# 2AC Round 7

## Case

### Waste

#### They say Yucca’s not long term – NIMBY attitudes and political pressure prevents the feasibility of other options. Empirically proven with proposals in Wyoming. That’s Tollefson.

#### They say no impact to nuke terror – their ev does not take into account the political pressure for retaliation following a terrorist attack that triggers global nuke war. Best studies agree that it’s also likely. That’s Rhodes.

#### They say on-site safe– fuel pools have no backup power, containment structures or similar security to the rest of the plant, making them particularly vulnerable. That’s Alvarez. Empirically this has lead to meltdowns with Fukushima. That’s Kinitisch. Our ev is the most recent.

#### They say no impact to meltdowns – reactors contain radioactivity 100x that of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That’s Lendman.

### Peak Oil

#### Concede no impact to resource war.

#### They say no peak oil – newest data says you’re wrong. Oil prices could soon reach $100 a barrel as data from the top 50 oil companies show costs increasing. That’s Worstall. All their claims are empirically denied.

#### They say peak oil doesn’t hurt the economy – every other economic indicator is up right now and oil is the only thing that is choking the recovery. That’s Zakaria. Time series analysis from 1971-2010 proves this. That’s Li.

#### They say no impact to econ collapse – econ collapse triggers nationalist sentiments in countries and pronounces divisions within countries triggering nuclear confrontation. Best statistical studies prove that growth solves conflict. That’s Royal.

## T

#### We meet: Nuclear fuel recycling increases energy production.

World Nuclear Association 12 [Processing of Used Nuclear Fuel, http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf69.html]

Used nuclear fuel has long been reprocessed to extract fissile materials for recycling and to reduce the volume of high-level wastes. ¶ New reprocessing technologies are being developed to be deployed in conjunction with fast neutron reactors which will burn all long-lived actinides. ¶ A significant amount of plutonium recovered from used fuel is currently recycled into MOX fuel; a small amount of recovered uranium is recycled. ¶ A key, nearly unique, characteristic of nuclear energy is that used fuel may be reprocessed to recover fissile and fertile materials in order to provide fresh fuel for existing and future nuclear power plants. Several European countries, Russia and Japan have had a policy to reprocess used nuclear fuel, although government policies in many other countries have not yet addressed the various aspects of reprocessing.¶ Over the last 50 years the principal reason for reprocessing used fuel has been to recover unused uranium and plutonium in the used fuel elements and thereby close the fuel cycle, gaining some 25% more energy from the original uranium in the process and thus contributing to energy security. A secondary reason is to reduce the volume of material to be disposed of as high-level waste to about one fifth. In addition, the level of radioactivity in the waste from reprocessing is much smaller and after about 100 years falls much more rapidly than in used fuel itself.¶

#### Counter interpretation:

#### The aff has to increase energy production in both resource extraction and conversion into energy

Australian Government, Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency 2011 [“Energy Production and Consumption,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/national-greenhouse-energy-reporting/publications/supplementary-guidelines/energy-production-consumption.aspx]

Production of energy: in relation to a facility, means the:

1. extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility
2. manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility, or for use other than in the operation of the facility (regulation 2.23(3) NGER Regulations).

#### We meet the counter-interpretation: recycling involves both the act of reprocessing the used fuel and increasing that amount and using it to create new nuclear energy.

#### Our interp good:

A. Predictability – Only our interpretation guarantees link arguments to both extraction and the burning of resources to produce energy. This is crucial link ground for pollution DAs and domestic/foreign energy tradeoff DAs.

B. Limits: Requiring the aff to both extract and convert the energy is necessary to eliminate affs that only extract, like capture carbon or methane or stockpile oil as a strategic military reserve with heg advantages. Also key to prevent affs that only burn fuels like Bataille-style affs that encourage rapid consumption or R&D affs that incentivize new ways to burn the same resources.

#### Competing interpretations are bad: Race to the bottom: they’re just trying to limit out one more case

#### Prefer reasonability: as long as we’re reasonably topical, there’s no reason to pull the trigger. Don’t vote on potential abuse.

## DoE Review CP

#### Perm do both. Pass both the plan and the counterplan. The result of passing both is that an investment is done but the plan is passed unconditionally. Fixes net benefit with doing the review which is popular

#### CP links to politics – still perceived as nuclear energy which is unpopular.

#### Perm do the CP.

#### a. This is legitimate because they’re not textually competitive.

#### b. This limits out abusive counterplans like the dollar PIC and the period PIC which are completely unpredictable – infinite number of processes that could be changed, coopt the entirety of the 1AC, which forces us to argue against ourselves. This CP is only legitimate as a normal means CP for which they must read evidence.

#### c. Process PICs are artificially competitive because they overinflate the value of a contrived net benefit.

#### d. Process PICs are illegitimate because they add to the plan and are plan plus. They haven’t read any evidence which would indicate that specification of the process that would make the CP competitive is topical.

#### No solvency: Timeframe – plan must be passed immediately.

#### Security experts agree that nuclear terrorism is most likely to happen by 2015. Any delays risk the impact. That’s Rhodes.

#### Waste blowup is very possible right now. Fukushima proves. That’s Kinitisch.

#### Yucca mountain will be approved after the election cycle.

Greenville Online, ‘12

[“Yucca Mountain gets potential nudge”, 8-8-12,

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/article/20120809/OPINION/308090006/Yucca-Mountain-gets-potential-nudge>, RSR]

A court order to move ahead with the evaluation would be a step forward — albeit a small one — for Yucca Mountain. The project has barely been on life support since President Barack Obama ordered the federal government to stop all work on the project. However, heading into 2013 when there could be new leadership in the White House and a Congress that’s more supportive of Yucca Mountain, it could give the project enough life to resurrect it. That’s what should happen. Yucca Mountain remains the only viable option on the table for disposing of the nation’s nuclear waste. The White House and Congress — led by Democratic Sen. Harry Reid of Nevada — have dragged their feet on the issue and all but killed it, but no other options have been suggested by opponents.

#### Peak oil coming now. Newest data is showing that there are trends in decline of production and lack of capacity. That’s Worstall.

#### No solvency: must show unconditional support for reprocessing. Ban has been lifted since 1981 yet no investment. That’s Saillan. Must provide an unconditional national policy in favor of it to get private industry on board. That’s Selyukh.

#### No solvency: The DOE review doesn’t guarante implementation – just provides guidance for the Administration in budget negotiations

Reuters 11 (September 27th, www.reuters.com/article/2011/09/27/us-usa-energy-research-idUSTRE78Q13220110927)

The first-ever "Quadrennial Technology Review" prioritizes research that can be commercialized within 10 years, and research that could make a substantial dent in oil use and greenhouse gas production in the next two decades.¶ "The stakes are high for our country, and I am optimistic that we can still lead the world in technological innovation," Chu, a Nobel-winning physicist, said in an introduction to the 168-page report.¶ Chu, who ran one of the Energy Department's national laboratories before his appointment, has come under scrutiny for his "clean energy" advocacy after a failed government investment in a solar company that filed for bankruptcy.¶ The review does not address loan guarantees that the Energy Department uses to help private-sector companies sell clean energy technology -- a program that was worth $180 million in fiscal 2011 and which ends on Friday.¶ The review said the Department of Energy needs to make sure it does not get too far ahead of the private sector in its research spending, which totaled $3 billion in fiscal 2011.¶ "Currently DOE focuses too much effort on researching technologies that are multiple generations away from practical use," said the review, which gathered ideas from more than 600 people in industry, academia and government.¶ But the department will reserve up to 20 percent of its funding for "out-of-the-box" research that private sector companies shy away from, the review said.¶ DOE UNDERINVESTED IN TRANSPORT¶ In fiscal 2011, the Energy Department "underinvested" in transportation with only 26 percent of its spending geared to the research, the review said.¶ Only 9 percent of its research spending went to electric vehicles, and 4 percent to making vehicles more fuel efficient, with the remainder spent on alternative fuels.¶ The DOE will focus on technology that does not require new fuel-station infrastructure, and hone in on advanced biofuels for heavy-duty trucks rather than the "mature" ethanol industry, the review said.¶ Clean electricity accounted for 51 percent of the department's spending, but the DOE in future will instead invest a greater proportion of its budget on projects that help modernize the aging power grid, and make buildings and factories more energy efficient, the review said.¶ The department will continue to fund carbon capture and storage research because its fits with existing power infrastructure, and will focus on engineering support for licensing a new type of nuclear reactor known as the small modular reactor.¶ "The Department will give priority to research on technologies that can be operated economically with low water consumption, including solar photovoltaic and wind," the review said.¶ The review is designed to provide longer-term planning for budgets, which must go through annual negotiations between the executive branch and Congress, and is modeled on similar efforts by the Defense Department.

#### No solvency: Assessment is just the SQUO. We read the results of assessments which says that a 20% tax credit is enough to make it competitive, which is what your evidence would find. That’s Lagus and IAEA. The impact to this is that the CP does not pass the plan.

#### Conditionality is a voting issue – being able to kick positions at will destroys argumentative responsibility, skews the 2AC, the focal point of all aff offense, because we have to spend more time answering things than they do kicking them, and justifies aff conditionality to be reciprocal.

