### CP-not going for it-perms test of comp

**50 state**

**The counterplan is legitimate –**

**1. Reciprocity** – affs can fiat a plethora of actors within the federal government like the Department of Energy

**2. Real world** – the National Governors Association and National Conference of State Legislatures prove the 50 states work together

**3. Neg ground** – the states counterplan is a core neg generic on domestic topics – it’s a key check against aff innovation

**4. Limits** – requiring a fed key warrant is key to determine which affs can be run strategically

**5. DAs don’t solve our offense –** the counterplan is key impact defense against a multiplicity of advantages and add-ons

**6. Doesn’t fiat out of solvency deficits** – they can provide evidence to the state implementation

**7. Reject the argument, not the team**

## Conditionality Good

**1. No Abuse- we’ll still advocate only one policy option in-round in addition to the SQ. The affirmative can advocate both their plan and a legitimate permutation. The grounds for both sides are even.**

**2. Checks aff bias- the affirmative speaks first, last, and has infinite prep time. The ability to kick the CP under certain conditions levels the playing field.**

**3. Negation theory- the negative has a burden in every round to prove that the affirmative plan is an undesirable policy option. They may do so by any means necessary, for that is their responsibility.**

**4. C/I: we get 1 condo k and 1 condo cp—key to test the implenetation of the plan and the methodologies behind it, solves their offense**

4. Real World- in reality, one can throw out a policy if it is found to be undesirable under certain conditions.

**6. 8. Potential abuse isn’t a voter- there’s always the possibility for abuse, if it were a voting issue the negative would never win a single round.**

**At worst, reject the argument, not the team. We can’t be held responsible for rejecting a bad policy: its our responsibility –dispo doesn’t solve offenes**

## K

### 2NC Overview

#### The affirmative’s attempt to manage the environment and treat the earth as an object creates an endless cycle that destroys intrinsic value of objects and turns them into instruments for human consumption and destroys all other modes of thought that’s mcwhorter 92.

#### The link is obvious—(insert specific analysis here)

#### We turn back their advantages.  There is no end to technological thought as long as actions such as the aff continue—the human ego will continue to find destructive ways to control life, death, and the environment that’s Beckman 2k.  As soon as the affirmative tries to use technology to solve social problems, that same technology will create new problems that are as difficult as the ones they try to solve.  Since they cannot prove their advantages, you should vote negative on presumption

#### Failure to rethink our relations to the earth must come before trying to prevent wars or save lives.  The affirmative renders life meaningless and creates a standing reserve where humans can no longer have an authentic relationship with being because of the destruction of intrinsic values of objects and the environment that’s Zimmerman 94. This impact is not a calculation—it’s an ethical obligation that comes before the affirmative, because life should have meaning.

#### Our alternative is to detach and release.  We must learn to let things be what they are.  This requires taking a step back to allow for a reorientation of how we relate to the world and beings in it. The alt is a prerequisite to the affirmative—it would change the way tech is developed and the purposes for which we use technology, allowing eventually for better action. That’s sabatino 07

#### The Link devastates solvency because even where they win the plan is sufficient to solve the harms of the 1AC they concede to the normalizing nature of their justifications furthering the replication of their impacts—their advantages reproduce their impacts

Szabo ‘2 [Matt, is a final-year PhD student in Geography at The University of Manchester. "Managerial ecology: Zygmunt Bauman and the gardening culture of modernity". Environments. 26 May, 2012. Wilfrid Laurier University, 2002. FindArticles.com.]

The logic of modern ordering is, to use Weston's terminology (1996), a

AND

human security and a challenge to the ordering tendency of the human intellect.

### L: Nuclear Energy

#### Nuclear Energy Development uses the instrumental enframing of the natural world and becomes determinate of nature. Stockpiles of plutonium are symptomatic of standing reserves

Dr. William J. Kinsella 2007 (Heidegger and Being at the Hanford Reservation: Standing Reserve, Enframing, and Environmental Communication Theory; Environmental Communication Vol. 1, No. 2, November 2007, pp.194-217 Dr. William J. Kinsella is an associate professor at North Carolina State University. His work on nuclear energy communication has encompassed the areas of nuclear fusion, environmental cleanup across the US nuclear weapons complex, and commercial nuclear energy in US and global contexts.)

