# UGA 3 2AC v Emory AB

## Warming

### 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.

## Prolif

#### Prolif increases the risk of conventional war – high costs encourage conflict

**Kapur ‘7** (S. Paul, Associate Prof. Strategic Research Department @ Naval War College, “Dangerous Deterrent: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia”, p. 171)

My study's findings have important implications for our theoretical understanding of nuclear proliferation's effects on international security. As noted, proliferation optimists argue that by threatening to raise the cost of war astronomically, nuclear weapons reduce the likelihood of conflict. My findings, however, indicate that this is not necessarily the case. Indeed, the study shows that the danger of nuclear weapons can in certain circumstances have the opposite effect. By potentially raising the costs of violence, nuclear weapons can make conflict more likely, encouraging a weak, revisionist state both to take territory while insulated from all-out conventional retaliation and to attempt to force third-party diplomatic intervention in ensuing crises. The high cost of nuclear war is precisely what promises to make such a strategy successful; nuclear danger deters adversaries and also attracts outside attention. If nuclear weapons were not so destructive, a weak, revisionist state would get neither of these benefits and would be less likely to engage in aggressive behavior. Thus, the high cost of nuclear war may not lead to lower level stability and can actually increase the likelihood of conflict.

## Solvency

## Off

### Con Con CP 2AC

Perm do both

Perm do the counterplan

#### It’s not competitive – either 1) plan goes through congress and this is just a mechanism through which it could pass or 2) plan doesn’t go through congress and doesn’t link to politics so there’s no net benefit

Counterplan links to politics – constitutional amendments will draw in national politics – things always stick to Obama

#### Nuke leadership – the Wallace and Williams ev indicates strong federal action to reverse our decline in nuclear leadership is key to send an international signal – countries view the NRC as the gold standard and CP kills it– that’s Lovering

#### And there’s no international perception of states – empirically proven for nuclear power – China hasn’t perceived the Votgle project

#### 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).

#### Investor Confidence

#### Extend the Wallace evidence – investors think federal tax credits are necessary to offset risks and generate licensing certainty – only after investors can see that will they be willing to finance future projects

#### --Financial protection is the only thing that gets investors on board

Morse 7 – Washington Post Staff Writer (Dan, “Money Matters in Debate Over New Reactor Project; Financing, Rather Than Safety, Appears to Be Key Factor in Whether Plans Proceed” Washington Post Staff Writer 2007, September 5. The Washington Post,p. B.5.  ProQuest)

It's not the greenies who worry those aiming to build a new nuclear reactor in Southern Maryland. It's the green. This seemed perfectly clear at a recent community meeting in Calvert County, where Constellation Energy has proposed the first new reactor project in the United States in nearly 30 years. The price tag: about $4.5 billion. "Without the federal loan guarantees, this whole thing will come to a stop," George Vanderheyden, a Constellation executive, said while standing outside the hotel conference room where the meeting was about to start. Ten feet from him, a row of environmentalists greeted Calvert residents with stacks of brochures. "Threatened Communities," from Greenpeace, showed rows of grave markers next to a nuclear cooling tower. Vanderheyden showed little concern and later said his company could dispel such notions during the long approval process for the reactor. What concerns him more -- and what appears to be the larger factor in whether the Calvert reactor gets built -- is taking place 55 miles away in Washington. There, nuclear companies such as Constellation, along with Wall Street bankers, are lobbying hard to get the federal government to help kick-start construction of a series of reactors. Their argument: Nuclear power is clean energy that can reduce greenhouse gases. Wall Street investors could help finance new reactors. But they're skittish, remembering nuclear projects in the 1970s and 1980s dogged by regulatory delays, cost overruns and the Three Mile Island meltdown. The government, according to the nuclear industry, should protect investors if the initial projects go bad.

#### Extend the Gale evidence – federal financing controls the risk factors that give rise to regulatory delays. Private lenders are much more eager to finance projects when they know that regulatory regimes won’t get in the way.

### Immigration Reform Econ 2AC

#### Obama’s backing off – thinks PC is a poison-pill

Avlon 1-31 (John, “Immigration Reform Proposal Shows Similar Ideas between Bush and Obama,” Daily Beast, 2013, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/31/immigration-reform-proposal-shows-similar-ideas-betweeen-bush-and-obama.html)

Wehner’s comments cut to the heart of the lessons learned. After essentially ignoring immigration reform in its first term, the Obama administration is front-loading the ambitious effort and—for the time, at least—**deferring to the Gang of Eight in hopes that it might be less polarizing if the president’s name isn’t on the bill when senators from the opposing party try to sell it to their base**. What’s old is new. It’s an irony not lost on Bush administration alumni and family members. The death of the Bush bill came largely at the hands of a right-wing talk-radio revolt that attacked any path to citizenship as “amnesty.” The fact that then–presidential candidate John McCain was sponsoring the bill with none other than Ted Kennedy created an opening for competitors like Mitt Romney to try to get to McCain’s right in a play to the primary’s conservative populist cheap seats. But the other hostile front came from resurgent House Democrats who frankly did not want to give the polarizing lame-duck incumbent named Bush a political win. Fast-forward six years, and the right-wing talk-radio crowd is weakened. The evangelical, law-enforcement, and business communities are now united behind comprehensive immigration reform. Responsible Republicans know they cannot afford to alienate Hispanics any longer. And the presence of Florida Sen. Marco Rubio—a onetime Jeb Bush protégé—is an essential addition to the coalition. “Senator Rubio, a Tea Party choice, is well respected and well liked and trusted,” adds Wehner. “With him as the lead in these negotiations, conservatives are more willing to consider immigration reform than in the past. You’re not seeing the explosion of opposition now that we saw in 2007. That doesn’t mean it won’t happen; but for now, it hasn’t.” Long story short: it’s much easier for Marco Rubio to make the case for the Senate’s bipartisan path to citizenship than to argue on behalf of President Obama’s bill, which would be a nonstarter to much of the base. And so the president wisely held off from offering his specific policy vision in the much-hyped Las Vegas speech earlier this week. It’s not unlike the reason Harry Truman gave for naming the postwar European-aid bill after his secretary of state, George Marshall: “Anything that is sent up to the Senate and House with my name on it will quiver a couple of times and then turn over and die.”

#### 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).

#### Gun control derails immigration

Rauch 1-20. [Jonathan, guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, "Tackle immigration first, Mr. President" NY Daily News -- www.nydailynews.com/opinion/tackle-immigration-mr-president-article-1.1242944?print]