#### Presidential leadership is necessary to overcome the stigma of investing in sustainable energy.

Cohen, Executive director, Columbia University’s Earth Institute, ‘11

[Steven, “A Plea for Presidential Leadership on Sustainable Energy”, The Huffington Post, 4-4-11,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-cohen/a-plea-for-presidential-l_b_844300.html>, RSR]

The problem is that the Administration assigns a lower priority to energy and environment than to the economy, health care, and our military engagements. While sustainable energy could be a huge boost for the economy, the American political right is unwilling to invest government money in R & D and will not allow tax policies that favor renewable energy. All of that could be overcome with Presidential leadership, but I do not get the sense that the President really cares about these issues. Until he does, I don't think anything will change.

#### Administrative leadership is the only way to revive US nuclear non-proliferation norms

Wallace and Williams, ‘12

(Michael (head of the Transatlantic Program at the Royal United Services Institute) and Sarah (program coordinator and research associate in the U.S. Nuclear Energy Project at CSIS), “Nuclear Energy in America: Preventing its Early Demise”, CSIS, 2012, RSR)

The results were not perfect, but America’s institutional support for global nonproliferation goals and the regulatory behaviors it modeled clearly helped shape the way nuclear technology was adopted and used elsewhere around the world. This influence seems certain to wane if the United States is no longer a major supplier or user of nuclear technology. With existing nonproliferation and safety and security regimes looking increasingly inadequate in this rapidly changing global nuclear landscape, American leadership and leverage is more important and more central to our national security interests than ever. To maintain its leadership role in the development, design, and operation of a growing global nuclear energy infrastructure, the next administration, whether Democrat or Republican, must recognize the invaluable role played by the commercial U.S. nuclear industry and take action to prevent its early demise.

#### Unchecked nuclear spread will cause global nuclear war – shorter flight times and lack of second strike capacity

Cimbala 8 (Stephen, Political Science Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, March, “Anticipatory Attacks: Nuclear Crisis Stability in Future Asia” Comparative Strategy, Vol 27 No 2, p 113-132, InformaWorld)

The spread of nuclear weapons in Asia presents a complicated mosaic of possibilities in this regard. States with nuclear forces of variable force structure, operational experience, and command-control systems will be thrown into a matrix of complex political, social, and cultural crosscurrents contributory to the possibility of war. In addition to the existing nuclear powers in Asia, others may seek nuclear weapons if they feel threatened by regional rivals or hostile alliances. Containment of nuclear proliferation in Asia is a desirable political objective for all of the obvious reasons. Nevertheless, the present century is unlikely to see the nuclear hesitancy or risk aversion that marked the Cold War, in part, because the military and political discipline imposed by the Cold War superpowers no longer exists, but also because states in Asia have new aspirations for regional or global respect.12 The spread of ballistic missiles and other nuclear-capable delivery systems in Asia , or in the Middle East with reach into Asia, is especially dangerous because plausible adversaries live close together and are already engaged in ongoing disputes about territory or other issues.13 The Cold War Americans and Soviets required missiles and airborne delivery systems of intercontinental range to strike at one another's vitals. But short-range ballistic missiles or fighter-bombers suffice for India and Pakistan to launch attacks at one another with potentially “strategic” effects. China shares borders with Russia, North Korea, India, and Pakistan; Russia, with China and North Korea; India, with Pakistan and China; Pakistan, with India and China; and so on. The short flight times of ballistic missiles between the cities or military forces of contiguous states means that very little time will be available for warning and attack assessment by the defender. Conventionally armed missiles could easily be mistaken for a tactical nuclear first use. Fighter-bombers appearing over the horizon could just as easily be carrying nuclear weapons as conventional ordnance. In addition to the challenges posed by shorter flight times and uncertain weapons loads, potential victims of nuclear attack in Asia may also have first strike-vulnerable forces and command-control systems that increase decision pressures for rapid, and possibly mistaken, retaliation. This potpourri of possibilities challenges conventional wisdom about nuclear deterrence and proliferation on the part of policymakers and academic theorists. For policymakers in the United States and NATO, spreading nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in Asia could profoundly shift the geopolitics of mass destruction from a European center of gravity (in the twentieth century) to an Asian and/or Middle Eastern center of gravity (in the present century).14 This would profoundly shake up prognostications to the effect that wars of mass destruction are now passe, on account of the emergence of the “Revolution in Military Affairs” and its encouragement of information-based warfare.15 Together with this, there has emerged the argument that large-scale wars between states or coalitions of states, as opposed to varieties of unconventional warfare and failed states, are exceptional and potentially obsolete.16 The spread of WMD and ballistic missiles in Asia could overturn these expectations for the obsolescence or marginalization of major interstate warfare. For theorists, the argument that the spread of nuclear weapons might be fully compatible with international stability, and perhaps even supportive of international security, may be less sustainable than hitherto.17 Theorists optimistic about the ability of the international order to accommodate the proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems in the present century have made several plausible arguments based on international systems and deterrence theory. First, nuclear weapons may make states more risk averse as opposed to risk acceptant, with regard to brandishing military power in support of foreign policy objectives. Second, if states' nuclear forces are second-strike survivable, they contribute to reduced fears of surprise attack. Third, the motives of states with respect to the existing international order are crucial. Revisionists will seek to use nuclear weapons to overturn the existing balance of power; status quo-oriented states will use nuclear forces to support the existing distribution of power, and therefore, slow and peaceful change, as opposed to sudden and radical power transitions. These arguments, for a less alarmist view of nuclear proliferation, take comfort from the history of nuclear policy in the “first nuclear age,” roughly corresponding to the Cold War.18 Pessimists who predicted that some thirty or more states might have nuclear weapons by the end of the century were proved wrong. However, the Cold War is a dubious precedent for the control of nuclear weapons spread outside of Europe. The military and security agenda of the Cold War was dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union, especially with regard to nuclear weapons. Ideas about mutual deterrence based on second-strike capability and the deterrence “rationality” according to American or allied Western concepts might be inaccurate guides to the avoidance of war outside of Europe.19

## Elections

#### Romney will win – most accurate polls

Chambers 9/18 (Dean, Arlington Conservative, “Mitt Romney likely election win indicated by polls from key swing states”, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-election-win-indicated-by-polls-released-today-from-key-swing)

Two national polls of the presidential race show Mitt Romney leading over President Obama while most of the others show the opposite. Most of the others and not those two polls are wrong because those polls are skewed by over-sampling Democrats. The Rasmussen Reports Daily Presidential Tracking Poll released today shows Romney with a 47 percent to 45 percent lead while the QstarNews Poll released yesterday shows Romney with a larger lead, 55 percent to 45 percent over the president. The UnSkewed Average of polls released today shows Romney with a 7.8 percent lead.¶ Romney's strength in the credible and accurate national polls also is reflected in the limited but available relatively non-skewed polling data in the key swing states. If Mitt Romney wins at least four of the states mentioned below, it will be impossible for Barack Obama to reach the needed 270 electoral votes, therefore Romney's election is quite likely. Below are some of the key swing states to have been recently polled. The map above shows these five states and their value in electoral voters in dark red.¶ Ohio (18 electoral votes): Election observers almost universally agree that both candidate need Ohio to get elected. Many are also believing a number heavily-skewed mainstream media polls showing Obama winning this state. A Rasmussen Reports survey of 500 likely voters released a few days ago for Ohio shows it nearly tied at Obama 47 percent, Romney 46 percent. A poll by Gravis Marketing earlier this month showed the race at Obama 47 percent, Romney 43 percent. Obama can't win this state with 47 percent, nor will be get many of the undecided voters in Ohio, who will break for Romney and allow him to carry this state as George W. Bush did in 2004 running against John Kerry.¶ Florida (29 electoral votes): Mitt Romney has lead in most of the credible polls in Florida for most of this year. A Gravis Marketing poll released today shows Romney leading 48 percent to 47 percent. The latest Rasmussen Reports poll of Florida released a few days ago shows Obama leading 48 percent to 46 percent for Romney. Wit most of the undecided voters going for Romney, there are few odds of this state not going for Romney in November.¶ Virginia (13 electoral votes): The last Rasmussen Reports poll of Virginia released a few days ago show race nearly tied with Obama at 49 percent and Romney at 48 percent. A Gravis Marketing poll released earlier this month shows a Romney 49 percent to 44 percent lead. As with Florida and Ohio, the undecided voters will clearly tip this state to Romney in November.¶ Colorado (9 electoral votes): The Rasmussen Reports poll of Colorado released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to Obama's 45 percent. A recent Denver Post/SurveyUSA poll released a few days ago shows Obama leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Romney. The state has welcomed Romney has a visitor several times and he will no doubt visit there several more times before election day, leading to winning the state.¶ Michigan (16 electoral votes): This state is a bit of a challenge for Mitt Romney, but given that it's somewhat of a home state for him that is suffering through the worst of the economic downturn more than most states, it should be one he can win. The Marketing Research Group poll released today shows Obama leading by just six percent, 47.5 percent to 42.3 percent over Mitt Romney. A recent poll by Democrat-leaning firm Baydoun/Foster shows Obama leading by only 46 percent to 44 percent. The Obama campaign has tried to hit Romney hard with his opposition to the bailouts of General Motors and Chrysler to score political points in Michigan, while just recently the administration rejected a proposal by General Motors to buy-back government-owned stock and remove the federal govenrment from their governance. Skillful use of that and related issues by Romney could allow him to neutralize any advantage Obama has in Michigan regarding the domestic auto industry. That could help Mitt Romney win Michigan if he plays this effectively.¶ Those five states are worth 85 electoral votes and could help either candidate on their road to the White House. The winner of a majority of them will probably win the election, and any candidate winning at least four of them is likely the next president. Mitt Romney seems likely today to win at least four if not all five of them. If Romney wins Michigan, it's game, set and match. Learn to say President Mitt Romney. If he can score an upset win in Pennsylvania, he'll be winning by a landslide.

