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## Case

### Grid

#### Microgrids don’t solve --- renewables are intermittent and backups fail

Hatziargyriou 3 Nikos, NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, 2003, “MICROGRIDS – Large Scale Integration of Micro-Generation to Low Voltage Grids”, http://microgrids.eu/micro2000/presentations/16.pdf

A key challenge of Microgrids is to ensure stable operation during faults and various network disturbances. Transitions from interconnected to islanding mode of operation are likely to cause large mismatches between generation and loads, posing a severe frequency and voltage control problem. Storage technologies, such as batteries, ultra-capacitors and flywheels may become important components of Microgrids, with the duty to provide stable operation of the network during network disturbances. Maintaining stability and power quality in the islanding mode of operation requires the development of sophisticated control strategies and needs to include both generation and demand sides. Microgrids Control Levels In order to achieve the full benefits from the operation of Microgrids, as outlined in the Introduction, it is important that the integration of the distributed resources into the LV grids, and their relation with the MV network upstream, will contribute to optimise the general operation of the system. To achieve this goal, a hierarchical system control architecture comprising three critical control levels, as shown in Figure 1, can be envisaged [1]. The different control levels comprise: • Local Microgenerator Controllers (MC) and Load Controllers (LC) • MicroGrid System Central Controller (MGCC) • Distribution Management System (DMS). The Microgenerator Controller (MC) takes advantage of the power electronic interface of the micro source and can be enhanced with various degrees of intelligence. It uses local information to control the voltage and the frequency of the Microgrid in transient conditions. MCs have to be adapted to each type of micro source (PV, fuel cell, micro turbine, etc.) Local Load Controllers (LC) installed at the controllable loads provide load control capabilities. The Microgrid Central Controller (MGCC) functions can range from monitoring the actual active and reactive power of the distributed resources to assuming full responsibility of optimizing the Microgrid operation by sending control signal settings to the distributed resources and controllable loads. MicroGrids connected on the feeders of Distribution Management Systems (DMS) should ideally look like concentrated loads. The issues of autonomous-non- autonomous operation of the MicroGrids and the related exchange of information are new important issues. Disconnection and re-synchronization of Microgrids during and post-fault periods need to be evaluated. It is clear that in order to operate a Microgrid in a coordinated manner it is important to provide a more or less decentralized decision making process in order to balance demand and supply coming both from the distributed resources and the MV distribution feeder. There are several levels of decentralization that can be possibly applied ranging from a fully decentralized approach to a basically centralized control depending on the share of responsibilities assumed by the MGCC and the MCs and LCs. These levels need to be explored and relative benefits identified. Islanded vs. Interconnected Mode of Operation In interconnected mode of operation, decisions on local generation are based on maximization of the Microgrids value, according to the availability of the primary energy sources and the energy prices. Network restrictions, namely capacity of the MV/LV transformer or LV network congestions have to be of course respected. When failures occur in the MV or HV system, the Microgrid is automatically transferred to isolated islanding operation, supplied by itself. Seamless transition between the interconnected to the islanding mode is crucial for uninterrupted continuity of supply. With an intelligent distributed approach, MCs and LCs act as independent agents and making efficient use of the local resources maintain system operation in islanded conditions. If a system disturbance provokes a general blackout at the upstream HV or MV networks, such that the Microgrid is not able to separate and continue in islanding mode, and if the MV system is unable to restore operation in a specified time, the MCs can provide local Black Start capabilities, exploiting autonomous agent concepts. Moreover, the MGCC can support re-connection during Black Start, helping in this way the upstream DMS system that is managing the MV distribution network. Management of voltage and frequency In isolated operation mode frequency and voltage control are challenging problems. The conventional power system employs conventional droops, as shown in Figure 2. In principle, this concept can be also adopted by the MCs of the DG, in order to provide load sharing capabilities. However, this is not straightforward to implement in Microgrids due to the close coupling of P&Q effects. For example, voltage regulation based on reactive power injection alone is impossible, unless excessive amounts are available. It has been shown, that the concept of Figure 2 can be effectively applied, as long as the frequency and voltage droops have the same sign.

#### Don’t underestimate the threat

Constantin 12 Lucian, IDG News Service, "Don't underestimate cyber terrorism threat, security experts say", March 2, www.infoworld.com/d/security/dont-underestimate-cyber-terrorism-threat-security-experts-say-187811

Concern about cyber terrorism was evident this week among security experts at the RSA security conference in San Francisco, who find that some people with extremist views have the technical knowledge that could be used to hack into systems.¶ Cyber terrorism does not exist currently in a serious form, but some individuals with extremist views have displayed a significant level of knowledge of hacking, so the threat shouldn't be underestimated, said F-Secure's chief research officer Mikko Hypponen on Thursday at the RSA security conference in San Francisco .¶ Other security experts agree. "I think it's something that we should be concerned about. I wouldn't be surprised if 2012 is the year when we start seeing more cyber terrorism," said Mike Geide, a senior security analyst at security vendor Zscaler.¶ Extremists commonly use the Internet to communicate, spread their message, recruit new members and even launder money in some cases, Hypponen said during a presentation about cyber terrorism at the conference.

#### Cyber-attack risk high

McClaim 2/19 Erin, NBC News, "Successful hacker attack could cripple U.S. infrastructure, experts say", 2013, usnews.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/02/19/17019005-successful-hacker-attack-could-cripple-us-infrastructure-experts-say?lite

A report tying the Chinese military to computer attacks against American interests has sent a chill through cyber-security experts, who worry that the very lifelines of the United States — its energy pipelines, its water supply, its banks — are increasingly at risk.¶ The experts say that a successful hacker attack taking out just a part of the nation’s electrical grid, or crippling financial institutions for several days, could sow panic or even lead to loss of life.¶ “I call it cyberterrorism that makes 9/11 pale in comparison,” Rep. Mike Rogers, a Michigan Republican and chair of the House Intelligence Committee, told NBC News on Tuesday.¶ An American computer security company, Mandiant, reported with near certainty that members of a sophisticated Chinese hacking group work out of the headquarters of a unit of the Chinese army outside Shanghai.¶ The report was first detailed in The New York Times, which said that the hacking group’s focus was increasingly on companies that work with American infrastructure, including the power grid, gas lines and waterworks.¶ The Chinese embassy in Washington told The Times that its government does not engage in computer hacking.¶ As reported, the Chinese attacks constitute a sort of asymmetrical cyberwarfare, analysts said, because they bring the force of the Chinese government and military against private companies.¶ “To us that’s crossing a line into a class of victim that’s not prepared to withstand that type of attack,” Grady Summers, a Mandiant vice president, said on the MSNBC program “Andrea Mitchell Reports.”¶ The report comes as government officials and outside security experts alike are sounding ever-louder alarms about the vulnerability of the systems that make everyday life in the United States possible.¶ Outgoing Defense Secretary Leon Panetta warned in October that the United States was facing a threat that amounted to “cyber Pearl Harbor” and raised the specter of intentionally derailed trains, contaminated water and widespread blackouts.¶ “This is a pre-9/11 moment,” Panetta told business executives in New York. “The attackers are plotting.”

#### Err towards sustainability – declinists rise the bar too high

Wohlforth 7 (William Wohlforth, Daniel Webster Professor of Government in the Dartmouth College Department of Government, Unipolar Stability: The Rules of Power Analysis, [A Tilted Balance](http://www.harvardir.org/symposia/72/), Vol . 29 (1) - Spring 2007, http://hir.harvard.edu/index.php?page=article&id=1611)

The larger problem with conflating power-as-resources with power-as-influence is that it leads to a constant shifting of the goalposts. The better the United States becomes at acquiring resources, the greater the array of global problems it is expected to be able to resolve, and the greater the apparent gap between its material capabilities and the ends it can achieve. The result is an endless raising of the bar for what it takes to be a unipolar power. Samuel Huntington defined a unipolar state as one able “effectively to resolve all important international issues alone, and no combination of other states would have the power to prevent it from doing so.” This is an extraordinary standard that essentially conflates unipolarity with universal empire. Great European powers did not lose great power status when they failed to have their way, in, for example, the Balkans in the nineteenth century. In turn, the United States did not cease to be a superpower when it failed to overthrow Fidel Castro in the 1960s. The fact that Washington cannot prevent Hugo Chavez from thumbing his nose at US power is interesting and perhaps even important, but it does not have bearing on the polarity of the international system. Defining power as the ability to solve whatever global problem is currently in the headlines virtually guarantees highly volatile prognostications about polarity. This sort of headline chasing led to talk of “empire” in 2002 and 2003, just as it feeds today’s multipolar mania. Assessing active attempts by the United States to employ its power capabilities may well be the most misleading way to think about power. This approach inevitably leads to a selection bias against evidence of the indirect, “structural” effects of US power that are not dependent upon active management. Many effects that can be attributed to the unipolar distribution of power are developments that never occur: counter-balancing coalitions, Cold War-scale arms races, hegemonic rivalry for dominance, security dilemmas among Asian powers, and decisions by Japan and others to nuclearize. Clearly, assessing unipolarity’s potential effects involves weighing such non-events against the more salient examples in which active attempts to use power resources are stymied. But the selection bias goes much further. Not only are non-events downplayed in comparison to salient events that appear to demonstrate the powerlessness of the United States, but patterns of events that do go its way are often missed. Consider, for example, how often Washington’s failure to have its way in the United Nations is cited as compared to its experience in the IMF. And, even in the United Nations, a focus on highly contested issues, such as the attempt at a second resolution authorizing the invasion of Iraq, fails to note how the institution’s entire agenda has shifted to address concerns, such as terrorism, that are particularly important to the United States.

