michael Green, 6/11/10, " The Do-Nothing 44th President ", http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html)

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around**.** This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

#### Obama won’t push CIR --- other priorities.

**Daily Caller**, **12/31**/2012 (Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest, p. <http://dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/>)

However, Obama’s language suggested that increased Latino immigration is a lower priority for him than other measures, and that he’s concerned any revamp would fail because of public opposition. Many previous immigration reform bills have died when leading supporters quietly backed away amid furious public opposition to what was perceived as an attempt at a general amnesty. In 2007, then-Sen. Obama voted against a temporary-worker provision in a pending immigration bill, helping kill the overall legislation. During his first term as president, Obama declined to push a comprehensive immigration bill, despite promising such a revamp while on the 2008 campaign trail. In his NBC interview, Obama showed more enthusiasm about other priorities. “We’ve got a huge opportunity around energy,” he said, “The most immediate thing I’ve got to do … is make sure that taxes are not going up on middle class families,” he claimed. Another priority, he added, is “rebuilding our infrastructure, which is broken.”

#### Weak labor market deters effective immigration reform.

**Grant**, **12/28**/2012 (David, Immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility now?, Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/1228/Immigration-reform-Is-amnesty-a-possibility-now>)

Moreover, increasing legal immigration above the current level of 1 million annually could be seen as a blow to those born in America. Hurting "the American worker with bad immigration policy is not going to get [Republicans] more Hispanic votes," says Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, a group that advocates lower immigration levels. "They've got to do something else." In that respect, increasing legal immigration might be a difficult sell in 2013. "I do not see Congress acting in this area in a robust way until the labor market is stronger," says Andrew Schoenholtz, deputy director for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. "Just how strong is hard to tell."

#### Disastrous Sino-Indian conflict results from shortages of water – cooperation and relations won’t solve

Brennan 8 (James F. Lieutenant, United States Navy, Master of Arts in Security Studies “THE CHINA-INDIA-PAKISTAN WATER CRISIS: PROSPECTS FOR INTERSTATE CONFLICT” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA488648)

A. PURPOSE This thesis examines how China’s growing water requirements may affect Beijing’s relations with South Asia. China’s shrinking water resources may lead Beijing to build dams and take other actions on the Tibetan Plateau in order to address this growing concern. 1 The Tibetan Plateau serves as an untapped resource for China and is the origin of many neighboring countries essential water supplies. More specifically, the Tibetan Plateau is the origin of India and Pakistan’s great rivers – the Indus, Ganges, and Brahmaputra. The decision to focus on the Tibetan Plateau as a solution to China’s water crisis will likely will affect the Brahmaputra River, essential to India. Additionally, although less likely due to geographical challenges, Beijing’s decision to dam Tibetan rivers could also impact the Indus and Ganges River, essential to India and Pakistan. The ongoing tension between India and Pakistan over critical water resources in the Kashmir region sets the stage for increased regional tension if Beijing moves forward with its proposed plans. The consequences of such actions could include a degradation of recently improved relations among these countries, and even to armed conflict. B. IMPORTANCE Water scarcity is a serious issue in many countries around the world. Historically, water-related crises originated in the Middle East – occasionally leading to armed conflict over the resource. Recently, however, Asia has increasingly faced a steady reduction in fresh water availability. 2 These water dilemmas, in conjunction with ineffective policies concerning shared resources, may set in motion a chain of events resulting in future armed conflict between China, India, and Pakistan. In order to prevent a potential disaster, it is important to identify the problem at hand. China, India, and Pakistan are all reliant on shared water supplies originating in the Tibetan Plateau (see Figure 1).3 For China, the Tibetan Plateau serves as an unexploited resource that could help to resolve a mounting water crisis. For India and Pakistan, the Tibetan Plateau serves as the starting point for their most important water lifelines – the Brahmaputra, Ganges, and Indus River. 4 In either case, as water requirements rise for these countries and as resources shrink, it is becoming clear that efforts to tap these resources may foster competition – possibly leading to interstate conflict. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the current status of the availability of water, examine the causes of the shortages, and discuss the proposed solutions that directly affect the possible outcome of this evolving situation.

#### Sino-Indian conflict ensures a massive retaliation and nuclear war

Kanwal 2k (Gurmeet, Senior Fellow – Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, “Does India Need Tactical Nuclear Weapons?”, Strategic Analysis: A Monthly Journal of the ISDA, May, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa\_may00kag01.html)

China is a status quo nuclear power with a long-standing territorial and boundary dispute with India. Despite the Border Peace and Tranquillity Agreement (BPTA) of 1993 and the confidence building measures (CBMs) agreed upon in 1996, the Line of Actual Control (LAC) continues to remain ill-defined and ambiguous and its early 'clarification' still appears to be a distant goal as China is apparently in no hurry for further progress on these substantive issues. China's continuing nuclear and missile collusion and defence cooperation with Pakistan, its support to the military regime in Myanmar and increasing activities in the Bay of Bengal, its attempts to isolate India in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and its relentless efforts to increase its influence in Nepal, Bhutan and Bangladesh, are all pointers to a carefully orchestrated plan aimed at the strategic encirclement of India. Apparently, China poses a long-term strategic challenge to India as a competing regional power in Asia. A border war between these two Asian giants, though improbable, cannot be ruled out. Jasjit Singh has stated that, "The non-strategic category of weapons, which constitute 96 percent (if warheads on SLBMs are taken into account, the proportion drops to a little over 93 percent) of China's nuclear arsenal, even after 34 years, have relevance only for China's immediate neighbours." [26](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note26) Besides some ICBMs and IRBMs, China has deployed a large number of medium-and short-range nuclear-tipped missiles and nuclear capable aircraft in Tibet. [27](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note27) As China has already signed a de-targeting agreement with Russia and the US, it is not clear where these nuclear weapons are aimed or intended to be aimed. These deployed nuclear weapons constitute a 'threat-in-being' to India. Also, China has lately modified its original no-first-use doctrine. "China's military strategists do not consider the use of nuclear weapons in their own territory as violating their NFU (no-first-use) doctrine." [28](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note28) Though China has never bothered to clarify the ambiguities inherent in this stand as it suits its purpose to play a guessing game, it can be deduced that since China clearly considers Taiwan as its own territory, the use of China's nuclear weapons during a war over Taiwan would not violate its no-first-use doctrine. As a corollary, Indian analysts are justified in concluding that as China has not renounced its claim over Arunachal Pradesh, or for that matter is still to recognise Sikkim, it may seriously consider the first use of tactical nuclear weapons during a border conflict with India in the future. China is continuing to modernise its nuclear and missile forces and tactical nuclear weapons, [29](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note29) including by acquiring Western technology through clandestine means. The US has claimed that China has acquired the technology for its W-88 nuclear warhead through illegal means. Notwithstanding the US claim and China's vigorous denial, it is clear that China is continuing to place immense emphasis on tactical nuclear weapons. It naturally follows that China's concept of fighting a 'limited war under high-tech conditions' includes a nuclear warfighting strategy. Hence, India may expect to witness Chinese mushroom clouds over the high Himalayas during a future Sino-Indian border war, particularly if the Chinese Military Region commander is convinced that Indian forces are gaining advantage at the operational level. Due to India's affinity and long-standing cultural links with the Tibetan people, India would naturally like to ensure that collateral damage in Tibet is scrupulously avoided. In fact, even more worrisome would be the long-term contamination of the Himalayan water sources. Since most of the Tibetan rivers drain into the Indian plains, it is in India's interest to ensure that nuclear exchanges over the Himalayan watershed are not allowed to occur. It is also for this reason that India must ensure that ADMs are not employed by either side during a Himalayan conflict, contrary to the proposals made by Bharat Karnad, [30](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note30) et al. How, then, is such a threat to be countered? Some Indian analysts argue that India must retaliate in kind on China's forward troops, firepower assets, headquarters, logistics support areas and communications choke points and that raising the ante and targeting Chinese cities would prove to be counter-productive as China has a much superior nuclear arsenal. In the unlikely event that China employs battlefield nuclear weapons against the Indian army on the grounds that it is justified in using them on the territory that it claims in 'self-defence', India will really have no option but to retaliate massively against Chinese cities and economic centres on China's well developed eastern seaboard. Only such a declaratory policy and matching operational plans will make the first use cost for China prohibitive. It is a moot point whether the loss of a single Chinese city would be acceptable to the proponents of the first use of battlefield nuclear weapons within the Chinese Central Military Commission

#### Immigration is not a priority --- promises of action will not fast track it.

**Voorhees**, **1/3**/2013 (Josh – editor of The Slatest, White House (Quietly) Promises Immigration Push, Slate, p. http://www.slate.com/blogs/the\_slatest/2013/01/03/obama\_s\_immigration\_plans\_white\_house\_officials\_suggest\_early\_2013\_won\_t.html)

With one fiscal-cliff fight in the rearview mirror and several more likely looming not too far up the road, many liberals are fretting aloud that President Obama won't have the energy or desire to tackle other issues near the top of his—and their—second-term wish list. White House officials, however, are doing their best to allay those concerns with the (somewhat quiet) promise of action on two high-profile issues: immigration and gun control. The Huffington Post: An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. In the wake of last month's tragedy in Newtown, the president promised to send a gun-control proposal to Congress early this year, likely as soon as this month. The suggestion that the White House will also get to work on immigration reform—long a priority of the president but one that has largely taken a back seat during his time in office—comes as slightly more of a surprise. However, just because the administration is declaring that an unofficial launch to the immigration push is imminent doesn't mean anyone should expect major action anytime soon. The aides who laid out the plans to HuffPo cautioned that it would probably take about two months to cobble together a bipartisan bill, and then another few before either chamber votes on it. That would mean that if all goes as planned (something that is far from certain) it would likely be early or mid-summer before any concrete actions are taken.

#### They’ve conceded that SMRs solve for global desalination – that’s 1ac Silverstein

#### Disastrous Sino-Indian conflict results from shortages of water – cooperation and relations won’t solve

Brennan 8 (James F. Lieutenant, United States Navy, Master of Arts in Security Studies “THE CHINA-INDIA-PAKISTAN WATER CRISIS: PROSPECTS FOR INTERSTATE CONFLICT” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA488648)

A. PURPOSE This thesis examines how China’s growing water requirements may affect Beijing’s relations with South Asia. China’s shrinking water resources may lead Beijing to build dams and take other actions on the Tibetan Plateau in order to address this growing concern. 1 The Tibetan Plateau serves as an untapped resource for China and is the origin of many neighboring countries essential water supplies. More specifically, the Tibetan Plateau is the origin of India and Pakistan’s great rivers – the Indus, Ganges, and Brahmaputra. The decision to focus on the Tibetan Plateau as a solution to China’s water crisis will likely will affect the Brahmaputra River, essential to India. Additionally, although less likely due to geographical challenges, Beijing’s decision to dam Tibetan rivers could also impact the Indus and Ganges River, essential to India and Pakistan. The ongoing tension between India and Pakistan over critical water resources in the Kashmir region sets the stage for increased regional tension if Beijing moves forward with its proposed plans. The consequences of such actions could include a degradation of recently improved relations among these countries, and even to armed conflict. B. IMPORTANCE Water scarcity is a serious issue in many countries around the world. Historically, water-related crises originated in the Middle East – occasionally leading to armed conflict over the resource. Recently, however, Asia has increasingly faced a steady reduction in fresh water availability. 2 These water dilemmas, in conjunction with ineffective policies concerning shared resources, may set in motion a chain of events resulting in future armed conflict between China, India, and Pakistan. In order to prevent a potential disaster, it is important to identify the problem at hand. China, India, and Pakistan are all reliant on shared water supplies originating in the Tibetan Plateau (see Figure 1).3 For China, the Tibetan Plateau serves as an unexploited resource that could help to resolve a mounting water crisis. For India and Pakistan, the Tibetan Plateau serves as the starting point for their most important water lifelines – the Brahmaputra, Ganges, and Indus River. 4 In either case, as water requirements rise for these countries and as resources shrink, it is becoming clear that efforts to tap these resources may foster competition – possibly leading to interstate conflict. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the current status of the availability of water, examine the causes of the shortages, and discuss the proposed solutions that directly affect the possible outcome of this evolving situation.