In his essay on ‘‘the question concerning technology,’’ Heidegger (1977a)

AND

implicit in the founding premises of modernism (Kinsella, 2004, 2005).

### AT: Perm: do both

### A2: Perm: Do Both

#### 1. Can’t combine –

#### Our alternative is non-action. You can’t combine action with non-action, that is nonsense.

#### 2. Permutation fails –

#### (a) Non-action with rethinking is the only way to recover meditative thinking. Trying to act and rethink at the same type fails, because technological thinking will end up crowding out any attempt at meditative thinking.

#### (b) It’s the link – The Affirmative is like someone who is trying to quit cigarettes, I will give up technological thinking, but I need it “just this one last time.” It is this type of managerial thinking that makes a recovery of meditative thinking impossible.

#### 3. Even if you think they win the permutation solves some of our offense, it’s “try or die”! That’s the 1NC Zimmerman evidence. Any risk that they don’t allow us to recover meditative thinking is a risk we can’t take, since soon technological thinking will come to make recovering meditative thinking impossible.

#### 4. No net benefit –

#### Any advantage to their permutation would be questions that our important in this discussion. The concept of “impacts” and “body counts” are largely irrelevant since the focus of this discussion is one of ontology.

#### 5. Any notion of modern enframing engaged with meditative thought would kill any potential solvency

**Weinberger 92** (Jerry, Ph.D., Professor MSU, “Politics and the Problem of Technology: An Essay on Heidegger and the Tradition of Political Philosophy”, Project Muse)

Recent thinking about technology and its implications for politics has taken a postmodern turn.

AND

it will not be to recur to the contending elements of modern rationalism.

### At: alt fails-group it

#### Detaching and release solves—reorients the way we look at tech-that’s in the overview

#### Reorienting the ontological relations between human beings and others in nature can foster changes in worldly relations, moving us away from technological exploitation

Leslie Paul **Thiele**, professor of political science at the University of Florida. *Timely Meditations: Martin Heidegger and Postmodern Politics*. 19**95** (pp. 184-185)

**Relations with others and nature would develop in a less technologically exploitative and more preservative, ecological direction**, Heidegger suggests, **once the understanding of human being as care displaces the subjectivism that grounds out metaphysical self-understandings. In writing that "man is not the lord of beings. Man is the shepherd of Being," Heidegger gestures at the changes to our concrete, worldly relationships that might ensue from changes in our ontological relationships**.

#### Releasement is not a retreat from the world; it is the only way to form a meaningful relationship in the world

Leslie Paul **Thiele**, professor of political science at the University of Florida. *Timely Meditations: Martin Heidegger and Postmodern Politics*. 19**95** (p. 83)

Disclosive freedom is always the freedom resolutely to will openness to Being and releasement to

AND

overt and its overtness in which everything that 'is' takes up its position."

### AT: perm: plan and non reject parts

### A2: Perm – Other Instances

#### The Perm fails — Each instance is important, the perm justifies spillover, asking you to allow this instance over and over again

#### Turn — At any risk of the rhetoric of the affirmative we lose our being which will make all other arguments in this round irrelevant there is no net benefit to the perm.

#### — nonsensical- the alt is to detach and release, it rejects the plan—there are no non-mutually exclusive parts

#### Only risk that technological rationality spills over – alt is always better.

Dreyfus, 2K3 [Hubert , Prof of Philosophy at Berkeley, 2003, Foucault and Heidegger: Critical Encounters, p. 43]

Foucault, in a variation on Heidegger's account of research, sees that our current

AND

a constant correlation between an increasing individualization and the reinforcement of this totality.

#### The alternative comes first. We have to reject the enframing that the affirmative perpetuates. Every instance matters

Catherine Frances Botha 2003 (Department of Philosophy University of Pretoria, South Africa, “Heidegger, technology and ecology”, South African Journal of Philosophy (2003), Vol. 22 Issue 2, 165.