### Primacy

#### Nuclear primacy doesn’t cause crisis instability

Long 8 – Austin Long, Assistant Professor of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, 2008, “Deterrence: From Cold War to Long War,” online: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND\_MG636.pdf

Lieber and Press found this U.S. nuclear primacy troubling, as it may mean that Russia and China will take risks that may make accidental war more likely. It may also mean that the United States will be more likely to run risks in confrontations with these states, secure in the knowledge that it once again possesses nearly splendid counterforce. The interaction of these dynamics may make crises extraordinarily dangerous in the future, possibly leading to a nuclear war that neither side truly intends (Lieber and Press, 2006a, pp. 31–33).¶ While Lieber and Press’s worries cannot be dismissed out of hand, they appear to be overstated. The United States, even when resting extended deterrence almost entirely on nuclear weapons, was always extremely circumspect about even obliquely threatening their use; this was no less the case during the 1950s when it still retained a nearmonopoly on long-range nuclear weapons.6 In addition, at present and for the near term, U.S. conventional capabilities greatly reduce the need to rely on nuclear weapons for extended deterrence relative to the 1950s. Further, Russia and China do not appear panicked by the current state of affairs. China has never sought to build an incredibly robust deterrent; U.S. forces have always had a counterforce capability against Chinese forces.7 While there are signs that China’s force modernization may make this force less vulnerable, there has never been any sign of Chinese desperation about U.S. counterforce. Russia, while slowly modernizing its forces, also appears to be relatively unconcerned.¶ This relative lack of concern by both of these near-peer competitors is understandable, as they have not sought to extend deterrence to others in the same way that the United States has. Russian and Chinese nuclear forces exist almost exclusively to provide basic deterrence, which is inherently credible in intent. Given this highly credible intent to “trade Moscow or Beijing for Washington,” even a relatively small capability is very effective. What U.S. president would undertake an operation with even a 5 percent chance of resulting in the destruction of one or two major U.S. cities in any but the direst circumstances? A similar rationale underpinned the French and British nuclear-force structure in the Cold War; the survival of even a handful of nuclear weapons would give even the most hardened Soviet pause in launching a first strike. Here, the fear aspect of deterrence is clearly critical; even small uncertainties about relative gains from a first strike can deter in all but the bleakest scenarios involving highly credible threats (see Kahn, 1961, pp. 126–144; Jervis, 1984, p. 175, n. 47; and Kahneman and Tversky, 1979).¶ At the same time, neither Russia nor China has an incentive to launch first in most circumstances. The submarine portion of the U.S. deterrent alone is enough to inflict a devastating countervalue attack on either country even if its first strike succeeded in totally destroying both land-based legs of the nuclear triad. Given that neither Russia nor China is likely to be able to disarm a large portion of the land components of the triad in the foreseeable future, both have that much less incentive to fire first. Only in circumstances in which crises escalated to the point at which China or Russia felt that its basic deterrence was being undermined would this seem likely. This argues for limits on certain military options in crisis or confrontation, examples of which will be given in the scenario in the next section.

## Solvency

### AT: Makhijani

#### Makhijani’s an idiot

Barton 10 Charles, Former PhD Candidate in History, MA in Philsophy, worked on the LFTR concept for about 2/3eds of his ORNL career and recognized by nuclear bloggers most of whom have technical training, and has been mentioned by the Wall Street Journal, “Arjun Makhijani and the Modular Small Reactor null-hypothesis” October 2, 2010, http://nucleargreen.blogspot.com/2010/10/arjun-makhijani-and-modular-small.html

Arjun Makhijani (with Michele Boyd) has recently published a fact sheet on Small Modular Reactors which in effect advertises itself as the null-hypothesis to the case I an others have been making for some time on the advantages of small reactors. Small Modular Reactors No Solution for the Cost, Safety, and Waste Problems of Nuclear Power, Makhijani’s title proclaims. But what is the evidence that backs Makhijani’s case up. As it turns out Makhijani offers no empirical data to back up his assertion, so as an example of scientific reasoning, Makhijani’s fact sheet rates an F.

### AT: Gas

#### SMR key to help nuclear beat-out natural gas

Lamonica 12—Tech Review Writer. 20 years of experience covering technology and business (8/9/12, Martin, A Glut of Natural Gas Leaves Nuclear Power Stalled, [www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/](http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/))

The nuclear renaissance is in danger of petering out before it has even begun, but not for the reasons most people once thought. Forget safety concerns, or the problem of where to store nuclear waste—the issue is simply cheap, abundant natural gas.¶ General Electric CEO Jeffrey Immelt caused a stir last month when he told the Financial Times that it's "hard to justify nuclear" in light of low natural gas prices. Since GE sells all manner of power generation equipment, including components for nuclear plants, Immelt's comments hold a lot of weight.¶ Cheap natural gas has become the fuel of choice with electric utilities, making building expensive new nuclear plants an increasingly tough sell. The United States is awash in natural gas largely thanks to horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking" technology, which allows drillers to extract gas from shale deposits once considered too difficult to reach. In 2008, gas prices were approaching $13 per million BTUs; prices have now dropped to around $3. ¶ When gas prices were climbing, there were about 30 nuclear plant projects in various stages of planning in the United States. Now the Nuclear Energy Institute estimates that, at most, five plants will be built by 2020, and those will only be built thanks to favorable financing terms and the ability to pay for construction from consumers' current utility bills. Two reactors now under construction in Georgia, for example, moved ahead with the aid of an $8.33 billion loan guarantee from the U.S. Department of Energy. ¶ What happens after those planned projects is hard to predict. "The question is whether we'll see any new nuclear," says Revis James, the director of generation research and development at the Electric Power Research Institute. "The prospects are not good."¶ Outside the United States, it's a different story. Unconventional sources of natural gas also threaten the expansion of nuclear, although the potential impact is less clear-cut. Around the world, there are 70 plants now under construction, but shale gas also looms as a key factor in planning for the future. Prices for natural gas are already higher in Asia and Europe, and shale gas resources are not as fully developed as they are the United States.¶ Some countries are also blocking the development of new natural gas resources. France, for instance, which has a strong commitment to nuclear, has banned fracking in shale gas exploration because of concerns over the environmental impact.¶ Fast-growing China, meanwhile, needs all the energy sources available and is building nuclear power plants as fast as possible.¶ Even in United States, of course, super cheap natural gas will not last forever. With supply exceeding demand, some drillers are said to be losing money on natural gas, which could push prices back up. Prices will also be pushed upward by utilities, as they come to rely on more natural gas for power generation, says James.¶ Ali Azad, the chief business development officer at energy company Babcock & Wilcox, thinks the answer is making nuclear power smaller, cheaper, and faster. His is one of a handful of companies developing small modular reactors that can be built in three years, rather than 10 or more, for a fraction of the cost of gigawatt-size reactors. Although this technology is not yet commercially proven, the company has a customer in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which expects to have its first unit online in 2021 (see "A Preassembled Nuclear Reactor").¶ "When we arrive, we will have a level cost of energy on the grid, which competes favorably with a brand-new combined-cycle natural gas plants when gas prices are between $6 to $8," said Azad. He sees strong demand in power-hungry China and places such as Saudia Arabia, where power is needed for desalination.¶ Even if natural gas remains cheaper, utilities don't want to find themselves with an overreliance on gas, which has been volatile on price in the past, so nuclear power will still contribute to the energy mix. "[Utilities] still continue [with nuclear] but with a lower level of enthusiasm—it's a hedging strategy," says Hans-Holger Rogner from the Planning and Economics Studies section of the International Atomic Energy Agency. "They don't want to pull all their eggs in one basket because of the new kid on the block called shale gas."

### AT: Siting

#### US has enough siting locations for nuclear expansion

McCorkle 11 Morgan, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, “Bird's-Eye View”, ORNL Review Vol. 44, No. 2, http://www.ornl.gov/info/ornlreview/v44\_2\_11/article10.shtml

The short answer to the team's initial question—does the U.S. have enough land to accommodate a large increase in the number of nuclear power plants—is a solid yes. Taking into account the need for contiguous land areas, the ORNL team in one baseline scenario assessed that 13 percent of land in the continental United States may be suitable for siting a large nuclear reactor, while 24 percent may be appropriate for hosting a small modular reactor.¶ EPRI is using results from the OR-SAGE project as input for economic analyses to explore options for deploying various types of electrical generation plants. As ORNL researchers crafted the modeling system, EPRI realized the value of OR-SAGE for evaluating sites beyond those for nuclear plants. "We started with nuclear, and once they saw it was a good tool, they wanted us to extend it to renewables, like solar, advanced coal and compressed air energy storage," Omitaomu says.¶ The national scope of the OR-SAGE tool, combined with its ability to analyze areas almost as small as a football field, means that it can be used to help make siting decisions on many different scales. By producing maps that show where different types of power plants can realistically be placed, the GIS model can also help policymakers who want to develop energy profiles or portfolios for a state, a region or the nation as a whole.

### AT: Barriers

#### Plan solves all NRC barriers and cost

Butler 11 Glen, Lt. Col, Not Green Enough, [www.mca-marines.org/gazette/not-green-enough](http://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/not-green-enough)

SMRs have relatively low plant cost, can replace aging fossil plants, and do not emit greenhouse gasses. Some are as small as a “hot tub” and can be stored underground, dramatically increasing safety and security from terrorist threats.25 Encouragingly, in fiscal year 2010 (FY10) the DoE allocated $0 to the U.S. SMR Program; in FY11, they’ve requested $38.9 million. This funding is to support two main activities—public/private partnerships to advance SMR designs and research and development and demonstrations. According to the DoE’s website, one of the planned program accomplishments for FY11 is to “collaborate with the Department of Defense (DoD) . . . to assess the feasibility of SMR designs for energy resources at DoD installations.”26 The Marine Corps should vigorously seek the opportunity to be a DoD entity providing one platform for this feasibility assessment.27¶ Fourth, SMR technology offers the Marine Corps another unique means to lead from the front—not just of the other Services but also of the Nation, and even the world.28 This potential Pete Ellis moment should be seized. There are simple steps we could take, and others stand ready to lead if we are not.30 But the temptation to “wait and see” and “let the others do it; then we’ll adopt it” mentality is not always best. Energy security demands boldness, not timidity.¶ To be fair, nuclear technology comes with challenges, of course, and with questions that have been kicked around for decades. An April 1990 Popular Science article asked, “Next Generation Nuclear Reactors—Dare we build them?” and included some of the same verbiage heard in similar discussions today.31 Compliance with National Environment Policy Act requirements necessitates lengthy and detailed preaction analyses, critical community support must be earned, and disposal challenges remain. Still, none of these hurdles are insurmountable.¶ Yet despite the advances in safety, security, and efficiency in recent years, nuclear in the energy equation remains the new “n-word” for most military circles. And despite the fact that the FY10 National Defense Authorization Act called on the DoD to “conduct a study [of] the feasibility of nuclear plants on military installations,” the Office of the Secretary of Defense has yet to fund the study.¶ Fifth, the cumbersome, bureaucratic certification process of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), often enough to scare away potential entrepreneurs and investors, is not necessarily a roadblock to success. The NRC is “responsible for licensing and regulating the operation of commercial nuclear power plants in the United States.” Military installations offer unique platforms that could likely bypass an extended certification process. With established expertise and a long safety record in nuclear reactor certification, operations, training, and maintenance, the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program comprises the civilian and military personnel who:¶ . . . design, build, operate, maintain, and manage the nuclear-powered ships and the many facilities that support the U.S. nuclear-powered naval fleet.”34¶ Bypassing the NRC and initiating SMR experimentation under ADM Hyman Rickover’s legacy umbrella of naval reactors could shorten the process to a reasonable level for Marine and naval installations.35

## CP

### 2AC States CP

#### Military bypasses and solves licensing lag

CSPO 10, Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes at ASU, “four policy principles for energy innovation & climate change: a synthesis”, June, <http://www.catf.us/resources/publications/files/Synthesis.pdf>