#### Sino-Indian conflict ensures a massive retaliation and nuclear war

Kanwal 2k (Gurmeet, Senior Fellow – Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, “Does India Need Tactical Nuclear Weapons?”, Strategic Analysis: A Monthly Journal of the ISDA, May, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa\_may00kag01.html)

China is a status quo nuclear power with a long-standing territorial and boundary dispute with India. Despite the Border Peace and Tranquillity Agreement (BPTA) of 1993 and the confidence building measures (CBMs) agreed upon in 1996, the Line of Actual Control (LAC) continues to remain ill-defined and ambiguous and its early 'clarification' still appears to be a distant goal as China is apparently in no hurry for further progress on these substantive issues. China's continuing nuclear and missile collusion and defence cooperation with Pakistan, its support to the military regime in Myanmar and increasing activities in the Bay of Bengal, its attempts to isolate India in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and its relentless efforts to increase its influence in Nepal, Bhutan and Bangladesh, are all pointers to a carefully orchestrated plan aimed at the strategic encirclement of India. Apparently, China poses a long-term strategic challenge to India as a competing regional power in Asia. A border war between these two Asian giants, though improbable, cannot be ruled out. Jasjit Singh has stated that, "The non-strategic category of weapons, which constitute 96 percent (if warheads on SLBMs are taken into account, the proportion drops to a little over 93 percent) of China's nuclear arsenal, even after 34 years, have relevance only for China's immediate neighbours." [26](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note26) Besides some ICBMs and IRBMs, China has deployed a large number of medium-and short-range nuclear-tipped missiles and nuclear capable aircraft in Tibet. [27](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note27) As China has already signed a de-targeting agreement with Russia and the US, it is not clear where these nuclear weapons are aimed or intended to be aimed. These deployed nuclear weapons constitute a 'threat-in-being' to India. Also, China has lately modified its original no-first-use doctrine. "China's military strategists do not consider the use of nuclear weapons in their own territory as violating their NFU (no-first-use) doctrine." [28](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note28) Though China has never bothered to clarify the ambiguities inherent in this stand as it suits its purpose to play a guessing game, it can be deduced that since China clearly considers Taiwan as its own territory, the use of China's nuclear weapons during a war over Taiwan would not violate its no-first-use doctrine. As a corollary, Indian analysts are justified in concluding that as China has not renounced its claim over Arunachal Pradesh, or for that matter is still to recognise Sikkim, it may seriously consider the first use of tactical nuclear weapons during a border conflict with India in the future. China is continuing to modernise its nuclear and missile forces and tactical nuclear weapons, [29](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note29) including by acquiring Western technology through clandestine means. The US has claimed that China has acquired the technology for its W-88 nuclear warhead through illegal means. Notwithstanding the US claim and China's vigorous denial, it is clear that China is continuing to place immense emphasis on tactical nuclear weapons. It naturally follows that China's concept of fighting a 'limited war under high-tech conditions' includes a nuclear warfighting strategy. Hence, India may expect to witness Chinese mushroom clouds over the high Himalayas during a future Sino-Indian border war, particularly if the Chinese Military Region commander is convinced that Indian forces are gaining advantage at the operational level. Due to India's affinity and long-standing cultural links with the Tibetan people, India would naturally like to ensure that collateral damage in Tibet is scrupulously avoided. In fact, even more worrisome would be the long-term contamination of the Himalayan water sources. Since most of the Tibetan rivers drain into the Indian plains, it is in India's interest to ensure that nuclear exchanges over the Himalayan watershed are not allowed to occur. It is also for this reason that India must ensure that ADMs are not employed by either side during a Himalayan conflict, contrary to the proposals made by Bharat Karnad, [30](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note30) et al. How, then, is such a threat to be countered? Some Indian analysts argue that India must retaliate in kind on China's forward troops, firepower assets, headquarters, logistics support areas and communications choke points and that raising the ante and targeting Chinese cities would prove to be counter-productive as China has a much superior nuclear arsenal. In the unlikely event that China employs battlefield nuclear weapons against the Indian army on the grounds that it is justified in using them on the territory that it claims in 'self-defence', India will really have no option but to retaliate massively against Chinese cities and economic centres on China's well developed eastern seaboard. Only such a declaratory policy and matching operational plans will make the first use cost for China prohibitive. It is a moot point whether the loss of a single Chinese city would be acceptable to the proponents of the first use of battlefield nuclear weapons within the Chinese Central Military Commission

#### Only SMR’s solve – they’re uniquely key because of technology and grid capacity

IAEA 7 (“Economics of Nuclear Desalination: New Developments and Site Specific Studies”, July, <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/te_1561_web.pdf>)

Seventy percent of the planet is covered with water, but only 2.5% of that is fresh water. Nearly 70% of this fresh water is frozen in the icecaps of Antarctica and Greenland. Most of the rest is in the form of soil moisture or in deep inaccessible aquifers or comes in the form of heavy rains and floods that are difficult to contain and exploit. Consequently, only less than 0.008% (about 70 000 km3) of the world’s water is readily accessible for direct human use, and even that is very unevenly distributed. Recent statistics show that currently 2.3 billion people live in water-stressed areas and among them 1.7 billion live in water-scarce areas, where the water availability per person is less than 1000 m3/year. In fact, the situation is expected to worsen further since, by 2025, the number of people suffering from water stress or scarcity could swell to 3.5 billion, out of which 2.4 billion would live in water-scarce regions. Water scarcity is a global issue. Every year new countries are affected by growing water problems. It is for this reason that the Millennium Declaration by UN General Assembly in 2000 set up a target to halve, by the year 2015, the world population, which is unable to reach, or to afford, safe drinking water. Vision 21: shared vision for Hygiene, Water Supply and Sanitation, has a target to provide water, sanitation and hygiene for all by 2025. Better water conservation, water management, pollution control and water reclamation are all part of the integrated solution to projected water stresses. So too are new sources of fresh water, including the desalination of seawater. Desalination technologies have been well established since the mid-20th century and widely deployed in the Middle East and North Africa. The contracted capacity of desalination plants has increased steadily since 1965 and is now about 36 million m3/day worldwide, as shown in Figure 1. This capacity could cater to world’s population roughly 6 litres a day per capita of fresh potable water. If this capacity were available to 1.5 billion in the world without direct access to drinking water, it would provide approximately 20 litres/day/capita. Large scale commercially available desalination processes can generally be classified into two categories: (a) distillation processes that require mainly heat plus some electricity for ancillary equipment, and (b) membrane processes that require only electricity. In the first category (distillation) there are two major processes: multi-stage flash (MSF) and multi-effect distillation (MED). In both processes, seawater is heated; the steam that evaporates is condensed and collected as freshwater; and the residual brine is discharged. In the second category (membranes) is the reverse osmosis process (RO), in which pure water passes from the high-pressure seawater side of a semi-permeable membrane to the low-pressure freshwater side. The pressure differential must be high enough to overcome the natural tendency for water to move from the low concentration freshwater side of a membrane to the high concentration seawater side in order to balance osmotic pressures. The energy for the desalination plants is generally supplied in the form of either steam or electricity. Conventional fossil fuel-powered plants have normally been utilized as the primary sources but their intensive use raises increasing environmental concerns, specifically in relation to greenhouse gas emissions (Section 1.3.3). The depleting sources and the future price uncertainty of the fossil fuels and their better use for other vital industrial applications are also the factors to be considered. 1.3. THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN DESALINATION The world energy requirements are presently met from oil, coal, gas, hydro, nuclear and renewable energies in that order as shown in Table 1. It is now universally recognized that there will be an increase in the world’s requirement for electricity over the next few decades. The present trend towards meeting this demand includes the building of fossil fuel plants, particularly combined cycle gas fired plants. However, the spiralling increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions has resulted in setting the emission targets in international meetings held at Toronto, Rio de Janeiro and Kyoto. The IAEA predicts that the GHG emissions would be 36-50% higher by 2010 compared to 1990 levels. Many analysts, therefore, feel that the only viable alternative to fossil fuels is nuclear energy to reduce the rate of increase of GHG, particularly, carbon dioxide. Yet another incentive for nuclear power is to maintain diversity of supply. A national strategy limited to one particular form of energy (fossil fuels) will be vulnerable to increased fuel costs and pressures from exporting countries. Nuclear power is a proven technology, which has provided more than 16% of world electricity supply in over 30 countries. More than ten thousand reactor-years of operating experience have been accumulated over the past 5 decades. There are many reasons which favour a possible revival of the nuclear power production in the years to come. It is thus expected that this revival would also lead to an increased role of nuclear energy in non-electrical energy services, which, at the moment, are almost entirely dominated by fossil energy sources. Among various utilization of nuclear energy for non-electrical products, using it for the production of freshwater from seawater (nuclear desalination) has been drawing broad interest in the IAEA Member States as a result of acute water shortage issues in many arid and semi-arid zones worldwide. With technical co-ordination or support of the IAEA, several demonstration programs of nuclear desalination are also in progress in several Member States to confirm its technical and economical viability under country-specific conditions The desalination of seawater using nuclear energy is a feasible option to meet the growing demand for potable water. Over 175 reactor-years of operating experience on nuclear desalination have already been accumulated worldwide. 1.3.1. Nuclear desalination In the IAEA terminology, nuclear desalination is defined to be the production of potable water from seawater in a facility in which a nuclear reactor is used as the source of energy for the desalination process. Electrical and/or thermal energy may be used in the desalination process on the same site. The facility may be dedicated solely to the production of potable water, or may be used for the generation of electricity and production of potable water, in which case only a portion of the total energy output of the reactor is used for water production. The design approaches for a nuclear desalination plant are essentially derived from those of the nuclear reactor alone, with some additional aspects to be considered in the design of a desalination plant and its integration with the nuclear system. All nuclear reactor types can provide the energy required by the various desalination processes. In this regard, it has been shown that Small and Medium Reactors (**SMRs) offer the largest potential as coupling options to nuclear desalination systems in developing countries**. The development of innovative reactor concepts and fuel cycles with enhanced safety features as well as their attractive economics are expected to improve the public acceptance and further the prospects of nuclear desalination. The coupling with nuclear system is not difficult technically but needs some consideration in (a) avoiding cross-contamination by radioactivity, (b) providing backup heat or power sources in case the nuclear system is not in operation (e.g. for refuelling and maintenance), (c) incorporation of certain design features, minimising the impact of the thermal desalination systems’ coupling to the nuclear reactors (Section 1.6). 1.3.2. Why nuclear desalination? The International Atomic Energy Agency is a specialized organization of the UN system that seeks to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. The institutional basis for the IAEA’s involvement in nuclear desalination is in its Statute and Medium Term Strategy. Article II of the IAEA Statute provides that: “ The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world”. This refers implicitly to nuclear desalination as an option for the use of nuclear technologies. The same applies to the Article III of the Statute, which authorizes the IAEA: “ To encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world….”; (Article III, A.1); and “To foster the exchange of scientific and technical information on peaceful uses of atomic energy.” (Article III, A.3). In addition, Objective A.3 of the Agency’s Medium Term Strategy requires the Agency: “ To support and facilitate the development of new and emerging applications of nuclear technologies by co-generation and heat applications, including seawater desalination”. Request of assessing feasibility of using nuclear energy for seawater desalination was first made by the five North African countries to the IAEA in 1989 and the General Conference adopted its resolution to resume the study. These countries are located in semi-arid zones and already suffer from water shortages. In recent years, interests have been also been indicated by Member States in South and South East Asia for the feasibility, as well as the demonstration, of nuclear desalination projects. The issue has since then been repeatedly stressed at the General Conference (Committee on the Whole) and supported by many Member States including most members of Group-77. The support stems not only from their expectation of its possible contribution to the freshwater issue but has also been motivated by a variety of reasons that include: the economic competitiveness of nuclear desalination in areas lacking cheap hydropower or fossil fuel resources, energy supply diversification, conservation of fossil fuel resources and spin-off effects of nuclear technology for industrial development. Looking to the future, there are several reasons for focusing now on expanding nuclear power’s contribution to desalination. Apart from the expanding demand for freshwater and the increasing concern about GHG emissions and pollution from fossil fuels, **there is a renewed and growing emphasis on small** and medium sized nuclear **reactors, and this is particularly important for desalination because the countries most in need of new sources of freshwater often have limited industrial infrastructures and relatively weaker electricity grids**. The size of the grid limits the possibilities for integrating a co-generating nuclear power plant into the grid to supply the electricity market, in addition to meeting the energy requirements of a desalination plant. The largest power unit that can be integrated into an electricity grid must not exceed about 10-20 % of the total grid capacity. Of course, smaller nuclear reactors would be more appropriate for remote areas that are not suitable for connections to the grid. For nuclear desalination to be attractive in any given country, two conditions have to be satisfied simultaneously: a lack of water and the ability to use nuclear energy for desalination. In most regions, only one of the two is present. Both are present for example **in China**, the Republic of **Korea, India and Pakistan**. These regions already account for almost half the world’s population, and thus represent a potential long term market for nuclear desalination. The market will expand further to the extent that regions with high projected water needs, such as the Middle East and North Africa, increase their nuclear expertise and capabilities. 1.3.3. Environmental impact of desalination by fossil fuelled energy sources Desalination is an energy intensive process. A future desalination strategy based only on the use of fossil fuelled systems is not sustainable: Fossil fuel reserves are finite and must be conserved for more important uses such as transport, petrochemical industry etc. Besides, the demands for desalted water would continue increasing as population grows and standards of living improve. Conservation measures such as the modernisation of water networks to minimise leakages, the recycling of used water etc. will certainly reduce the future water demands slightly but they would not be able to halt the dissemination of desalination plants and consequently of the fossil fuelled based systems for the production of needed electricity and heat. The following paragraphs illustrate the damaging consequences of such a policy by taking the example of the Mediterranean region. Following the recent “Blue Plan” [2], the total available natural water resources (1), based on the statistics from 1990 to 1998, in the principle countries of the Mediterranean region, are as shown in Table 2. The projected demands (3) for the year 2025 [31] are also included in Table 1. It is obvious that available natural water resources would rather decrease in 2025 because of increased pollution, over exploitation and other human activities. However, to keep matters simple, it would be supposed that they would remain at the same level as in 1998. It can be observed that, in 2025, the total projected water deficit (balance) in the Mediterranean region would of the order of 294 km3/per year. Not all this required capacity would be met by desalination plants. Current contribution of desalination is of the order of 1 to 2 %. If it is supposed that in 2025, this contribution would be about 2.5 %, then the total required desalting capacity would be 7.3 km3/year (20.1 million m3/day). According to the EC ExternE study2, the total emissions of GHG per MW(e).h of electricity produced by representative fossil fuelled power plants in France, are as presented in Table 3. The specific heat and electricity consumptions of three main desalination plants are given in Table 4, [3]. The data presented in the above Tables allows to calculate the approximate3 total GHG emissions produced by the fossil fuelled plants and the three desalination plants. Results for a total desalting capacity of 20.1 million m3/day are presented in Table 5. It can thus be concluded that for a desalting capacity of 20.1 million m3/day in the Mediterranean region alone, required in 2025, one would produce, depending upon the energy source and the desalination process used, 13 to 264 million tonnes/year of CO2. 1350 to 1 310 000 tonnes/year of SOx. 21 100 to 540 000 tonnes/year of NOx. 1190 to 40 000 tonnes/year of particles. The potential levels of GHG and particle emissions on the world scale could then be more than double these figures. **These could naturally be avoided through the use of nuclear energy.**