We can say both “yes” and “no” to technology by having

AND

two and a half millennia in the West has encouraged this technological servitude.

### AT: ext o/w

#### **Ontology comes first- it’s the starting point for all political considerations**

Dillon, Prof of Politics- University of Lancaster, 99 [Michael, Moral Spaces p. 97-98]

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake

AND

-innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

### A2 –Framework

#### 1. That’s a new link --

#### Our critique would criticize the policy-making framework, since the policy-making framework is focused on using debate as a means to learn about government action and management and trying to apply this thinking to the real world. It is this thinking that is linked to the need for management and action, and our McWhorter evidence argues that these calls for action and management are the basis for the calculative thinking that displaces meditative thinking now.

#### 2. Our framework should supersede policy questions –

#### Before asking what policies we should pass, we should ask what our relationship to the world is. It is only by establishing what our relationship should be to the world that we can determine how and why we should act.

### AT: Management k2 solve extinction (calc good)

### AT: CAlc thought good

#### All of the links are disads to calc thought-they’re a reason why calculating is bad because it leads toa standing reserve-that’s mcwhorter

#### Calculative thought reduces all surroundings into a homogenous standing reserve

**Mitchell ‘5** [Andrew J., is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at Stanford University in the Humanities. "Heidegger and Terrorism," Research in Phenomenology, Volume 35, Number 1, 2005, pp. 181-218].

Opposition is no longer an operative concept for Heidegger, since technology has served to

AND

distribution and circulation. In short, leaders serve the standing-reserve.

### AT: standing reserve k2 solve ext

#### Standing reserve leads to extinction-that’s in the overview-their global warming impacts are a result of human managagment of the environment and resources—our fossil fuel use is what increased co2 emissions—proves why the interventions the aff calls for are bad

#### A standing reserve isn’t necessary to solve extinction—we can act without devaluing life, just not in the world of the affirmative

#### The constant call for political action is the basis for our impending problems. In order to reconfigure these problems and overcome technological thinking we need to not act and rethink what it means to think. It is the only way to open up the possibilities for political responses that truly solve and for alternative types of thinking.

Zimmerman, Tulane Philosophy Professor, 96

[Minding Nature, Ed. McCauley]

Critics have often charged that Heidegger's otherwise charming account of the fourfold fails to confront

AND

only temporary, constitutes a necessary step toward the advent of an alternative disclosure

### Case t/ k-nuke inev bc other countries developing

#### Case does’nt turn the k—case debate proves nuke revival is not inevitable and that isn’t a reason why the aff’s management of the environment is good—in the world of the alternative this wouldn’t be inevitable because the prioritization of nuclear energy would no longer take place

## Solvency

### 2NC Solvency – Timeframe

Solvency takes decades and the reactors won’t be cost-competitive – requires re-orienting the nuclear manufacturing industry—in the short term SMR’s are slower to build because currently all facilities are geared towards LWR’s—shifting to SMR’s would take decades

**Ryan 11**

#### Plan takes at least 10 years to solve**—has to obtain design certification, licenses, and build the next generation of plants—will take at least 6 years and that’s only if all of that happens fast/ efficiently—even if construction only takes 2-3, the rest of the process makes it take longer**

King 11 (

#### New safety plans and nuclear waste prevention will be required for SMRS

Wang 12, [Ucilia, renewable energy and green tech journalist for Forbes, 1/20/12, "Feds To Finance Small Nuclear Reactor Designs," online: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/uciliawang/2012/01/20/feds-to-finance-small-nuclear-reactor-designs/print/>]

The U.S. Department of Energy on Friday announced a plan to support

AND

that nuclear power should remain an important part of the country’s energy mix.

#### Safety requirements and legal restrictions force long timeframe or trigger accidents

Mycle Schneider and Antony Froggatt 9/14/2012 (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "2011-2012 world nuclear inustry status report" bos.sagepub.com/content/68/5/8.full.pdf+html)

Increased construction times. Since the beginning of the nuclear age, there has been

AND

a large range: 3.2 years to 36.3 years.

### Gradualism 2NC

**Gradualism Turn**

**NRC is conducting SMR assessments with industry participation, solves commercialization. Letting their demanding review process finish before giving incentives is key to solvency—in order to be mass produced SMR’s must go through the licensing process**

**Heft, ‘11**

**accelerating domestic SMR process during the review process leads to catastrophic accidents because companies will scale up production before safe designs are fully developed**

**Wang, 12**

That leads to **Extinction—nuclear accidents lead to contamination, pollution and widescale disease spread**

**Lendman, ‘11**

**Transparent public engagement in this process is key to manage concerns and prevent visceral public backlash – turns case—without transparency the public will reject new nuclear development**

**Guy, 12**

#### Rushing SMR licensing increases liability cases—turns viability and supercharges the safety link

Feinstein, ‘11

[Dianne, US Senator, “AN EXAMINATION OF THE SAFETY AND ECONOMICS OF LIGHT WATER SMALL MODULAR REACTORS: HEARING before a SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION, SPECIAL HEARING, JULY 14, 2011--WASHINGTON DC,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg72251/html/CHRG-112shrg72251.htm]

The Fukushima crisis also demonstrated the potential danger of storing spent fuel in pools on

AND

they must offset the loss of economies of scale with economies of manufacturing.

### 2NC Solvency – Cost Competitiveness

#### Not cost-competitive:

**Confining radiation won’t scale down and by the time we can build them they won’t be competitive-competitors don’t want to scale down and are decades away from mass production necessary—they prefer the more efficient approaches that are already available**

**Lovins 10**

#### Delay gap into proven technology means no competitiveness

Amory B. Lovins 9, Physicist, environmental scientist, writer, and Chairman/Chief Scientist of the Rocky Mountain Institute http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory

Toshiba claims to be about to market a 200-kWe nuclear plant (~50

AND

energy, climate, and proliferation problems, led by business for profit.

#### Material cost – surface area per kilowatt of capacity is smaller for SMRs

Makhijani & Boyd 2010 (IEER Institute of energy and environmental research <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf>) JA

SMR proponents claim that small size will enable mass manufacture in a factory, enabling

AND

to achieve ¶ economies of scale and make nuclear power ¶ economically competitive.

#### Cleanup and fuel management is more expensive

Makhijani & Boyd 2010 (IEER Institute of energy and environmental research <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf>) JA

Proponents claim that with longer operation on a single fuel charge and with less ¶

AND

kilowatt ¶ ¶ of capacity than faced by present-day aboveground reactors.¶

### 2NC- No Nuclear Revival

#### No nuclear revival—that’s Schneider and Froggatt—all key indicators point to industry collapse with no chance to scale up quickly—manufacturing bottleneck, worker shortage and regulatory issues are all structural barriers to development.

#### Prefer it—from the World Nuclear Status report—most recent and comprehensive peer reviewed study.

#### That’s a framing issue—nuclear industry suffers from an optimism bias that distorts all projections

Mycle Schneider and Antony Froggatt 9/14/2012 (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "2011-2012 world nuclear inustry status report" bos.sagepub.com/content/68/5/8.full.pdf+html)

Unrealistic projections. In 1973 and 1974, the International Atomic Energy Agency gave a

AND

to start up, at least for now. Times have indeed changed.

#### That’s empirically true

Mycle Schneider and Antony Froggatt 9/14/2012 (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "2011-2012 world nuclear inustry status report" bos.sagepub.com/content/68/5/8.full.pdf+html)

The nuclear industry and its promoters have a long history of promising the impossible. Fantasy projections of installed nuclear capacity, on-time and on-budget construction, and unlimited cheap, clean, and safe electricity have been almost omnipresent throughout nuclear history. That trend continues, even as underlying facts strongly suggest an industry in decline.