Government purchase of new technologies is a powerful way to accelerate innovation through increased demand (Principle 3a). We explore how this principle can be applied by considering how the DoD could purchase new nuclear reactor designs to meet electric power needs for DoD bases and operations. Small modular nuclear power reactors (SMRs), which generate less than 300 MW of power (as compared to more typical reactors built in the 1000 MW range) are often listed as a potentially transformative energy technology. While typical traditional large-scale nuclear power plants can cost five to eight billion dollars, smaller nuclear reactors could be developed at smaller scale, thus not presenting a “bet the company” financial risk. SMRs could potentially be mass manufactured as standardized modules and then delivered to sites, which could significantly reduce costs per unit of installed capacity as compared to today’s large scale conventional reactor designs. It is likely that some advanced reactors designs – including molten salt reactors and reactors utilizing thorium fuels – could be developed as SMRs. Each of these designs offers some combination of inherently safe operation, very little nuclear proliferation risk, relatively small nuclear waste management needs, very abundant domestic fuel resources, and high power densities – all of which are desirable attributes for significant expansion of nuclear energy. Currently, several corporations have been developing small nuclear reactors. Table 2 lists several of these companies and their reactor power capacities, as well as an indication of the other types of reactor innovations that are being incorporated into the designs. Some of these technologies depend on the well-established light water reactor, while others use higher energy neutrons, coolants capable of higher temperature operation, and other innovative approaches. Some of these companies, such as NuScale, intend to be able to connect as many as 24 different nuclear modules together to form one larger nuclear power plant. In addition to the different power ranges described in Table 2, these reactors vary greatly in size, some being only 3 to 6 feet on each side, while the NuScale reactor is 60 feet long and 14 feet in diameter. Further, many of these reactors produce significant amounts of high-temperature heat, which can be harnessed for process heating, gas turbine generators, and other operations. One major obstacle is to rapid commercialization and development are prolonged multi-year licensing times with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Currently, the NRC will not consider a reactor for licensing unless there is a power utility already prepared to purchase the device. Recent Senate legislation introduced by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) has pushed for DOE support in bringing down reactor costs and in helping to license and certify two reactor designs with the NRC. Some additional opportunities to facilitate the NRC licensing process for innovative small modular reactors would be to fund NRC to conduct participatory research to get ahead of potential license applications (this might require ~$100million/year) and potentially revise the current requirement that licensing fees cover nearly all NRC licensing review costs. One option for accelerating SMR development and commercialization, would be for DOD to establish SMR procurement specifications (to include cost) and agree to purchase a sufficient amount of SMR’s to underwrite private sector SMR development. Of note here may be that DARPA recently (3/30/10) issued a “Request for Information (RFI) on Deployable Reactor Technologies for Generating Power and Logistic Fuels”2 that specifies may features that would be highly desirable in an advanced commercial SMR. While other specifications including coproduction of mobility fuel are different than those of a commercial SMR power reactor, it is likely that a core reactor design meeting the DARPA inquiry specifications would be adaptable to commercial applications. While nuclear reactors purchased and used by DOD are potentially exempt from many NRC licensing requirements3, any reactor design resulting from a DOD procurement contract would need to proceed through NRC licensing before it could be commercially offered. Successful use of procured SMR’s for DOD purposes could provide the knowledge and operational experience needed to aid NRC licensing and it might be possible for the SMR contractor to begin licensing at some point in the SMR development process4. Potential purchase of small modular nuclear reactors would be a powerful but proven way in which government procurement of new energy technologies could encourage innovation. Public procurement of other renewable energy technologies could be similarly important.

#### Perm shields

Wells 7Christina, Professor of Law Univ. of Missouri-Columbia “Katrina and the Rhetoric of Federalism” Lexis Mississippi Law Review

Cooperative federalism (along with its constituent programs) is not, however, without its critics. Some note that such programs, especially those that attach conditions to the receipt of funds, effectively coerce the states into accepting unattractive conditions because the states are rarely in a position to refuse such funding. [n22](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n22) Others argue that cooperative federalism programs "reduce political transparency[,] obscure political responsibility[,] and facilitate political blame-shifting" because the public can never be sure which level of government is responsible for failures in government programs. [n23](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n23) Still others argue that because these programs require states to implement national policy, they entail a "concentration of political powers in the national government." [n24](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n24) The debate among proponents and critics of cooperative federalism is unlikely to be resolved in the near future. Indeed, for every criticism, there seems to be a response, counter-response, and so forth in a seemingly endless loop of argument regarding the costs and benefits of cooperative federalism. [n25](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n25) Perhaps the answer is somewhere in between the two extremes. There are benefits to shared authority - especially in a nation so large that a single government authority cannot possibly undertake certain tasks. On  [\*132]  the other hand, without vigilance, such programs may indeed be abused - either by a government official attempting to escape accountability for bad decision making or by the federal government ostensibly abiding by federalism principles while actually imposing rigid substantive policies on the states and, thus, consolidating power. As with many things, the devil is in the details rather than in the concept, which proved to be the case with the federal government's response to Hurricane Katrina - a response that occurred largely in the context of a cooperative federalism program.

#### CP links to politics---interstate compacts especially

Ferrey 12 Steven, Professor of Law at Suffolk University Law School and served as Visiting Professor of Law at Harvard Law School in 2003, "Follow the Money!", Virginia Journal of Law & Technology, Summer, www.vjolt.net/vol17/issue2/v17\_i2\_89-Ferrey.pdf

Constitutional concerns are not wholly avoided even when states combine collectively to address renewable power issues. An interstate compact may make sense for energy planning on a regional basis, but such a compact creates legal issues. The Interstate Compact Clause of the Constitution provides:¶ No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.113¶ Multi-state compacts require federal congressional approval to be constitutional. Multistate agreements fall into this category. To the contrary, actions by regional Independent System Operators (ISOs), which can transcend state borders because they operate pursuant to federal approval of the Federal Energy Regulation Commission (FERC), would not invoke the Compact Clause. Action by an ISO does not confront the legal impediments that a multi-state compact would since it is established by federal order and tariff. As an entity approved by federal law and order, ISOs are not subject to Compact Clause, Supremacy Clause, or Commerce Clause restrictions. ¶ A multi-state compact, once approved by Congress, elevates state action to federal law. As federal law, the compact preempts other state law, even if it discriminates against out-of-state entities. 114 The compact would preempt all other conflicting state laws and even state constitutions.115 If there were an interstate compact, it would avoid Supremacy Clause preemption challenges because it constitutes federal law that would preempt all other state law or orders. Since the federal government can discriminate against particular states through federal legislation, an interstate compact becomes federal law, and the action is immunized against dormant Commerce Clause violations, which are a matter of state action. 116¶ Multi-state agreements are not entitled to constitutional Eleventh Amendment immunity because they are not the act of a single sovereign state. The multiple states involved are thus subject to suit in federal court regarding any disputes. 117 Sovereign immunity is lost once more than one sovereign state is involved.118 The ―Appointments Clause‖ of the Constitution requires that regional energy entity members be appointed by the President.119 Recently, the Supreme Court interpreted a historic compact between New Jersey and Delaware, regarding the veto power of one over the energy facility siting decisions of the other.120

## DA

### 2AC Immigration DA

#### Won’t pass

Altman 3/20 [Alex Altman, Washington correspondent for TIME, “Four Hurdles That Could Block Immigration Reform,” http://swampland.time.com/2013/03/20/four-hurdles-that-could-block-immigration-reform/]

The next few months offer the best chance in a generation for the two parties to solve a problem that has bedeviled Congress like few others. Both sides agree the U.S. immigration system is broken. Both would seem to gain from a deal that clears a pathway out of legal oblivion for the nation’s 11 million illegal immigrants. Support is building for a landmark pact. But while negotiations are progressing in both the House and Senate, an agreement is a long way off. As the talks grow more detailed, obstacles to a deal may begin to emerge:¶ Problem #1: The Gang of Eight¶ The first snag lurks in the Senate, where the so-called Gang of Eight has huddled privately since the election in hopes of hammering out a bill. Members have crafted a set of measures that would create a pathway to citizenship for the nation’s estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants within about 13 years while requiring them to register with federal authorities, pay back taxes and fines, learn English and undergo background checks. The deal, both sides agree, would also beef up border security and determine how the future flow of immigrants will be regulated to match the needs of the economy.¶ The Gang’s closed conclaves have been marked by Vatican-style secrecy, often a sign of progress in a town where silence is rare. The Gang’s members – Republicans Marco Rubio, Lindsey Graham, John McCain and Jeff Flake, and Democrats Chuck Schumer, Dick Durbin, Bob Menendez and Michael Bennet – have, by all accounts, developed a rapport. “You can tell by the tone of their voices,” says an elected Democrat briefed on the progress of the private talks.¶ But the broad themes are the easy part. The full bill will stretch to hundreds of pages, each peppered with detailed provisions that could spike it. Members bring clashing political imperatives and ideologies to the talks. Rubio, for example, is trying to repair the GOP’s tattered image with Hispanic voters without sparking a backlash among the movement conservatives he’d need in a presidential bid. Graham, who faces a probable primary challenge in 2014, has a habit of basking in the bipartisan spotlight before bolting when negotiations intensify. The measure of the Gang of Eight’s success isn’t whether they are aligned at the start of their talks. It’s whether they are all aligned at the end.¶ Problem #2: The Lobbyists¶ A few years ago, an impasse between the leaders of the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO helped scupper an immigration-reform bill backed by President George W. Bush. At that time, business and labor could not agree on how many visas to grant low skilled workers who make the construction, agriculture and hotel and restaurant industries hum. The Chamber wanted cheap labor, but didn’t want workers to stay; unions were concerned about protecting citizens’ jobs. Soon after, reform collapsed.¶ This time the two groups have nurtured an unlikely alliance. “There has been a sea change,” says a labor source close to the discussions. Nudged by Graham and Schumer, the two lobbies released a set of shared principles, including one stating that Americans should get “first crack” at available jobs and that businesses should have the flexibility to hire to meet the demands of the market. But history could repeat itself again. The two sides call for a new federal agency charged with setting visa levels, but they have yet to agree on who’s eligible or how the new bureau will work. The issue of future flow has been a stubborn sticking point before. And it is as easy to imagine conservatives balking at efforts to create a new government agency as it is to foresee unions drawing a line at a small number of foreign workers.¶ Problem #3: House Republicans¶ Even if Senate negotiators can come up with a package to get 60 votes in the upper chamber, “the question continues to be, how does it get through the House?” says Frank Sharry, an expert on immigration reform. As in the Senate, a bipartisan cluster of eight representatives from across the ideological spectrum have been secretly meeting for months. Congressman Luis Gutierrez, an Illinois Democrat who has long been a leader on immigration reform, is full of praise for the new tack taken by his Republican counterparts. But, he acknowledges, “You still have to put those votes on the board, and that’s going to be a real, real test in the House of Representatives.”¶ For their part, Republicans say the party’s old dogma, which held that illegal immigrants should self-deport and then go to the back of the line, is not viable policy. Even many immigration hard-liners say they want to help shape comprehensive reform. “It’s time for us to belly up to the bar,” says Ted Poe, the Texas Republican who chairs the House immigration reform caucus. But for conservatives, amnesty remains a dirty word. “A bill that’s basically amnesty, that says you’re here and you’re going to be a citizen — those two things are not going to come out of this conservative House,” says Poe. Even citizenship is charged enough that Republican Senator Rand Paul, who gave a speech March 19 backing a path to legalization for undocumented immigrants, avoided using the term. Many House Republicans, including several in the Judiciary Committee through which a bill must pass, have a long history of antipathy to amnesty, and only a grassroots rebellion to fear as next year’s primaries approach.¶ Then there is the reality that even if Republicans were to be widely supportive of amnesty, very few of those new citizens are likely to abandon the Democratic Party anytime soon. “Republicans face a choice: do they ditch their principles and go all out in a failing attempt to outpander Democrats?” asks Rosemary Jenks, director of government relations at NumbersUSA, which advocates for lower immigration levels. “It’s becoming very clear to Republicans in Congress that this is not going to get them the Hispanic vote.”¶ Problem #4: The Democrats¶ Little discussed but also looming is the possibility that Democrats drag their feet on reform. Liberals will balk if the path to citizenship is too long or too onerous, or if enforcement provisions are too rigid. Many conservatives also suspect that Democratic power brokers, despite their daily hammering of Republicans to get moving on immigration reform, would privately prefer to keep the issue as a cudgel than actually pass a law. Barack Obama “wants to make a bill come out of the Senate that is so far out there that it would never pass, so that he can blame us for not being compassionate and use the issue to take back the House in 2014,” says a House Republican. Even some liberals see this as a plausible scenario. “There’s always a lingering doubt in my mind,” admits one House Democrat. Obama knows that putting his fingerprints on the deal is an easy way to kill it; when a draft of his proposal leaked in the press, he called Republican negotiators individually to apologize. But if negotiations in Congress bog down, he may not be so hands off.¶ By all accounts, negotiators are making genuine progress toward a landmark deal that builds on a foundation laid during its last fumbled attempts. But lawmakers still have to thread a bill through a thicket of obstacles in a bitterly divided Congress. Sources close to the negotiations say they expect both chambers to introduce legislation in early April, giving Congress several months to haggle out a pact before members scatter for their summer recess. It sounds like plenty of time, but it’s not. Immigration will have to jockey for attention this spring with gun control, budgets and a potential grand bargain on tax and entitlement reform. Meanwhile, the human cost of the political stalemate is high. Each day, 1,400 undocumented immigrants are deported.