# Navy 4 2AC v USMA BS

### Tax Incentives 2ac [Long]

#### We meet – production cost incentives include direct payment funding

Rosner and Goldberg 11 – William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor in the Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Physics at the University of Chicago, and Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory (Robert and Stephen, November. “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.” <https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf>)

Production Cost Incentive: A production cost incentive is a performance-based incentive. With a production cost incentive, the government incentive would be triggered only when the project successfully operates. The project sponsors would assume full responsibility for the upfront capital cost and would assume the full risk for project construction. The production cost incentive would establish a target price, a so-called “market-based benchmark.” Any savings in energy generation costs over the target price would accrue to the generator. Thus, a production cost incentive would provide a strong motivation for cost control and learning improvements, since any gains greater than target levels would enhance project net cash flow. Initial SMR deployments, without the benefits of learning, will have significantly higher costs than fully commercialized SMR plants and thus would benefit from production cost incentives. Because any production cost differential would decline rapidly due to the combined effect of module manufacturing rates and learning experience, the financial incentive could be set at a declining rate, and the level would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis, based on the achievement of cost reduction targets. 43 The key design parameters for the incentive include the following: 1. The magnitude of the deployment incentive should decline with the number of SMR modules and should phase out after the fleet of LEAD and FOAK plants has been deployed. 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly. 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit. 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly. 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit.

#### Counter-interpretation – “Financial incentives” means exchange of money, credits and reduction in price paid

Montana Secretary of State 94 (“CASHING PAYROLL CHECKS -- DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES,” Rule: 23.16.3502, 10-28, http://www.mtrules.org/gateway/ruleno.asp?RN=23.16.3502)

23.16.3502 CASHING PAYROLL CHECKS -- DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

(1) A licensee may not offer financial incentives or conduct promotional games of chance in connection with an offer to cash payroll checks on the premises.

(2) A "financial incentive," means any inducement involving the payment of money, any reduction in price paid for goods or services, or any award of credit.

## Prolif

### A2: Nat Gas Blocks

#### SMRs are competitive with natural gas

Skutnik, 11

[Skutnik, Steve. Assistant Professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Tennessee; regular contributor toThe Neutron Economy. His areas of research expertise include nuclear fuel cycles, waste management, and nuclear nonproliferation. “Small Modular Reactors and the Economics of Nuclear,” The Neutron Economy. Saturday, June 25, 2011. http://neutroneconomy.blogspot.com/2011/06/excellent-op-ed-on-small-modular.html]

SMRs have the potential to change the economics of the game by several means. First, many proposed SMR designs are engineered to be mass-produced and pre-fabricated in factories, rather than built on-site. This could tremendously push down prices while also shortening construction times, thus ameliorating what is currently one of nuclear's biggest weaknesses at the moment. Meanwhile, the "small" in SMRs also may have potentially positive implications for both cost and safety: SMRs can be potentially built into the ground, using the surrounding earth as containment, due to their relatively small size. Given the lower total power and nuclear material within the reactor, it can be said to have a lower overall "radiological footprint," meaning simplified safety planning. Finally, the "right-size" power of SMR capacity may allow them to be sold in a greater number of markets - places both where a new full-sized reactor is too big for the needs of a community (for example, Fort Calhoun, north of Omaha, is the smallest reactor in the U.S. nuclear fleet, clocking in at only 500 MW; compare this to currently proposed new reactor designs, which begin in the neighborhood of 1000-1100 MW). Likewise, the smaller size means that for utilities only looking to incrementally expand capacity, small reactors may prove to be competitive with alternatives such as natural gas turbines.

#### Natural gas prices rising – industrial and electricity demand

Lackey 12 (Mark, energy analyst with CHF Investor Relations, “This Is Your Energy Entry Point: Mark Lackey,” 8-30-12, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/14243>)

Natural gas has been somewhat weaker, but it bounced off the $2/thousand cubic feet (Mcf) price a few months ago up to the $2.85–3/Mcf range in North America. With more industrial demand coming back, particularly in the auto sector, and stronger demand from electric utilities, gas should move back up closer to $3.25–3.30/Mcf in the next year. By way of comparison, prices in Europe can be anywhere from $4–8/Mcf, and in China they're as high as $15/Mcf.

## Off

**Heg Bad Disad**

**Plus decline causes aggression- triggers the impact**

**Snyder 07**

Robert and Renee Belfer Professor of International Relations at Columbia University

[Jack “FREE HAND ABROAD, DIVIDE AND RULE AT HOME: THE DOMESTIC POLITICS OF UNIPOLARITY” (http://www.henryfarrell.net/unipolarity.pdf)]

Plausible as these arguments may be, the opposite case may be equally plausible. States that are under intense international pressure may be especially vulnerable to myth-ridden foreign policies. Hostile encirclements heighten the enemy images, bunker mentalities, and double standards in perception that are common in competitive relationships of all kinds, especially in international relations. 9 Nationalist and garrison-state ideologies are reinforced. Likewise, Charles Kupchan argues that declining empires typically adopt strategic ideologies of aggressive forward defense out of fear that their opponents will discover the truth about their growing weakness. 10 In contrast, diplomatic historians commonly applaud the pragmatism of powerful “off-shore balancers,” whose privileged position grants them the freedom to be selective and fact-driven, waiting upon developments before committing troops. Whether powerful, unconstrained states are more ideological than weaker or highly constrained states depends greatly on their domestic politics, not simply their position in the international system. 11 Krasner’s corollary hypothesis—that powerful or unconstrained states are likely to succumb to an ideology of expansionism—is also an oversimplification. Powerful, secure states have the option to express their ideological values in the world through coercion, but they also have other options. They might choose to engage with the world pragmatically, taking what they need and ignoring the global problems that good fortune insulates them from. Or they might adopt a highly principled foreign policy that increases humanitarian assistance abroad, but eschews empire and declines to meddle in the internal politics of foreign peoples. Finally, they might be tempted by policies of limited liability, embarking on good works and moralistic hectoring abroad, but then heading for the exits when backlash makes costs rise. 12 Simply being powerful says little about whether or how ideology will express itself.

There will be a short term transition war

Posen and Ross 97

[Barry Posen, Professor of Political Science in the Defense and Arms Control Studies Program at MIT, Andrew Ross, Professor of National Security Studies at the Naval War College, International Security, Winter 1997]

The United States can, more easily than most, go it alone. Yet we do not find the arguments of the neo-isolationists compelling. Their strategy serves U.S. interests only if they are narrowly construed. First, though the neo-isolationists have a strong case in their argument that the United States is currently quite secure, disengagement is unlikely to make the United States more secure, and would probably make it less secure. The disappearance of the United States from the world stage would likely precipitate a good deal of competition abroad for security. Without a U.S. presence, aspiring regional hegemons would see more opportunities. States formerly defended by the United States would have to look to their own military power; local arms competitions are to be expected. Proliferation of nuclear weapons would intensify if the U.S. nuclear guarantee were withdrawn. Some states would seek weapons of mass destruction because they were simply unable to compete conventionally with their neighbors. This new flurry of competitive behavior would probably energize many hypothesized immediate causes of war, including preemptive motives, preventive motives, economic motives, and the propensity for miscalculation**. There would** like **be more war. W**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction **might be used in** some of **the wars**, with unpleasant effects even for those not directly involved.

And we’ll always pursue heg

Shalmon and Horowitz 09

(Dan, Mike, Total B.A.’s, Orbis, Spring)

It is important to recognize at the outset two key points about United States strategy and the potential costs and benefits for the United States in a changing security environment. First, the United States is very likely to remain fully engaged in global affairs. Advocates of restraint or global withdrawal, while popular in some segments of academia, remain on the margins of policy debates in Washington D.C. This could always change, of course. However, at present, it is a given that the United States will define its interests globally and pursue a strategy that requires capable military forces able to project power around the world. Because ‘‘indirect’’ counter-strategies are the rational choice for actors facing a strong state’s power projection, irregular/asymmetric threats are inevitable given America’s role in the global order.24

**AT: Light-Water Reactor**

**SMRs can’t meltdown – cooling system is irrelevant – its about fuel quantitities**

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less. So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

**Light water SMRs can’t produce a nuclear weapon**

**Kuznetsov 8** – former Lead Researcher at the Kurchatov Institute (Russia) (Vladimir, March-August. “Options for small and medium sized reactors (SMRs) to overcome loss of economies of scale and incorporate increased proliferation resistance and energy security” Progress in Nuclear Energ Vol 50 issues 2-6, p 248. ScienceDirect)

For many less developed countries, these are the features of enhanced proliferation resistance and increased robustness of barriers for sabotage protection that may ensure the progress of nuclear power. All NPPs with innovative SMRs will provide for the implementation of the established safeguards veriﬁcation procedures under the agreements of member states with the IAEA. In addition to this, many innovative **SMRs offer** certain **intrinsic proliferation resistance features to prevent the misuse, diversion or undeclared production of ﬁssile materials and/or to facilitate the implementation of safeguards** (IAEA, 2006b). For example, many of **water-cooled SMRs employ low enrichment uranium and once-through fuel cycle as basic options**. Therefore, **the features contributing to proliferation resistance of such SMRs are essentially similar to that of presently operated PWRs and BWRs. They also include an unattractive isotopic composition of the plutonium in the discharged fuel, and radiation barriers provided by the spent fuel. The intrinsic proliferation resistance features** common to all HTGRs **include high fuel burn-up** (low residual inventory of plutonium, high content of 240 Pu); a **difﬁcult to process fuel matrix; radiation barriers; and a low ratio of ﬁssile to fuelblock/fuel-pebble** mass. Although several HTGRs make a provision for reprocessing of the TRISO fuel, the corresponding technology has not been established yet and, until such time as when the technology becomes readily available, the lack of the technology is assumed to provide an enhanced proliferation resistance. All liquid metal cooled SMRs are fast reactors that can ensure a self-sustainable operation on ﬁssile materials or realize fuel breeding to feed other reactors present in nuclear energy systems. In both cases, and **if the fuel cycle is closed, the need of fuel enrichment and relevant uranium enrichment facilities would be eliminated, which is a factor contributing to enhanced proliferation resistance. Other features to enhance proliferation resistance of fast reactors are** the following: **No separation of plutonium and uranium at any fuel cycle stage and leaving a small** (1e2% by weight) fr**action of ﬁssion products permanently in the fuel; Denaturing of the ﬁssile materials,** e.g., through the optimization of the core design to achieve a higher content of 238 Pu in the plutonium, to preclude the possibility of weapon production via securing an inadmissibly high level of residual heat of the plutonium fuel e the 238 Pu/Pu ratio needed to achieve this still needs to be deﬁned adequately.