#### Turn: Nevada – Romney wins now because of Nevada – Obama can’t turn out voters.

Parnes 9-12 (Amie, Obama, Romney locked in tight race in Nevada, The Hill, 12 September 2012, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/248893-obama-romney-tight-race-nevada, da 9-13-12)

“The stakes are high, the election is going to be close and the president will be fighting for every vote,” an Obama campaign aide said. Romney’s campaign says the economic arguments will win over state voters to his side, providing a gateway to 270 electoral votes. The governor must win a majority of the eight or nine battleground states being contested by the two campaigns and cannot afford to give up Nevada’s votes. Romney campaign aides — who expect to have about a dozen field offices set up before Election Day — predict Obama’s team will have a problem turning out voters. “No state has borne the brunt of the president’s policies like Nevada,” said Mason Harrison, the Romney campaign’s Nevada communications director. “Despite the fact that President Obama has spent the entire summer trying to distract from his failed economic record, he hasn’t been able to convince Nevadans that they are better off than they were almost four years ago.” Obama won the state by 12 points in 2008, but even some Democrats express worry that they wouldn’t have the same outcome this time around given the economy. “The situation definitely isn’t as good as it was in 2008,” the Democratic strategist said. “There’s still big economic uncertainty there, and there are still big problems with housing. People are just taking more sober assessments of this race than they were in 2008.

#### Plan flips Nevada – provides a specific solution to Yucca.

Sanchez, Roll Call Staffer, 8-9 (Humberto, Mitt Romney Tries to Neutralize Yucca Mountain Issue in Quest for Nevada, Roll Call, 9 August 2012, http://www.rollcall.com/news/Mitt-Romney-Tries-to-Neutralize-Yucca-Mountain-Issue-in-Quest-for-Nevada-216786-1.html, da 9-16-12)

Damore thinks Romney’s stance on Yucca is emblematic of his cautious political strategy where he seems to be unwilling to take definitive positions on specific issues for fear of alienating voters. Damore added that Sharron Angle, who ran against Reid in 2010, used the same strategy and came up short in a state where voters are yearning for specific solutions. Nevada has the highest unemployment rate and is first in home foreclosures. “He’s falling into the trap that Sharron Angle fell into,” Damore said. “Everybody knows what the problems are; you don’t have to point out the problems. It’s what are your solutions, and he hasn’t articulated anything.”

#### Turn: Plan key to Florida which is key to the election – addresses voter concerns regarding energy and the economy.

Whitman and Avilla, ‘12

[Christine and Karen, “Nuclear energy = green jobs, economic growth in Fla., beyond”, The Orlando Sentinel, 6-22-12,

http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621\_1\_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community, RSR]

We all know how critical Florida is to the outcome of this year's election. This week, as Orlando hosts the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, all eyes are on the presidential candidates as they speak to Hispanic elected officials — and by extension, to their constituents — about the issues that are top of mind for voters. Notably, the conference addresses two issues also of paramount concern to all Floridians: energy and the economy. From our perspective, these issues are deeply intertwined — and one way that Floridians and the state's thriving Hispanic community can advocate for economic growth through renewed investment in clean energy is by supporting nuclear energy. We need to let the candidates know that Americans are relying on the next president for clean, sustainable energy policies that benefit us all. As we look toward diversifying America's energy portfolio and building out the energy generated by renewables, candidates should look to nuclear energy as one proven way to effectively meet growing demand. In doing so, they are registering their support for well-paying jobs, sustained economic growth and clean, affordable energy options.

#### Funding now. Worthington ev. says subsidies now. Even if no new reactors, there’s already the perception of Obama pushing.

#### Turn: Subsidies for nuclear power popular with the American public.

Bisconti, PhD and President of Bisconti Research Inc., ‘12

[Ann Stoufer, “High Expectations for Nuclear Energy”, NEI, RSR]

Strong majorities support renewing the licenses of nuclear power plants that meet federal safety standards and preparing for new nuclear power plants when needed. Nearly six of 10 surveyed (58 percent) would agree on definitely building new nuclear power plants in the future. The public has moderately favorable perceptions of nuclear plant safety, due in part to high expectations for American technology to advance and a long history without major events in this country. The American public historically does not want to put all of its energy production eggs in one basket. There is near consensus that the country should take advantage of all low-carbon energy sources, including nuclear energy, hydropower and renewable energy. To help make that happen, three-fourths of the public supports loan guarantees for the development of these low-carbon sources.

#### Turn: The plan will be spun as job creation.

Ling, NYT Staff Writer, ‘9

[Katherine, New York Times, 5-19-2009, “Is the solution to the U.S. nuclear waste problem in France?”,

<http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/05/18/18climatewire-is-the-solution-to-the-us-nuclear-waste-prob-12208.html?pagewanted=all> Published, RCM]

The outgoing Bush administration tested the political reaction to reprocessing in 2006 and found 11 communities that showed interest in having a reprocessing facility. The approach promised high-paying jobs for hosting a regional intermediate highly radioactive nuclear waste site, a sort of "energy park."

#### Personality, not policy, matters more to swing voters

Martin 9/18 (Jonathan, 2012, “Why Barack Obama is winning”, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=978F5153-3BFA-42E3-83CA-54E1A0C143DF)

The phenomenon is the result of three powerful factors, according to interviews with some two dozen political veterans from both parties.¶ The first is a rapidly changing, deeply polarized electorate — one in which external circumstances don’t necessarily swing large numbers of voters whose minds are deeply made up — and also one that, on balance, is becoming more Democratic due to demographic trends. In an environment like this, Obama has not seen his political bottom fall out, as happened to George H.W. Bush in 1992, when Al Gore cited a barrage of statistics and taunted, “Everything that should be down is up, and everything that should be up is down.”¶ (POLITICO’s Swing-State Map)¶ But a more hardened political landscape also means that — at the margins — candidate skills and attributes matter more than ever.¶ Obama’s durability, according to polling and interviews, is the result of a unique connection with voters as someone who broke racial barriers in 2008, his ability to evade much the blame for the recession and a brutally effective campaign.¶ Romney’s inability to capitalize on trends with the economy and national mood that would normally create a wide opening for a challenger is in large measure a reflection of his own defects as candidate and failure to sell himself to voters, according to these same sources, many of whom are Republicans hoping to beat Obama. “He came into the general election with a very negative [image] rating and he has not effectively addressed that,” said longtime GOP pollster Jan van Lohuizen, who worked for Romney in 2008. “What they’ve been doing for five months hasn’t worked. At some point, they need to come to the conclusion that it’s not worked.”

#### No difference between Obama and Romney for Russia relations

Shevtsova and Kramer 9/11 (Lilia Shevtsova, an AI editorial board member, is senior fellow at the Carnegie Moscow Center. David J. Kramer, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, is president of Freedom House in Washington, DC., Obama vs. Romney: Who Would Putin Pick?, http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1312)

Still, Kremlin pragmatists might assume that Romney, notwithstanding his tough rhetoric as a candidate, would be more moderate as a President and want to avoid the risk of confrontation with Russia. Thus the Kremlin might conclude that its new assertiveness will not provoke American retaliation under either President, enabling it to maintain bilateral ties while also cracking down at home without paying any price.¶ This leads us to conclude the Kremlin could be happy with either a second Obama term or a first Romney one: with Obama looking the other way while the Kremlin cracks down at home, or with Romney giving the Kremlin pretexts to hold up the U.S. as a threat. In both cases, the Kremlin believes that America needs Russia more than Russia needs America. As one of the leading Kremlin foreign policy experts and the Duma official Alexei Pushkov said, “ . . . after admission to WTO, this country [Russia] does not need the support of the White House very much while Americans need Moscow's support on Iran, Afghanistan, North Korea and on nuclear nonproliferation." ¶ At the end of the day, regardless of who wins the election, U.S.-Russian relations will be much cooler and figure less prominently in U.S. foreign policy calculations. Russian expert Fyodor Lukyanov offered this insight:¶ Reset-2 with the same content is impossible. Not because we have Putin and not Medvedev in the Kremlin. The moment when the interests of two sides coincided has passed. . . . Contrary to anticipations, the second Obama presidency could become a serious test for both—Russia and America.

#### Low probability of miscalculation or war – history proves.

Lowther, Defense Analyst at the Air Force Research Institute, ‘9

[Adam, Air Force Research Institute, August 2009, “Challenging Nuclear Abolition”,

<http://www.afa.org/EdOp/2010/Logic_of_Nuclear_Arsenal.pdf>, RSR]

With more than 60 years of nuclear weapons experience, there is also a low probability of political miscalculation. Neither the president of the United States nor his counterpart in Moscow has ever “miscalculated” and launched a nuclear weapon. Rather than expecting miscalculation, a better approach may be to assist other nuclear powers in developing the sound practices that have led to six decades of American and Russian restraint.

#### A host of alt causes means no relations solvency.

Cohen, Senior Research Fellow in Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, a division of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, at The Heritage Foundation, ‘12

[Ariel, Ph.D., “How the U.S. Should Deal with Putin’s Russia”, 3-7-12

<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/how-the-us-should-deal-with-putins-russia>]

Vladimir Putin’s victory in Russia’s presidential election was marred with fraud, but nevertheless he appears to have a mandate from the Russian voters to rule for another six-year term. If re-elected in 2018, he may rule until 2024. Regardless of the outcome of the November U.S. elections, a clear Russia policy is necessary, and it should not be the ill-fated “reset,” which naively bet on President Dmitry Medvedev’s staying in power.[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/how-the-us-should-deal-with-putins-russia" \l "_edn1) **Roadblocks to Rapprochement Anti-Status-Quo Foreign Policy.** During his campaign, Putin provided ample insights into how he views the world and Russia’s relationship with the U.S. The picture is bleak. Much of Putin’s pre-election rhetoric harkened back the 19th-century nationalism and imperialism. He likes to quote the 19th-century Russian foreign minister Count Alexander Gorchakov that “Russia is concentrating.” Another slogan from the same era, often heard in the Moscow policy circles, belongs to the Czar Alexander III: “Russia has no allies but its army and navy.” This is a prescription for a prickly foreign policy, belt tightening, rearmament, wars with neighbors, and a chronic confrontation with the West. Xenophobia. Anti-Americanism in Russia is rampant.[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/how-the-us-should-deal-with-putins-russia" \l "_edn2) Putin has relentlessly created an image of Russia under attack from Western enemies. It worked for the elections and is likely to continue as a pillar of Russia’s domestic and foreign policy. Putin accused U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and the State Department of “giving the signal” for recent mass demonstrations in Moscow. Putin dehumanized opposition leaders by calling them “jackals scavenging near Western embassies”[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/how-the-us-should-deal-with-putins-russia" \l "_edn3)and, taking a page from Rudyard Kipling, “monkey packs.” After the elections, some of them—such as Alexei Navalny, Ilya Yashin, and hundreds of others in Moscow and St. Petersburg—were detained during a post-election protest and issued summons to the notorious dissident-busting judge Olga Borovkova. It is likely some of them will be jailed for some time. The New Imperial Union? Putin’s geopolitical vision for Fortress Russia dominating the former Soviet Union is an independent pole in a “multi-polar world.” It includes the overlapping organizational spaces of the Joint Economic Space, the Customs Union, and the Eurasian Union under the Russian leadership. The pressures on Georgia and Ukraine continue unrelenting, with the view to bring Kyiv into Moscow’s fold and to change the regime in Tbilisi. Such a quasi-imperial contraption, however, will come at a cost—and Putin is willing to pay the price as long as oil prices are in triple digits. **Enabler of Iran and Syria**. Flush with oil cash, Putin chose to confront the West and the Arab world over Syria and Iran. Together with China, he imposed two vetoes in the U.N. Security Council against the Syria sanctions. Russian support enables Syrian President Bashar al-Assad to kill his own people with impunity. **Rearmament**. Putin put his money where his mouth is. He demanded that the U.S. severely curtail its NATO missile defenses, provide a treaty-like guarantee that ballistic missile defense will not be aimed at Russia, and share these technologies at no cost. He also announced a $700 billion rearmament program, including a massive nuclear missile modernization.[[4]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/how-the-us-should-deal-with-putins-russia" \l "_edn4) So much for President Obama’s “getting to zero.” Russia will also spend billions of dollars buying French *Mistral* assault ships, Israeli unmanned aerial vehicles, and German combat training systems. No more autarkic military-industrial complex when the Russian software and electronics industries are falling behind. **The Real Problems** However, Russia’s problems are the 21st century’s problems: the lack of good governance and the rule of law to make the citizens safe and to attract domestic and foreign investment, the rise of Islamic minorities at home, poor relations with the West and the geopolitical competition with China and Turkey, and a threat of economically falling behind even India and Brazil. Yet Russia is increasingly integrated into global trade flows. International business views Russia as an unsaturated market for housing, durable and consumer goods, oil and gas services, and infrastructure. Today, much Soviet-era infrastructure—roads, airports, and power stations—are falling apart and need trillions of dollars in investments. However, investors pay a high price for the Kremlin’s domestic heavy-handedness. As Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer, the U.S. Congress is likely to lift the obsolete 1974 Jackson–Vanik Amendment, which predicated Permanent Normal Trade Relations on free emigration. Yet, given the sorry state of the rule of law in Russia, Members of Congress are unlikely to remove the Jackson–Vanik roadblock without gaining a legislative tool to address Russian corruption and human rights violations. “Reset” Failure The current anti-American tilt of Russian foreign policy **prevents diplomatic cooperation**, as a shared threat assessment and mutual understanding between the U.S. and Russia in dealing with the changing global environment is currently absent. Despite clear statements to the contrary by Putin and Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, the Obama Administration repeatedly declared that it is not competing with Russia for regional influence—not in the Middle East and not in Eurasia. Apparently, the Kremlin has not received the memo. Instead, Russia is attempting to constrain U.S. foreign policy with little or no counteraction from Washington. Moscow would like to see the U.S. power so diminished in the Middle East and Europe that America could not act without Russia’s permission.[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/how-the-us-should-deal-with-putins-russia" \l "_edn5) To address Putin’s anti-American foreign policy, the U.S. should: Reexamine the strategy of “reset” with Russia. The President should commission the National Security Council to form a task force for a bottom-up review of Russia policy in view of Putin’s return to the Kremlin and Moscow’s sabotage of the U.S. policies on Iran and Syria. The U.S. should use its public diplomacy assets to “name and shame” Russia as an enabler of the Iranian and Syrian regimes. Revitalize relations with the sovereignty-minded countries of Eastern Europe and Eurasia, which were neglected during the first two years of the Obama Administration. The U.S. should emphasize ties with countries that care about their independence—Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan—without compromising the U.S. democracy agenda and, if requested, provide economic advice and political-military cooperation, which is particularly timely as the U.S. is planning to withdraw troops from Afghanistan by 2013. Consider the bipartisan bill called Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, proposed by Senators John McCain (R–AZ) and Benjamin Cardin (D–MD). It is named after a lawyer who exposed a $230 million corruption scheme and died in pre-trial detention, apparently as a result of torture, beatings, and denial of medical care. The Magnitsky Act would ban most notoriously corrupt foreign officials from entering the U.S. and allow their ill-gotten property to be seized and confiscated by U.S. courts. Similar legislation is being debated in Canada and some European countries. Tough Times Ahead Russia’s intransigent foreign policy will require the Administration to recognize its “reset” failures and provide leadership and consistent and robust pushback. With the fourth Putin term, it is Russia’s zero-sum foreign policy that prevents Washington and Moscow from exploring areas where there may be a convergence of U.S. and Russian interests, including anti-terrorism, nonproliferation, and business ties. Spillover of disagreements over security and geopolitics hinders cooperation in nonproliferation, global security, and business, as demonstrated in clashes over Iran, Syria, and missile defense. Putin’s comeback could mean tough times ahead for U.S.–Russian relations. But when engaging Moscow, the U.S. has to guard its national security interests, not engage in a self-deluding feel-good policy exercise.

## Rates

#### **Nuclear renaissance now – long term prospects remain strong, NRC ruling has no effect, and cost issues are solved by SMRs.**

Downey, Senior Staff Writer, 8-31

[John, “Anticipated nuclear rebirth faces tough challenges”, The Charlotte Business Journal, 8-31-12,

<http://www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/print-edition/2012/08/31/anticipated-nuclear-rebirth-faces.html?page=all>, RSR]

But inside the industry, representatives insist the challenges are not insurmountable. In the United States, they say, the nuclear renaissance has been slower than anticipated. But the long-term prospects for nuclear power remain strong. “I would say the nuclear renaissance is just pushed a little to the right,” says Tom Franch, senior vice president for nuclear reactors and services at Areva Inc. A key test for the industry will be the construction just under way of four new-generation nuclear reactors — two at Southern Co.’s Plant Vogtle expansion in Georgia and two at SCANA Corp.’s V.C. Summer plant in South Carolina. “If the industry does as we’ve promised and can be predictable on costs and construction time in this cycle of new construction, it will answer a lot of questions,” Franch says. “People will look at it from a business perspective.” And he says the waste issue will have little practical effect on nuclear projects. None of that affects the licenses for the four reactors now being built. And while several utilities (including Duke Energy Corp.) have applications in process for new licenses, none are far enough along that the recent federal actions are likely to delay approval. There have been questions raised about the fate of relicensing applications for nine plants. But if, as Franch hopes, the NRC quickly addresses the court’s concerns about the waste issue, he expects no significant delays.

#### Plan decreases costs by providing government mitigation of market risks and long timeframes. That’s the IAEA evidence. Also, we mitigate government regulation costs. That’s Selyukh.

#### Government investment in reprocessing is necessary to get private/consumer capital on board.

IAEA, ‘8

[International Atomic Energy Agency, “Spent Fuel Reprocessing Options”, August 2008, RSR]

The design, construction and commissioning of a reprocessing plant is a financial venture requiring customers’ backing because of the associated high capital costs and long commissioning period. The commercial reprocessing plants operating today in Europe (such as UP2/UP3 and THORP) were underpinned by cost-plus contracts and provision of capital for their construction, which stemmed from legal and political imperatives to reprocess. As those plants have operated for many years, they have benefited from technological developments while much of the investment has now been amortized. As a consequence, costs have decreased substantially for the large commercial plants. In contrast, private investments in new reprocessing plants are only likely if and when there is a strong incentive for doing so, such as increasing nuclear fuel costs, disposal costs, or both, and also national government guarantees on financial returns [65].

#### Plan solves peak oil. This is biggest internal link to economic collapse. Every other economic indicator is picking up now, meaning oil poses the biggest threat to recovery. That’s Zakaria. The best studies show a substitution effect between oil prices and economic recovery. That’s Li.

#### Economic recovery sluggish now only spending prevents collapse —Europe, experts, research, and state economies prove

Krugman 12 (Paul, Nobel prize in Economics, professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University, Ph.D in Economics from MIT, Nisarg’s favorite economics author, 1/29/12,“The Austerity Debacle,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/30/opinion/krugman-the-austerity-debacle.html?ref=paulkrugman>, NP)

Last week the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, a British think tank, released a startling chart comparing the current slump with past recessions and recoveries. It turns out that by one important measure — changes in real G.D.P. since the recession began — Britain is doing worse this time than it did during the Great Depression. Four years into the Depression, British G.D.P. had regained its previous peak; four years after the Great Recession began, Britain is nowhere close to regaining its lost ground. Nor is Britain unique. Italy is also doing worse than it did in the 1930s — and with Spain clearly headed for a double-dip recession, that makes three of Europe’s big five economies members of the worse-than club. Yes, there are some caveats and complications. But this nonetheless represents a stunning failure of policy. And it’s a failure, in particular, of the austerity doctrine that has dominated elite policy discussion both in Europe and, to a large extent, in the United States for the past two years. O.K., about those caveats: On one side, British unemployment was much higher in the 1930s than it is now, because the British economy was depressed — mainly thanks to an ill-advised return to the gold standard — even before the Depression struck. On the other side, Britain had a notably mild Depression compared with the United States. Even so, surpassing the track record of the 1930s shouldn’t be a tough challenge. Haven’t we learned a lot about economic management over the last 80 years? Yes, we have — but in Britain and elsewhere, the policy elite decided to throw that hard-won knowledge out the window, and rely on ideologically convenient wishful thinking instead. Britain, in particular, was supposed to be a showcase for “expansionary austerity,” the notion that instead of increasing government spending to fight recessions, you should slash spending instead — and that this would lead to faster economic growth. “Those who argue that dealing with our deficit and promoting growth are somehow alternatives are wrong,” declared David Cameron, Britain’s prime minister. “You cannot put off the first in order to promote the second.” How could the economy thrive when unemployment was already high, and government policies were directly reducing employment even further? Confidence! “I firmly believe,” declared Jean-Claude Trichet — at the time the president of the European Central Bank, and a strong advocate of the doctrine of expansionary austerity — “that in the current circumstances confidence-inspiring policies will foster and not hamper economic recovery, because confidence is the key factor today.” Such invocations of the confidence fairy were never plausible; researchers at the International Monetary Fund and elsewhere quickly debunked the supposed evidence that spending cuts create jobs. Yet influential people on both sides of the Atlantic heaped praise on the prophets of austerity, Mr. Cameron in particular, because the doctrine of expansionary austerity dovetailed with their ideological agendas. Thus in October 2010 David Broder, who virtually embodied conventional wisdom, praised Mr. Cameron for his boldness, and in particular for “brushing aside the warnings of economists that the sudden, severe medicine could cut short Britain’s economic recovery and throw the nation back into recession.” He then called on President Obama to “do a Cameron” and pursue “a radical rollback of the welfare state now.” Strange to say, however, those warnings from economists proved all too accurate. And we’re quite fortunate that Mr. Obama did not, in fact, do a Cameron. Which is not to say that all is well with U.S. policy. True, the federal government has avoided all-out austerity. But state and local governments, which must run more or less balanced budgets, have slashed spending and employment as federal aid runs out — and this has been a major drag on the overall economy. Without those spending cuts, we might already have been on the road to self-sustaining growth; as it is, recovery still hangs in the balance. And we may get tipped in the wrong direction by Continental Europe, where austerity policies are having the same effect as in Britain, with many signs pointing to recession this year. The infuriating thing about this tragedy is that it was completely unnecessary. Half a century ago, any economist — or for that matter any undergraduate who had read Paul Samuelson’s textbook “Economics” — could have told you that austerity in the face of depression was a very bad idea. But policy makers, pundits and, I’m sorry to say, many economists decided, largely for political reasons, to forget what they used to know. And millions of workers are paying the price for their willful amnesia.

#### Turn: Government spending is the biggest internal link to growth – our evidence is comparative.

Livingston 11 (James, professor of history at Rutgers, author of “Against Thrift: Why Consumer Culture Is Good for the Economy, the Environment and Your Soul.”, “It’s Consumer Spending, Stupid,” this card is super awesome, 10/25/11, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/26/opinion/its-consumer-spending-stupid.html,> NP)

AS an economic historian who has been studying American capitalism for 35 years, I’m going to let you in on the best-kept secret of the last century: private investment — that is, using business profits to increase productivity and output — doesn’t actually drive economic growth. Consumer debt and government spending do. Private investment isn’t even necessary to promote growth. This is, to put it mildly, a controversial claim. Economists will tell you that private business investment causes growth because it pays for the new plant or equipment that creates jobs, improves labor productivity and increases workers’ incomes. As a result, you’ll hear politicians insisting that more incentives for private investors — lower taxes on corporate profits — will lead to faster and better-balanced growth. The general public seems to agree. According to a New York Times/CBS News poll in May, a majority of Americans believe that increased corporate taxes “would discourage American companies from creating jobs.” But history shows that this is wrong. Between 1900 and 2000, real gross domestic product per capita (the output of goods and services per person) grew more than 600 percent. Meanwhile, net business investment declined 70 percent as a share of G.D.P. What’s more, in 1900 almost all investment came from the private sector — from companies, not from government — whereas in 2000, most investment was either from government spending (out of tax revenues) or “residential investment,” which means consumer spending on housing, rather than business expenditure on plants, equipment and labor. In other words, over the course of the last century, net business investment atrophied while G.D.P. per capita increased spectacularly. And the source of that growth? Increased consumer spending, coupled with and amplified by government outlays. The architects of the Reagan revolution tried to reverse these trends as a cure for the stagflation of the 1970s, but couldn’t. In fact, private or business investment kept declining in the ’80s and after. Peter G. Peterson, a former commerce secretary, complained that real growth after 1982 — after President Ronald Reagan cut corporate tax rates — coincided with “by far the weakest net investment effort in our postwar history.” President George W. Bush’s tax cuts had similar effects between 2001 and 2007: real growth in the absence of new investment. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, retained corporate earnings that remain uninvested are now close to 8 percent of G.D.P., a staggering sum in view of the unemployment crisis we face. So corporate profits do not drive economic growth — they’re just restless sums of surplus capital, ready to flood speculative markets at home and abroad. In the 1920s, they inflated the stock market bubble, and then caused the Great Crash. Since the Reagan revolution, these superfluous profits have fed corporate mergers and takeovers, driven the dot-com craze, financed the “shadow banking” system of hedge funds and securitized investment vehicles, fueled monetary meltdowns in every hemisphere and inflated the housing bubble. Why, then, do so many Americans support cutting taxes on corporate profits while insisting that thrift is the cure for what ails the rest of us, as individuals and a nation? Why have the 99 percent looked to the 1 percent for leadership when it comes to our economic future? A big part of the problem is that we doubt the moral worth of consumer culture. Like the abstemious ant who scolds the feckless grasshopper as winter approaches, we think that saving is the right thing to do. Even as we shop with abandon, we feel that if only we could contain our unruly desires, we’d be committing ourselves to a better future. But we’re wrong. Consumer spending is not only the key to economic recovery in the short term; it’s also necessary for balanced growth in the long term. If our goal is to repair our damaged economy, we should bank on consumer culture — and that entails a redistribution of income away from profits toward wages, enabled by tax policy and enforced by government spending. (The increased trade deficit that might result should not deter us, since a large portion of manufactured imports come from American-owned multinational corporations that operate overseas.) We don’t need the traders and the C.E.O.’s and the analysts — the 1 percent — to collect and manage our savings. Instead, we consumers need to save less and spend more in the name of a better future. We don’t need to silence the ant, but we’d better start listening to the grasshopper.

## Cap

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus a competitive policy option.

#### This is key to ground and predictability – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Abandoning politics causes war, slavery, and authoritarianism

Boggs 2k (CAROL BOGGS, PF POLITICAL SCIENCE – SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, 00, THE END OF POLITICS, 250-1)

But it is a very deceptive and misleading minimalism. While Oakeshott debunks political mechanisms and rational planning, as either useless or dangerous, the actually existing power structure-replete with its own centralized state apparatus, institutional hierarchies, conscious designs, and indeed, rational plans-remains fully intact, insulated from the minimalist critique. In other words, ideologies and plans are perfectly acceptable for elites who preside over established governing systems, but not for ordinary citizens or groups anxious to challenge the status quo. Such one-sided minimalism gives carte blanche to elites who naturally desire as much space to maneuver as possible. The flight from “abstract principles” rules out ethical attacks on injustices that may pervade the status quo (slavery or imperialist wars, for example) insofar as those injustices might be seen as too deeply embedded in the social and institutional matrix of the time to be the target of oppositional political action. If politics is reduced to nothing other than a process of everyday muddling-through, then people are condemned to accept the harsh realities of an exploitative and authoritarian system, with no choice but to yield to the dictates of “conventional wisdom”. Systematic attempts to ameliorate oppressive conditions would, in Oakeshott’s view, turn into a political nightmare. A belief that totalitarianism might results from extreme attempts to put society in order is one thing; to argue that all politicized efforts to change the world are necessary doomed either to impotence or totalitarianism requires a completely different (and indefensible) set of premises. Oakeshott’s minimalism poses yet another, but still related, range of problems: the shrinkage of politics hardly suggests that corporate colonization, social hierarchies, or centralized state and military institutions will magically disappear from people’s lives. Far from it: the public space vacated by ordinary citizens, well informed and ready to fight for their interests, simply gives elites more room to consolidate their own power and privilege. Beyond that, the fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian civil society, not too far removed from the excessive individualism, social Darwinism and urban violence of the American landscape could open the door to a modern Leviathan intent on restoring order and unity in the face of social disintegration. Viewed in this light, the contemporary drift towards antipolitics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more authoritarian and reactionary guise-or it could simply end up reinforcing the dominant state-corporate system. In either case, the state would probably become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.16 And either outcome would run counter to the facile antirationalism of Oakeshott’s Burkean muddling-through theories.

#### **Case outweighs. Waste is there packed on-site right now and its going to blow up. It’s also vulnerable to prolif and terrorist attacks that culminate extinction. Also, they can’t solve Yucca long term which also blows up. Rejecting capitalism doesn’t address the underlying problems of waste storage.**

#### **Perm: do both—the plan’s approach to the current energy crisis presents a unique opportunity to reform capitalism**

Peters 12 (Michael A Peters 2012, [Michael A. Peters is professor of education at the University of Waikato in New Zealand and professor emeritus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. ]10 June 2012, “Greening the Knowledge Economy: A Critique of Neoliberalism,” Truthout, http://truth-out.org/news/item/9642-greening-the-knowledge-economy-a-critique-of-neoliberalism)

Ecopolitics must come to terms with the scramble for resources that increasingly dominates the competitive motivations and long-range resource planning of the major industrial world powers. There are a myriad of new threats to the environment that have been successfully spelled out by eco-philosophers and that have already begun to impact upon the world in all their facets. First, there is the depletion of non-renewable resources - in particular, oil, gas, timber and minerals. Second, and in related fashion, is the crisis of energy itself, upon which the rapidly industrializing countries and the developed world depend. Third, the rise of China and India, with their prodigious appetites, which will match the United States within a few decades in rapacious demand for more of everything that triggers resource scrambles and the heavy investment in resource-rich regions such as Africa. Fourth, global climate change will have the greatest impact upon the world's poorest countries, multiplying the risk of conflict and resource wars. With these trends and possible scenarios, only a better understanding of the environment can save us and the planet. A better understanding of the earth's environmental system is essential if scientists **working in concert with communities, ecology** groups **across the board, green politicians, policymakers and business leaders** are to promote green exchange and to ascertain whether green capitalism strategies that aim at long-term sustainability are possible. The energy crisis may be a blessing in disguise for the United States. Jeremy Rifkin (2002) envisions a new economy powered by hydrogen that will fundamentally change the nature of our market, political and social institutions as we approach the end of the fossil-fuel era, with inescapable consequences for industrial society. New hydrogen fuel-cells are now being pioneered - which, together with the design principles of smart information technologies, can provide new distributed forms of energy use. While Thomas Friedman (2008) has also argued the crisis can lead to reinvestment in infrastructure and alternative energy sources in the cause of nation-building, his work and intentions have been called into question.[2] Education has a fundamental role to play in the new energy economy, both in terms of changing worldviews and the promotion of a green economy, and also in terms of research and development's contribution to energy efficiency, battery storage and new forms of renewable energy

#### Rejecting capitalism will spark transition wars, re-entrenching cycles of exploitation

Gubrud 97 [Mark Avrum (Center for Superconductivity Research); “Nanotechnology and International Security”; Foresight Nanotechnology Institute; <http://www.foresight.org/Conferences/MNT05/Papers/Gubrud/>

With molecular manufacturing, international trade in both raw materials and finished goods can be replaced by decentralized production for local consumption, using locally available materials. The decline of international trade will undermine a powerful source of common interest. Further, artificial intelligence will displace skilled as well as unskilled labor. A world system based on wage labor, transnational capitalism and global markets will necessarily give way. We imagine that a golden age is possible, but we don't know how to organize one. As global capitalism retreats, it will leave behind a world dominated by politics, and possibly feudal concentrations of wealth and power. Economic insecurity, and fears for the material and moral future of humankind may lead to the rise of demagogic and intemperate national leaders. With almost two hundred sovereign nations, each struggling to create a new economic and social order, perhaps the most predictable outcome is chaos: shifting alignments, displaced populations, power struggles, ethnic conflicts inflamed by demagogues, class conflicts, land disputes, etc. Small and underdeveloped nations will be more than ever dependent on the major powers for access to technology, and more than ever vulnerable to sophisticated forms of control or subversion, or to outright domination. Competition among the leading technological powers for the political loyalty of clients might imply reversion to some form of nationalistic imperialism.

#### The status quo is structurally improving.

Golanky, Policy Analyst for the Department of the Interior, ‘10

[Indur, PhD from MSU, “Population, Consumption, Carbon Emissions, and Human Well-Being in the Age of Industrialization (Part III — Have Higher US Population, Consumption, and Newer Technologies Reduced Well-Being?)”, April 24,

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/population-consumption-carbon-emissions-and-human-well-being-in-the-age-of-industrialization-part-iii-have-higher-us-population-consumption-and-newer-technologies-reduced-well-being/#more-9194>]

In my previous post I showed that, notwithstanding the Neo-Malthusian worldview, human well-being has advanced globally since the start of industrialization more than two centuries ago, despite massive increases in population, consumption, affluence, and carbon dioxide emissions. In this post, I will focus on long-term trends in the U.S. for these and other indicators. Figure 1 shows that despite several-fold increases in the use of metals and synthetic organic chemicals, and emissions of CO2 stoked by increasing populations and affluence, life expectancy, the single best measure of human well-being, increased from 1900 to 2006 for the US. Figure 1 reiterates this point with respect to materials use. These figures indicate that since 1900, U.S. population has quadrupled, affluence has septupled, their product (GDP) has increased 30-fold, synthetic organic chemical use has increased 85-fold, metals use 14-fold, material use 25-fold, and CO2 emissions 8-fold. Yet life expectancy advanced from 47 to 78 years. Figure 2 shows that during the same period, 1900–2006, emissions of air pollution, represented by sulfur dioxide, waxed and waned. Food and water got safer, as indicated by the virtual elimination of deaths from gastrointestinal (GI) diseases between 1900 and 1970. Cropland, a measure of habitat converted to human uses — the single most important pressure on species, ecosystems, and biodiversity — was more or less unchanged from 1910 onward despite the increase in food demand. For the most part, life expectancy grew more or less steadily for the U.S., except for a brief plunge at the end of the First World War accentuated by the 1918-20 Spanish flu epidemic. As in the rest of the world, today’s U.S. population not only lives longer, it is also healthier. The disability rate for seniors declined 28 percent between 1982 and 2004/2005 and, despite quantum improvements in diagnostic tools, major diseases (e.g., cancer, and heart and respiratory diseases) now occur 8–11 years later than a century ago. Consistent with this, data for New York City indicate that — despite a population increase from 80,000 in 1800 to 3.4 million in 1900 and 8.0 million in 2000 and any associated increases in economic product, and chemical, fossil fuel and material use that, no doubt, occurred —crude mortality rates have declined more or less steadily since the 1860s (again except for the flu epidemic). Figures 3 and 4 show, once again, that whatever health-related problems accompanied economic development, technological change, material, chemical and fossil fuel consumption, and population growth, they were overwhelmed by the health-related benefits associated with industrialization and modern economic growth. This does not mean that fossil fuel, chemical and material consumption have zero impact, but it means that overall benefits have markedly outweighed costs. The reductions in rates of deaths and diseases since at least 1900 in the US, despite increased population, energy, and material and chemical use, belie the Neo-Malthusian worldview. The improvements in the human condition can be ascribed to broad dissemination (through education, public health systems, trade and commerce) of numerous new and improved technologies in agriculture, health and medicine supplemented through various ingenious advances in communications, information technology and other energy powered technologies (see here for additional details). The continual increase in life expectancy accompanied by the decline in disease during this period (as shown by Figure 2) indicates that the new technologies reduced risks by a greater amount than any risks that they may have created or exacerbated due to pollutants associated with greater consumption of materials, chemicals and energy, And this is one reason why the Neo-Malthusian vision comes up short. It dwells on the increases in risk that new technologies may create or aggravate but overlooks the larger — and usually more certain — risks that they would also eliminate or reduce. In other words, it focuses on the pixels, but misses the larger picture, despite pretensions to a holistic worldview.

#### Capitalism solves war.

Gartzke, Associate Professor of Political Science and a member of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, ‘7

[Eric, “The Capitalist Peace”, American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 51, No. 1, January 2007, Pp. 166–191]

If war is a product of incompatible interests and failed or abortive bargaining, peace ensues when states lack differences worthy of costly conflict, or when circumstances favor successful diplomacy. Realists and others argue that state interests are inherently incompatible, but this need be so only if state interests are narrowly defined or when conquest promises tangible benefits. Peace can result from at least three attributes of mature capitalist economies. First, the historic impetus to territorial expansion is tempered by the rising importance of intellectual and financial capital, factors that are more expediently enticed than conquered. Land does little to increase the worth of the advanced economies while resource competition is more cheaply pursued through markets than by means of military occupation. At the same time, development actually increases the ability of states to project power when incompatible policy objectives exist. Development affects who states fight (and what they fight over) more than the overall frequency of warfare. Second, substantial overlap in the foreign policy goals of developed nations in the post–World War II period further limits the scope and scale of conflict. Lacking territorial tensions, consensus about how to order the international system has allowed liberal states to cooperate and to accommodate minor differences. Whether this affinity among liberal states will persist in the next century is a question open to debate. Finally, the rise of global capital markets creates a new mechanism for competition and communication for states that might otherwise be forced to fight. Separately, these processes influence patterns of warfare in the modern world. Together, they explain the absence of war among states in the developed world and account for the dyadic observation of the democratic peace.

#### Capitalism the only way to save the environment from ecological disaster—technology drives efficiency

Taylor 12, Christopher. "Green Capitalism." *Breaking Washington DC News, Maryland News, Virginia News, US Politics News and Analysis*. N.p., 16 Mar. 2012. http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/141806.

James Watt, secretary of the Interior for Ronald Reagan is quoted as saying "After the last tree is felled, Christ will come back," as a reason for not worrying about the environment. Watt never said this, it was simply attributed to him by an author in Grist magazine, and later retracted. Still, many believe that conservatives and capitalists think that it’s okay to rape and destroy the planet in the name of riches and God. In reality, capitalism is one of the best hopes for our environment. The oil age did arguably save whales from extinction after all. Looking around the world, you can find a direct correlation between poverty and ecological disaster. Where people are poorest, the pollution and economic destruction are far worse than in more wealthy areas. Places where many poor people live in close quarters such as Calcutta, Beijing, and Mexico City are even worse. The main reason that poorer areas are such ecological disasters is because of the poverty. Economic stress causes people to stop being so fussy about how they find their next meal, or shelter, or clothing. When resources are limited, people begin choosing more critical needs over less, and picking up the trash stops being a priority, as does cleaning up waste, planting trees, and so on. It is also no coincidence that the poorer and less ecologically sound places in the world tend to be less capitalist. One of the most shocking things to academics and leftists when the Soviet Union collapsed is what an incredibly horrendous wasteland much of Russia had become under their rule. One infamous example is Lake Karachay, which the Soviet government used as a dumping ground for radioactive materials from their nuclear power plants. There is a company which specializes in finding radioactive materials scattered around the nation, including inside Moscow. China is the world’s leading producer of carbon dioxide and general pollution. Instead of resulting in better care for the environment, countries under totalitarian rule tend to have significantly worse care. The more collectivist the government, the worse their environmental care tends to be, for a few simple reasons. A significant reason is economic. Capitalism gives incentive to taking care of your environment because it is costly and less attractive to customers and investors. If your company is destroying the land around it, that tends to annoy and upset customers. Further, capitalism provides not just opportunity, but pressure for poor to get out of poverty and thus away from the desperation that creates environmental stress. Capitalism helps people achieve more and opens the way for anyone to become whatever they have the ability and will to become. Other, collectivist systems such as socialism and communism stifle and discourage this economic growth. However, the main reason is technological; capitalism tends to encourage and benefit people who innovate, invent, and create. Other systems with top-down control tend to stifle this, encouraging the status quo and simply obeying the rules to get a check. There’s no incentive to try harder, invent, or find a new way because you get paid the same either way. Technology results in less damage to the environment for better results. In the 1960’s Paul Ehrlich believed farming and food production techniques could not and would not get any better, so we’d become overpopulated and starve. In reality, food technology exploded in the end of the 20th century, resulting in massive increases in production while using fewer resources. Similarly, technology, driven by free-market capitalism, has resulted in a more energy-efficient world. Air conditioners and heaters are far more efficient today than they were even ten years ago. Computers, televisions, and other entertainment media use far less energy, often through simple innovations such as flat-screen LCD technology. These innovations come about because of the freedom and rewards which a free market affords, providing the tools for a cleaner planet. Companies realize that it’s cheaper in the long run to pollute less (and clean up less in the future) and they can advertise themselves as being good for the environment, which is popular with buyers. Capitalism can be destructive to the environment, but the free market inevitably over time provides counters and solutions to that, with advances to technology and pressures in the market. Collectivist systems tend to suppress both, resulting in stagnation and less benefit to the environment.

#### The system’s resilient DESPITE income inequality and the alt fails.

Rose, Editor of Foregin Affairs, ‘12

[Gideon, Foreign Affairs, January/February 2012, “Making Modernity Work”]

The central question of modernity has been how to reconcile capitalism and mass democracy, and since the postwar order came up with a good answer, it has managed to weather all subsequent challenges. The upheavals of the late 1960s seemed poised to disrupt it. But despite what activists at the time thought, they had little to offer in terms of politics or economics, and so their lasting impact was on social life instead. This had the ironic effect of stabilizing the system rather than overturning it, helping it live up to its full potential by bringing previously subordinated or disenfranchised groups inside the castle walls. The neoliberal revolutionaries of the 1980s also had little luck, never managing to turn the clock back all that far. All potential alternatives in the developing world, meanwhile, have proved to be either dead ends or temporary detours from the beaten path. The much-ballyhooed "rise of the rest" has involved not the discrediting of the postwar order of Western political economy but its reinforcement: the countries that have risen have done so by embracing global capitalism while keeping some of its destabilizing attributes in check, and have liberalized their polities and societies along the way (and will founder unless they continue to do so). Although the structure still stands, however, it has seen better days. Poor management of public spending and fiscal policy has resulted in unsustainable levels of debt across the advanced industrial world, even as mature economies have found it difficult to generate dynamic growth and full employment in an ever more globalized environment. Lax regulation and oversight allowed reckless and predatory financial practices to drive leading economies to the brink of collapse. Economic inequality has increased as social mobility has declined. And a loss of broad-based social solidarity on both sides of the Atlantic has eroded public support for the active remedies needed to address these and other problems. Renovating the structure will be a slow and difficult project, the cost and duration of which remain unclear, as do the contractors involved. Still, at root, this is not an ideological issue. The question is not what to do but how to do it--how, under twenty-first-century conditions, to rise to the challenge Laski described, making the modern political economy provide enough solid benefit to the mass of men that they see its continuation as a matter of urgency to themselves. The old and new articles that follow trace this story from the totalitarian challenge of the interwar years, through the crisis of liberalism and the emergence of the postwar order, to that order's present difficulties and future prospects. Some of our authors are distinctly gloomy, and one need only glance at a newspaper to see why. But remembering the far greater obstacles that have been overcome in the past, optimism would seem the better long-term bet.

#### The alt fails – just pointing out the flaws doesn’t work.

Kliman, professor of economics at Pace University, ‘4

[Andrew, “Alternatives to Capitalism: What Happens After the Revolution?” http://akliman.squarespace.com/writings/]

I. Concretizing the Vision of a New Human Society We live at a moment in which it is harder than ever to articulate a liberatory alternative to capitalism. As we all know, the collapse of state-capitalist regimes that called themselves “Communist,” as well as the widespread failures of social democracy to remake society, have given rise to a widespread acceptance of Margaret Thatcher’s TINA – the belief that “there is no alternative.” Yet the difficulty in articulating a liberatory alternative is not mostly the product of these events. It is an inheritance from the past. To what extent has such an alternative ever been articulated? There has been a lot of progress – in theory and especially in practice – on the problem of forms of organization – but new organizational forms by themselves are not yet an alternative. A great many leftists, even revolutionaries, did of course regard nationalized property and the State Plan, under the control of the “vanguard” Party, as socialism, or at least as the basis for a transition to socialism. But even before events refuted this notion, it represented, at best, an evasion of the problem. It was largely a matter of leftists with authoritarian personalities subordinating themselves and others to institutions and power with a blind faith that substituted for thought. How such institutions and such power would result in human liberation was never made clear. Vague references to “transition” were used to wave the problem away. Yet as Marxist-Humanism has stressed for more than a decade, the anti-Stalinist left is also partly responsible for the crisis in thought. It, too, failed to articulate a liberatory alternative, offering in place of privateand state-capitalism little more than what Hegel (Science of Logic, Miller trans., pp. 841-42) called “the empty negative … a presumed absolute”: The impatience that insists merely on getting beyond the determinate … and finding itself immediately in the absolute, has before it as cognition nothing but the empty negative, the abstract infinite; in other words, a presumed absolute, that is presumed because it is not posited, not grasped; grasped it can only be through the mediation of cognition … . The question that confronts us nowadays is whether we can do better. Is it possible to make the vision of a new human society more concrete and determinate than it now is, through the mediation of cognition? According to a long-standing view in the movement, it is not possible. The character of the new society can only be concretized by practice alone, in the course of trying to remake society. Yet if this is true, we are faced with a vicious circle from which there seems to be no escape, because acceptance of TINA is creating barriers in practice. In the perceived absence of an alternative, practical struggles have proven to be self-limiting at best. They stop short of even trying to remake society totally – and for good reason. As Bertell Ollman has noted (Introduction to Market Socialism: The Debate among Socialists, Routledge, 1998, p. 1), “People who believe [that there is no alternative] will put up with almost any degree of suffering. Why bother to struggle for a change that cannot be? … people [need to] have a good reason for choosing one path into the future rather than another.” Thus the reason of the masses is posing a new challenge to the movement from theory. When masses of people require reasons before they act, a new human society surely cannot arise through spontaneous action alone. And exposing the ills of existing society does not provide sufficient reason for action when what is at issue is the very possibility of an alternative. If the movement from theory is to respond adequately to the challenge arising from below, it is necessary to abandon the presupposition – and it seems to me to be no more than a presupposition – that the vision of the new society cannot be concretized through the mediation of cognition. We need to take seriously Raya Dunayevskaya’s (Power of Negativity [PON], p. 184) claim in her Hegel Society of America paper that “There is no trap in thought. Though it is finite, it breaks through the barriers of the given, reaches out, if not to infinity, surely beyond the historic moment” (RD, PON, p. 184). This, too, is a presupposition that can be “proved” or “disproved” only in the light of the results it yields. In the meantime, the challenges from below require us to proceed on its basis.

#### Capitalism is ethical.

Bhagwati, University Professor and Senior Fellow in International Economics at Columbia, ‘9

[Jagdish, “Feeble Critiques: Capitalism's Petty Detractors”, World Affairs

<http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/articles/2009-Fall/full-Bhagwati-Fall-2009.html>, RSR]

Inevitably, the crisis on Wall Street has revived the never-ending notion that markets undermine morality. Oliver Stone, ever restless to recapture the days of former glory, has begun production on a sequel to the 1987 movie Wall Street, which immortalized Gordon Gekko as the symbol of markets and greed. But the debate on how markets affect morality has not always been a slam dunk for capitalism’s naysayers. Matthew Arnold, especially in his influential 1868 book, Culture and Anarchy, might have been spectacularly critical, but Voltaire’s passionate defense of markets, most eloquently stated in his 1734 Philosophical Letters, made him the most influential hero of the new bourgeois age. He proposed quite reasonably that peace and social harmony, as opposed to the religious strife common until then, would flow from the secular religion of the marketplace. After two and a half centuries of this fascinating debate, I have to say that my own sympathies lie with those who have found markets, on balance, to be on the side of the angels. But I should also add that I find the specific notion that markets corrupt our morals, and determine our ethical destiny, to be a vulgar quasi-Marxist notion about as convincing as that other vulgar notion that ownership of the means of production is critical to our economic destiny. The idea that working with and within markets fuels our pursuit of self-interest, greed, avarice, and self-love, in ascending orders of moral turpitude, is surely at variance with what we know about ourselves. Yes, markets will influence values. But, far more important, the values we develop will affect in several ways how we behave in the marketplace. Consider just the fact that different cultures exhibit different forms of capitalism. The Dutch burghers Simon Schama wrote about in The Embarrassment of Riches used their wealth to address the embarrassment of poverty. They, the Jains of Gujerat (from whom Mahatma Gandhi surely drew inspiration), and the followers of John Calvin were all taking values from religion and culture to bring morality to the market. Many economists, perhaps most noticeably André Sapir of Brussels, have used their study of the diverse forms of capitalism that flourish in the world to deny the claim that markets determine what we value. The Scandinavians, for example, have an egalitarian approach to their capitalism, which differs from what we find in the United States, where equality of access, rather than of success, is the norm. So, where do we get our values? They come from our families, communities, schools, churches, and indeed from our religion and literature. My own exposure to the conflicts of absolute values came initially from reading Dostoevsky’s Crime and Punishment, wherein Sofya Semyonovna Marmeladov turns to prostitution to support her family. My love of the environment came from reading Yasunari Kawabata’s famous novel, The Old Capital, which purports a harmony between man and nature, rather than the traditional Christian belief that nature must serve man. How does one react then to a phenomenon like Bernie Madoff? Does it not represent the corrosion of moral values in the marketplace? Not quite. The payoffs from corner-cutting, indeed outright theft, have been so huge in the financial sector that those who are crooked are naturally drawn to such scheming. The financial markets did not produce Madoff’s crookedness; Madoff was almost certainly depraved to begin with. The financial sector corrupts morality in the same sense that the existence of an escort service corrupted Eliot Spitzer. Should we blame the governor’s transgressions on the call girls rather than on his own flaws?

#### And not the root cause

Aberdeen, Author & Philanthropist, ‘3

[Richard, Uncommon Sense, Ch. 80, p. google]

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed.  This is a rather unfortunate and historically myopic view, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon **resorted to violence** as a means to achieve rather questionable ends.  And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem.  Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors.  These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed.  For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors.  Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation.  More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation.  The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹  does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see for more details).  So-called “classes” of people,unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation.  Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest.  War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this. Junior Bush and the neo-conservative genocidal maniacs of modern-day America could not have recently effectively gone to war against Iraq without the individual support of individual troops and a certain percentage of individual citizens within the U.S. population, each lending support for their own personal motives, whatever they individually may have been.  While it is true that corrupt leaders often provoke war, using all manner of religious, social and political means to justify, often as not, entirely ludicrous ends, very rare indeed is a battle only engaged in by these same unscrupulous miscreants of power.  And though a few iniquitous elitist powerbrokers may initiate nefarious policies of global genocidal oppression, it takes a very great many individuals operating from individual personal motivations of survival, desire and greed to develop these policies into a multi-national exploitive reality. No economic or political organization and no political or social cause exists unto itself but rather, individual members power a collective agenda.  A workers’ strike has no hope of succeeding if individual workers do not perceive a personal benefit.  And similarly, a corporation will not exploit workers if doing so is not believed to be in the economic best interest of those who run the corporation and who in turn, must answer (at least theoretically) to individuals who collectively through purchase or other allotment of shares, own the corporation.  Companies have often been known to appear benevolent, offering both higher wages and improved benefits, if doing so is perceived to be in the overall economic best interest of the immediate company and/or larger corporate entity. Non-unionized business enterprises frequently offer ‘carrots’ of appeasement to workers in order to discourage them from organizing and historically in the United States, concessions such as the forty-hour workweek, minimum wage, workers compensation and proscribed holidays have been grudgingly capitulated to by greedy capitalist masters as necessary concessions to avoid profit-crippling strikes and outright revolution. It is important to understand that so-called workers ‘rights’ and benefits were not volunteered by American capitalists or their political stooges (including several U.S. presidents) without extreme and often violent worker coercive persuasion over a great many years of prolonged strikes and similar worker revolts.  Modern supply-side Adam Smith inspired economic pipe dreams of unencumbered markets freely moving toward the common good are clearly and fundamentally, based on outright lies and not very well-masked, deliberate capitalist deception (again, see [Gallo Brothers](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/gallobrothers.html) for more information.  Those who proclaim the twisted gospel of modern supply-side economic theory are generally those who have a lot to gain from its acceptance, both economically and politically. Large political and other problems are historically created gradually stemming from negative individual leading to negative group motivation, in turn leading to negative individual and group action.  The correct root solution to humanity’s problems becomes, by historical default, changing individual negative motivation towards positive motivation.  This is not at all a new theory, as it was first stated over two thousand years ago by Jesus, historically the founder of Human and Civil Rights and not at all, the founder of Christianity or of any other religious movement; virtually everything Jesus said and did goes directly to human motivation, is community oriented, has little to do with modern conceptions of religion and is the antithesis of modern Christianity (see [Revolution](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/revolution.html) for more information).  Contrary to many current views painted of him, Jesus was extremely political, the correct political (and other) solution from true perspective being to center on and change individual motivation.  That is, if we wish to constructively change the extensive political and social problem plaguing our planet today, the root cause of negative individual human motivation leading to negative action must be addressed at the fundamental individual level. This correct political theory is seen as successfully initiated by early followers of Jesus, who practiced extreme communism, having no law “but to love one another”, sharing all things in common, allotting to each according to their need and giving the excess to the poor (which since they were mostly very poor, was a true sacrifice). ²   This was a way of life foreign to their culture, was viewed as a severe threat to the established religious and political order and thus, they were thrown to the lions accordingly.  The arising extended movement, called “The Way” by those who joined (it was not called “Christianity” by them, nor did these early followers view themselves as founders of a religion ), ³  represents extreme far-left radicalism even by modern liberal activist cooperative standards.  It has thus been historically demonstrated that if people practice the Human Rights foundation axiom set down by Jesus to treat other people as we ourselves wish to be treated, established ways of living will change, including non-violent elimination of the entire idea of capitalist oppression based on individual gain and private property ownership.  In practicing The Way, economic oppression is dealt with from the root cause up and thus, is overcome with love and peaceful unselfish collective co-existence. It is important to note that claiming to be a follower of Jesus and actually practicing “The Way” are today usually two entirely different realities; the modern 21st Century world has plenty of examples of the former and virtually no examples of the latter. Lenin and the Communist party overthrew a very oppressive capitalist Czarist system.  It did not take long for one corrupt system to be replaced by another, where even without capitalism and free enterprise to aggravate the Human Rights problem, people of power within the Communist political structure began, similar to their counterparts of capitalistic excess in Europe and America, exploiting the mass population for their own individual benefit, comfort and excess.  Thus the root problem is exposed as going deeper than simply changing an oppressive capitalist or other system.  Quite obviously, changing a corrupt system does not by itself, change the corrupt people who invented and supported it, neither does it change negative individual motivation leading to group oppression based on irrational disparagement of others regarding sex, color, intelligence or other perceived difference and neither does it prevent waste, laziness, murder, theft and rape by individuals within a perceived economic “class”.