#### Means there’s no impact uniqueness or internal link to the aff.

#### Even if there’s a global revival they can’t solve leadership—D’Ambrosio and O’Brien say we’re dependent on foreign materials for our tech which turns leadership.

### No Licenses 1NC

#### Their Domensci and Merserve evidence is from 2010—our evidence postdates, means even if financing was more key then, it doesn’t mean that’s still the biggest roadblock—licensing fees prevent solvency:

#### The NRC is not distributing SMR licenses – zero solvency

Tucker 11 (William, energy writer for the American Spectator, "America’s Last Nuclear Hope," March 2011, http://0101.nccdn.net/1\_5/28c/010/2c9/America-s-Last-Nuclear-Hope-Tucker-TAS.pdf-http://0101.nccdn.net/1\_5/28c/010/2c9/America-s-Last-Nuclear-Hope-Tucker-TAS.pdf)

So why isn't there more coordination between the civilian and military efforts? In fact

AND

will be a miracle if any proposal ever makes it through the process.

### 2NC- Labor Shortage

#### Labor shortages prevent scale up—we let the industry fail for too long to mobilize the necessary force to make a timely transition—independently short circuits the aff’s major internal link.

#### It’s the key factor in mobilizing nuclear energy

NEI 8/22/2012 (Nuclear energy institute, "US nuclear energy industry/US Navy agreement of understanding on workforce initiative" [www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/careersandeducation/report/us-nuclear-energy-industryus-navy-agreement-of-understanding-on-workforce-initiative-aug-22-2012](http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/careersandeducation/report/us-nuclear-energy-industryus-navy-agreement-of-understanding-on-workforce-initiative-aug-22-2012)

The nation is experiencing a nuclear energy skilled worker shortage. A significant number of the incumbent workforce is, or will soon become, eligible for retirement. Consumption of electricity continues to increase. Upgrading existing nuclear power plants and construction of new nuclear power plants is essential to the United States’ quest for clean energy independence. Workforce development is paramount to supporting the 21st century clean energy initiatives.

## Prolif

### 2NC- No Prolif Leadership

#### Prolif leadership fails—three reasons—US won’t use it, it’ll fail when they do and there are too many alt causes that deter effectiveness—that’s Cleary and Wellen.

#### Inconsistent application, reluctance to share tech, a desire to avoid US control, and attempts to maintain other political objectives all prevent effective leadership on prolif. There will inevitably be motivations to aquire because the perception of our overwhelming military advantage.

### 2NC- Emulation Turn

#### Emulation turn—that’s Sokolski—increasing profile of nuclear power incentivizes acquisition—makes it a political bargaining chip and encourages competition to drive rapid development.

#### Prefer this—he’s the executive direction of the nonproliferation policy center quantifying the perceptions of nuclear scale in terms of proliferation.

#### Either makes their impacts inevitable or proves they can’t solve the internal link.

#### Even if they win reactors are safer, increasing nuclear production creates an incentive for acquisition—still causes other countries to develop weapons

### A2- SMRs Don’t Link

#### Proliferation risk with SMRs – enables countries with high prolif risk to get nuclear energy

Moor 12 (Mr. Phillip O. Moor P.E., Consultant in nuclear technology, licensing, and business structuring and former Director of Project Management at GPU Nuclear, Chair of the American Nuclear Society (ANS) President’s Special Committee on SMR Licensing Issues, “Small Modular Reactor Panel Discussion Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee”, Summary Prepared by Derek Updegraff, Rebecca Lordan, Pierce Corden Dirksen-­‐366 May 9, 2012, http://cstsp.aaas.org/files/SummaryFinalSMR.pdf)

Moor also discussed one of the downsides of SMRs: The O&M costs

AND

remove spent SMR fuel for disposal or reprocessing outside the country of concern.

**Technical changes don’t solve– motivation is political**

**Acton 9** (James M. Acton is an associate in the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and frequent contribu- tor to the prominent blog Arms Control Wonk. a member of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, The myth of proliferation-resistant technology, December)

Forty years on, Hardin’s central thesis—that it is impossible to solve a

AND

nuclear insecurity, a more politically savvy approach to proliferation resistance is needed.

**Lack of effective inspections turns the whole case—-makes SMRs worse for prolif, safety and security than large reactors**

**Lyman 11**[ Dr. Edwin, Senior Scientist, Global Security Program, Union of Concerned Scientists, July 14, 2011, Testimony Before the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, "An Examination of the Safety and Economics of Light Water Small Modular Reactors"

Proponents of small modular reactors (SMRs) claim that their designs have inherent safety

AND

comparable or even greater safety, security and proliferation risks than large reactors.

**READ: SMRs are worse for prolif than large reactors**

**Nealon 11** [Corey, "Could small nukes be the energy answer?," 12-4-11, <http://articles.dailypress.com/2011-12-04/news/dp-nws-nuclear-reactors-20111203_1_nuclear-power-reactors-energy-department>]

Also, small reactor technology is newer than conventional reactors, many of which date

AND

plans for small reactors."We're not pursuing them," Rick Zuercher said.

### Prolif Not Cause War –

#### Prolif is stabilizing—that’s Tepperman and Asal—empirically have a pacifying effect—makes escalation impossible by imposing internal checks. Prefer our evidence—

#### A. Historical—best empirics prove—no nuclear engagement or escalation by small nuclear powers—history is the key lens—only way to understand causality.

Gavin ’10 (Francis J. Gavin is Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin “Same As It Ever Was” International Security 34:3 January 7, 2010. http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7)

My argument is not based on Kenneth Waltz’s contention that “more may be better

AND

. policies to be successful, an understanding of this history is vital.

#### B. Stats prove—Asal is the most recent statistical measure—proves no correlation between weapons spread and risk of escalation.

#### Proliferation will be with small arsenals – solves any offense.

Seng, phd candidate in Political Science @ Chicago 97 [Security Studies] Summer pg. 63

<Minor proliferators are likely to enjoy two main sorts of command and control advantages

AND

to help alleviate dangers of minor proliferators losing possession of their nuclear weapons.>

the conflict increases.

## Warming

### 2NC- Can’t Solve Warming

#### Can’t solve warming—that’s Leiter—number of facilities needed can’t be scaled up quickly enough—would require 20 plants a week which independently generates enough construction emissions to offset gains—means they can’t solve.

#### And, studies are conclusive – one reactor every two weeks at a cost of 4 billion each would be needed.

Mary Olson 6, Director of the Southeast Office, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, May 3, Confronting a False Myth of Nuclear Power: Nuclear Power Expansion is Not a Remedy for Climate Change, Commission on Sustainable Development, United Nations

Before offering some conjecture about such motives, there remain several points about why nuclear

AND

(Vogtle 1 & 2) cost more than $4 billion each!

#### Nuclear power only effects electricity – can’t solve other causes of climate change.

Ferguson and Squassoni 7, Charles D. Ferguson is a fellow for science and technology at the Council on Foreign Relations and is the author of the Council Special Report “Nuclear Energy: Balancing Benefits and Risks.”, Sharon Squassoni is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace., 2007, “Why Nuclear Energy Isn’t the Great Green Hope”, http://a4nr.org/library/globalwarmingclimatechange/06.2007-foreignpolicy

When U.S. President George W. Bush speaks of using technology to

AND

power expansion do not foresee a much larger share for nuclear energy globally.

**( ) Runaway warming inevitable -- gasses already built up and the most radical plans fail.**

**Zakaria, '7** (CFR & Editor -- Newsweek, Newsweek International)

The most inconvenient truth about global warming is that we cannot stop it. Please

AND

the industrialized world will continue to burn substantial amounts of coal and oil.

**( ) CO2 can't absorb further radiation -- it can only benefit the environment.**

**Emsley, '94** (Chemistry Professor -- Imperial College, New Scientist, Oct 8)

Meanwhile, Jack Barrett of Imperial College, London, has also questioned the likely

AND

consequence, says Barrett, is flourishing vegetation rather than runaway global warming.