**Light water SMRs solve radioactive waste**

**Szondy 12** [David Szondy, Writer for Gizmag, “Feature: Small Modular Nuclear Reactors- The Future Of Energy. February 16, 2012”, <http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/>, Chetan]

**Small light-water reactors** aren't as efficient as their larger cousins, but they **have a number of advantages.** Steam is produced in a nuclear plant by passing a loop of cooling water from the reactor through the steam generator, which is a separate vessel filled with coiling pipes. The hot cooling water enters the generator and as it runs through the pipes a second coil filled with water is heated by the water from the reactor. This changes to steam, which turns the turbines that turns the dynamos. On a conventional reactor, most types have the steam generator outside the reactor vessel. **With light-water SMRs, the steam generator can be placed inside the vessel. This** not only **makes the reactor** more compact and self-contained, but it also makes it **much safer. One** common **problem** in reactors **is radioactive water leaking** as it travels from the reactor to the steam generator. **With the steam generator** inside the reactor vessel, **it's the much safer situation of only non-radioactive water/steam going into and out of the reactor vessel.**

**That solves terror and marine biodiversity**

**Haskell, 8** – Physicist and Senior Science Fellow at the Institute of Energy and Environmental Research (Hugh, 10/14. “Nuclear power: the negatives.” <http://www.newsobserver.com/opinion/columns/story/1254081.html>)

WASTE. Nuclear generation is the only source of electric power that creates seriously dangerous waste for which no acceptable means of disposal yet exists. Long-term storage at Yucca Mountain in Nevada is mired in bureaucratic, political, cost and scientific quagmires, and its opening, if ever, is now 2020 or later, by which time there will be enough waste stored at reactor sites around the country to fill it, even if we build no new reactors. Geologists have raised legitimate concerns about the feasibility of Yucca Mountain to protect the material stored there for the requisite thousands of years. DOE admits that it must create "engineered" barriers within the storage area to prevent leakage into local ground water -- the natural barriers assumed to exist when Yucca Mountain was chosen have been shown to be inadequate. Meanwhile waste has nowhere to go and piles up at reactors, becoming an **increasingly attractive target for terrorists**. WATER. Keeping the reactor cool and condensing the steam from the generating turbines demand a large and reliable supply of water -- upwards of 20 million gallons of water is evaporated into the atmosphere daily from a typical nuclear plant with a closed-cycle cooling system. According to Progress Energy, operating the two proposed reactors at Shearon-Harris would require raising the level of Harris Lake by 20 feet (thereby intercepting runoff that would otherwise go to the Cape Fear River) to provide sufficient cooling water. Replacing the water evaporated in the cooling process will require withdrawing up to 87 million gallons per day from the Cape Fear River itself. During times of water scarcity, reactors may have to be shut down for safety reasons, as happened at the Browns Ferry reactor in Alabama during the 2007 drought. In addition, cooling water discharged into a river or the ocean re-enters the stream at a higher temperature which can have **detrimental effects on downstream marine life**

**Marine life solves extinction**

**Craig 3** (Robin Kundis, Associate Prof Law, Indiana U School Law, Lexis)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems **impairs the planet's ability to support life**. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems.Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: **if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves**, and we will take most of the biosphere with us.

**Even a failed terrorist attack causes extinction**

**Sid-Ahmed 4**, political analyst 04 (Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

**What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the** new and frightening **world in which we are now living**. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, **tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate**. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is **if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious.** Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. **When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers**.

### Immigration Reform 2AC

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### No impact

Tellis 2 (Ashley, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Orbis, Winter, p. 19)

In any event, the saving grace that mutes the potential for exacerbated competition between both countries remains their relatively strong economic constraints. At the Pakistani end, these constraints are structural: Islamabad simply has no discretionary resources to fritter away on an open-ended arms race, and it could not acquire resources for this purpose without fundamentally transforming the nature of the Pakistani state itself—which transformation, if it occurs successfully, would actually mitigate many of the corrosive forces that currently drive Islamabad’s security competition with India. [21](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808#fn22#fn22) At the Indian end, these constraints may be more self-imposed. New Delhi commands a large pool of national resources that could be siphoned off and reallocated to security instruments, but the current weaknesses of the central government’s public finances and its reform program, coupled with its desire to complete the technological modernization programs that have been underway for many decades, prevents it from enlarging the budgetary allocations for strategic acquisitions at will. [22](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808#fn23#fn23) With these constraints on both sides, future nuclearization in India and Pakistan is more likely to resemble an "arms crawl" than a genuine Richardson-type "arms race." The strategic capabilities on both sides will increase incrementally but slowly—and in India will have further to go because of its inferior capabilities compared to China’s. This slowness may be the best outcome from the viewpoint both of the two South Asian competitors and the United States.

#### Relations don’t solve

**Tellis 5** (Ashley, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues. 11/16/05 “The U.S.-India ''Global Partnership'': How Significant for American Interests? ““<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17693>)

Several practical implications, which ought to be of significance to the Congress as it ponders the U.S.-Indian civilian nuclear agreement, flow from these realities. To begin with, the strengthening U.S.-Indian relationship does not imply that New Delhi will become a formal alliance partner of Washington at some point in the future. It also does not imply that India will invariably be an uncritical partner of the United States in its global endeavors. India’s large size, its proud history, and its great ambitions, ensure that it will likely march to the beat of its own drummer, at least most of the time. The first question, for the Congress in particular and for the United States more generally, therefore, ought not to be, “What will India do for us?”—as critics of the civilian nuclear agreement often assert. Rather, the real question ought to be, “Is a strong, democratic, (even if perpetually) independent, India in American national interest?” If, as I believe, this is the fundamental question and if, as I further believe, the answer to this question is “Yes,” then the real discussion about the evolution of the U.S.-Indian relationship ought to focus on how the United States can assist the growth of Indian power, and how it can do so at minimal cost (if that is relevant) to any other competing national security objectives.

#### Won’t pass – GOP doesn’t support Obama’s proposal

Winstrom 1-14 (Brent D., “Kobach: Obama immigration proposal ‘out of touch’,” http://www.kansas.com/2013/01/14/2636023/kobach-obama-immigration-proposal.html#storylink=cpy)

President Obama must not be very serious about immigration reform because the proposal outlined over the weekend is out of touch with sentiments in the U.S. House and with the American public, said Kris Kobach, one of the nation’s leading anti-illegal immigration advocates and Kansas’ secretary of state. “Instead of going for limited reform, he’s asking for the full monty,” Kobach told The Eagle on Monday. Kobach said he thinks the proposal, which calls for a path to citizenship for most of the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants in the country, is set up to divide Congress into groups for and against amnesty to make Democrats look like champions of an important voter block – Hispanics. Hispanics proved to be a key demographic in Obama’s victory in November over Republican Mitt Romney, and many Democrats have urged Obama to seize on the opportunity to push for a massive overhaul of the nation’s immigration laws. Reports over the weekend said Obama’s plan would require illegal immigrants to pay back taxes and other fines while also adding more visas and creating a guest-worker program. It also would require employers to verify the legal status of new workers. Kobach agrees with verifying the legal status of workers, but he said allowing a path to citizenship could add more than $2 trillion to the nation’s debt if illegal immigrants become eligible for Medicaid, Medicare and other benefits. He acknowledged illegal immigrants would be paying taxes, but he said because many of them are low-skill workers it wouldn’t make up for the additional costs. “You’re basically giving citizenship to people who will be a fiscal drag on the economy,” he said.

#### PC not key, Obama’s PC fails, He has no leverage, and Hagel trumps

#### Gun control and budget battles sidelines immigration reform.

**Bennett**, **12/30**/2012 (Brian, Immigration reform could get overshadowed in Congress, Los Angeles Times, p. <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/dec/30/nation/la-na-immigration-20121230>)

The window to pass immigration laws next year is narrowing as the effort competes with a renewed debate over gun laws and the lingering fight over taxes and the budget, according to congressional staffers and outside advocates. Key congressional committees are preparing for a package of gun control laws to be negotiated and possibly introduced in Congress during the first few months of next year. The shift would push the debate in Congress over immigration reform into the spring. But as budget negotiations continue to stir tensions between Republicans and Democrats, and as lobbyists take to their corners over gun laws, some are concerned that the heated atmosphere could spoil the early signs of bipartisan cooperation on immigration that emerged after the election.

#### Link is non-unique – Obama has already pushed and taken credit for incentives towards SMRs – that’s the 1ac Koch evidence

#### Nuclear power has tons of political support.

Koplow, ‘11

[Doug, founder of Earth Track, Inc., has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for more than 20 years, mainly in the energy sector, holds a B.A. in economics from Wesleyan University, M.B.A. from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Union of Concerned Scientists, February, “Nuclear Power: Still Not Viable Without Subsidies,” http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_subsidies\_report.pdf]

The industry and its allies are now pressuring all levels of government for large new subsidies to support the construction and operation of a new generation of reactors and fuel-cycle facilities. The substantial political support the industry has attracted thus far rests largely on an uncritical acceptance of the industry’s economic claims and an incomplete understanding of the subsidies that made—and continue to make—the existing nuclear fleet possible.

#### Double bind – no PC now because Obama just used it on the fiscal cliff, and if he does it proves winners win

**Green 10** 6/11/10 – professor of political science at Hofstra University (David Michael Green, 6/11/10, " The Do-Nothing 44th President ", http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html)

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around**.** This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

#### Not intrinsic – a logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform

#### Fiscal cliff kills immigration reform.

Wall Street Journal, **1/1**/2013 (Lack of Grand Bargain Complicates Obama’s Priorities, p. ht**t**p://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323635504578216253683816078.html)

Historically, second-term presidents have had a limited window to roll out major policy proposals before lame-duck status sets in and passing significant legislation becomes a steeper challenge. With that in mind, Mr. Obama has said he would roll out proposals aimed at reducing gun violence and overhauling immigration laws early this year. The White House view is that Mr. Obama would have been ill-positioned to pass policy priorities if the country was still preoccupied with the effects of having gone over the fiscal cliff. But now, because lawmakers postponed for two months the spending cuts that were set to take effect Wednesday, fiscal issues will continue to consume much of the political oxygen in the near future. So will talks about whether to raise the nation's statutory borrowing limit. Even in the best of times, issues such as immigration and gun control are flash points for the political parties, said William Galston, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a former policy adviser to President Bill Clinton. The past couple of months suggest that these aren't the best of times in Washington, he said. "Whatever hope [Mr. Obama] may have had of changing the tone in Washington must have disappeared by now," he said. "It's an unpleasant discovery that the election appears to have changed much less and settled much less than he at least hoped."

#### SMRs have bipartisan support

Sullivan 10 (Mary Anne Sullivan – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Daniel F. Stenger – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Amy C. Roma – Senior associate in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Are Small Reactors the Next Big Thing in Nuclear?, November 2010, Electric Light & Power, Nov/Dec2010, Vol. 88 Issue 6, p46)

Congress SMRs have enjoyed **bipartisan support** in Congress. The House Committee on Science and Technology and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have approved similar legislation designed to promote the development and deployment of SMRs along the lines the DOE has proposed. Promoting SMR development in legislation has its price. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the Senate bill would cost $407 million over the next five years to support cost-sharing programs with private companies for the development of two standard SMR designs. Costs for the out-years were not included in the estimate, but the bill would require the DOE to obtain NRC design certifications for the reactors by 2018 and to secure combined construction and operating licenses by Jan. 1, 2021. If Congress can pass an energy bill, it seems likely the bill **will support SMRs**. Even in the absence of new authorizing legislation, however, **appropriations bills** that must be passed to **keep the government running** almost certainly will contain strong support for the DOE's research and development program for SMRs. SMRs respond to a critical suite of power needs: reliable, low-carbon, baseload generation at a manageable capital cost for even small utilities. But as with many other power solutions, much still needs to happen to realize the promise

#### The GOP won’t support CIR --- momentum hasn’t changed.

San Francisco **Chronicle**, **12/31**/2012 (Congress Dysfunction as Deadline Arrives Poses 2013 Risks, p. http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Congress-Dysfunction-as-Deadline-Arrives-Poses-4157560.php#page-3)

“Boehner and his Republican conference will have leverage over the Democrats on raising the debt ceiling,” Bonjean said. “You will see the first quarter of the year being dominated by spending cuts and entitlement reform as a permission slip for the Democrats to raise the debt ceiling.” That suggests more roadblocks for Obama’s agenda even after his decisive re-election in November. “Immigration is going to be a very tough issue for Republicans to tackle,” Bonjean said. “Coming off a very bruising fiscal cliff fight, pivoting to immigration is going to be more troublesome for Republicans to coalesce around the plan.” Obama’s re-election “doesn’t mean he should get everything he wants” yet “it certainly means that everything he reasonably proposes should get a fair hearing,” said Representative Rob Andrews, a New Jersey Democrat.

#### Not intrinsic – a logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform

**Obama pushing SMRS now**

**Silverstein 1/15** (Ken– Editor-In-Chief for Energy Central's EnergyBiz Insider, research focus in economics and energy policy, MBA, MA “After Fukushima, U.S. Seeks to Advance Small Nuclear Reactors,” 1/15/12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2013/01/15/after-fukushima-u-s-seeks-to-advance-small-nuclear-reactors/)

“Restarting the nation’s nuclear industry and advancing small modular reactor technologies will help create new jobs and export opportunities for American workers and businesses, and ensure we continue to take an all-of-the-above approach to American energy production,” says Energy Secretary Steven Chu. To that end, the Obama administration is partnering with Babcock & Wilcox and Bechtel to develop those smaller nuclear reactors for the federally-owned utility Tennessee Valley Authority. The Department of Energy is expected to invest about $450 million in the project, which equates to roughly half of the overall cost. Industry will pony up the other half. Babcock builds smaller nuclear units of 100 megawatts, which can also be aggregated together to supply as much power as a base-load nuclear generator, or 1,000 megawatts. The modules are stored underground. Christopher Mowry, president of Babcock, says that TVA should expect to have those units running by 2020. Beyond the federal wholesaler of electricity, he says that other potential clients exist: smaller utilities that can only afford to make “bite size” investments in nuclear energy that include the electric cooperatives and municipalities.