#### Won’t pass---border security

Byron York 3-27, Chief Political Correspondent - The Washington Examiner, “Border security in exchange for immigration reform? Napolitano says no deal.” 3-27-13, http://washingtonexaminer.com/border-security-in-exchange-for-immigration-reform-napolitano-says-no-deal./article/2525505

Republicans working to craft a comprehensive immigration reform bill say there is one rock-bottom requirement for any deal: The border must be secure, and proven to be secure, before any path to citizenship is created for the millions of immigrants currently in the country illegally. That is the one non-negotiable GOP demand. And on Tuesday, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano flatly rejected it.¶ “Relying on one thing as a so-called trigger is not the way to go,” Napolitano told a breakfast meeting of journalists. Asked about her department’s recent revelation that it will not produce a long-promised method of measuring border security, known as the Border Condition Index, Napolitano said, “We’re confident that the border is as secure as it’s ever been. But there’s no one number that captures that.” Without a way to measure border security, many Republican reform advocates say, there’s no way to go forward with a reform agreement.¶ Napolitano’s comments were one more bit of evidence, if Republicans needed any, that the Obama administration does not intend to make enhanced border security a precondition of immigration reform. “Every position and action the administration takes is consistent with the idea that they have no desire to accomplish immigration security,” said one GOP Senate aide who spoke on condition of anonymity.¶ “One of the challenges in crafting any reform is that the American people do not have confidence in this administration’s willingness to enforce current immigration law,” said Alex Conant, spokesman for Marco Rubio, the Republican senator and Gang of Eight member who has staked considerable political capital on the negotiations. “Senator Rubio and several members of the immigration working group share these concerns, and it’s reflected in the solution they are trying to craft. Our legislation will include real security triggers to make sure out borders are secured.”¶ Added Conant: “Senator Rubio will not support any legislation that does not include real security triggers to make sure our borders are secured.”¶ As for Napolitano, another aide said, “I wonder if she’s freelancing, or carrying a message from the White House.” At Tuesday’s White House briefing, spokesman Jay Carney was asked that very question, and while he spoke at length without saying anything definitive, Carney appeared to suggest that President Obama agrees with Napolitano. From the transcript:¶ QUESTION: Secretary Napolitano said today that triggers are not necessary before comprehensive immigration reform. So what does the White House do to convince those on the other side? Since there are no reliable metrics about border security, what will you do to convince them that the border is secure enough for immigration and a path to citizenship to begin?¶ MR. CARNEY: Well, I think the question is excellent, and I would note that what Secretary Napolitano has said — Secretary Napolitano has said that the Department of Homeland Security measures progress using a number of metrics to make sure we are putting our resources where they will have the most impact. And I think that while there are different ways to look at this issue, the fact is, by a host of measures, there has been great improvement in our border security.¶ Certainly the facts are there when it comes to the resources that have been applied to border security — the doubling of border security agents, as well as the other metrics that you will often hear Secretary Napolitano or others discuss. So we look at a variety of measures.¶ And I think you can look at what this President has committed to and the record on border security since he came into office to evaluate his assertion that border security is a vital element of comprehensive immigration reform. That has been his position, and it continues to be. And I would note — and this is something that has been acknowledged by important members of the Senate, Republican members — the progress that has been made on this very important issue, border security. Much of — the last time comprehensive immigration reform was essentially abandoned, some of the issues — the principal reason for that was because of concerns about border security. And many of the metrics that were put forward then have been met — the goals and the targets that were said to have to be achieved before we could move forward have been met.¶ But this is an ongoing issue. This is an ongoing concern, and it’s an ongoing project of this administration. And it will certainly be an important part of immigration reform.¶ QUESTION: Do you — does the White House oppose commissions or certain triggers before a path to citizenship can begin?¶ MR. CARNEY: What we have said and I’ll say today is that we are not going to judge the bill before it’s been written. And we are working with the senators who are in the Gang of Eight as they make progress, and they’ve made considerable progress, and that is worth noting. Senator Schumer just the other day talked about where they are in that process and the progress that they’ve been making, and we were heartened by that.¶ But as the President said yesterday, we have to keep pushing. We have to make sure that we follow through on this progress, and that that progress leads to a bill that has bipartisan support and that can be signed by this President. And we’re not there yet. Progress is being made. It’s being made in the Senate, which is where the President hoped it would be made. And we are very much monitoring that process and engaging in that process. But it’s not done yet, and I don’t want to prejudge a bill that hasn’t been written.¶ QUESTION: But if I could just press you on it, it does appear as though that Secretary Napolitano did today prejudge. She said the triggers are not necessary. Does the White House agree with that assessment?¶ MR. CARNEY: I think what she was saying — and the assessment we do agree with — is that there are a variety of metrics by which you can measure, and we do measure, progress on border security. And these are metrics that others use to measure border security, including Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and beyond the Senate, beyond the Congress.¶ So we’re working with Congress on this, with the Senate on this. Progress has been made. Border security is one of the key principles that the President has put forward that has to be part of comprehensive immigration reform. He has demonstrated his seriousness on this issue, as has Secretary Napolitano. But it is something that we’re — it’s not a done project. We have to continue working on it.¶ Cut through all the verbiage, and Carney seemed to say precisely what Napolitano said: If Republicans demand that tougher border enforcement be a precondition for comprehensive immigration reform, they can forget about making a deal, now or ever.

#### Perez nomination pounds the link

NPR 3-27-13, Carrie Johnson, “Obama's Labor Nominee Faces GOP Opposition Over His Role In A Supreme Court Case”, http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/03/27/175513560/obamas-labor-nominee-faces-gop-opposition-over-his-role-in-a-supreme-court-case

Thomas Perez, the president's nominee to lead the Department of Labor and a high-profile Latino advocate for civil rights, is scheduled for a Senate confirmation hearing April 18. **But behind-the-scenes wrangling over his nomination, and his controversial role in a Supreme Court case, is already well under way.**¶ House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Darrell Issa, R-Calif., and the ranking GOP member on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Charles Grassley, are investigating what they call a quid pro quo deal that may have cost the federal Treasury as much as $180 million.¶ The GOP lawmakers are upset by the appearance that the Justice Department used inappropriate reasons to stay out of a whistle-blower lawsuit that claimed the city of St. Paul, Minn., had misused funds it got from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under the False Claims Act, the Justice Department can intervene in such cases and support whistle-blowers, which often leads to victories or settlements that return millions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury.¶ Under the GOP theory, the Justice Department declined to throw its weight into that whistle-blower case as part of an improper deal with St. Paul, Minn. What's the other end of the alleged quid pro quo? That would be St. Paul agreeing to withdraw its bid for Supreme Court review in a separate case that put at risk a major legal tool the federal government uses in civil rights and housing discrimination cases.¶ In the case, Magner v. Gallagher, St. Paul asked the Supreme Court to consider the government's use of the so-called disparate impact theory, which allows lawsuits to proceed under the Fair Housing Act if people can prove a practice has a statistically significant negative impact on minorities, rather than specific bad acts involving individual landlords. That theory has been a frequent target of political conservatives and some members of Congress, and its supporters fear if the issue gets to the Supreme Court, it could be invalidated there.¶ Republican lawmakers have demanded more answers from Perez, the assistant attorney general for civil rights, and others in the Justice Department who may have played a role in that decision, which they consider a "dubious bargain."¶ Grassley told reporters earlier this month, "It's hard to believe that the president would nominate somebody at the heart of a congressional investigation and so deeply involved in a controversial decision to make a shady deal with the city of St. Paul, Minn."¶ New documents indicate Perez and other top DOJ officials have spent hours talking to members of Congress behind closed doors this month about that arrangement.¶ Perez told investigators in an eight-hour session on March 22 that the St. Paul case heading to the Supreme Court last year "caught my attention and was a source of concern."¶ In the first explanation of his role in the case, Perez said the dispute headed toward the Supreme Court presented some bad facts, and "because bad facts make bad law, this could have resulted in a decision that undermined our ability...to protect victims of housing and lending discrimination." He told lawmakers he reached out to people in Minnesota and found out they were interested in getting the Justice Department to stay out of a separate whistle-blower case that could cost the state money.¶ Perez said he reached out inside the Justice Department for ethics advice and told lawmakers he learned "there would be no concerns so long as I had permission" from counterparts in the civil unit handling the whistle-blower case and that "there was no prohibition on linking matters."¶ He added that he learned former Vice President Walter Mondale, who played a role in sponsoring the Fair Housing Act in Congress, and who had close ties to the mayor of St. Paul, was going to reach out regarding the Supreme Court case and its effects on civil rights enforcement as well.¶ "I believe then, and I believe now, that the result achieved here was in the best interests of the United States," he said.¶ Justice Department officials have turned over 1,500 pages of documents about the controversy, **but that's unlikely to satisfy Republicans on Capitol Hill.**