So what does Obama do first? Gun control.¶ If ever there was a political sticky wicket, this is it. “Gun Agenda Faces an Uphill Battle,” headlined the Washington Post the other day. You can say that again. On the merits, in a magic-wand world, it makes sense to tighten some gun regulations, especially by closing the so-called “gun show loophole,” which allows non-dealers to buy firearms without background checks.¶ But let’s not kid ourselves: In a country with perhaps 250 million firearms already in private hands, even the deftest regulatory improvements will bring only marginal reductions in violence. No one likes to hear this, but it is true: the mass murder at Sandy Hook Elementary School was an atrocity of the first magnitude, and even one such atrocity is too many — but mass shootings in schools are very rare, and way, way down the list of causes of violent deaths. Moreover, there is little the federal government can do to prevent them.¶ No doubt, Obama was distraught by those murders. We all were. But this was a case when his more characteristic cold-blooded realism would have served him better.¶ None of what makes immigration so urgent and accomplishable is true of gun control. There is no bipartisan desire to get it done. In fact, not even Democrats are united. Republicans already smell blood: a chance to grind Obama down by stalling and obstructing in the usual way and to re-energize what has been, until now, a demoralized conservative base. The National Rifle Association will provide plenty of assistance with that project, fattening its coffers along the way.¶ Now, Obama is more popular today than Bush was in 2005, and he won a stronger reelection victory; nor is gun regulation as quixotic as was Bush’s effort to reform Social Security with only one party’s support. Obama may yet succeed where Bush failed.¶ Suppose he does succeed, though. What with the upcoming two (or is it three? four?) budgetary crises, the bandwidth for immigration was always narrow. It will be narrowed still further by diverting legislative time and energy toward guns. Gun control gives liberals a new crusade, but in doing so it opens an attention-distracting, resource-depleting two-front war.¶ Meanwhile, the window of opportunity for immigration might stay open for a while, but it might not, especially if Obama is weakened and conservatives regroup.¶ And if he loses on guns? Bush thought he could afford to lose on Social Security and move on to immigration. He was wrong. In fact, he never recovered. His political strength and strategic credibility were shaken, and he spent the rest of his second term playing defense. Also, of course, the immigration-reform window closed. Republican moderates were marginalized by conservatives who had no interest in any reform that Democrats might accept.¶ Unlike President Bill Clinton, Obama has never broken in any important way with his liberal base. Gun control, despite its poor return on investment as a policy matter, is catnip to liberals. They just can’t stay away from it. That might be all right if the opportunity cost weren’t so high — for Democrats and liberals, for the economy, and not least for immigrants.¶ One thing I have learned about Barack Obama: When he and I disagree, he is usually right and I am usually wrong. Maybe he sees something I don’t. Maybe it is true, as liberals seem to believe, that public opinion on guns has undergone a fundamental change (though more likely, based on the available facts, is that the public is undergoing a short-term reaction to a prominent news story).¶ As a supporter of both immigration reform and smarter gun regulation, I hope Obama, unlike Bush at the same point eight years ago, gets away with his off-center lurch. If not, in a few years senior administration officials will be scratching their heads, wondering why the heck they didn’t put immigration first.

#### 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.

#### No link – their “costs political capital” evidence is from 2004 – don’t let them spin this ev, make them read recent SMR specific evidence

#### 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.

#### GOP will cave

Lawrence 1-29 (Jill, Obama to Congress: No Repeat of Obamacare on Immigration, National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-to-congress-no-repeat-of-obamacare-on-immigration-20130129)

Between the lecture on timeliness and a campaign rally atmosphere punctuated by bursts of adoring applause, there was not much in Obama’s appearance for Republicans to love. His deadlines, his tone, even the lofty rhetoric he employed -- all served as a reminder, once again, that he won the White House. But Republicans can’t afford to opt out of this enterprise. They're unlikely to win the White House themselves until immigrants, legal or not, view them as friends rather than foes.

#### 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

#### Pol cap isn’t key–Obama is letting congress work out the details

Elise Foley, staff writer, 1/15/13 [“Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” HuffPost, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html]

In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. The White House also needs to convince GOP lawmakers that there's support from their constituents for immigration reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role the president will play, but sources say he does plan to lead on the issue. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said **the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership** -- while keeping the president heavily involved.¶ In other words, **it's not the place for steamrolling**. "He needs to be an honest broker here," said Ali Noorani, executive director of the National Immigration Forum, which works on bipartisan consensus for reform. "Instead of the politician forcing immigration reform, Obama needs to be the statesman creating immigration reform."¶ Beyond the border, Obama will push for changes to the legal immigration system, which is universally considered to be out of date and ill-suited to the labor market and to managing the future flow of immigrant workers. Any bill will almost certainly include an increase in visas for graduates with advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering or math, and more and better flexibility for foreign migrant labor.

#### 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."

#### 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

#### 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

### Byrne and Toly K (Emory AB) – 2AC

#### Perm – do both

#### Perm do the plan in favor of social and critical analysis of energy production

#### 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 cedes the political – energy specific

**Kuzemko 12** [Caroline Kuzemko, CSGR University of Warwick, Security, the State and Political Agency: Putting ‘Politics’ back into UK Energy, <http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2012/381_61.pdf>]

Both Hay (2007) and Flinders and Buller (2006) suggest that there are other forms that depoliticisation can take, or in the terminology of Flinders and Buller ‘tactics’ which politicians can pursue in order to move a policy field to a more indirect governing relationship (Flinders and Buller 2006: 296). For the purposes of understanding the depoliticisation of UK energy policy, however, two of Colin Hay’s forms of depoliticisation are most useful: the ‘… offloading of areas of formal political responsibility to the market…’ and the passing of policymaking responsibility to quasipublic, or independent, authorities (Hay 2007: 82-3). 1 What each of these forms of depoliticisation has in common is the degree to which they can serve, over time, to reduce political capacity by removing processes of deliberation and contestation, thereby reducing the ability for informed agency and choice. In that politics can be understood as being inclusive of processes of deliberation, contestation, informed agency and collective choice the lack of deliberation and capacity for informed agency would result in sub-optimal politics (Hay 2007: 67; cf. Gamble 2000; Wood 2011; Jenkins 2011). There seems little doubt that, with regard to energy as a policy area, the principal of establishing a more indirect governing system had become accepted by UK political elites. One of the very few close observers of UK energy policy from the 1980s to early 2000s claims that both Conservative and New Labour politicians had actively sought to remove energy from politics, making it an ‘economic’ subject: From the early 1980s, British energy policy, and its associated regulatory regime, was designed to transform a state-owned and directed sector into a normal commodity market. Competition and 1 "These"forms"are"referred"to"elsewhere"by"the"author"as"‘marketised’"and"‘technocratic’"depoliticisation"(Kuzemko" 2012b:").liberalization would, its architects hoped, take energy out of the political arena… Labour shared this vision and hoped that energy would drop off the political agenda…. (Helm 2003: 386) 2 As already suggested this paper considers the intention to depoliticise energy to have been reasonably successful. By the early 2000s the Energy Ministry had been disbanded, there was little or no formal Parliamentary debate, energy was not represented at Cabinet level, responsibility for the supply of energy had been passed to the markets, it was regulated by an independent body, and the (cf. Kuzemko 2012b). Furthermore, the newly formed Energy Directorate within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), which now had responsibility for energy policy, had no specific energy mandates but instead mandates regarding encouraging the right conditions for business with an emphasis on competition (Helm et al 1989: 55; cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 107). As feared by various analysts who write about depoliticisation as a sub-optimal form of politics, these processes of depoliticisation had arguably resulted in a lack of deliberation about energy and its governance outside of narrow technocratic elite circles. Within these circles energy systems were modelled, language was specific and often unintelligible to others, including generalist politicians or wider publics, and this did, indeed, further encourage a high degree of disengagement with the subject (cf. Kern 2010; Kuzemko 2012b; Stern 1987). Technical language and hiring practices that emphasised certain forms of economic education further isolated elite technocratic circles from political contestation and other forms of knowledge about energy. Arguably, by placing those actors who have been elected to represent the national collective interest at one remove from processes of energy governance the result was a lack of formal political capacity in this policy field. It is worth, briefly, at this point reiterating the paradoxical nature of depoliticisation. Whilst decisions to depoliticise are deeply political, political capacity to deliberate, contest and act in an issue area can be reduced through these processes. Depoliticisation has been an ongoing form of governing throughout the 20 th century it may (Burnham 2001: 464), however, be particularly powerful and more difficult to reverse when underpinned by increasingly dominant ideas about how best to govern. For example Hay, in looking for the domestic sources of depoliticisation in the 1980s and 1990s, suggests that these processes were firmly underpinned by neoliberal and public choice ideas not only about the role of the state but also about the ability for political actors to make sound decisions relating, in particular, to economic governance (Hay 2007: 95-99). Given the degree to which such ideas were held increasingly to be legitimate over this time period depoliticisation was, arguably, genuinely understood by many as a process that would result in better governance (Interviews 1, 2, 3, 15 cf. Hay 2007: 94; Kern 2010). This to a certain extent makes decisions to depoliticise appear both less instrumental but also harder to reverse given the degree to which such ideas become further entrenched via processes of depoliticisation (cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 61-66; Wood 2011: 7).