#### Obama won’t push CIR --- other priorities.

**Daily Caller**, **12/31**/2012 (Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest, p. <http://dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/>)

However, Obama’s language suggested that increased Latino immigration is a lower priority for him than other measures, and that he’s concerned any revamp would fail because of public opposition. Many previous immigration reform bills have died when leading supporters quietly backed away amid furious public opposition to what was perceived as an attempt at a general amnesty. In 2007, then-Sen. Obama voted against a temporary-worker provision in a pending immigration bill, helping kill the overall legislation. During his first term as president, Obama declined to push a comprehensive immigration bill, despite promising such a revamp while on the 2008 campaign trail. In his NBC interview, Obama showed more enthusiasm about other priorities. “We’ve got a huge opportunity around energy,” he said, “The most immediate thing I’ve got to do … is make sure that taxes are not going up on middle class families,” he claimed. Another priority, he added, is “rebuilding our infrastructure, which is broken.”

#### Weak labor market deters effective immigration reform.

**Grant**, **12/28**/2012 (David, Immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility now?, Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/1228/Immigration-reform-Is-amnesty-a-possibility-now>)

Moreover, increasing legal immigration above the current level of 1 million annually could be seen as a blow to those born in America. Hurting "the American worker with bad immigration policy is not going to get [Republicans] more Hispanic votes," says Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, a group that advocates lower immigration levels. "They've got to do something else." In that respect, increasing legal immigration might be a difficult sell in 2013. "I do not see Congress acting in this area in a robust way until the labor market is stronger," says Andrew Schoenholtz, deputy director for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. "Just how strong is hard to tell."

#### Immigration is not a priority --- promises of action will not fast track it.

**Voorhees**, **1/3**/2013 (Josh – editor of The Slatest, White House (Quietly) Promises Immigration Push, Slate, p. http://www.slate.com/blogs/the\_slatest/2013/01/03/obama\_s\_immigration\_plans\_white\_house\_officials\_suggest\_early\_2013\_won\_t.html)

With one fiscal-cliff fight in the rearview mirror and several more likely looming not too far up the road, many liberals are fretting aloud that President Obama won't have the energy or desire to tackle other issues near the top of his—and their—second-term wish list. White House officials, however, are doing their best to allay those concerns with the (somewhat quiet) promise of action on two high-profile issues: immigration and gun control. The Huffington Post: An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. In the wake of last month's tragedy in Newtown, the president promised to send a gun-control proposal to Congress early this year, likely as soon as this month. The suggestion that the White House will also get to work on immigration reform—long a priority of the president but one that has largely taken a back seat during his time in office—comes as slightly more of a surprise. However, just because the administration is declaring that an unofficial launch to the immigration push is imminent doesn't mean anyone should expect major action anytime soon. The aides who laid out the plans to HuffPo cautioned that it would probably take about two months to cobble together a bipartisan bill, and then another few before either chamber votes on it. That would mean that if all goes as planned (something that is far from certain) it would likely be early or mid-summer before any concrete actions are taken.

### K 2AC

#### -- Alt fails – wishful calls for revamping sovereignty do nothing – simultaneous political action is vital to prevent short-term threats to survival

Lombardi 96 (Mark Owen, Associate Professor of Political Science – Tampa, Perspectives on Third-World Sovereignty, p. 161)

Sovereignty is in our collective minds. What we look at, the way we look at it and what we expect to see must be altered. This is the call for international scholars and actors. The assumptions of the paradigm will dictate the solution and approaches considered. Yet, a mere call to change this structure of the system does little except activate reactionary impulses and intellectual retrenchment. Questioning the very precepts of sovereignty, as has been done in many instances, does not in and of itself address the problems and issues so critical to transnational relations. That is why theoretical changes and paradigm shifts must be coterminous with applicative studies. One does not and should not precede the other. We cannot wait until we have a neat self-contained and accurate theory of transnational relations before we launch into studies of Third-World issues and problem-solving. If we wait we will never address the latter and arguably most important issue-area: the welfare and quality of life for the human race.

#### --No root causes AND war turns the K – no risk of a turn

Goldstein 03 (Joshua, Prof of Int'l Relations @ American University, War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, p. 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 influence 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 (gender 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 towards 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.**

#### Lacanian theory is non-falsifiable and tautological – stavrakakis is wrong

Robinson 5 (Andrew, Early Career Fellow in the School of Politics – University of Nottingham, “The Political Theory of Constitutive Lack: A Critique”, Theory & Event, 8(1))

Lacanian analysis consists mainly of an exercise in projection.  As a result, Lacanian "explanations" often look more propagandistic or pedagogical than explanatory.  A particular case is dealt with only in order to, and to the extent that it can, confirm the already-formulated structural theory.  Judith Butler criticizes Zizek's method on the grounds that 'theory is applied to its examples', as if 'already true, prior to its exemplification'.  'The theory is articulated on its self-sufficiency, and then shifts register only for the pedagogical purpose of illustrating an already accomplished truth'.  It is therefore 'a theoretical fetish that disavows the conditions of its own emergence'[52](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn52).  She alleges that Lacanian psychoanalysis 'becomes a theological project' and also 'a way to avoid the rather messy psychic and social entanglement' involved in studying specific cases[53](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn53" \o ").  Similarly, Dominick LaCapra objects to the idea of constitutive lack because specific 'losses cannot be adequately addressed when they are enveloped in an overly generalised discourse of absence... Conversely, absence at a "foundational" level cannot simply be derived from particular historical losses'[54](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn54).  Attacking 'the long story of conflating absence with loss that becomes constitutive instead of historical'[55](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn55" \o "), he accuses several theorists of eliding the difference between absence and loss, with 'confusing and dubious results', including a 'tendency to avoid addressing historical problems, including losses, in sufficiently specific terms', and a tendency to 'enshroud, perhaps even to etherealise, them in a generalised discourse of absence'[56](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn56).  Daniel Bensa’d draws out the political consequences of the projection of absolutes into politics.  'The fetishism of the absolute event involves... a suppression of historical intelligibility, necessary to its depoliticization'.  The space from which politics is evacuated 'becomes... a suitable place for abstractions, delusions and hypostases'.  Instead of actual social forces, there are 'shadows and spectres'[57](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn57).      The operation of the logic of projection is predictable.  According to Lacanians, there is a basic structure (sometimes called a 'ground' or 'matrix') from which all social phenomena arise, and this structure, which remains unchanged in all eventualities, is the reference-point from which particular cases are viewed.  The "fit" between theory and evidence is constructed monologically by the reduction of the latter to the former, or by selectivity in inclusion and reading of examples.  At its simplest, the Lacanian myth functions by a short-circuit between a particular instance and statements containing words such as "all", "always", "never", "necessity" and so on.  A contingent example or a generic reference to "experience" is used, misleadingly, to found a claim with supposed universal validity.  For instance, Stavrakakis uses the fact that existing belief-systems are based on exclusions as a basis to claim that all belief-systems are necessarily based on exclusions[58](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn58), and claims that particular traumas express an 'ultimate impossibility'[59](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn59).  Similarly, Laclau and Mouffe use the fact that a particular antagonism can disrupt a particular fixed identity to claim that the social as such is penetrated and constituted by antagonism as such[60](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn60).  Phenomena are often analysed as outgrowths of something exterior to the situation in question.  For instance, Zizek 's concept of the "social symptom" depends on a reduction of the acts of one particular series of people (the "socially excluded", "fundamentalists", Serbian paramilitaries, etc.) to a psychological function in the psyche of a different group (westerners).  The "real" is a supposedly self-identical principle which is used to reduce any and all qualitative differences between situations to a relation of formal equivalence.  This shows how mythical characteristics can be projected from the outside, although it also raises different problems: the under-conceptualization of the relationship between individual psyches and collective phenomena in Lacanian theory, and a related tendency for psychological concepts to acquire an ersatz agency similar to that of a Marxian fetish.  "The Real" or "antagonism" occurs in phrases which have it doing or causing something.      As Barthes shows, myth offers the psychological benefits of empiricism without the epistemological costs.  Tautology, for instance, is 'a minor ethical salvation, the satisfaction of having militated in favour of a truth... without having to assume the risks which any somewhat positive search for truth inevitably involves'[61](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn61).  It dispenses with the need to have ideas, while treating this release as a stern morality.  Tautology is a rationality which simultaneously denies itself, in which 'the accidental failure of language is magically identified with what one decides is a natural resistance of the object'[62](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn62).      This passage could almost have been written with the "Lacanian Real" in mind.  The characteristic of the Real is precisely that one can invoke it without defining it (since it is "beyond symbolization"), and that the accidental failure of language, or indeed a contingent failure in social praxis, is identified with an ontological resistance to symbolization projected into Being itself.  For instance, Zizek 's classification of the Nation as a Thing rests on the claim that 'the only way we can determine it is by... empty tautology', and that it is a 'semantic void'[63](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn63).  Similarly, he claims that 'the tautological gesture of the Master-Signifier', an empty performative which retroactively turns presuppositions into conclusions, is necessary, and also that tautology is the only way historical change can occur[64](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn64).  He even declares constitutive lack (in this case, termed the "death drive") to be a tautology[65](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn65). Lacanian references to "the Real" or "antagonism" as the cause of a contingent failure are reminiscent of Robert Teflon's definition of God: 'an explanation which means "I have no explanation"'[66](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn66" \o ").  An "ethics of the Real" is a minor ethical salvation which says very little in positive terms, but which can pose in macho terms as a "hard" acceptance of terrifying realities.  It authorizes truth-claims - in Laclau's language, a 'reality' which is 'before our eyes[67](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn67)', or in Newman's, a 'harsh reality' hidden beneath a protective veil[68](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn68) - without the attendant risks.  Some Lacanian theorists also show indications of a commitment based on the particular kind of "euphoric" enjoyment Barthes associates with myths.  Laclau in particular emphasizes his belief in the 'exhilarating' significance of the present[69](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.1robinson.html" \l "_edn69" \o "), hinting that he is committed to euphoric investments generated through the repetition of the same.

#### Zizek’s Act reproduces the worst aspects of capitalism

Robinson and Tormey 4 (Andrew, Early Career Fellow in the School of Politics – University of Nottingham and Simon, Professor of Politics and Critical Theory and Head of the School of Politics – University of Nottingham, “Zizek is Not a Radical”, http://homepage.ntlworld.com/simon.tormey/articles/Zizeknotradical.pdf)

The choice of the term ‘suspension’ is revealing, for although in Zizek’s account the surface structure of the social system is changed during such a ‘suspension’, the deep structure of the social system as set out in Lacanian theory is not (and cannot be) changed in the slightest. So an Act shatters capitalism, but it **leaves intact** many of **its most objectionable** **features**, including social exclusion,56 violence,57 naturalisation,58 reification and myths,59 all of which are for Zizek primordial, ever-present and necessary in any society. Further, since the Act involves submission to a Cause and a Leader, it cannot destroy the authoritarian structure of capitalism: ‘often, one does need a leader in order to be able to “do the impossible”... subordination to [the leader] is the highest act of freedom’.60 So, while an Act may destroy the specific articulations of oppression within the present system (e.g. the identification of the Real with illegal immigrants), it **necessarily produces a system which is equally oppressive**.

#### The theory of the Act is junk – Zizek’s criteria are arbitrary and inconsistent

Robinson and Tormey 4 (Andrew, Early Career Fellow in the School of Politics – University of Nottingham and Simon, Professor of Politics and Critical Theory and Head of the School of Politics – University of Nottingham, “Zizek is Not a Radical”, http://homepage.ntlworld.com/simon.tormey/articles/Zizeknotradical.pdf)

How does Zizek distinguish his ‘leftist’ politics from ‘rightist’ alternatives which would equally meet the formal criteria of an Act? He introduces the idea of the ‘false Act’ (or ‘rightist suspension of the ethical’) to deal with this problem. False acts, such as the Nazi seizure of power and the bombing of Afghanistan, have the formal structure of an Act, but are false because they involve impotent acting-out against a pseudo-enemy, and therefore do not traverse the actual social fantasy.99 Their function, rather, is to preserve the system through the actingout. 100 One can tell a true Act from a false Act by assessing whether an act is truly negative, i.e. negates all prior standards,101 and by whether it emerges from the actual void in a situation,102 which is always a single ‘touchy nodal point … which decides where one ‘truly stands’.103 This is problematic because Zizek here introduces external criteria while elsewhere stating that the Act must negate all such criteria. Furthermore, if the authenticity of an Act is dependent on an empirical assessment of where the actual social void is, then Zizek’s account of the Act as the assertion of a Truth *over and* against the facts is undermined.