#### Executive military action shields

Davenport 12 Coral, energy and environment correspondent for National Journal, Prior to joining National Journal in 2010, Davenport covered energy and environment for Politico, and before that, for Congressional Quarterly. In 2010, she was a fellow with the Metcalf Institute for Marine and Environmental Reporting. From 2001 to 2004, Davenport worked in Athens, Greece, as a correspondent for numerous publications, including the Christian Science Monitor and USA Today, covering politics, economics, international relations and terrorism in southeastern Europe. She also covered the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, and was a contributing writer to the Fodor’s, Time Out, Eyewitness and Funseekers’ guidebook series. Davenport started her journalism career at the Daily Hampshire Gazette in Northampton, Massachusetts, after graduating from Smith College with a degree in English literature. National Journal, 2/10, White House Budget to Expand Clean-Energy Programs Through Pentagon, ProQuest

The White House believes it has figured out how to get more money for clean-energy programs touted by President Obama without having it become political roadkill in the wake of the Solyndra controversy: **Put it in the Pentagon**. While details are thin on the ground, lawmakers who work on both energy- and defense-spending policy believe the fiscal 2013 budget request to be delivered to Congress on Monday probably won't include big increases for wind and solar power through the Energy Department, a major target for Republicans since solar-panel maker Solyndra defaulted last year on a $535 million loan guarantee. But they do expect to see increases in spending on alternative energy in the Defense Department, such as programs to replace traditional jet fuel with biofuels, supply troops on the front lines with solar-powered electronic equipment, build hybrid-engine tanks and aircraft carriers, and increase renewable-energy use on military bases. While Republicans will instantly shoot down requests for fresh spending on Energy Department programs that could be likened to the one that funded Solyndra, many support alternative-energy programs for the military. "I do expect to see the spending," said Rep. Jack Kingston, R-Ga., a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, when asked about increased investment in alternative-energy programs at the Pentagon. "I think in the past three to five years this has been going on, but that it has grown as a culture and a practice - and it's a good thing." "If Israel attacks Iran, and we have to go to war - and the Straits of Hormuz are closed for a week or a month and the price of fuel is going to be high," Kingston said, "the question is, in the military, what do you replace it with? It's not something you just do for the ozone. It's strategic." Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who sits on both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said, "I don't see what they're doing in DOD as being Solyndra." "We're not talking about putting $500 million into a goofy idea," Graham told National Journal . "We're talking about taking applications of technologies that work and expanding them. I wouldn't be for DOD having a bunch of money to play around with renewable technologies that have no hope. But from what I understand, there are renewables out there that already work." A senior House Democrat noted that this wouldn't be the first time that the **Pentagon has been utilized to advance policies that wouldn't otherwise be supported**. "They did it in the '90s with medical research," said Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Calif., ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In 1993, when funding was frozen for breast-cancer research programs in the National Institutes of Health, Congress boosted the Pentagon's budget for breast-cancer research - to more than double that of the health agency's funding in that area. **Politically, the strategy makes sense**. Republicans are ready to fire at the first sign of any pet Obama program, and renewable programs at the Energy Department are an exceptionally ripe target. That's because of Solyndra, but also because, in the last two years, the Energy Department received a massive $40 billion infusion in funding for clean-energy programs from the stimulus law, a signature Obama policy. When that money runs out this year, a request for more on top of it would be met with flat-out derision from most congressional Republicans. Increasing renewable-energy initiatives at the Pentagon can also help Obama advance his broader, national goals for transitioning the U.S. economy from fossil fuels to alternative sources. As the largest industrial consumer of energy in the world, the U.S. military can have a significant impact on energy markets - if it demands significant amounts of energy from alternative sources, it could help scale up production and ramp down prices for clean energy on the commercial market. Obama acknowledged those impacts in a speech last month at the Buckley Air Force Base in Colorado. "The Navy is going to purchase enough clean-energy capacity to power a quarter of a million homes a year. And it won't cost taxpayers a dime," Obama said. "What does it mean? It means that the world's largest consumer of energy - the Department of Defense - is making one of the largest commitments to clean energy in history," the president added. "That will grow this market, it will strengthen our energy security." Experts also hope that Pentagon engagement in clean-energy technology could help yield breakthroughs with commercial applications. Kingston acknowledged that the upfront costs for alternative fuels are higher than for conventional oil and gasoline. For example, the Air Force has pursued contracts to purchase biofuels made from algae and camelina, a grass-like plant, but those fuels can cost up to $150 a barrel, compared to oil, which is lately going for around $100 a barrel. Fuel-efficient hybrid tanks can cost $1 million more than conventional tanks - although in the long run they can help lessen the military's oil dependence, Kingston said Republicans recognize that the up-front cost can yield a payoff later. "It wouldn't be dead on arrival. But we'd need to see a two- to three-year payoff on the investment," Kingston said. Military officials - particularly Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who has made alternative energy a cornerstone of his tenure - have been telling Congress for years that the military's dependence on fossil fuels puts the troops - and the nation's security - at risk. Mabus has focused on meeting an ambitious mandate from a 2007 law to supply 25 percent of the military's electricity from renewable power sources by 2025. (Obama has tried and failed to pass a similar national mandate.) Last June, the DOD rolled out its first department-wide energy policy to coalesce alternative and energy-efficient initiatives across the military services. In January, the department announced that a study of military installations in the western United States found four California desert bases suitable to produce enough solar energy - 7,000 megawatts - to match seven nuclear power plants. And so far, those **moves have met with approval from congressional Republicans**. Even so, any request for new Pentagon spending will be met with greater scrutiny this year. The Pentagon's budget is already under a microscope, due to $500 billion in automatic cuts to defense spending slated to take effect in 2013. But even with those challenges, clean-energy spending probably won't stand out as much in the military budget as it would in the Energy Department budget. Despite its name, the Energy Department has traditionally had little to do with energy policy - its chief portfolio is maintaining the nation's nuclear weapons arsenal. Without the stimulus money, last year only $1.9 billion of Energy's $32 billion budget went to clean-energy programs. A spending increase of just $1 billion would make a big difference in the agency's bottom line. But it would probably be easier to tuck another $1 billion or $2 billion on clean-energy spending into the Pentagon's $518 billion budget. Last year, the Pentagon spent about $1 billion on renewable energy and energy-efficiency programs across its departments.

#### SMRs are popular

Nelson and Northey 12 Gabriel and Northey, energy and environment reports for Greenwire, “DOE funding for small reactors languishes as parties clash on debt,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3>

It's not just wind and solar projects that are waiting for federal help as Congress duels over the importance of putting taxpayer dollars on the line for cutting-edge energy projects. Some of the nation's largest nuclear power companies are anxious to hear whether they will get a share of a $452 million pot from the Department of Energy for a new breed of reactors that the industry has labeled as a way to lessen the safety risks and construction costs of new nuclear power plants. The grant program for these "small modular reactors," which was announced in January, would mark the official start of a major U.S. foray into the technology even as rising construction costs -- especially when compared to natural-gas-burning plants -- cause many power companies to shy away from nuclear plants. DOE received four bids before the May 21 deadline from veteran reactor designers Westinghouse Electric Co. and Babcock & Wilcox Co., as well as relative newcomers Holtec International Inc. and NuScale Power LLC. Now the summer has ended with no announcement from DOE, even though the agency said it would name the winners two months ago. As the self-imposed deadline passed, companies started hearing murmurs that a decision could come in September, or perhaps at the end of the year. To observers within the industry, it seems that election-year calculations may have sidelined the contest. "The rumors are a'flying," said Paul Genoa, director of policy development at the Nuclear Energy Institute, in an interview last week. "All we can imagine is that this is now caught up in politics, and the campaign has to decide whether these things are good for them to announce, and how." Small modular reactors do not seem to be lacking in political support. The nuclear lobby has historically courted both Democrats and Republicans and still sees itself as being in a strong position with key appropriators on both sides of the aisle. Likewise, top energy officials in the Obama administration have hailed the promise of the new reactors, and they haven't shown any signs of a change of heart. DOE spokeswoman Jen Stutsman said last week that the department is still reviewing applications, but she did not say when a decision will be made.

#### Issues are compartmentalized---budget fight proves

Judson Berger 3-4, 2013, “Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities,” Fox News, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/#ixzz2OknXmt3G>

Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., a vocal advocate for immigration reform, voiced confidence Monday that the administration and Congress could handle the busy agenda. ¶ "The spirit of **bipartisan cooperation that is keeping the immigration issue moving forward has not been poisoned by the sequester and budget stalemate**, so far," he said in a statement. "The two sets of issues seem to exist in parallel universes where I can disagree with my Republican colleagues strenuously on budget matters, but still work with them effectively to eventually reach an immigration compromise. ... I remain extremely optimistic that immigration reform is going to happen this year." ¶ Immigration reform efforts are still marching along despite the budget drama. Obama met last week on the issue with Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who both are part of a bipartisan group crafting legislation.

#### Winner’s win

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### XO’s solve

Whitesides 1-4 – John Whitesides, writer for Reuters, January 4th, 2013, "Obama Second-Term Plans Threatened By Bruising Budget Fights" www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/04/obama-second-term-plans\_n\_2411168.html

When blocked in Congress, Obama has shown a willingness to use executive orders and agency rules to make policy changes. During last year's campaign, **Obama ordered an end to deportations of young undocumented immigrants who came to the country as children and had never committed a crime**.¶ **This week, the** D**epartment of** H**omeland** S**ecurity changed its rules** to make it easier for undocumented immigrants to get a waiver allowing them to stay in the country as they seek permanent residency.