#### Turns the k

**McClean ‘1**

[David. Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope” [www.americanphilosophy.org/archives/2001%2520Conference/Discussion%2520papers/david\_mcclean.htm+foucault+habermas+slapped+cud&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=1](http://www.americanphilosophy.org/archives/2001%2520Conference/Discussion%2520papers/david_mcclean.htm%2Bfoucault%2Bhabermas%2Bslapped%2Bcud%26hl%3Den%26gl%3Dus%26ct%3Dclnk%26cd%3D1) 2001]

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems **of its country.** Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).[(1)](file:///E%3A%5C%5CWINDOWS%5C%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5C%5CContent.IE5%5C%5COTKXU3YH%5C%5Cthe%20city.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22N_1_) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?"The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from **being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about** but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

#### Perm – do the plan and the alt in all other instances – either the alt can overcome this one instance or it can’t ever solve

#### Tech thought is inevitable

Kateb 97 George, Professor of politics at Princeton, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2267/is\_/ai\_19952031

But the question arises as to where a genuine principle of limitation on technological endeavor would come from. It is scarcely conceivable that Western humanity--and by now most of humanity, because of their pleasures and interests and their own passions and desires and motives--would halt the technological project. Even if, by some change of heart, Western humanity could adopt an altered relation to reality and human beings, how could it be enforced and allowed to yield its effects? The technological project can be stopped only by some global catastrophe that it had helped to cause or was powerless to avoid. Heidegger's teasing invocation of the idea that a saving remedy grows with the worst danger is useless. In any case, no one would want the technological project halted, if the only way was a global catastrophe. Perhaps even the survivors would not want to block its reemergence. As for our generation and the indefinite future, many of us are prepared to say that there are many things we wish that modern science did not know or is likely to find out and many things we wish that modern technology did not know how to do. When referring in 1955 to the new sciences of life, Heidegger says We do not stop to consider that an attack with technological means is being prepared upon the life and nature of man compared with which the explosion of the hydrogen bomb means little. For precisely if the hydrogen bombs do not explode and human life on earth is preserved, an uncanny change in the world moves upon us (1966, p. 52). The implication is that it is less bad for the human status or stature and for the human relation to reality that there be nuclear destruction than that (what we today call) genetic engineering should go from success to success. To such lengths can a mind push itself when it marvels first at the passions, drives, and motives that are implicated in modern technology, and then marvels at the feats of technological prowess. The sense of wonder is entangled with a feeling of horror. We are past even the sublime, as conceptualized under the influence of Milton's imagination of Satan and Hell. It is plain that so much of the spirit of the West is invested in modern technology. We have referred to anger, alienation, resentment. But that cannot be the whole story. Other considerations we can mention include the following: a taste for virtuosity, skill for its own sake, an enlarged fascination with technique in itself, and, along with these, an aesthetic craving to make matter or nature beautiful or more beautiful; and then, too, sheer exhilaration, a questing, adventurous spirit that is reckless, heedless of danger, finding in obstacles opportunities for self-overcoming, for daring, for the very sort of daring that Heidegger praises so eloquently when in 1935 he discusses the Greek world in An Introduction to Metaphysics (1961, esp. pp. 123-39). All these considerations move away from anger, anxiety, resentment, and so on. The truth of the matter, I think, is that the project of modern technology, just like that of modern science, must attract a turbulence of response. The very passions and drives and motives that look almost villainous or hypermasculine simultaneously look like marks of the highest human aspiration, or, at the least, are not to be cut loose from the highest human aspiration.

#### The Aff’s a prerequisite to the Alt – we make tech better

Feenberg 7 (Andrew, Canada Research Chair in the Philosophy of Technology in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Danish Yearbook of Philosophy, Volume 42, “Between Reason and Experience,” p. 24-27, http://www.sfu.ca/~andrewf/books/Between\_Reason\_and\_Experience\_DYP42.pdf)

As I reformulate this social version of the technical revealing, it has political consequences. Political protests arise as feedback from disastrous technical projects and designs reaches those excluded from the original networks of control. These protests are often based on scientific knowledge of the devastation caused by technology designed in indifference to human needs. This is the point at which objective facts enter experience as motives for distrust and fear of technology and technical authority. The subjects become aware of the contingency of the technically structured world on choices and decisions that do not proceed from a supposedly pure rationality. The lifeworld reacts back on technology through the objective contents of knowledge of its side effects. There have been many attempts to articulate the implications of this new situation. My approach is closest to that of Ulrich Beck. Like him I argue that we are entering a new phase of technological development in which the externalities associated with the prevailing technologies threaten the survival of the industrial system (Beck, 1992). This threat has begun to force redesign of many technologies and changes in the disciplines and training underlying the technical professions. Beck explains the transition from a capitalism based on distinct spheres with little interaction, to a “reflexive modernity” in which interaction between spheres becomes the norm. Multiple approaches and cross disciplinary conceptions increasingly shape the design process in response. He develops the social consequences of the resultant changes while I have focused primarily on the technological dimension of the new phase. In this phase, what Gilbert Simondon calls “concretizing” innovations emerge designed to accommodate a wider range of social influences and contextual factors.12 As design is pulled in different directions by actors attempting to impose their differing functional requirements on devices, the winning design strategies are often those that reconcile multiple functions in simple and elegant structures capable of serving them all. Examples abound: hybrid engines in automobiles, refrigerants and propellants that do not damage the ozone layer, substitutes for lead in consumer products, and so on. In the process of developing these technologies environmental, medical and other concerns are brought to bear on design by new actors excluded from the original technological regime. Of course, no small refinements such as these can resolve the environmental crisis, but the fact that they are possible at all removes the threat of technological regression as a major alibi for doing nothing. The emergence of a radically new technical politics requires us to rethink the basic concept of rationality that has supplied the existing industrial society with its highest philosophical sanction. Heidegger and Marcuse help us to understand the limitations of the prevailing concept. They remind us that the hypostatization of a reason fragmented into specializations and differentiated from a broader cultural and normative context is not inevitable but belongs to a specific historical era, an era that may well be approaching its end. A new understanding of rationality is possible based not on a return to a teleological worldview in which we can no longer believe but on recognition of the complexity of experiences that have been cast in artificially narrow instrumental schemas. Concrete experience is thus the touchstone of this ontology because it is only there that the world reveals itself in its multifarious and unpredictable connections and potentialities. From this new standpoint specialization and differentiation will not disappear, but they will be treated as methodologically useful rather than as ontologically fundamental. The resultant breaching of the boundaries between disciplines and between the technical realm and the lifeworld responds to the crisis of industrial society. We may learn to bound the cosmos in modern forms by attending to the limits that emerge from the unintended interactions of domains touched by powerful modern technologies. This is the form in which the lived world we have discovered in the thought of Heidegger and Marcuse becomes active in the structure of a rationality that still has for its mission the explanation of objective nature. The discovery of a limit reveals the significance of that which is threatened beyond it. This dialectic of limitation is most obvious in the case of threats to human health or species survival. On the one side, the experienced world gains a ground in respect for an object, in this case the human body or a threatened species. On the other side, a concrete technical response is solicited employing the means at hand in new combinations or inventing new ones. From this standpoint no return to a qualitative science is possible or necessary. Modern science objectifies and reifies by its very nature but it could operate within limits standing in for the lost essences of antiquity and like them referring us to an irreducible truth of experience. As we encounter this truth we are reminded of the necessity of restraint. This must be a productive restraint leading to a process of transformation, not a passive refusal of a reified system. The forward looking Janus face is fundamental and grants hope not by rejecting scientific-technical achievements but by revealing their essential nature as processes in which human action can intervene.13 Innovative responses to the new limits can serve in the reconstruction of both technical disciplines and technology. To be sure, the process character and full complexity of reality cannot be reflected immediately in the scientific-technical disciplines, but the disciplines can be deployed in fluid combinations that reflect the complexity of reality as it enters experience through humanly provoked disasters of all sorts and through the consciousness of new threats of which we ourselves are the ultimate source. The goal is not merely to survive but to reconstruct modern technology around a new model of wealth that is environmentally compatible and that draws on human capacities suppressed or ignored in the present dispensation. Marcuse interpreted this in terms of the surrealist “hazard objectif,” the rather fantastic notion of an aesthetically formed world in which “human faculties and desires ... appear as part of the objective determinism of nature – coincidence of causality through nature and causality through freedom” (Marcuse, 1969: 31).

#### -- can’t advocate the plan – steals all the aff ground, allows tiny impossible to beat PICs and proves the Aff true

#### 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.**

#### Alt doesn’t solve macro—any practical implementation wouldn’t make a dent in individual or macro-level consumption patterns

**Røpke 05** [Inge Røpke, Department for Manufacturing Engineering and Management Technical University of Denmark, Consumption in ecological economics, International Society for Ecological Economics, April 2005, <http://www.ecoeco.org/pdf/consumption_in_ee.pdf>]

Compared to the other research questions, the question about how to change consumption patterns in a more sustainable direction is relatively under-researched in ecological economics. In relation to the fields of consumer behaviour, economic psychology and environmental psychology, research on 'sustainable consumption' developed, and energy studies provided new knowledge about energy saving behaviour – research that is sometimes reflected in ecological economics (an extensive review of literature on consumer behaviour and behavioural change in relation to sustainable consumption can be found in (Jackson 2005)). The main focus of this research is consumer choice and individual consumer behaviour, and sustainable consumption is about choosing more environmentally friendly products and services (e.g. organic food) and about recycling behaviour, water saving, room temperature etc. The question is how to encourage consumers to make the environmentally correct choices, and measures such as labelling and information campaigns are studied. This research has also tried to distinguish between different social groups or lifestyles to consider whether the political measures should be tailored to different target groups (Empacher and Götz 2004). A successful contribution from this field has been the NOA-model that describes consumer behaviour as the result of the consumer's Needs, Opportunities and Abilities (Ölander and Thøgersen 1995; Gatersleben and Vlek 1998). For instance, the model is used as an organizing device in the OECD publication Towards Sustainable Household Consumption 11(OECD 2002). The model opens up for public initiatives that can improve the opportunities for more sustainable household behaviour, but neither the social construction of needs, nor the macro aspects of the model akre well developed. However, the idea works well together with strategies for increased technological efficiency: more efficient products and services are provided, and the consumers are encouraged to buy them. Whereas the behavioural research usually focuses on individual consumers or households and how they can be motivated to change behaviour, others have taken an interest in bottom-up initiatives where consumers or citizens organize collectively to change their lifestyle and consumption patterns – initiatives varying from mutual help to be 'green consumers' to the establishment of eco-communities (Georg 1999; Michaelis 2004). Unfortunately, such initiatives still seem to have marginal importance. In general, organizational measures are increasingly studied, both bottom-up initiatives and commercial enterprises – for instance, car-sharing has been arranged in both ways (Prettenthaler and Steininger 1999). A widely promoted idea is to reduce resource use by selling services instead of products, the so-called product-service system concept (Mont 2000; Mont 2004). In this way the final services can be provided with fewer resources, as the provider will have an incentive to reduce costs also in the use phase, and as hardware can sometimes be shared by several consumers. Most of the practical steps to change consumption patterns and most of the related research concern relatively marginal changes that **are like a snowball in hell** compared to the challenge we face, if consumption patterns should deserve to be called sustainable – consistent with a level of consumption that could be generalized to all humans without jeopardizing the basic environmental life support systems. Very little is done to face the 'quantity problem'. At the level of research it is difficult to translate the complexity of driving forces behind the ever-increasing consumption into suggestions for workable solutions, and at the level of politics it is hard to imagine how to achieve support for such solutions. As the driving forces are as strong as ever, all **the small steps towards 'sustainable consumption' co-exist with a general worsening of the situation – although many of these steps can be fine, they are far from sufficient.**

#### Condo is a voter- results in argument irresponsibility, time and strat skews- no cost options in the 1nc make the 2ac impossible- one condo advocacy/ dispo solves your offense

#### Tech optimism based on empirical research is good

Krier 85 (James E., Professor of Law at the University of Michigan, “The Un-Easy Case for Technological Optimism,” Michigan Law Review, Vol. 84, No. 3; December 1985, pp. 405-429)

A technological optimist is **not** simply **a person with unqualified enthusiasm about technological promise**. Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was an enthusiast, but he was not a technological optimist as the term is currently used. Saint-Simon, rather, was a utopian who happened to attach his vision to technocratic expertise.4 He was the forefather of Technocracy, an active utopian movement in the 1930s and one not entirely dead even today.5 Technological optimists are not utopians, but something less - let us say quasi-utopians, after a recent usage (applied to himself) of Robert Dahl's.6 Unlike any self-respecting pure utopian, quasi-utopians (and technological optimists) seek not perfection but **tolerable imperfection**, tolerable because it is better than anything else they consider attainable though not nearly as good as lots of alternatives that can be imagined. But technological optimists are also something more than mere be- lievers, or faddists, or techniks.7 Their views are rigorously formulated, grounded in an apparent reality, based on knowledge and experience, and artfully defended. There are no crazies among the best of the optimists; they are **conservative, respected experts who command enormous authority**. They have a very specific position namely, "that exponential technological growth will allow us to expand resources ahead of exponentially increasing demands."8

# UGA 3 1AR

#### Should doesn’t mean immediate

Dictionary.com – Copyright © 2010 – http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should

should    /ʃʊd/ Show Spelled[shood] Show IPA –auxiliary verb 1. pt. of shall. 2. (used to express condition): Were he to arrive, I should be pleased. 3. must; ought (used to indicate duty, propriety, or expediency): You should not do that. 4. would (used to make a statement less direct or blunt): I should think you would apologize. Use should in a Sentence See images of should Search should on the Web Origin: ME sholde, OE sc ( e ) olde; see shall —Can be confused:  could, should, would (see usage note at this entry ). —Synonyms 3. See must1 . —Usage note Rules similar to those for choosing between shall and will have long been advanced for should and would, but again the rules have had little effect on usage. In most constructions, would is the auxiliary chosen regardless of the person of the subject: If our allies would support the move, we would abandon any claim to sovereignty. You would be surprised at the complexity of the directions. Because the main function of should in modern American English is to express duty, necessity, etc. ( You should get your flu shot before winter comes ), its use for other purposes, as to form a subjunctive, can produce ambiguity, at least initially: I should get my flu shot if I were you. Furthermore, should seems an affectation to many Americans when used in certain constructions quite common in British English: Had I been informed, I should (American would ) have called immediately. I should (American would ) really prefer a different arrangement. As with shall and will, most educated native speakers of American English do not follow the textbook rule in making a choice between should and would. See also shall. Shall –auxiliary verb, present singular 1st person shall, 2nd shall or ( Archaic ) shalt, 3rd shall, present plural shall; past singular 1st person should, 2nd should or ( Archaic ) shouldst or should·est, 3rd should, past plural should; imperative, infinitive, and participles lacking. 1. plan to, *intend* to, or expect to: I shall go later.

#### Root cause doesn’t matter - Intervention has irreparably altered the environment. Abandoning management risks extinction

**Levy 99** (Neil, Ph.D. in Comparative Literature and Critical Theory – Monash University, and Currently Tutor, Centre for Critical Theory, Monash University, (Discourses of the Environment edited by Eric Darier) p. 214-215)

If our current situation can really be accurately characterized as the extension of bio-power from the realm of population to that of all life, does that entail that the strategies we should be adopting are those of management of the non-human world, as well as that of the human? I believe that **it does**. But I do not believe that this necessitates, or even makes possible, the genetically engineered, artificial world which McKibben and many others who have advocated non-anthropocentric ethics have feared, the replacement of the natural world with `a space station' (McKibben 1989: 170). And not just for the reason that, after the end of nature, the artificial/natural distinction is impossible to maintain. The world McKibben fears, in which forests are replaced by trees designed by us for maximum efficiency at absorbing carbon, and new strains of genetically engineered corn flourish in the new conditions brought about by global warming, seems to me unlikely in the extreme. The systems with which we are dealing, the imbrication of a huge variety of forms of life with chemical processes, with meteorological and geographic processes, are so complex, and occur on such scale, that I can see no way in which they could be replaced by artificial systems which would fulfil the same functions. Every intervention we make in' that direction has consequences which are so far-reaching, and involve so many variables and as yet undetected connections between relatively independent systems, that they are practically unforeseeable. To replace non-human systems with mechanisms of our own devising would involve thousands of such interventions, each of which would then require follow-up interventions in order to reverse or control their unintended consequences. Even when, and if, our knowledge of the environment were to reach a stage at which we were able to predict the consequences of our interventions, it would be likely to be far easier, and, in the long run, cheaper, simply to turn the already functioning, `natural' systems to our advantage. No method of reducing the amount of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere is likely to be more effective than preserving the Amazonian rain forest. For this reason, I believe, environmentalists **have nothing to fear from** such **an apparently instrumental approach.** If the `technological fix' is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our use of resources, we are nevertheless **unable simply to leave the environment as it is.** There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have **already set in train** will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to **develop** real, **concrete proposals for action**, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also **preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources** and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, **we risk exacerbating these inequalities**. It is not us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result from a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternatives which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current green-house gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals **for concrete action** must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalists, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, **very much the province of Foucault's specific intellectual,** the one who works `within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them' (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as `the strategists of life and death' than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man's `politics places his existence as a living being in question' (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the **fate of our species**, and of those with whom we share this planet, **will be decided**.

# UGA 5 2AC v JMU MM

### Asset Creation/Reprocessing 2ac

#### We meet – the plan provides incentives for development of SMRs which includes the asset creation – the tech exists now – that’s Rosner and Goldberg – ignoring stacey’s cross-x answers to this question doesn’t make the neg right

#### Counter Interp - Japan thinks reprocessing is T

Williamson 12 (Piers, research assistant to Professor Andrew DeWit at Rikkyo University, “Plutonium and Japan’s Nuclear Waste Problem: International Scientists Call for an End to Plutonium Reprocessing and Closing the Rokkasho Plant,” Asia-Pacific Journal, May, http://www.japanfocus.org/-Piers-\_Williamson/3763)

Prof. von Hippel closed his presentation by stating that although some in Japan argue that reprocessing is too complicated a process to stop, the UK has chosen to do just that. This comment led into Prof. MacKerron’s lecture. He opened by noting that Japan assumes that nuclear power production includes reprocessing; however the UK has shown that they are quite different. Simply put, the UK plans to build more reactors to add to the eleven online today, but is abandoning reprocessing and so offers a case study of how reprocessing may be halted.

#### Prefer our interpretation –

#### Aff flex – they destroy half the topic – wind and solar also aren’t CREATING wind or sunrays, they’re harnessing it – means we can’t run any renewables affs which are the part of the topic that’s good against the k. Aff ground outweighs neg ground – process CPs, Das, the K – err aff

#### Brightline – it’s hard to determine what is and isn’t asset creation with regard to specific energies – this turns precision and makes the topic less predictable as a whole which is worse for both sides

#### No ground loss – our interpretation doesn’t let us spike their links, potential abuse is not a voter

#### Competing interpretations is bad – causes a race to the bottom and trades off with substantive debate about the topic – reasonability is best and good is good enough.

## 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.

### 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

### A2: Makujani

#### Nope

Barton 10 Charles Barton, Masters in Philosophy from Memphis University, [ “Arjun Makhijani and the Modular Small Reactor null-hypothesis”, <http://robertmayer.wordpress.com/2010/10/31/arjun-makhijani-and-the-modular-small-reactor-null-hypothesis/> October 2, 2010]

Finally, we should consider Makhijani assertions about small reactor costs. First he claims, SMR proponents claim that small size will enable mass manufacture in a factory, enabling considerable savings relative to field construction and assembly that is typical of large reactors. In other words, modular reactors will be cheaper because they will be more like assembly line cars than handmade Lamborghinis. In the case of reactors, however, several offsetting factors will tend to neutralize this advantage and make the costs per kilowatt of small reactors higher than large reactors. Makujani claims in contrast to cars or smart phones or similar widgets, the materials cost per kilowatt of a reactor goes up as the size goes down. This is because the surface area per kilowatt of capacity, which dominates materials cost, goes up as reactor size is decreased. Material costs do effect the cost of other industrial produced products including cars, and manufacturers take several approaches to that problem, including careful redesign of components to eliminate part of the expensive material, or the substitution of low cost materials for high cost materials. Makujani does not believe that this is possible, but for example it is possible to eliminate some of the cement and steel in the massive reactor containment dome by housing the reactor in an underground chamber. Thus high cost concrete and steel are replaced by low cost earth and rock, Reactors with compact cores, require less manufacturing material, and smaller housing facilities. Thus the choice of a compact core nuclear technology might offer considerable savings in materials costs. Thus the small reactor manufacturer may have several options to lower materials costs.¶ Makhijani claims that other costs might be inversely proportional to reactor size, Similarly, the cost per kilowatt of secondary containment, as well as independent systems for control, instrumentation, and emergency management, increases as size decreases. Yet as I have already noted there are things that manufacturers can do about containment costs. Control rooms are not huge parts of overall reactor costs, and there are undoubtedly things which reactor manufacturers could do to lower control room building costs. For example whole control room modules can be factory fabricated and moved to the reactor housing site where they could be house underground or in preexisting recycled structures. Similar solutions could be found for the emergency management housing issues. Finally Makhijani tells us Cost per kilowatt also increases if each reactor has dedicated and independent systems for control, instrumentation, and emergency management. Yet smaller reactors will require fewer sensors, reactor control and emergency management and with the very large number of instruments required by mass produced factory manufactured reactors, the cost of instrument manufacture and indeed whole instrument room manufacture will fall significantly. Small reactors require smaller, less costly control and emergency management systems, and the the cost benefits of serial manufacturing will affect the costs of these systems as well. Finally it should be noted that Makhijani fails to mention the clear cut cost lowering benefits of factory manufactured reactors. For example, Labor costs are significantly lowered in several ways. Factory assembly offers superior labor organization and thus the same tasks take less time in the factory. Secondly workers can live close to factory sites, thus do not require high wages to induce them into the transient lifestyle of construction workers. Thirdly, in a factory in which several reactors are being constructed at any one time, individual workers will require fewer skills. The less skilled workers will command lower wages. Taken together significant labor savings are possible through factory manufacture. Labor is by no means the only source of savings. A further source of savings would come from the serial manufacture of parts. It is well known that as the number of a part built increases, the cost of manufacturing that part falls. Thus serial production tends to lower unit costs. In addition serial production introduces cost lowering learning. As knowledge of a manufacturing process rises, awareness of cost lowering possibilities also increase. This is called the learning curve. It is reasonable to anticipate a learning curve based saving for serial produced small reactors. Thus cost savings will be available to the manufacturers of small factory built reactors. We lack cost the cost date that we need to judge the extent to which small factory manufactured reactors will lower nuclear costs. Arguments for the nuclear cost lowering benefits of economies of scale are not nearly strong as Makhijani believes them to be, while the evidence of a cost lowering effect of serial reactor manufacturer is stronger. Thus Makhijani has chosen to reject the stronger evidence while upholding the case for which the evidence appears to be so weak as to offer no support.¶ We can conclude then, that Arjun Makhijani has not established reasonable grounds in support of his assertion that Small Modular Reactors offer no solution for the cost, safety, and waste problems of nuclear power. Thus to the extent that this assertion can be viewed as a null-hypothesis to the claim that Small Modular Reactors offer an valuable attractive alternative to large conventional power plants, the hypothesis must be still be viewed as unfalsified by the available evidence. Further evidence could still change this picture, but for the moment advocates of small reactors have plausible grounds for their case.

## Solvency

### A2: Bottlenecks

#### Current construction resolves bottlenecks

**Bowman, 8** – CEO of the NEI (Skip, 6/19. HEARING OF THE ENERGY AND AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE; SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: AN OVERVIEW,” Lexis.)

REP. BURGESS: Is there any difficulty in getting the actual reactors and materials that are needed to build the plant?
ADM. BOWMAN: That has not become a problem. We are certainly aware of the bottlenecks in the infrastructure because we haven't built in a long time. We're aware that the rest of the world is going in this direction. Those people who are in that first wave that I discussed earlier, those four to eight plants that might be on line by 2016 are already buying long lead time components, in some cases those long lead time components have been delivered. If they aren't delivered the companies are in the queue. So that's not causing the difficulty.

### A2: Worker Shortages

#### Building new plants is vital to expanding the nuclear workforce

Howard, 7 – Vice President Office of the President Nuclear Energy Institute (Angie, 2/5. “Achieving Excellence in Human Performance: Nuclear Energy Training and Education.” <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2007/americannuclearsocietyextended>)

And, finally, Number Four—New Plant Pressures on Current Workforce. Yes, new plant activities are putting additional pressure on scarce utility human resources in areas like operations training, licensing and engineering, not to mention the project management and construction skills that will be needed. But, utility announcements of plans to build new plants and the resulting media coverage are raising the interest level of young people in careers in our industry. This new plant activity has also resulted in new job creation at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And vendors are aggressively hiring in nuclear-related disciplines. What young people are hearing is that, right now, 14 companies or consortia have publicly announced plans to apply for licenses for up to 33 new nuclear reactors. The first applications for a license to construct and operate a new nuclear plant will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission later this year.

## Off

**AT: Light-Water Reactor**

**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**.

### Eco Fem 2AC

#### -- Alt fails – reverses the error and can’t build transformational theory

Caprioli 4 (Mary, Professor of Political Science – University of Tennessee, “Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis”, International Studies Review, 42(1), March, http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/0020-8833.00076)

If researchers cannot add gender to an analysis, then they must necessarily use a purely female-centered analysis, even though the utility of using a purely female centered analysis seems equally biased. Such research would merely be gendercentric based on women rather than men, and it would thereby provide an equally biased account of international relations as those that are male-centric. Although one might speculate that having research done from the two opposing worldviews might more fully explain international relations, surely an integrated approach would offer a more comprehensive analysis of world affairs. Beyond a female-centric analysis, some scholars (for example, Carver 2002) argue that feminist research must offer a critique of gender as a set of power relations. Gender categories, however, do exist and have very real implications for individuals, social relations, and international affairs. Critiquing the social construction of gender is important, but it fails to provide new theories of international relations or to address the implications of gender for what happens in the world.

#### Solves best – alt alone fails – combining it with practical problem-solving is best --- overcomes the failings of both

**Keohane 98** (Robert, Professor – Duke University, “Beyond Dichotomy: Conversations Between International Relations and Feminist Theory”, International Studies Quarterly 42, http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/action/showPdf?submitPDF=Full+Text+PDF+%2889+KB%29&doi=10.1111%2F0020-8833.00076)

The problem with Tickner’s dichotomies, however, goes much deeper. The dichotomies should be replaced by continua, with the dichotomous characterizations at the poles. Each analyst of world politics has to locate herself or himself somewhere along the dimensions between critical and problem-solving theory, nomothetic and narrative epistemology, and a social or structural conception of international relations. In my view, none of the ends of these continua are the optimal places to rest one’s perspective. Criticism of the world, by itself, becomes a jeremiad, often resting implicitly on a utopian view of human potential. Without analysis, furthermore, it constitutes merely the opinion of one or a number of people. On the other hand, implicit or complacent acceptance of the world as it is would rob the study of international relations of much of its meaning. How could one identify “problems” withough criticism at some level? The issue is not problem-solving vs. critical theory- a convenient device for discarding work that one does not wish to accept- but how deeply the criticism should go. For example, most students of war study it because they hope to expose its evils or to control it in some way: few do so to glorify war as such. But the depth of their critique varies. Does the author reject certain acts of warfare, all warfare, all coercion, or the system of states itself? The deeper the criticism, the more wide-ranging the questions. Narrowly problem-solving work, as in much policy analysis, often ignores the most important causal factors in a situation because they are not manipulable in the short run. However, the more critical and wide-ranging an author’s perspective, the more difficult it is to do comparative empirical analysis. An opponent of some types of war can compare the causes of different wars, as a way to help to eliminate those that are regarded as pernicious; but the opponent of the system of states has to imagine the counterfactual situation of a system without states.

[\*\* Note – “jeremiad” = a prolonged lamentation or mournful complaint.]

#### Viewing all problems through the lens of gender is counter-productive --- blocks crucial progressive action

Jarvis 2k (Daryl, Lecturer in Government and International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline)

Celebrating and reifying difference as a political end in itself thus run the risk of creating increasingly divisive and incommensurate discourses where each group claims a knowledge or experienced based legitimacy but, in doing so, precluding the possibility of common understanding or intergroup political discourse. Instead, difference produces antithetical dis­cord and political-tribalism: only working class Hispanics living in South Central Los Angeles, for instance, can speak of, for, and about their com­munity, its concerns, interests and needs; only female African Americans living in the projects of Chicago can speak "legitimately" of the housing and social problems endemic to inner city living. Discourse becomes con­fined not to conversations between identity groups since this is impossible, but story telling of personal/group experiences where the "other" listens intently until their turn comes to tell their own stories and experiences. Appropriating the voice or pain of others by speaking, writing, or theoriz­ing on issues, perspectives, or events not indicative of one's group-identity becomes not only illegitimate but a medium of oppression and a means to silence others. The very activity of theory and political discourse as it has been understood traditionally in International Relations, and the social sciences more generally, is thus rendered inappropriate in the new milieu of identity politics. Politically, progressives obviously see a danger in this type of discourse and, from a social scientific perspective, understand it to be less than rig­orous. Generalizing, as with theorizing, for example, has fallen victim to postmodern feminist reactions against **methodological essentialism** and the adoption of what Jane Martin calls the instillation of **false difference** into identity discourse. By reacting against the assumption that "all indi­viduals in the world called `women' were exactly like us" (i.e. white, mid­dle class, educated, etc.), feminists now tend "a priori to give privileged status to a predetermined set of analytic categories and to affirm the exis**­**tence of nothing but difference." In avoiding the "pitfall of false unity," feminists have thus "walked straight into the trap of false difference. Club words now dominate the discourse. Essentialism, ahistoricism, uni­versalism, and androcentrism, for example, have become the "prime idiom[s] of intellectual terrorism and the privileged instrument[s] of polit­ical orthodoxy." While sympathetic to the cause, even feminists like Jane Martin are critical of the methods that have arisen to circumvent the evils of essentialism, characterizing contemporary feminist scholarship as imposing its own "chilly climate" on those who question the method­ological proclivity for difference and historicism. Postmodern feminists, she argues, have fallen victim to compulsory historicism, and by "rejecting one kind of essence talk but adopting another," have followed a course "whose logical conclusion all but precludes the use of language." For Martin, this approaches a "**dogmatism** on the methodological level that we do not countenance in other contexts.... It **rules out theories, categories, and research projects** in advance; prejudges the extent of difference and the nonexistence of similarity." In all, it speaks to a methodological **trap** th**at produces many of the same problems as before**, but this time in a language otherwise viewed as progressive, sensitive to the particularities of identity and gender, and destructive of conventional boundaries in disci­plinary knowledge and theoretical endeavor.

#### -- Turn – essentialism: they equal women with ecology. This solidifies gender roles

Davion 94 (Victoria, Professor of Philosophy – UGA, Ecological Feinism, Ed. Karren Warren, p. 16)

Feminism pays attention to women. Although ther are many different kinds of feminism, all feminists agree that sexist oppression is wrong and seek to overthrow patriarchy in its various forms. Thus, for an analysis to be feminist, it must include an analysis of sex, gender, and patriarchy. It must look for the various ways that sexist oppression damages women, and seek nonpatriarchal alternatives to them. In looking at how patriarchy damages women, a feminist analysis must look closely at the roles women play in various patriarchies, e.g., the historically identified feminine roles. In so far as these roles are damanging (especially to those who play them) they must be viewed with suspicion. If feminists fail to assert that at least some of the roels assigned to women under patriarchy are damaging, we fail to assert the very premise that makes feminism, the overthrowing of patriarchy, important. For, if sexist oppression is not damaging to women, women have no reason to resist it. If it does cause damage, we should expect to see this damage in traditionally assigned feminine roles. Thus, ecofeminist solutions which assert that feminine roles can provide an aswer to the ecological crisis, without first examining how these roles presently are, or historically been, damaging to those who play them, undermine the very conceptual significance and underpinnings of feminism that ecofeminist philosophers such as Warren and Plumwood assert.

#### Rejecting traditional security analysis guarantees the sector will be dominated by the most conservative policymakers

Olav. F. **Knudsen**, Prof @ Södertörn Univ College, **‘1** [*Security Dialogue* 32.3, “Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization,” p. 366]

A final danger in focusing on the state is that of building the illusion that states have impenetrable walls, that they have an inside and an outside, and that nothing ever passes through. Wolfers’s billiard balls have contributed to this misconception. But the state concepts we should use **are in no need of** such an illusion. Whoever criticizes the field for such sins in the past needs to **go back to the literature**. Of course, we must continue to be open to a frank and unbiased assessment of the transnational politics which significantly in- fluence almost every issue on the domestic political agenda. The first decade of my own research was spent studying these phenomena – and I disavow none of my conclusions about the state’s limitations. Yet I am not ashamed to talk of a domestic political agenda. Anyone with a little knowledge of Euro- pean politics knows that Danish politics is not Swedish politics is not German politics is not British politics. Nor would I hesitate for a moment to talk of the role of the state in transnational politics, where it is an important actor, though only one among many other competing ones. In the world of transnational relations, the exploitation of states by interest groups – by their assumption of roles as representatives of states or by convincing state representatives to argue their case and defend their narrow interests – is a significant class of phenomena, today as much as yesterday. Towards a Renewal of the Empirical Foundation for Security Studies Fundamentally, the sum of the foregoing list of sins blamed on the Copen- hagen school amounts to a lack of attention paid to just that ‘reality’ of security which Ole Wæver consciously chose to leave aside a decade ago in order to pursue the politics of securitization instead. I cannot claim that he is void of interest in the empirical aspects of security because much of the 1997 book is devoted to empirical concerns. However, the attention to agenda-setting – confirmed in his most recent work – draws attention away from the important issues we need to work on more closely if we want to contribute to a better understanding of European **security as it is** currently developing**.** That inevitably requires a more **consistent** interest in security policy in the making – not just in the development of alternative security policies. The dan- ger here is that, as alternative policies are likely to fail grandly on the political arena, crucial decisions may be made in the ‘**traditional’ sector of security** policymaking, **unheeded by any but the most uncritical minds.**

#### -- The specific political project of the Aff augments solvency – it raises consioucness amongst feminist movements

Sturgeon 97 (Noel, Professor of Women’s Studies – Washington State University, “Ecofeminist Natures”)

The popularity of recent anti-essentialist theories of situational political identities notwithstanding, such theories rarely make explicit the conditions for the creation of a politically “oppositional consciousness” that is strategic and positional. There is acknowledgment that an oppositional consciousness is created by those movements that engage in “consciousness-raising.” Bell hooks, among others, points out that consciousness-raising in small groups is a crucial practice for building both a feminist movement and feminist theory. But as I will point out later in this book, simply exploring difference, finding patterns in experience, and bonding between women in such small groups is not sufficient. What is also called for are **specific political projects** for such small groups that operate with awareness of multiple and intersecting kinds of difference and under conditions that allow these differences to influence the definition of issues and the choice of strategies. A similar point is made by Val Plumwood, who notes that “forms of oppression” can be seen “as very closely…related, and working together to form a single system without losing a degree of distinctness and differentiation.” She recommends that such a conception of oppression as both a “single mutual supporting system” and a “differential system,” requires a “cooperative movement strategy [that] suggests a methodological principle for both theory and action, that whenever there is a choice of strategies or of possibilities for theoretical development, then other things being equal those…that take account of or promote this wider, connected set of objectives are to be preferred to ones that do not. This should be regarded as a minimum principle of cooperative strategy. Even more specifically, I argue that radically democratic, participatory, and nonhierarchical movement structures, especially within movements that attempt coalitions, provide the conditions for destabilizing the essentialist moments that are perhaps inevitably involved in the construction of a political collectivity or an oppositional consciousness. I intend to explore the uses of carious and heterogeneous kinds of essentialist formulations for ecofeminism and at the same point to the ways in which radically democratic ecofeminist organizations and theoretical production constantly revise and contest political identities. I will try to mitigate what I see as prevailing reductionist account of the essentialism of ecofeminism by examining contradiction, factures, and debates within the movement’s discursive practices. I also pay particular attention, however, to the moments these essentialisms become barriers to more productive coalitions, especially between ecofeminists and the environmental justice movement, and between U.S. ecofeminist and nonwestern feminist environmentalists.

#### -- Alt fails – no mechanism to translate theory into practice

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.

.

#### -- Eco-feminism reinforces patriarchy

Merchant 90 (Carolyn, Chair of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources – University of California, Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism. edited by Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein)

Yet in emphasizing the female, body, and nature components of the dualities male/female, mind/body, and culture/nature, radical eco­feminism runs the risk of **perpetuating the very hierarchies it seeks to overthrow.** Critics point to the problem of women's own reinforce­ment of their identification with a nature that Western culture de­grades.7 If "female is to male as nature is to culture," as anthropologist Sherry Ortner argues," then women's hopes for liberation are **set back by association with nature**. Any analysis that makes women's, essence and qualities special ties them to a biological destiny that thwarts the possibility of liberation. A politics grounded in women's culture, ex­perience, and values can be **seen as reactionary**.

#### -- Women frequently contribute to environmental destruction – they’re reductionist

Archambault 93 (Anne, “A Critique of Ecofeminism”, Canadian Women Studies, 13(3), https://pi.library.yorku.ca/ojs/index.php/cws/article/viewFile/10403/94920)

Because women have historically been less implicated than men in the process of environmental degradation, they "occupy avantage point of 'critical otherness' from which they can offer a different way of looking at the problems both of patriarchy and ecological destruction" as do other groups such as indigenous people and other ethnic minorities (Eckersley, 67). This lends support to the "oppression argument." However, Robyn Eckersley cautions ecofeminists to be wary of "over-dentifying with, and hence accepting uncritically, the perspective of women." She points out three ways in which overprivileging women's experiences can "inhibit the general emancipatory process." First, such an analysis can overlook the extent to which many women have been accessories in the process of ecological destruction in the past. Second, it can fail to identify the different ways in which men themselves have suffered from "masculine" stereotypes. Third, it can be less responsive to the impact of other social dynamics and prejudices that are unrelated to the question of gender. Ulti- mately, she feels that while "rendering visible and critically incorporating" wom- en's experiences is commendable, over- privileging their experiences can **only lead to a "lopsided and reductionist analysis** of social and ecological problems" (67).

#### 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.**

### Immigration Reform Econ 2AC

#### Obama’s backing off – thinks PC is a poison-pill

Avlon 1-31 (John, “Immigration Reform Proposal Shows Similar Ideas between Bush and Obama,” Daily Beast, 2013, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/31/immigration-reform-proposal-shows-similar-ideas-betweeen-bush-and-obama.html)

Wehner’s comments cut to the heart of the lessons learned. After essentially ignoring immigration reform in its first term, the Obama administration is front-loading the ambitious effort and—for the time, at least—deferring to the Gang of Eight in hopes that it might be less polarizing if the president’s name isn’t on the bill when senators from the opposing party try to sell it to their base. What’s old is new. It’s an irony not lost on Bush administration alumni and family members. The death of the Bush bill came largely at the hands of a right-wing talk-radio revolt that attacked any path to citizenship as “amnesty.” The fact that then–presidential candidate John McCain was sponsoring the bill with none other than Ted Kennedy created an opening for competitors like Mitt Romney to try to get to McCain’s right in a play to the primary’s conservative populist cheap seats. But the other hostile front came from resurgent House Democrats who frankly did not want to give the polarizing lame-duck incumbent named Bush a political win. Fast-forward six years, and the right-wing talk-radio crowd is weakened. The evangelical, law-enforcement, and business communities are now united behind comprehensive immigration reform. Responsible Republicans know they cannot afford to alienate Hispanics any longer. And the presence of Florida Sen. Marco Rubio—a onetime Jeb Bush protégé—is an essential addition to the coalition. “Senator Rubio, a Tea Party choice, is well respected and well liked and trusted,” adds Wehner. “With him as the lead in these negotiations, conservatives are more willing to consider immigration reform than in the past. You’re not seeing the explosion of opposition now that we saw in 2007. That doesn’t mean it won’t happen; but for now, it hasn’t.” Long story short: it’s much easier for Marco Rubio to make the case for the Senate’s bipartisan path to citizenship than to argue on behalf of President Obama’s bill, which would be a nonstarter to much of the base. And so the president wisely held off from offering his specific policy vision in the much-hyped Las Vegas speech earlier this week. It’s not unlike the reason Harry Truman gave for naming the postwar European-aid bill after his secretary of state, George Marshall: “Anything that is sent up to the Senate and House with my name on it will quiver a couple of times and then turn over and die.”

#### Gun control derails immigration

Rauch 1-20. [Jonathan, guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, "Tackle immigration first, Mr. President" NY Daily News -- www.nydailynews.com/opinion/tackle-immigration-mr-president-article-1.1242944?print]

So what does Obama do first? Gun control.¶ If ever there was a political sticky wicket, this is it. “Gun Agenda Faces an Uphill Battle,” headlined the Washington Post the other day. You can say that again. On the merits, in a magic-wand world, it makes sense to tighten some gun regulations, especially by closing the so-called “gun show loophole,” which allows non-dealers to buy firearms without background checks.¶ But let’s not kid ourselves: In a country with perhaps 250 million firearms already in private hands, even the deftest regulatory improvements will bring only marginal reductions in violence. No one likes to hear this, but it is true: the mass murder at Sandy Hook Elementary School was an atrocity of the first magnitude, and even one such atrocity is too many — but mass shootings in schools are very rare, and way, way down the list of causes of violent deaths. Moreover, there is little the federal government can do to prevent them.¶ No doubt, Obama was distraught by those murders. We all were. But this was a case when his more characteristic cold-blooded realism would have served him better.¶ None of what makes immigration so urgent and accomplishable is true of gun control. There is no bipartisan desire to get it done. In fact, not even Democrats are united. Republicans already smell blood: a chance to grind Obama down by stalling and obstructing in the usual way and to re-energize what has been, until now, a demoralized conservative base. The National Rifle Association will provide plenty of assistance with that project, fattening its coffers along the way.¶ Now, Obama is more popular today than Bush was in 2005, and he won a stronger reelection victory; nor is gun regulation as quixotic as was Bush’s effort to reform Social Security with only one party’s support. Obama may yet succeed where Bush failed.¶ Suppose he does succeed, though. What with the upcoming two (or is it three? four?) budgetary crises, the bandwidth for immigration was always narrow. It will be narrowed still further by diverting legislative time and energy toward guns. Gun control gives liberals a new crusade, but in doing so it opens an attention-distracting, resource-depleting two-front war.¶ Meanwhile, the window of opportunity for immigration might stay open for a while, but it might not, especially if Obama is weakened and conservatives regroup.¶ And if he loses on guns? Bush thought he could afford to lose on Social Security and move on to immigration. He was wrong. In fact, he never recovered. His political strength and strategic credibility were shaken, and he spent the rest of his second term playing defense. Also, of course, the immigration-reform window closed. Republican moderates were marginalized by conservatives who had no interest in any reform that Democrats might accept.¶ Unlike President Bill Clinton, Obama has never broken in any important way with his liberal base. Gun control, despite its poor return on investment as a policy matter, is catnip to liberals. They just can’t stay away from it. That might be all right if the opportunity cost weren’t so high — for Democrats and liberals, for the economy, and not least for immigrants.¶ One thing I have learned about Barack Obama: When he and I disagree, he is usually right and I am usually wrong. Maybe he sees something I don’t. Maybe it is true, as liberals seem to believe, that public opinion on guns has undergone a fundamental change (though more likely, based on the available facts, is that the public is undergoing a short-term reaction to a prominent news story).¶ As a supporter of both immigration reform and smarter gun regulation, I hope Obama, unlike Bush at the same point eight years ago, gets away with his off-center lurch. If not, in a few years senior administration officials will be scratching their heads, wondering why the heck they didn’t put immigration first.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### GOP will cave

Lawrence 1-29 (Jill, Obama to Congress: No Repeat of Obamacare on Immigration, National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-to-congress-no-repeat-of-obamacare-on-immigration-20130129)

Between the lecture on timeliness and a campaign rally atmosphere punctuated by bursts of adoring applause, there was not much in Obama’s appearance for Republicans to love. His deadlines, his tone, even the lofty rhetoric he employed -- all served as a reminder, once again, that he won the White House. But Republicans can’t afford to opt out of this enterprise. They're unlikely to win the White House themselves until immigrants, legal or not, view them as friends rather than foes.

#### 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."

#### 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

#### 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

#### 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.

# UGA 5 1AR

#### 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.