#### -- Alt fails – they view power as top-down – makes resistance impossible

Hardt 2k (Michael Hardt, Literature @ Duke, 2000, Theory and Event, 4.3, p Muse)

But still none of that addresses the passivity you refer to. For that we have to look instead at Agamben’s notions of life and biopower. Agamben uses the term “naked life” to name that limit of humanity, the bare minimum of existence that is exposed in the concentration camp. In the final analysis, he explains, modem sovereignty rules over naked life and biopower is this power to rule over life itself What results from this analysis is not so much passivity, I would say, but powerlessness. There is no figure that can challenge and contest sovereignty. Our critique of Agamben’s (and also Foucault’s) notion of biopower is that it is conceived only from above and we attempt to formulate instead a notion of biopower from below, that is, a power by which the multitude itself rules over life. (In this sense, the notion of biopower one finds in some veins of ecofeminism such as the work of Vandana Shiva, although cast on a very different register, is closer to our notion of a biopower from below.) What we are interested in finally is a new biopolitics that reveals the struggles over forms of life.

#### -- Turn – political vacuum – abandoning state reforms causes worse forces to fill-in

Barbrook 97 (Dr. Richard, School of Westminster, Nettime, “More Provocations”, 6-5,

http://www.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-l-9706/msg00034.html)

I thought that this position is clear from my remarks about the ultra-left posturing of the 'zero-work' demand. In Europe, we have real social problems of deprivation and poverty which, in part, can **only be solved by state action**. This does not make me a statist, but rather an anti-anti-statist. By opposing such intervention because they are carried out by the state, anarchists are **tacitly lining up with the neo-liberals**. Even worse, refusing even to vote for the left, they acquiese to rule by neo-liberal parties. I deeply admire direct action movements. I was a radio pirate and we provide server space for anti-roads and environmental movements. However, this doesn't mean that I support political abstentionism or, even worse, the mystical nonsense produced by Hakim Bey. It is great for artists and others to adopt a marginality as a life style choice, but most of the people who are economically and socially marginalised were never given any choice. They are excluded from society as a result of deliberate policies of deregulation, privatisation and welfare cutbacks carried out by neo-liberal governments. During the '70s, I was a pro-situ punk rocker until Thatcher got elected. Then we learnt the hard way that voting did change things and **lots of people suffered** if state power was withdrawn from certain areas of our life, such as welfare and employment. Anarchism can be a fun artistic pose. However, human suffering is not.

#### --Impact is extinction

Boggs 97 (Carl, Professor of Political Science – National University, Theory & Society 26, December, p. 773-774)

The decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America poses a series of great dilemmas and challenges. Many ideological currents scrutinized here ^ localism, metaphysics, spontaneism, post- modernism, Deep Ecology – intersect with and reinforce each other. While these currents have deep origins in popular movements of the 1960s and 1970s, they remain very much alive in the 1990s. Despite their different outlooks and trajectories, they all share one thing in common: a depoliticized expression of struggles to combat and overcome alienation. The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved – perhaps even unrecognized – only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites – an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise – or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.75

# Navy 7 2AC v USMA

## Prolif

### A2: Causes prolif

#### Can’t make weapons from SMRs

**Szondy, 12** – freelance writer based in Monroe, Washington (David, 2/16. “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

**SMR’s are prolif resistant**

**Kuznetsov 8** – former Lead Researcher at the Kurchatov Institute (Russia) (Vladimir, March-August. “Options for small and medium sized reactors (SMRs) to overcome loss of economies of scale and incorporate increased proliferation resistance and energy security” Progress in Nuclear Energ Vol 50 issues 2-6, p 248. ScienceDirect)

For many less developed countries, these are the features of enhanced proliferation resistance and increased robustness of barriers for sabotage protection that may ensure the progress of nuclear power. All NPPs with innovative SMRs will provide for the implementation of the established safeguards veriﬁcation procedures under the agreements of member states with the IAEA. In addition to this, many innovative **SMRs offer** certain **intrinsic proliferation resistance features to prevent the misuse, diversion or undeclared production of ﬁssile materials and/or to facilitate the implementation of safeguards** (IAEA, 2006b). For example, many of **water-cooled SMRs employ low enrichment uranium and once-through fuel cycle as basic options**. Therefore, **the features contributing to proliferation resistance of such SMRs are essentially similar to that of presently operated PWRs and BWRs. They also include an unattractive isotopic composition of the plutonium in the discharged fuel, and radiation barriers provided by the spent fuel. The intrinsic proliferation resistance features** common to all HTGRs **include high fuel burn-up** (low residual inventory of plutonium, high content of 240 Pu); a **difﬁcult to process fuel matrix; radiation barriers; and a low ratio of ﬁssile to fuelblock/fuel-pebble** mass. Although several HTGRs make a provision for reprocessing of the TRISO fuel, the corresponding technology has not been established yet and, until such time as when the technology becomes readily available, the lack of the technology is assumed to provide an enhanced proliferation resistance. All liquid metal cooled SMRs are fast reactors that can ensure a self-sustainable operation on ﬁssile materials or realize fuel breeding to feed other reactors present in nuclear energy systems. In both cases, and **if the fuel cycle is closed, the need of fuel enrichment and relevant uranium enrichment facilities would be eliminated, which is a factor contributing to enhanced proliferation resistance. Other features to enhance proliferation resistance of fast reactors are** the following: **No separation of plutonium and uranium at any fuel cycle stage and leaving a small** (1e2% by weight) fr**action of ﬁssion products permanently in the fuel; Denaturing of the ﬁssile materials,** e.g., through the optimization of the core design to achieve a higher content of 238 Pu in the plutonium, to preclude the possibility of weapon production via securing an inadmissibly high level of residual heat of the plutonium fuel e the 238 Pu/Pu ratio needed to achieve this still needs to be deﬁned adequately.

## Warming

### A2: No impact to C02 (Idso)

#### Best and newest studies conclude that C02 causes anthropogenic warming – that’s Mueller

#### Your authors are biased and receive funding from major coal and oil companies

Union of Concerned Scientists 7 (“Responding to Global Warming Skeptics—Prominent Skeptics Organizations”, http://www.ucsusa.org/global\_warming/science/skeptic-organizations.html)

Greening Earth Society The Greening Earth Society (GES) was founded on Earth Day 1998 by the Western Fuels Association to promote the view that increasing levels of atmospheric CO2 are good for humanity. GES and Western Fuels are essentially the same organization. Both used to be located at the same office suite in Arlington, VA. Until December 2000, Fred Palmer chaired both institutions. The GES is now chaired by Bob Norrgard, another long-term Western Fuels associate. The Western Fuels Assocation (WFA) is a cooperative of coal-dependent utilities in the western states that works in part to discredit climate change science and to prevent regulations that might damage coal-related industries. Spin: CO2 emissions are good for the planet; coal is the best energy source we have. Affiliated Individuals: Patrick Michaels, Robert Balling, David Wojick, Sallie Baliunas, Sylvan Wittwer, John Daley, Sherwood Idso

Funding: The Greening Earth Society receives its funding from the Western Fuels Association**,** which in turn receives its funding from its coal and utility company members. Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide & Global Change The Center claims to "disseminate factual reports and sound commentary on new developments in the world-wide scientific quest to determine the climactic and biological consequences of the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content." The Center is led by two brothers, Craig and Keith Idso. Their father, Sherwood Idso, is affiliated with the Greening Earth Society; the Center also shares a board member (Sylvan Wittwer) with GES. Both Idso brothers have been on the Western Fuels payroll at one time or another. Spin: Increased levels of CO2 will help plants, and that's good. Funding: The Center is extremely secretive of its funding sources, stating that it is their policy not to divulge it funders. There is evidence for a strong connection to the Greening Earth Society (ergo Western Fuels Association). Affiliated Individuals: Craig Idso, Keith Idso, Sylvan Wittwer

## S

#### SMRs avoid major licensing problems.

**Cunningham**, Policy Analyst for Energy and Climate at the American Security Project, 12 (Nick, October, American Security Project, Small Modular Reactors: A Possible Path Forward for Nuclear Power” http://americansecurityproject.org/featured-items/2012/report-small-modular-reactor/)

Another major drawback for conventional large reactors is the lack of standardization. This leads to long, expensive, and uncertain time periods for licensing and siting. SMRs can overcome this hurdle with standardized designs, standardized components, and enhanced safety from reduced reactor size, all of which are not easy to accomplish with large reactors. 31 Small Modular Reactors, as their name suggests, can be “modularized”. SMRs can be constructed in factories and actually shipped to site. Factory construction allows for greater quality control, predictability and scheduling. In contrast, large reactors are designed and built uniquely for each project, which can lead to delays and inflated costs. 3

### A2: Nat Gas Blocks

#### Price spikes are inevitable and only nuclear can stabilize them – that’s Somsel

#### SMRs are competitive with natural gas

Skutnik, 11

[Skutnik, Steve. Assistant Professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Tennessee; regular contributor toThe Neutron Economy. His areas of research expertise include nuclear fuel cycles, waste management, and nuclear nonproliferation. “Small Modular Reactors and the Economics of Nuclear,” The Neutron Economy. Saturday, June 25, 2011. http://neutroneconomy.blogspot.com/2011/06/excellent-op-ed-on-small-modular.html]

SMRs have the potential to change the economics of the game by several means. First, many proposed SMR designs are engineered to be mass-produced and pre-fabricated in factories, rather than built on-site. This could tremendously push down prices while also shortening construction times, thus ameliorating what is currently one of nuclear's biggest weaknesses at the moment. Meanwhile, the "small" in SMRs also may have potentially positive implications for both cost and safety: SMRs can be potentially built into the ground, using the surrounding earth as containment, due to their relatively small size. Given the lower total power and nuclear material within the reactor, it can be said to have a lower overall "radiological footprint," meaning simplified safety planning. Finally, the "right-size" power of SMR capacity may allow them to be sold in a greater number of markets - places both where a new full-sized reactor is too big for the needs of a community (for example, Fort Calhoun, north of Omaha, is the smallest reactor in the U.S. nuclear fleet, clocking in at only 500 MW; compare this to currently proposed new reactor designs, which begin in the neighborhood of 1000-1100 MW). Likewise, the smaller size means that for utilities only looking to incrementally expand capacity, small reactors may prove to be competitive with alternatives such as natural gas turbines.

#### Natural gas prices rising – industrial and electricity demand

Lackey 12 (Mark, energy analyst with CHF Investor Relations, “This Is Your Energy Entry Point: Mark Lackey,” 8-30-12, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/14243>)

Natural gas has been somewhat weaker, but it bounced off the $2/thousand cubic feet (Mcf) price a few months ago up to the $2.85–3/Mcf range in North America. With more industrial demand coming back, particularly in the auto sector, and stronger demand from electric utilities, gas should move back up closer to $3.25–3.30/Mcf in the next year. By way of comparison, prices in Europe can be anywhere from $4–8/Mcf, and in China they're as high as $15/Mcf.

## Off

### A2: C02 Good – Generic

**No offense – increase in CO2 will overall lead to decrease in crop production and cause global starvation**

**Strom 7** [Robert Strom, Professor Emeritus of planetary sciences in the Department of Planetary Sciences at the University of Arizona, 2007 (studied climate change for 15 years, the former Director of the Space Imagery Center, a NASA Regional Planetary Image Facility, “Hot House”, SpringerLink, p. 211-216]