### AT: Economy Impact

#### No economic benefit to legalization

Hill et al. 10 – Laura E. Hill is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. She has been a research associate at The SPHERE Institute and a National Institute of Aging postdoctoral fellow. She holds a Ph.D. in demography from the University of California, Berkeley AND\*\*\* Magnus Lofstrom is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. He also holds appointments as a research fellow at the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) at the University of Bonn and as a research associate at the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies at the University of California, San Diego. He has also served as a researcher and has taught at IZA and at the University of California, Irvine. He received his Ph.D. in economics from the University of California, San Diego. AND\*\*\* Joseph M. Hayes is a research associate at the Public Policy Institute of California, where he studies migration and population change throughout the state. He has studied migration in the Central Valley, the families of newly arrived immigrants to California, and the state’s prison population. He holds an M.S. in agricultural economics from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. 2010, “Immigrant Legalization Assessing the Labor Market Effects,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\_410LHR.pdf#ppic](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_410LHR.pdf#ppic)

Legalization of the estimated 12 million unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States would lead to both **economic benefits and costs for the nation.** **Some arguments for comprehensive immigration reform suggest that legalizing immigrants will help end the current recession.** This seems unlikely. Our research suggests that earlier findings from the IRCA era may overstate anticipated earnings from a new reform, at least in the short run. ¶ We do expect occupational mobility to improve for formerly unauthorized immigrants with higher skill levels. When compared to the continuously legal, their occupational earnings growth was about 9 to 10 percent. These higher-skill unauthorized immigrants are more likely to be overstayers than crossers, but unauthorized immigrants with college degrees are found in both groups. **Lower-skill unauthorized immigrants are not likely to experience strong occupational mobility as a result of a legalization program** (although their occupational earnings grow over time in the United States). It will be important that any new legislation give legalized immigrants incentives to improve their skills, especially in English. ¶ The majority of studies investigating the effect of legalizing immigrants on natives’ earnings suggest that the effects are slightly negative for workers with low skill levels. Since we find no improvements in occupational mobility or wages for the lowest skill levels in the short run, we do not expect that legalizing immigrants would place any increased pressure on the wages of low-skill natives or low-skill legal immigrants. Tax revenues may increase, although **many unauthorized immigrants already file federal and state tax returns and pay sales and payroll taxes.** We found that about 90 percent of unauthorized immigrants filed federal tax returns in the year before gaining LPR status. We expect that increases in **tax revenues** resulting from increased earnings among the formerly unauthorized would be modest.

#### SMR expansion solves growth

MSCR 11 US Department of Commerce International Trade Administration Manufacturing and Services Competitiveness Report, February 2011, “The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors”, http://trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg\_ian/@nuclear/documents/webcontent/tg\_ian\_003185.pdf

A primary advantage of SMRs is in their production. Their small size means that they do not need the ultra-heavy forged components that currently can be made only by Japan Steel Works and Doosan Heavy Industries in South Korea.7 In most of the current U.S. SMR designs, the reactor pressure vessels and other large forgings could be supplied by **domestic vendors**, which would create U.S. jobs and potential exports of SMR components to international customers. In addition, most SMR designs allow for factory manufacturing, which could potentially provide opportunities for cost savings, for increased quality, and for more efficient production. Those attributes mean that **SMRs could be a** significant source of economic growth **in the United States.**

## K

### 2AC Heidegger

#### Util outweighs ontology

Macauley 96—Associate prof of philosophy and environmental studies, Penn State (David, Minding Nature, p 74)

We may approach the issue of what Heidegger may teach today's radical environmentalists by examining an issue about which they and Heidegger would profoundly disagree. Heidegger claimed that there is a greater danger than the destruction of all life on earth by nuclear war.40 For radical environmentalists, it is hard to imagine anything more dangerous than the total destruction of the biosphere! Heidegger argued, however, that worse than such annihilation would be the totally technologized world in which material "happiness" for everyone is achieved, but in which humanity would be left with a radically constricted capacity for encountering the being of entities. This apparently exorbitant claim may be partially mitigated by the following con- sideration. If human existence lost all relationship to transcendent being, entities could no longer show themselves at all, and in this sense would no longer "be." Who needs nuclear war, Heidegger asked rhetorically, if entities have already ceased to be? For many environmentalists, such a question reveals the extent to which Heidegger remained part of the human-centered tradition that he wanted to overcome. By estimating so highly human Dasein's contribution to the manifesting of things, Heidegger may well have underesti- mated the contribution made by many other forms of life, for which the extinction of humankind's ontological awareness would be far preferable to their own extinction in nuclear war!

#### Perm do the plan and <> --- energy policy is key to actualize the alt

Pattison 2k—Professor of Divinity at the University of Oxford (George, Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to the Later Heidegger, p 205-7)

One of the dominant themes of the later Heidegger is the critique of technology. Tracing the danger of contemporary technology back to its essence in the enframing mind-set of metaphysics, his figuration of the fourfold of earth, sky, mortals and gods might seem to offer a way of envisaging the world that could break the grip of technological thinking and prepare us for a post-technological era. Yet although Heidegger's rhetoric clearly invokes many of the anxieties aroused by the contemporary environmental crisis, his concern with the essence rather than with the fact of technology might seem to result in a situation parallel to that of his relation to religion — i.e., that his is a policy of deliberate non-involvement in the 'merely' ontic, the level on which the day-to-day decisions of societies as well as individuals operate. Even if there are passages that suggest that his preoccupation with the essence of technology was in the cause of preparing humanity to face the challenge of assuming responsibility for technology, the very fact that many of his reflections on technology come from the period of his inner emigration and his retreat from the public world of political decision-making makes it all the more difficult to see how what he has to say might help us in the face of environmental degradation and devastation. There is a real difficulty here, both in understanding the exact thrust of Heidegger's argument and in relating his insights to what we might regard as the needs of the present. If one of his complaints against Nazism was that it finally failed to confront the issue of technology, doesn't his own refusal to engage with the practicalities of technology also amount to failure? Heidegger himself liked to quote Holderlin's line 'Where danger is, grows also that which saves', and is it not the case that, if technology itself is creating a danger for humanity and for the whole bio-sphere, only science and technology can save us? Indeed, isn't it geographers, biologists, chemists, botanists and other scientists who have done most to alert us to the catastrophic potential of many current industrial practices? And isn't it precisely a better scientific understanding of what is going on that will best prepare us for the most appropriate technological response? Solar panels, wind farms, insulation systems, cleaner cars and other 'green' initiatives all depend on the application of science, rather than its abandonment. Surely the further development of such technologies is more important than musing about the metaphysical foundations of enframing? Looking at it like this, we might conclude that Heidegger's strategy is, bluntly, one of intellectual surrender, a failure to engage with what is most existentially pressing in the concrete reality of our contemporary destiny. Don't we, as in the case of religion, have to say that actual life is lived on the plane of the ontic, and involves wrestling with particular decisions and accepting particular responsibilities? It might be objected that, whether we are talking about religion, politics or technology, the distinction between the ontic and the ontological does not of itself involve neglecting the former. It doesn't have to be a matter of either/or. We don't have to stop being religious in order to reflect on the ontological structures disclosed by the religious life, and many theologians have chosen to follow Heidegger in, as they see it, seeking an ontological anchor for the exigencies of the religious life as it is lived. Similarly, it would not seem necessary to suspend our efforts to solve particular environmental problems until we have succeeded in refiguring the world in a post-technological way. So, Heidegger need not be construed as saying that there is no point in doing what we can while we can to improve things in the here and now. Isn't his position rather one of giving unto Caesar's that which is Caesar's — i.e., of warning against assuming that the immediate problems of today and tomorrow are the only things that should concern us? But if Heidegger's aim is neither to decry nor to promote the actual world of technology but simply to ask us to reflect critically on the limits of technology by considering its essence, does it follow that his strategy has no relation to the concrete, no practical significance or application? One way of answering this question would be to acknowledge that Heidegger was no more of a practical environmentalist than he was a Christian preacher or a teacher of Buddhist meditation. He will not give us concrete answers to concrete problems (although which modern philosopher has given us any real help in the face of the environmental crisis?), and the one occasion when he tried to do so, in 1933, simply demonstrated the gulf separating his way of essential thinking from everyday reality. Nevertheless, the nature of the crisis confronting us today is so all-encompassing, permeating every level of society and culture, that its solution cannot be left to the scientists and technologists alone. For science and technology will necessarily direct their best efforts to particular problems, but, over and above the question of how to maximise renewable energy sources or how to take countermeasures against ozone depletion, we also need to be considering the kind of life-style, the kind of society we want to be living in. No matter how sophisticated our science, it will never be able to achieve more than crisis management so long as we go on living in an acquisitive, self-assertive society of individuals pursuing the maximisation of their personal autonomy, in moral, financial and political terms, and for whom the earth itself is nothing but a resource for human self-realisation. So long as this is how we choose to live, we will continue to degrade our environment in a cycle of ever more total crises. Unless we change at the fundamental level of values and of vision we will find ourselves, later if not sooner, passing the point of no return and rendering our planet humanly uninhabitable. On this line of reasoning, we not only need technical solutions, we also need the vision thing. Alongside ecology we need 'deep ecology', a spiritual re-orientation that will make us fit custodians of planetary good.

#### Prior questions fail and paralyze politics

Owen 2 (David Owen, 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.

#### No impact---enframing doesn’t cause violence

Bronner 95—Professor of Political Science, Comparative Literature, and German Studies at Rutgers University (Stephen Eric, The Great Divide: The Enlightenment and its Critics, http://nova.wpunj.edu/newpolitics/issue19/bronne19.htm)

Horkheimer and Adorno identified "Enlightenment" with a debunking of what stands beyond the scientific domination over nature or what Kant called "pure reason." For this reason, however, they ultimately wound up engaging in the very form of dogmatic ahistorical philosophical inquiry that they initially wished to oppose. Their form of argumentation perverts history and obscures what is politically at stake.¶ Horkheimer and Adorno place the domination of nature at the center of emancipatory philosophical discourse. But they never take into account the actual movements with which the Enlightenment spirit and its critics were connected. They are unable to deal with its legacy for a progressive politics and, insofar as "the whole is false" (Adorno), their critique evidences a deeply indeterminate and abstract quality. Indeed, they never took to heart the insight from Nietzsche that: "to perceive resemblances everywhere, making everything alike, is a sign of weak eyesight."32¶ Their claim that fascism is a continuation of the "Enlightenment," according to either of their definitions, is empirically and normatively wrong. Neither from the standpoint of economic or political history, let alone class interests, does the interpretation offered by Horkheimer and Adorno make sense. Fascism was a self-conscious ideological response to the Revolution of 1848, whose democratic values derived from Lessing and the German Enlightenment,33 as well as the two great offspring of modernity. The mass base of the Nazis lay in precapitalist classes like the peasantry and the petty- bourgeoisie whose interests were directly threatened by the capitalist production process and its two dominant classes.34 Sections of the bourgeoisie and a great majority of the proletariat, for their part, identified respectively with an impotent set of parties embracing a continental form of liberalism and a social democratic party still formally embracing orthodox Marxism. These were the supporters of the Weimar Republic and the enemies of the Nazis who made war on them in word and deed.¶ Dialectic of Enlightenment casts real historical conflicts into an anthropological fog. The tale of Odysseus, wherein the destruction of subjectivity becomes the only way to preserve the subject, offers a case in point. Instrumental reason did not bring about fascism or even destroy the ability of individuals to make normative judgments. It was rather the product of a clash between real movements, whose members were quite capable of making diverse judgments concerning both their interests and their values, which resulted in the victory of the Nazis.¶ The attempt to unify qualitatively different phenomena under a single rubric can only produce pseudo-dialectical sophistry and political confusion.35 The decision to broaden the "Enlightenment" to include its greatest and most self-conscious critics -- Sade, Schopenhauer, Bergson and Nietzsche 36 -- offers a case in point. None of these thinkers had the least identification with Enlightenment political theory or the practice associated with it. They were anti-liberal, anti-socialist, anti-democratic and anti-egalitarian, anti- rationalist and anti-historical.¶ Adorno would later write that "not least among the tasks now confronting thought is that of placing all the reactionary arguments against Western culture in the service of progressive Enlightenment."37 As usual, however, this imperative was left hanging in the abstract. He never thought to consider the contradictions capable of arising from the attempt to merge right-wing ideology with left-wing practice.¶ The famous analysis of the culture industry suffers from the same exaggeration and lack of determinacy as their critique of instrumental rationality and modern forms of bureaucratic politics. Horkheimer and Adorno were content to highlight the repressive character of mass culture per se. They dismissed the idea that genuine works of art or important sources of information could appear in the mass media. They also ignored the manner in which even works of high culture have learned from the technology generated by attempts to produce popular culture. It was enough for Horkheimer to note that, if the culture industry comes to define the public realm, then the moment of emancipatory resistance will enter the tenuous domain of a private experience constantly threatened by the extension of instrumental rationality.38 Thus, interestingly enough, he was actually less sanguine about the emancipatory role of aesthetics than either Adorno or Marcuse in their later writings.¶ Talk about the "integration" of works, however, only begs the question of whether they were really rendered impotent or whether they actually helped change the "hegemonic" system and were only then turned into museum pieces. Questions of this sort, however, are never entertained in Dialectic of Enlightenment. The "whole" is what counts while attempts to transform it are never radical enough since either revolution or reform must, in some degree, make recourse to instrumental rationality.¶ But, for this very reason, the repressive conditions this form of critique claims to contest are left intact. Without making reference to institutions and movements, incapable of drawing qualitative distinctions between phenomena, the attempt to preserve subjectivity from the incursions of society turns into little more than an aesthetic exercise in what Thomas Mann initially called a "power-protected inwardness." Solidarity is treated either as an arbitrary sentiment or a demand for conformity while Enlightenment collapses into the "mass deception" of the culture industry. Critique has a different fate in store: it can now only talk itself into exhaustion.¶ The Enlightenment Spirit¶ 1968 marked the beginnings of a change in the prevalent understandings of the Enlightenment. Conservatives had previously condemned it for generating a revolutionary rejection of tradition while critical theorists and the ultra-left emphasized the impotence of its ethical ideals relative to the repressive power of its commitment to instrumental rationality. Especially following the death of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, however, the situation changed. The earlier critique of instrumental rationality was retained by significant intellectual elements of the New Left and most notably by the ecology movement. Nevertheless, it became fused with a belief in the fundamentally repressive character of the Enlightenment in terms of both its political worldview and its normative assumptions.¶ Vietnam had symbolized the connection of liberalism and imperialism and many were led to question the "Eurocentric" character of the Enlightenment. A new sensitivity about the twin cancers of racism and sexism created a new concern about the "white" and "male" prejudices of its representatives as well as the manner in which minorities, women, and outsiders were unrepresented. New social movements began the preoccupation with "identity politics" and the emphasis on local struggles, or what Michel Foucault originally termed "micro-politics," even as they sought to overcome the organizational legacy of bureaucracy and hierarchy on the left.¶ Postmodernism reflected all of this and -- relying for its theoretical inspiration on political reactionaries like Nietzsche, Bergson, and Heidegger -- sought to present its insights in a matter which "would be simultaneously post-Marxist and post- liberal."39 Its proponents condemned "essentialism" as little more than a dogmatic striving for absolute truth. They castigated rationalism in favor of relativism and the centrality of "experience." They rejected historical materialism for its "totalistic" -- or totalitarian -- ambitions and use of "grand narratives." They criticized the use of universal categories for veiling one or another -- western, male, or white -- "master discourse." They chastized liberalism for fostering illusions about "rights," the equality of citizens, the political centrality of the state, and even cosmopolitanism for undermining any sense of the particular or "lived" identity.¶ The New Left made genuine contributions and undertook its critique in the name of a populist commitment to democracy.40 Many of its earlier advocates like Paul Goodman and Erich Fromm and Christian Bay were influenced by Enlightenment values and even the best postmodern thinkers took the bourgeois heritage seriously. They sought to contest its limitations and empower repressed groups with very different experiences of reality.41 But the "owl of Minerva" did not really spread its wings in the aftermath of the 1968s. The new philosophical movement of postmodernism was born of defeat. Its popularity grew concurrently with the rising conservative tide of the late 1970s and, especially in the United States, carried over into the present.¶ Perhaps, for this very reason, a problem presents itself with respect to the relation between theory and practice. For, whether explicitly or implicitly, the advocates of particularism always made reference to the moral obligations of others to support their cause and, in spite of all the talk about the inherently alienating character of the state, sought legislation in order to make their concerns concrete. Postmodern theorists were unconcerned. Illuminating this relationship in keeping with the philosophical idealism of Kant and Hegel or the historical materialism of Marx, after all, would necessarily lead them to contest the unqualified "contingency" of all "significations" and obviously involve them in some form of "grand narrative."¶ The effects of this situation on practice are becoming increasingly evident. The ideological emphasis on identity and particularism, relativism and various forms of historical reductionism, have fostered fragmentation and political confusion. It is becoming ever more difficult to deny that, whatever the achievements of the last 25 years, the new social movements have lost the moral high ground the left held during the civil rights movement and the early struggles against the Vietnam War.¶ Some have sought to face such matters directly. Judith Butler accepted the need for a notion of "contingent epistemology" without ontological grounding, for example, while Gayitri Spivak introduced the idea of "strategic essentialism." Neither is sufficient, however, to deal with the real issues at hand. Epistemology never had an ontological foundation in the first place, which was precisely the problem Fichte and Schelling and Hegel had with the "subjective idealism" of Kant, but it offered a way of thinking about what categories are necessary for which particular forms of inquiry and action. The new notion of "contingent epistemology" gives no clue when it is necessary to privilege universalistic against particularistic claims, however, and it is the same with the concept of "strategic essentialism."¶ Neither thinker considers how the employment of epistemological or essentialist categories necessarily generates the need for "grand narratives" along with "impartial" criteria for discriminating between particular interests and institutions. Nor is either theorist willing to develop the implications of such philosophical compromises for postmodern analysis or its validity. The relativism and emphasis on particular "experience," which originally gave the tendency its philosophical power, are neither denied nor embraced. They are simply left in a strange form of limbo.¶ Even more important, however, the basic issue still remains unresolved. The commitment to those universalistic assumptions underpinning republicanism, socialism, and internationalism is -- as Mendelssohn realized -- always one of conviction. It is not a tactical or "strategic" matter especially when the advocates of liberal and socialist programs are engaged in challenging an authoritarian regime. The new importance attributed to epistemology and essentialism can also only confuse adherents of those new social movements inspired by various forms of identity politics and particularist ideologies.¶ The contradiction between theory and practice now exists for postmodernism as surely as it did for the socialist labor movement when Eduard Bernstein chastized its leaders for preaching a revolutionary Marxist theory while engaging in a purely reformist practice. And the response to this current situation must take the same form. It is time to end the equivocations. Let the postmodern critics of Enlightenment values either keep their radically subjectivist form of theory and, in the manner of Nietzsche and Heidegger, transform the notion of praxis to meet their theoretical beliefs or come to grips with reality, recognize the needs of existing forms of progressive political action, and draw the theoretical consequences.¶ Postmodernism, of course, is not the only popular theory critical of the Enlightenment legacy. There is even a certain overlap with certain left proponents of the quite popular philosophical tendency known as "communitarianism" and thinkers like Richard Rorty or Chantal Mouffe are actually open to identification with either tendency. Communitarianism also rejects the universalism, cosmopolitanism, and emphasis on individual rights associated with the Enlightenment. Its proponents often enjoy referring to Rousseau's Draft for a Constitution of Poland and the manner in which it cautions Catherine the Great against making dramatic moves, which might contradict the traditions out of which a people organically formed.¶ Communitarians generally condemn the explosion of claims associated with "rights" as against "duties" for their fragmenting impact upon the national community. Thinkers like Amitai Etzioni also seek to shift government activities to the type of voluntary associations enthusiastically described by Alexis de Tocqueville. If the first concern surely exaggerates the corroding influence of the new social movements on the polity, as against the egoism generated by the new unleashing of market forces, the second idea is even more problematical given the increased time spent on work, the classification of nearly one-third of all workers as members of the "working poor," the impact of markets on "voluntary associations," and -- finally -- the fact that the various and complex programs undertaken by the state cannot simply be transferred into the nebulous sphere of non-institutionalized forces supposedly defined neither by the market nor the state.¶ Communitarians oppose the rationalism and universalism, the preoccupation with the state and its bureaucratic institutions, which derive from the Enlightenment. They prefer instead to base their political theory on the belief that it is necessary to begin with the customs and traditions carried over from the past. But there is no sense of the terms by which one tradition gains privilege over another and how to judge between them. Also, from this philosophical perspective, it is difficult to justify the condemnation of repressive traditions in a culture other than one's own.¶ Is the United States a "liberal" nation or a racist one? There is surely no definitive answer. Michael Walzer would suggest that "moral sentiment" alone can inform a judgment. The weakness of relying on intuition, however, is obvious. Also, even if a major left communitarian thinker like Charles Taylor should maintain that commitment to liberal values is necessary since liberalism is part of "our" European tradition, it will logically lack relevance for those suffering under theocratic or authoritarian nations devoid of a liberal legacy. Thus, in the name of opposing the abstract rationalism and "Eurocentrism" deriving from the Enlightenment, even the best communitarians will find themselves in a situation where the benefits of liberalism or social democracy can exist only for those nations already in the possession of them.¶ Nelson Mandela, of course, knew better. The fact of the matter is that the most successful and emancipatory movements of the oppressed were all inspired by a commitment to either the language of rights or universalist principles. These movements championed the power of reasoned dialogue, cultural cosmopolitanism, and what Jurgen Habermas has appropriately termed "constitutional patriotism" or a vision of the state predicated on the rule of law (Rechtsstaat). It has traditionally been movements of the right which have employed arguments about the inherent uniqueness of their constituency, privileged "experience" over reasoned dialogue, and identified with the organic community (Volksstaat). A basic choice of worldview is still with us and seeking to combine left-wing politics with right-wing assumptions can only lead to moral disillusionment and unprincipled compromise.¶ Nothing is more false or self-defeating for a progressive than to reduce the Enlightenment to the interests of white, male, bourgeois Europeans. This view, which is embraced by so many on the left, rests on the assumption that the value of an idea is reducible to the particular attributes of its author or the complex of interests dominant when the given work was produced. Such a stance is nothing other than a crude version of the sociology of knowledge, which was never particularly radical in the first place.¶ ¶ The value of the Enlightenment spirit lies precisely in its ability to jut beyond its historical context. Its commitment to tolerance and equality, its skepticism of religion and established tradition, reflect more than the interests of a white, male bourgeoisie on the rise. It projects an invigorated notion of the individual -- or the expansion of what Goethe termed the "personality" -- and a new respect for work beyond any market incentives. "Labor," wrote Adam Smith, is the "original price of everything." Indeed, "work makes the person," could have been a slogan of the Enlightenment.¶ Candide is a case in point. An early "educational novel" (Bildungsroman), it expresses the excitement of travel and new experiences. It condemns religious intolerance no less than the unwarranted optimism about this being "the best of all possible worlds." Rather than exhibiting a simplistic form of resignation, furthermore, its famous closing actually poses a challenge for the future. Voltaire wrote this work, after all, while building his ideologically progressive and economically successful community, which would serve as a refuge for many victims of religious intolerance, in political exile at Ferney. Indeed, the decision of Candide to "tend his garden" is nothing other than a recognition that the time has come to give up on metaphysical speculation and begin to do some work.¶ Perhaps the most powerful critique of the Enlightenment, for all that, derives from its emphasis on the domination over nature. Instrumental rationality employed without respect for the intricacies of various eco-systems has created an environmental nightmare. Pollution of the air, withering of the forests, des- poilation of the oceans, have profoundly altered any previous optimism connected with technological progress. The ecological movement, for all its problems, has opened the eyes of the world. But still, identifying technology or instrumental rationality with the domination of nature is a mistake. Ecology is not rigidly opposed to Enlightenment notions of science and technology. Coming to terms with the technological degradation of the environment, in fact, can only occur from the standpoint of technology itself. A return to the premodern past is no option. It is a matter of setting new priorities for technological development in the future and invigorating liberal and socialist values with ecological concerns.¶ Ecology offers new possibilities for linking the efforts of reason with the creation of a safer, better, and more beautiful world. Such a vision is only betrayed by the introduction of half-baked spiritualism, uncritical reliance on intuition, and naive ideas about some "golden age" hidden in the mists of the past. Modernity has had a progressive impact on social interaction and, in this vein, Ulrich Beck is completely correct when he writes that "the needle of Enlightenment is found in the haystack of relationships, not under the searchlight of theory."42

#### 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.

### Tech Optimism Good

#### Tech optimism based on empirical research is good---prefer specific experts

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 believers, 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 This is the precise meaning of technological optimism as a term of art.

### AT: Enviro Impact

#### All environmental factors getting better

Lomberg 10**—**Ph.D in pol science (4/21, Bjorn Earth Day: Smile, don't shudder; Ignore doomsday environmentalists. Things aren't so bad. And if rich countries would worry about the right things, all the better, USA Today, LexisNexis)

Given all the talk of impending catastrophe, this may come as a surprise, but as we approach the 40th anniversary of the first Earth Day, people who care about the environment actually have a lot to celebrate. Of course, that's not how the organizers of Earth Day 2010 see it. In their view (to quote a recent online call to arms), "The world is in greater peril than ever." But consider this: In virtually every developed country, the air is more breathable and the water is more drinkable than it was in 1970. In most of the First World, deforestation has turned to reforestation. Moreover, the percentage of malnutrition has been reduced, and ever-more people have access to clean water and sanitation. Apocalyptic predictions from concerned environmental activists are nothing new. Until about 10 years ago, I took it for granted that these predictions were sound. Like many of us, I believed that the world was in a terrible state that was only getting worse with each passing day. My thinking changed only when, as a university lecturer, I set out with my students to disprove what I regarded at the time as the far-fetched notion that global environmental conditions were actually improving. To our surprise, the data showed us that many key environmental measures were indeed getting better. ,

### AT: Alt – Wright

#### The alt’s all-or-nothing choice fails --- small reforms like the plan are key to institutional change and getting others to sign on to the alt

Erik Olin Wright 7, Vilas Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, “Guidelines for Envisioning Real Utopias”, Soundings, April, www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Guidelines-soundings.pdf

5. Waystations¶ The final guideline for discussions of envisioning real utopias concerns the importance of waystations. The central problem of envisioning real utopias concerns the **viability of institutional alternatives** that embody emancipatory values, but the practical achievability of such institutional designs often **depends upon the existence of smaller steps**, intermediate institutional innovations **that move us in the right direction but only partially embody these values.** Institutional proposals which have an **all-or-nothing quality** to them are both **less likely to be adopted in the first place, and may pose more difficult transition-cost problems** if implemented. The catastrophic experience of Russia in the “shock therapy” approach to market reform is historical testimony to this problem.¶ Waystations are a difficult theoretical and practical problem because there are many instances in which partial reforms may have very different consequences than full- bodied changes. Consider the example of unconditional basic income. Suppose that a very limited, below-subsistence basic income was instituted: not enough to survive on, but a grant of income unconditionally given to everyone. One possibility is that this kind of basic income would act mainly as a subsidy to employers who pay very low wages, since now they could attract more workers even if they offered below poverty level¶ earnings. There may be good reasons to institute such wage subsidies, but they would not generate the positive effects of a UBI, and therefore might not function as a stepping stone.¶ What we ideally want, therefore, are **intermediate reforms** that have two main properties: first, they concretely **demonstrate the virtues of the fuller program of transformation, so they contribute to the ideological battle of convincing people that the alternative is credible and desirable;** and second, they **enhance the capacity for action of people**, increasing their ability to push further in the future. Waystations that increase popular participation and **bring people together in problem-solving deliberations** for collective purposes are particularly salient in this regard. This is what in the 1970s was called “nonreformist reforms”: reforms that are **possible within existing institutions** § Marked 18:45 § and that **pragmatically solve real problems** while at the same time **empowering people in ways which** **enlarge their scope of action in the future.**

# 1AR

## Case

### AT: Workforce Shortage

#### No workforce shortage

ITA 11 International Trade Administration, “The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors” Manufacturing and Services Competitiveness Report, February, US Department of Commerce

A serious obstacle to the resurgence of traditional nuclear power in the United States is the eroded domestic manufacturing capacity for the major nuclear components. A robust program of building SMRs, however, could make use of existing domestic capacity that is already capable of completely constructing most proposed SMR designs. **SMRs would not require the ultra-heavy forgings that currently can only be made overseas.** U.S. suppliers say that firms could retool using existing capabilities and resources and could source most of the components of SMRs here in the United States. This ability could mean tremendous new commercial opportunities for U.S. firms and workers.¶ A substantial SMR deployment program in the United States could result in the creation of many new jobs in manufacturing, engineering, transportation, construction (for site preparation and installation) and craft labor, professional services, and ongoing plant operations. As SMR manufacturers prove their designs in the domestic market, **they will likely consider export opportunities**. The modular nature of SMRs and their relative portability means that locating export-oriented SMR manufacturing and assembly could make sense for U.S. companies, as opposed to the localiza-tion that is typically necessary for building larger reactors.

## K

### AT: Commodification/Incentives K

#### Commodification is wrong---policy solutions are the only way to prevent extinction

Wagner 11 Gernot, economist at EDF, where he works in the office of economic policy and analysis, “But Will the Planet Notice? How Smart Economics Can Save the World.” Hill and Wang Press, p. 11-12

The fundamental forces guiding the behavior of billions are much larger than any one of us. It's about changing our system, creating a new business as usual. And to do that we need to think about what makes our system run. In the end, it comes down to markets, and the rules of the game that govern what we chase and how we chase it. Scientists can tell us how bad it will get. Activists can make us pay attention to the ensuing instabilities and make politicians take note. When the task comes to formulating policy, only economists can help guide us out of this morass and save the planet. In an earlier time with simpler problems, environmentalists took direct action against the market's brutal forces by erecting roadblocks or chaining themselves to trees. That works if the opposing force is a lumberjack with a chain saw. It might even work for an entire industry when the task is to ban a particular chemical or scrub a pollutant out of smokestacks. But that model breaks down when the opposing force is ourselves: each and every one of us demanding that the globalized market provide us with cheaper and better food, clothes, and vacations. There is no blocking the full, collective desires of the billions who are now part of the market economy and the billions more who want to—and ought to—be part of it. The only solution is to guide all-powerful market forces in the right direction and create incentives for each of us to make choices that work for all of us. The guideposts we have today for market forces evolved helter- skelter from a historical process that gave almost no weight to the survival of the planet, largely because the survival of the planet was not at stake. Now it is. Since we can't live without market forces, we need to guide them to help us keep the human adventure going in workable ways, rather than continue on the present path right off the edge of a cliff.

## Politics

### AT: Worker Shortage

#### Immigrants not key to SMRs or primacy

Ron Adams 10 The Energy Collective "Nuclear Industry Can Lead a Revival in Skilled Labor and Manufacturing in the United States" Nov 15 http://theenergycollective.com/rodadams/47144/nuclear-industry-can-lead-revival-skilled-labor-and-manufacturing-united-states.

At this point 13 license applications for up to 22 new reactors have been filed with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and the industry expects four-to-eight new plants to be operating by the end of the decade. Construction activities already have begun at plant sites in Georgia and South Carolina. As a consequence, over the past three years more than 15,000 careers, not just jobs, have been created as the nuclear industry has invested over $4 billion in new nuclear plant development. Plans call for the investment of another $8 billion to be in position to supply the materials needed to begin large-scale construction in 2011-2012. Many of these careers don’t require a college degree, but have earnings potential that equals, and even exceeds, that of college graduates. Teachers can play an instrumental part in creating awareness among their students of these careers.

### Perez Thumper

#### Perez nomination pounds immigration reform

US News 3-21-13, Ron Bonjean, “Tread Carefully, GOP—The Perez Nomination Is a Trap”, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/ron-bonjean/2013/03/21/perez-nomination-could-be-a-trap-for-the-gop

While the GOP continues to try to thread the needle over amnesty, pathways to citizenship and a guest worker program, the White House made a politically brilliant move which could help keep Republican poll numbers in the gutter. President Obama nominated Thomas E. Perez, who heads the Civil Rights Division at the Justice Department, to be the next Secretary of Labor which has provoked a fight with some Senate Republicans about voting rights, immigration and discrimination.

### 1AR XT – DOD Shields

#### No politician will oppose the plan---helps troops

Merchant 10 Political & Environment Columnist-Discovery, 10/21, “How the US Military Could Bring Solar Power to Mass Market,” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/how-the-us-military-could-bring-solar-power-to-mass-market.html

Furthermore, **Congress is infinitely more likely to approve funding for R&D**; and infrastructure **if the projects are military-related**. Which is depressing, but true -- the one thing that **no politician can get caught opposing is the safety of American troops.** In fact, the whole premise of the article is rather depressing, on point though it may be: The only way we may end up getting a competitive clean energy industry is through serious military investment, which is of course, serious government spending. Which **under any other guise would be vehemently opposed by conservatives.**