Agriculture is critical to **the survival of civilization**. Crops feed not only us but also the domestic animals we use for food. Any disruption in food production means a disruption of the economy, government, and health. The increase in CO2 will result in **some growth** of crops, and rising temperatures will open new areas to crop production at higher latitudes and over longer growing seasons; however, **the overall result** will be **decreased crop production** in most parts of the world. A 1993 study of the effects of a doubling of CO2 (550 ppm) above pre-industrial levels shows that there will be **substantial decreases** in the world food supply (Rosenzweig et al., 1993). In their research they studied the effects of global warming on four crops (wheat, rice, protein feed, and coarse grain) using four scenarios involving various adaptations of crops to temperature change and CO2 abundance. They found that the amount of world food reduction ranged from 1 to 27%. However, the optimistic value of 1% is almost certainly much too low, because it assumed that the amount of degradation would be offset by more growth from "CO2 fertilization." We now know that this is not the case, as explained below and in Chapter 7. The most probable value is a worldwide food reduction between 16 and 27%. These scenarios are based on temperature and CO2 rises that may be too low, as discussed in Chapter 7. However, even a decrease in world food production of 16% would lead to large-scale starvation in many regions of the world. Large-scale experiments called Free-Air Concentration Enrichment have shown that the effects of higher CO2 levels on crop growth is about 50% less than experiments in enclosure studies (Long et al., 2006). This shows that the projections that conclude that rising CO2 will fully offset the losses due to higher temperatures are wrong. The downside of climate change will far outweigh the benefits of increased CO2 and longer growing seasons. One researcher (Prof. Long) from the University of Illinois put it this way: Growing crops much closer to real conditions has shown that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will have roughly half the beneficial effects previously hoped for in the event of climate change. In addition, ground-level ozone, which is also predicted to rise but has not been extensively studied before, has been shown to result in a loss of photosynthesis and 20 per cent reduction in crop yield. Both these results show that we need to seriously re-examine our predictions for future global food production, as they are likely to be far lower than previously estimated. Also, studies in Britain and Denmark show that only a few days of hot temperatures can severely reduce the yield of major food crops such as wheat, soy beans, rice, and groundnuts if they coincide with the flowering of these crops. This suggests that there are certain thresholds above which crops become very vulnerable to climate change. The European heat wave in the summer of 2003 provided a large-scale experiment on the behavior of crops to increased temperatures. Scientists from several European research institutes and universities found that the growth of plants during the heat wave was reduced by nearly a third (Ciais et al., 2005). In Italy, the growth of corn dropped by about 36% while oak and pine had a growth reduction of 30%. In the affected areas of the mid- west and California the summer heat wave of 2006 resulted in a 35% loss of crops, and in California a 15% decline in dairy production due to the heat-caused death of dairy cattle. It has been projected that a 2 °C rise in local temperature will result in a $92 million loss to agriculture in the Yakima Valley of Washington due to the reduction of the snow pack. A 4'C increase will result in a loss of about $163 million. For the first time, the world's grain harvests have fallen below the consumption level for the past four years according to the Earth Policy Institute (Brown, 2003). Furthermore, the shortfall in grain production increased each year, from 16 million tons in 2000 to 93 million tons in 2003. These studies were done in industrialized nations where agricultural practices are the best in the world. In developing nations the impact will be much more severe. It is here that the impact of global warming on crops and domestic animals will be most felt. In general, the world's most crucial staple food crops could fall by as much as one-third because of resistance to flowering and setting of seeds due to rising temperatures. Crop ecologists believe that many crops grown in the tropics are near, or at, their thermal limits. Already research in the Philippines has linked higher night-time temperatures to a reduction in rice yield. It is estimated that for rice, wheat, and corn, the grain yields are likely to decline by 10% for every local 1 °C increase in temperature. With a decreasing availability of food, malnutrition will become more frequent accompanied by damage to the immune system. This will result in a greater susceptibility to spreading diseases. For an extreme rise in global temperature (> 6 'C), it is likely that worldwide crop failures will lead to mass starvation, and political and economic chaos with all their ramifications for civilization.

#### Warming results in less productive plants – initial growth doesn’t outweigh long term consequences

Laeschke 12 (Bernard – Science reporter, George Koch – Professor of Forestry at NAU, Coauthor of Study cited “Global warming: Plants exposed to rising temperatures deteriorate”, 4/10, http://www.global-adventures.us/2012/04/10/global-warming-plants/)

Global warming related to rising average temperatures of Earth's atmosphere, lakes and oceans may initially make the grass greener, but not for long periods of time. Plants begin to deteriorate quickly after the early stages of a warming environment, new research suggests. "We were really surprised by the pattern, where the initial boost in growth just went away," said scientist Zhuoting Wu of Northern Arizona University (NAU), a lead author of the study. "As ecosystems adjusted, the responses changed." Ecologists subjected four grassland ecosystems to simulated climate change during a decade-long study. Plants grew more the first year in the global warming treatment, but this effect progressively diminished over the next nine Drought years and finally disappeared. The research shows the long-term effects of global warming on plant growth, on the plant species that make up a community, and on changes in how plants use or retain essential resources like nitrogen. "The plants and animals around us repeatedly serve up surprises," said Saran Twombly, program director in the National Science Foundation (NSF)'s Division of Environmental Biology. "These results show that we miss these surprises because we don't study natural communities over the right time scales. For plant communities in Arizona, it took researchers 10 years to find that responses of native plant communities to warmer temperatures were the opposite of those predicted." The team transplanted four grassland ecosystems from a higher to lower elevation to simulate a future warmer environment, and coupled the warming with the range of predicted changes in precipitation -more, the same, or less. The grasslands studied were typical of those found in northern Arizona along elevation gradients from the San Francisco Peaks down to the Great Basin Desert. The researchers found that long-term warming resulted in loss of native species and encroachment of species typical of warmer environments, ultimately pushing the plant community toward less productive species. The warmed grasslands also cycled nitrogen more rapidly. This should make more nitrogen available to plants, scientists believed, helping plants grow more. But instead much of the nitrogen was lost, converted to nitrogen gases in the atmosphere or leached out by rainfall washing through the soil. Bruce Hungate, senior author of the paper and an ecologist at NAU, said the study challenges the expectation that warming will increase nitrogen availability and cause a sustained increase in plant productivity. "Faster nitrogen turnover stimulated nitrogen losses, likely reducing the effect of warming on plant growth," Hungate said. "More generally, changes in species, changes in element cycles--these really make a difference. Its classic systems ecology: the initial responses elicit knock-on effects, which here came back to bite the plants. These ecosystem feedbacks are critical--you can't figure this out with plants grown in a greenhouse."

### CP

#### Perm do both

#### Perm do the counterplan

#### The counterplan isn’t competitive – DOD action doesn’t preclude plan action – it’s just a way the plan COULD be done

#### No solvency - picking winners subverts the market AND ensures investment does into suboptimal designs rather than new, innovative ones - that's Rosner and Goldberg from the 1ac

#### Permute - do the CP - plan text merely says SMR, it doesn't specify a type hence the CP doesn't textually compete - CPs must be TEXTUALLY and FUNCTIONALLY competitive in order to ensure Aff ground AND to ensure LEGITIMATE, not arbitrarily crafted, net-benefits

**That’s a voter – puts the aff at ground zero meaning we can’t leverage the plan as offense. Focuses the debate on trivial net benefits that detract from topic education**

**Infinitely Regressive – Justifies doing the plan minus one penny and claiming a penny saved is a penny earned.**

**Net benefits don’t check abuse – The disad alone would test the merits of the plan and the fact that they run a pic means that we’re uniquely stripped of our offense against the disad.**

#### Counterplan doesn’t solve case – they cant access COMMERCIALIZATION of SMR technology so they don’t solve warming or prolif – there’s no spillover- that’s Rosner and Goldberg

#### Counterplan doesn’t specifically incentive SMRs – means they don’t solve – certainty is key – that’s Wallace

#### There’s no net benefit – don’t let them read one in the block – solving better isn’t a reason to vote for the counterplan

#### NRC won’t block -

#### DOE initiatives have made licensing easier

**McMahon, 12** – environmental and green technology journalist, writer and editor, teaches journalism at the University of Chicago (Jeff, 5/23. “Small Modular Nuclear Reactors By 2022 -- But No Market For Them.” http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2012/05/23/small-modular-reactors-by-2022-but-no-market-for-them/)

The Department of [Energy](http://www.forbes.com/energy/) will spend $452 million—with a match from industry—over the next five years to guide two small modular reactor designs through the nuclear regulatory process by 2022. But cheap natural gas could freeze even small nuclear plants out of the energy market well beyond that date. DOE accepted bids through Monday for companies to participate in the Small Modular Reactor program. A number of reactor manufacturers submitted bids, including [NuScale Power](http://www.energyonline.com/Industry/News.aspx?NewsID=7575&NuScale_Power_LLC_Submits_Proposal_to_DOE_for_SMRs" \t "_blank) and a collaboration that includes [Westinghouse and General Dynamic](http://www.sacbee.com/2012/05/21/4505348/westinghouse-burns-mcdonnell-and.html). “This would allow SMR technology to overcome the hurdle of NRC certification – the ‘gold standard’ of the international nuclear industry, and would help in the proper development of the NRC’s regulatory framework to deal with SMRs,” according to Paul Genoa, Senior Director of [Policy](http://www.forbes.com/policy/) Development at the [Nuclear Energy Institute](http://www.nei.org/).

#### More evidence

**Madia 12** (William Madia, Stanford Energy Journal, Dr. Madia serves as Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University. Previously, he was the Laboratory Director at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory from 2000-2004 and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory from 1994-1999., “SMALL MODULAR REACTORS: A POTENTIAL GAME-CHANGING TECHNOLOGY”, <http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small_Modular_Reactors_by_William_Madia>, Spring 2012)

**Nevertheless, since the most developed of the SMRs are mostly based on proven and licensed components and are configured at power levels that are passively safe**, **we should not expect many new significant licensing issues to be raised for this class of reactor.**

### Heidegger 2AC

#### -- Perm do both – Alt alone fails – ‘letting be’ and waiting for metaphysical transformation dooms us to extinction

**Santoni 85** (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to **omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we **simultaneously act** to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about our disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be **too permissive** in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

#### Also, Perm do the plan and all parts of the alternative that don’t consist of rejecting the aff

#### -- No extinction – tech and calculation have existed forever – and the world is getting better

#### -- Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being

**Zimmerman 93** (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

#### -- Framework – evaluate the aff vs. status quo or a competitive policy option. That’s best for fairness and predictability – there are too many frameworks to predict and they moot all of the 1ac – makes it impossible to be aff. Only our framework solves activism.

#### Alt doesn’t solve the case –

1. doesn’t build nuclear reactors – it rejects tech
2. changing relations to nature doesn’t change temp
3. there’s no spillover between demand we reject tech and people doing it

#### -- Case turns the K – nuclear tech is inevitable – other countries view nature as a standing reserve – plan sends a global signal to other countries to use environment-friendly tech.

#### Plan solves meltdowns from squo reactors

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less. So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

#### Meltdowns cause extinction

Lendman 11 – Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (Stephe, 3/13. “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan” The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>)

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It could be, literally, an apocalyptic event.

#### The alternative is a goal - not a mechanism to create that goal – their repoliticization never moves beyond the seminar room

Jones 99 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

#### No prior questions

**Owen 02** David Owen, 2 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.**

#### -- Valuing nature as standing reserve of natural resources for human benefit is essential to the survival of all species

**Younkins 4** (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified, AG)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. **Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer**. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. **People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently** of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. **All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans]** men **affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress**. Mankind’s **survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things**, even man himself. **Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe**. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. **Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value**. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. **The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature**. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. **Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans]** men **sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them**. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, **only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation**. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This **antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.**

#### -- Perm – do the plan and the alternative to engage in the paradox

**McWhorter 92** (Ladelle, Assistant Professor of Philosophy – Northeast Missouri State University, Heidegger and the Earth, p. 3)

Heidegger's work is a call to reflect, to think in some way other than calculatively, technologically, pragmatically. Once we begin to move with and into Heidegger's call and begin to see our trying to seize control and solve problems as itself a problematic approach, if we still believe that thinking's only real purpose is to function as a prelude to action, we who attempt to think will twist within the agonizing grip of paradox, feeling nothing but frustration, unable to conceive of ourselves as anything but paralyzed. However, as so many peoples before us have known, paradox is not only a trap; it is also a scattering point and passageway. Paradox invites examination of its own constitution (hence of the patterns of thinking within which it occurs) and thereby breaks a way of thinking open, revealing the configurations of power that propel it and hold it on track. And thus it makes possible the dissipation of that power and the deflection of thinking into new paths and new possibilities.

#### No alt solvency - only they have forgotten Being by forgetting its existence in science and technology

Latour 91 [Bruno Latour teaches sociology at the E´ cole des Mines in Paris **We have never been modern,** p. 65-67 GAL] x

But immediately the philosopher loses this well-intentioned simplicity. Why? Ironically, he himself indicates the reason for this, in an apologue on Heraclitus who used to take shelter in a baker's oven. *'Emm gar kai entautha theous\* —* 'here, too, the gods are present,\* said Heraclitus to visitors who were astonished to see him warming his poor carcass like an ordinary mortal (Heidegger, 1977b, p. 233). *'Auch bier namlich wesen Gotter an.'* But **Heidegger** is taken in as much as those naive visitors, since he **and his epigones do not expect to find Being except along the Black Forest** Holzwege. **Being cannot reside in ordinary beings**. Every­where, there is desert. **The gods cannot reside in technology** — **that pure Enframing** (Zimmerman, 1990) **of being** *[Ge-Stelf],* that ineluctable fate [Geschick], that supreme danger [Gefahr]. **They are not to be sought in science, either, since science has no other essence but that of technology** (Heidegger, 1977b). **They are absent from politics, sociology, psychol­ogy, anthropology, history** - which is the history of Being, and counts its epochs in millennia. **The gods cannot reside in economics — that pure calculation forever mired in beings and worry**. **They are not to be found in philosophy, either, or in ontology, both of which lost sight of their destiny** 2,500 years ago. **Thus Heidegger treats the modern world** as the visitors treat Heraclitus: **with contempt**. **And yet — 'here too the gods are present**\*: **in a hydroelectric plant** on the banks of the Rhine, **in subatomic particles, in Adidas shoes** as well as in the old wooden clogs hollowed out by hand, in **agribusiness** as well as in timeworn landscapes, in shopkeepers\* **calculations** as well as in Holderlin's heartrending verse. **But why do those philosophers no longer recognize them?** Because they believe what the modern Constitution says about itself! This paradox should no longer astonish us. **The moderns indeed declare that technology is nothing but pure instrumental mastery**, science pure Enframing and pure Stamping [Das Ge-Stell], **that econo­mics is pure calculation, capitalism pure reproduction,** the subject pure consciousness. **Purity everywhere**! They claim this, but **we must be careful not to take them at their word, since what they are asserting is only half of the modern world, the work of purification that distils what** the work of **hybridization supplies**. **Who has forgotten Being?** No one**, no one ever has**, **otherwise Nature would be truly available as a pure 'stock**\*. Look around you: **scientific objects are circulating simultaneously as subjects objects and discourse. Networks are full of Being**. As for **machines**, they **are laden with subjects and collectives. How could a being** **lose** its difference, its incompleteness, its mark, **its trace of Being**? **This is never in anyone's power**; otherwise we should have to imagine that we have truly been modern, we should be taken in by the upper half of the modern Constitution. **Has someone**, however, **actually forgotten Being**? **Yes: anyone who really thinks that Being has really been forgotten.** As Levi-Strauss says, 'the barbarian is first and foremost the man who believes in barbarism.' (Levi-Strauss, [1952] 1987, p. 12). **Those who have failed to undertake empirical studies of sciences, technologies, law, politics, economics, religion or fiction have lost the traces of Being that are distributed everywhere among beings. If, scorning empiricism**, you opt out of the exact sciences, then the human sciences, then traditional philosophy, then the sciences of language, and **you hunker down in your forest - then you will indeed feel a tragic loss. But what is missing is you yourself, not the world!** **Heidegger's epigones have converted that glaring weakness into a strength. 'We don't know anything empirical, but that doesn't matter, since your world is empty of Being. We are keeping the little flame of Being safe from everything, and you, who have all the rest, have nothing**.' **On the contrary: we have everything, since we have Being, and beings, and we have never lost track of the difference between Being and beings**. **We are carrying out the impossible project undertaken by Heidegger**, who believed what the modern Constitution said about itself without understanding that what is at issue there is only half of a larger mechanism which has never abandoned the old anthropological matrix. **No one can forget Being, since there has never been a modern world, or,** by the same token, **metaphysics**. **We have always remained pre-Socratic, pre-Cartesian, pre-Kantian, pre-Nietzschean**. No radical revolution can separate us from these pasts, so there is no need for reactionary counter­revolutions to lead us back to what has never been abandoned. Yes, Heraclitus is a surer guide than Heidegger: *'Einai gar kai entautha theous?*

### Cap 2AC

#### It’s net beneficial – using capitalism to fight itself is more effective

Rothkrug 90 (Paul, Founder – Environmental Rescue Fund, Monthly Review, March, 41(10), p. 38)

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

#### No prior questions

**Owen 02** David Owen, 2 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.**

#### The alternative is a goal - not a mechanism to create that goal – their repoliticization never moves beyond the seminar room

Jones 99 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

#### Alternatives to capitalism will inevitably collapse

Taylor 94 (Jerry, Director of Natural Resource Studies – Cato Institute, “The Challenge of Sustainable Development”, Regulation, http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/reg17n1-taylor.html)

The free, competitive marketplace creates not only human capital but natural capital as well. That is because capitalism is the most productive engine of intellectual and technological advance, and it is that stock of human knowledge and technology that turns the earth's material into useful commodities. "Humans are the active agent, having ideas that they use to transform the environment for human purposes, observes economist Thomas De Gregori. "Resources are not fixed and finite because they are not natural. They are a product of human ingenuity resulting from the creation of technology and science." David Osterfeld adds that "since resources are a function of human knowledge, and since our stock of knowledge has increased over time, it should come as no surprise that the stock of physical resources has also been expanding." Closed societies and economies under the heavy hand of state planning are doomed to live within the **confines of dwindling resource bases** and **eventually experience the** very collapse feared by the proponents of sustainable development.

#### Alt causes transition wars

Harris 3 (Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html)

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, **a full-fledged** civil **war** not just within one society, but **across the globe**. Without this **catastrophic upheaval**, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

**Extinction**

Kothari 82 (Rajni, Professor of Political Science – University of Delhi, Toward a Just Social Order, p. 571)

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centres of power -- and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification of the old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for **eventual global holocaust**.

#### --No root causes AND war turns the K – no risk of a turn

Goldstein 03 (Joshua, Prof of Int'l Relations @ American University, War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, p. 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 influence 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 (gender 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 towards 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.**

#### Capitalism is resilient – it’ll bounce back

Foster 9 (JD, Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of fiscal policy – Heritage Foundation, "Is Capitalism Dead? Maybe," 3-11, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=101694302)

Capitalism is down. It may even be out. But it's **far from dead**. Capitalism is **extremely resilient**. Why? Because here, as in every democratic-industrial country around the world, it has always had to struggle to survive against encroachments — both benign and malevolent — of the state. At the moment, capitalism is losing ground most everywhere. But when the economic crisis passes, capitalism and the freedoms it engenders will **recover again**, if only because freedom beats its lack. It is said that the trouble with socialism is socialism; the trouble with capitalism is capitalists. The socialist economic system, inherently contrary to individual liberties, tends to minimize prosperity because it inevitably allocates national resources inefficiently. On the other hand, a truly capitalist system engaged in an unfettered pursuit of prosperity is prone to occasional and often painful excesses, bubbles and downturns like the one we are now experiencing globally. When capitalism slips, governments step in with regulations and buffers to try to moderate the excesses and minimize the broader consequences of individual errors. Sometimes these policies are enduringly helpful. Severe economic downturns inflict collateral damage on families and businesses otherwise innocent of material foolishness. Not only are the sufferings of these innocents harmful to society, but they are also downright expensive. A little wise government buffering can go a long way. The trick, of course, is the wisdom part. A good example of a wise government buffer is deposit insurance at commercial banks. Without it, depositors would have withdrawn their funds en masse, leading to a rapid collapse of the banking system. It happened in years gone by. But today, deposits have flowed into the banking system in search of safety, helping banks staunch their many severe wounds. Yet for every example of helpful government intervention, there are many more that do more harm than good. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac leap to mind. These congressional creatures helped create, then inflate the subprime market. When that balloon popped, it triggered a global economic meltdown. The current financial crisis clearly has capitalism on its back foot. Government ownership of the largest insurance company, the major banks, and Fan and Fred are awesome incursions into private markets. But, as President Obama has underscored, these incursions are only temporary. In time, these institutions — even Fan and Fred — will be broken up and sold in parts. It will leave government agents with stories to tell their grandkids, and taxpayers stuck with the losses. But the power of the state will again recede, and **another new age of** freedom and **capitalism will arrive and thrive**… until we repeat the cycle again sometime down the road.

#### Rejection won’t dislodge capitalism – no critical mass exists

Grossberg 92 (Lawrence, Professor of Communication Studies – UNC-Chapel Hill and Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Program in Cultural Studies, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture, p. 388-389)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be **tempered by** the **realities** of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are not waiting to be led into revolution, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide-rather undemocratically, I might add-to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain "civility" in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is **simply too weak** in the current context to effectively organize people, and **too vague** to provide any direction.

#### Retreat solidifies capitalism – the void allows corporate power to go unchallenged

Boggs 97 (Carl, Professor of Political Science – National University, Theory & Society 26, December, p. 750-751)

Both mall culture and mass media symbolize the prevailing mood of anti-politics: they reproduce to a deeply-atomized, commodified social life-world which corresponds to the mode of consciousness described by Richard Sennett in The Fall of Public Man, where citizen involvement in a res publica is effaced ``by the belief that social meanings are generated by the feelings of individual human beings,'' so that the common terrain of power relations and social space is obliterated.15 Sheldon Wolin refers to this development as a ``crisis of citizenship,'' reflected in the carving up of the public sphere by local, privatized interests.16 The point has been reached where most Americans can no longer imagine a system truly open to citizen participation, where the ordinary person might have influence. Viewed in this way, modernity is two-sided: it coincides with the spread of technology, knowledge, and expertise but also reinforces widespread feelings of alienation and powerlessness. Individuals feel engulfed by forces beyond their control – bureaucracy, government, huge corporations, the global economy. Under these conditions psychological retreat from the public sphere may seem normal enough. The problem, however, is that such firmly entrenched bastions of power will not vanish simply because they are denigrated or ignored; on the contrary, their hegemony will simply go unchallenged.

#### Extinction results

Boggs 97 (Carl, Professor of Political Science – National University, Theory & Society 26, December, p. 773-774)

The decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America poses a series of great dilemmas and challenges. Many ideological currents scrutinized here ^ localism, metaphysics, spontaneism, post- modernism, Deep Ecology – intersect with and reinforce each other. While these currents have deep origins in popular movements of the 1960s and 1970s, they remain very much alive in the 1990s. Despite their different outlooks and trajectories, they all share one thing in common: a depoliticized expression of struggles to combat and overcome alienation. The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved – perhaps even unrecognized – only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites – an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise – or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.75

#### Capitalism is critical to peace.

Bandow 5 (Doug Bandow, Cato Institute, 05

[“Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace,” 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. His conclusion hasn't gone unchallenged. Author R.J. Rummel, an avid proponent of the democratic peace theory, challenges Gartzke's methodology and worries that it "may well lead intelligent and policy-wise analysts and commentators to draw the wrong conclusions about the importance of democratization." Gartzke responds in detail, noting that he relied on the same data as most democratic peace theorists. If it is true that democratic states don't go to war, then it also is true that "states with advanced free market economies never go to war with each other, either." The point is not that democracy is valueless. Free political systems naturally entail free elections and are more likely to protect other forms of liberty - civil and economic, for instance. However, democracy alone doesn't yield peace. To believe is does is dangerous: There's no panacea for creating a conflict-free world. That doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets - that is, spreading capitalism - is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity. Notes Gartzke: "Warfare among developing nations will remain unaffected by the capitalist peace as long as the economies of many developing countries remain fettered by governmental control." Freeing those economies is critical. It's a particularly important lesson for the anti-capitalist left. For the most part, the enemies of economic liberty also most stridently denounce war, often in near-pacifist terms. Yet they oppose the very economic policies most likely to encourage peace. If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war. Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

#### A) Ending capitalism dooms artificial intelligence

Kurzweil 1 (Ray, Ph.D. and Genius Inventor, “The Law of Accelerating Returns”, Lifeboat Foundation Special Reports, http://lifeboat.com/ex/law.of.accelerating.returns)

There is a vital economic imperative to create more intelligent technology. Intelligent machines have enormous value. That is why they are being built. There are tens of thousands of projects that are advancing intelligent machines in diverse incremental ways. The support for "high tech" in the business community (mostly software) has grown enormously. When I started my optical character recognition (OCR) and speech synthesis company ([Kurzweil Computer Products, Inc.](http://www.kurzweiltech.com/kcp.html)) in 1974, there were only a half-dozen high technology IPO's that year. The number of such deals has increased one hundred fold and the number of dollars invested has increased by more than one thousand fold in the past 25 years. In the four years between 1995 and 1999 alone, high tech venture capital deals increased from just over $1 billion to approximately $15 billion. We will continue to build more powerful computational mechanisms because it creates enormous value. We will reverse-engineer the human brain not simply because it is our destiny, but because there is valuable information to be found there that will provide insights in building more intelligent (and more valuable) machines. **We would have to repeal capitalism** and every visage of economic competition **to stop this progression**.

#### B) AI solves extinction

Howe 2 (Mitchell, The Singularity Institute, “What are the Odds?”, Accelerating The Future, http://www.acceleratingfuture.com/articles/whataretheodds.htm)

Between now and 2029, scientists will work out a functional design for true AI that possesses a core desire to understand and assist humanity (a characteristic called Friendliness by some researchers). While unimpressive at first, the new AI will learn quickly and receive extra computing capacity to increase its capabilities. Once mature, it will assist its programmers in the design of a next-generation AI. This process will be repeated a number of times with considerable improvements in both intelligence and Friendliness, and before too long will produce one or more minds that can only be called superintelligent. Applying phenomenal brilliance to the betterment of the human condition, Friendly superintelligence will ensure that nanotechnology and genetic engineering are quickly mastered to an extent that human scientists alone could never have reached. Technological progress will be so rapid as to fundamentally change our perception of civilization itself. As a consequence of these conditions, you (and everyone else) will enjoy unconditional material prosperity and indefinite life-expectancy - with the resulting time and means for pursuits that may include increasing your own intelligence and exploring the galaxy. You will be free to forgo most of the usual misfortunes of illness and injury, and no person close to you will suffer death from disease or old age unless they choose to. The same intelligence that allows for the mastery of genetic engineering and nanotechnology will also work to prevent the possibility of cataclysmic disasters stemming from these technologies. And **other** potential **threats** **to our planet, such as asteroid strikes** and climate change, will be averted or remedied with surprising ease.

#### Cap key to value to life

Robert Tracinski, Editor, The Intellectual Activist, 08

[“The Moral and the Practical,” http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm]

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceabl

e value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each [hu]man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity.