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#### Production misdefines the problem – profit explains their impacts & guts solvency

Chien 74 Chang Chien, @ the Peking Review, “Behind the So-Called “Energy Crisis”, March 15th, 1974, http://www.marxists.org/subject/china/peking-review/1974/PR1974-11a.htm

THE major capitalist countries are going through a serious “energy crisis.” The oil supply shortage has caused production and living conditions to be affected by a “petroleum shock.” Prices are soaring in step with oil prices and stocks are falling in the face of bleak economic prospects. International political and economic relations also have been influenced by the “energy crisis.” The situation is being widely discussed. Some bourgeois newspapers and journals abroad blamed the “energy crisis” on an “exhaustion of energy resources” while others absurdly reproached the Arab people with using oil as a weapon. These assertions which evade the heart of the matter or shift the responsibility on to other people are simply designed to create confusion and mislead people. What is it really all about? The current “energy crisis” takes mainly the form of an insufficient supply of oil. While on the surface it may be a question of natural resources, in reality this is absolutely not so. The world’s energy resources, including those of the main capitalist countries, are plentiful. Furthermore, with the development of production and the steady rise of human knowledge, people are discovering and will continue to discover new sources of energy. In essence, the “energy crisis” gripping the capitalist world is a reflection of the crisis of the capitalist system, an outcome of the sharpening contradictions within the capitalist-imperialisi system, and a result of the monopoly capitalists’ ruthless exploitation and nefarious plunder of the people at home and abroad; today, it is also a direct result of unbridled foreign expansion and rivalry for world hegemony by the two superpowers, U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism. Under the capitalist system, “production of surplus-value is the absolute law of this mode of production” (Marx, Capital). The nature of the monopoly capitalist class is to seek fabulous monopoly profits. In exploiting energy resources, the capitalists do not consider the rational use of natural resources but only seek maximum profits. The decrease and increase of the various energy resources often depend on the amount of profit they give. Once the main source of energy, coal was known as the “food of industry.” Today, though there we still very rich deposits of coal, the industry in general has declined in the leading capitalist countries. Even in the United States, which has the biggest reserves, coal accounts for only one-fifth of its energy production. The reason is that as it is much more profitable to exploit oil than to mine coal, the capitalists have, therefore, preferred to set coal aside. Although, oil c also be extracted from oil shale and oil sand, they have not been exploited proprely, because the capitalists are not interested; they find that extracting oil from shale and sand is less profitable than direct oil exploitation and therefore cannot satisfy their ravenous appetites. Capitalism means waste. In the capitalist world, large quantities of petroleum are wasted because of anarchy in production and general wastefulness in life. A large amount of precious oil has been freely abandoned underground because indiscriminate drilling destroyed oil-bearing formations, or because pressures were lowered so much by drawing oil recklessly that it no longer could be made to flow out, etc. It is estimated that the present rate of oil recovery is only 35 per cent in the United States. In other words, for every ton of oil obtained, two tons are abandoned. As to lavish waste in consumption, this is even more shocking. Nowadays, electricity for non-productive use in the capitalist countries takes up one-third to one-half their total electric power output. The U.S. press admits that half the energy consumption in the United States is wasted. Wild arms expansion and war preparations by imperialism and social-imperialism and their wars of aggression are bottomless pits in consuming and squandering oil. This is the basic reason why the “energy crisis” has hit the so-called developed capitalist countries when the world’s energy resources have never been so rich and varied as they are today. As some Americans say, the blame lies not with Mother Nature but with Uncle Sam. Imperialism means aggression and plunder. In view of the economic and strategic importance of oil and also because it is more profitable to grab oil abroad than to exploit it at home, the monopoly capitalists often leave domestic oil unexploited and swarm to plunder the oil of the Third World countries. They have a special interest in the Middle East which has rich oil deposits and occupies an important strategic position politically and geographically. Two-thirds of the world’s proven oil reserves are in the Middle East. Cost of exploitation there is very low as the oil beds are fairly shallow, the rate of success in well drilling is high, output is big and labour is cheap. For example, in Kuwait the cost of extracting one ton of oil is only one-twentieth of that in the United States. Middle East oil has become a golden stream yielding fabulous profits for foreign monopoly capitalists. The Middle East has long been a centre of contention among the imperialist countries. Since World War II, the United States has replaced Britain as the biggest plunderer of Middle East oil resources. At present, U.S. monopoly capitalists control more than half the Middle East’s oil production. Direct U.S. private investments in Middle East oil amounted to 1,800 million dollars by the end of 1972 whereas U.S. profits from the investments was 2,400 million dollars that year alone. The profit rate was as high as 130 per cent, or 10 times the average for all overseas U.S. investments. The temporary and false prosperity of the imperialist countries in postwar years is built on the natural resources and the blood and sweat of the people of the Third World.

#### Extinction

Meszaros, prof Philosophy & Political Theory, 95

Istvan Meszaros, 1995, Professor at University of Sussex, England, “Beyond Capital: Toward a Theory of Transition”

With regard to its innermost determination the capital system is expansion oriented and accumulation-driven. Such a determination constitutes both a formerly unimaginable dynamism and a fateful deficiency. In this sense, as a system of social metabolic control capital is quite irresistible for as long as it can successfully extract and accumulate surplus-labour-whether in directly economic or in primarily political form- in the course of the given society’s expandoed reproduction. Once, however, this dynamic process of expansion and accumulation gets stuck (for whatever reason) the consequences must be quite devastating. For even under the ‘normality’ of relatively limited cyclic disturbances and blockages the destruction that goes with the ensuing socioeconomic and political crises can be enormous, as the annals of the twentieth century reveal it, including two world wars (not to mention numerous smaller conflagrations). It is therefore not too difficult to imagine the implications of a systemic, truly structural crisis; i.e. one that affects the global capital system not simply under one if its aspects-the financial/monetary one, for instance-but in all its fundamental dimensions, questioning its viability altogether as a social reproductive system. Under the conditions of capital's structural crisis its destructive constituents come to the fore with a vengeance, activating the spectre of total uncontrollability in a form that foreshadows self-destruction both for this unique social reproductive system itself and for humanity in general. As we shall see in Chapter 3, capital was near amenable to proper and durable control or rational self-restraint.

#### Reject on ethics

**Zizek and Daly 2k4** (Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears).This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’).

#### Alt: withdraw completely from the ideology of capitalism

**Johnston**, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory University, 200**4**  Adrian, Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society, December v9 i3 p259 page infotrac

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Zizek's recent writings isn't a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Zizek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance (Zizek, 2001d, pp 22-23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Zizek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of "magic," that is, the belief in money's social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance's powers. The "external" obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, "internally" believe in it--capitalism's life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others' belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism's frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic's fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Zizek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing

#### Alt solves the root cause; plan’s incrementalism gets rolled back

http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strategy/GettingFree/ A Sketch of An Association of Democratic, Autonomous Neighborhoods And How to Create It And Other Essays Plus An Annotated Bibliography in English for the Libertarian Left By Jared **James 2002**

10. Single-issue campaigns. We cannot destroy capitalism with single-issue campaigns. Yet the great bulk of the energies of radicals is spent on these campaigns. There are dozens of them: campaigns to preserve the forests, keep rent control, stop whaling, stop animal experiments, defend abortion rights, stop toxic dumping, stop the killing of baby seals, stop nuclear testing, stop smoking, stop pornography, stop drug testing, stop drugs, stop the war on drugs, stop police brutality, stop union busting, stop red-lining, stop the death penalty, stop racism, stop sexism, stop child abuse, stop the re-emerging slave trade, stop the bombing of Yugoslavia, stop the logging of redwoods, stop the spread of advertising, stop the patenting of genes, stop the trapping and killing of animals for furs, stop irradiated meat, stop genetically modified foods, stop human cloning, stop the death squads in Colombia, stop the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, stop the extermination of species, stop corporations from buying politicians, stop high stakes educational testing, stop the bovine growth hormone from being used on milk cows, stop micro radio from being banned, stop global warming, stop the militarization of space, stop the killing of the oceans, and on and on. What we are doing is spending our lives trying to fix up a system which generates evils far faster than we can ever eradicate them. Although some of these campaigns use direct action (e.g., spikes in the trees to stop the chain saws or Greenpeace boats in front of the whaling ships to block the harpoons), for the most part the campaigns are directed at passing legislation in Congress to correct the problem. Unfortunately, reforms that are won in one decade, after endless agitation, can be easily wiped off the books the following decade, after the protesters have gone home, or after a new administration comes to power. These struggles all have value and are needed. Could anyone think that the campaigns against global warming, or to free Leonard Peltier, or to aid the East Timorese ought to be abandoned? Single issue campaigns keep us aware of what's wrong, and sometimes even win. But in and of themselves, they cannot destroy capitalism, and thus cannot really fix things. It is utopian to believe that we can reform capitalism. Most of these evils can only be eradicated for good if we destroy capitalism itself and create a new civilization. We cannot afford to aim for anything less. Our very survival is at stake. There is one single-issue campaign I can wholehearted endorse: the total and permanent eradication of capitalism.

#### Reject the method of the 1AC

James **Marsh, 1995** (Critique, Action, and Liberation, p. 333-335)

To the extent, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason but the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factual, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted, topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.'2 A rationality, however, that confines itself to understanding the facts and accepting the facts as normal cannot pierce the veil. Indeed, piercing the veil becomes irrational according to such a definition of reason.
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#### Obama wins easily absent future events – conventions, combined data prove – counterspin is self interested

Bruce Bartlett. 9-7-12. Why Barack Obama Will Win the Election Easily

http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2012/09/07/Why-Barack-Obama-Will-Win-the-Election-Easily.aspx#page2

Having failed rather spectacularly to correctly predict Mitt Romney’s running mate—I said it definitely would not be Paul Ryan less than 24 hours before he was picked -- I should probably avoid political predictions for a while. But as all those who make their livings in the prediction business know, the secret to success is to make so many of them that a few are bound to be right. That said, I’m going to go out on a limb and predict that Barack Obama will win the election easily, at least in the all-important Electoral College. I have thought so for some time, but wanted to wait and see if the party conventions changed the political dynamics. They have; they have made me more certain of Obama’s victory. Pollster Nate Silver has done an excellent job of assembling all of the known political data on where the presidential race stood as of Wednesday. His analysis leads him to project that Obama will beat Romney 51.2 percent to 47.6 percent in the popular vote, and 311 to 227 in the Electoral College where only 270 votes are needed to win. Overall, Silver gives Obama a 76 percent chance of winning the election. Those who don’t follow the data intensively can be forgiven for not knowing what good shape Obama is in, because it is rarely reported in the mainstream media. There is a simple reason for this: it has a huge vested interest in maintaining the idea that the election is so close it cannot be called and will come down to the last vote cast on Election Day. That is because the media have huge political operations with many highly-paid commentators who need people reading and tuning in daily to see if their preferred candidate has made any headway. There is also an enormous amount of data being produced daily that requires reporting and analysis—polls, campaign contributions, charges and counter charges, endorsements, gaffes and so on. It is not hard to spin this vast cacophony of material in such a way as to maintain the fiction that the election will be close. The media, collectively, are in the position of sports announcers calling a game where one team is heavily favored and well ahead. They need to keep people watching so that advertisers will get value for their money. So they use every cliché in the book to tell viewers that “it ain’t over till it’s over” and about all the times the losing team has come from behind to win and so on and so on. Of course, it goes without saying that once in a while, the losing team does make a comeback and wins unexpectedly. But by the time that happens, all except the winning team’s hardcore fans have changed the channel or left the stadium. However, we all know about those magical come-from-behind victories because the media have an incentive to hype them as a warning to fickle fans that they better stay tuned next time. The same is going on today with the presidential race. Reporters and commentators are building up Romney’s chances and downplaying Obama’s to keep people interested. This was most evident last week when Republican speakers at their convention were played up and their talking points repeated, as if they were changing the course of the election as they spoke. This week, they are doing the same for the Democrats. I thought the Republican convention went very poorly. And apparently, I was not the only one. According to Nielsen, television ratings for the Republican convention were down sharply from 2008. And according to Gallup, Romney’s convention “bounce” was the worst for any candidate of either party except for John Kerry in 2004—and we know what happened to him. We don’t yet know what kind of bounce Obama will get, but anecdotal evidence suggests that it will at least be significantly better than Romney’s. Whereas few Republicans raved about any convention speech other than actor Clint Eastwood’s rambling conversation with an empty chair, Democrats are raving about those by Michele Obama, Bill Clinton and a number of other speakers at their convention. To be sure, there are still opportunities for Republicans to level the playing field. There will be three debates between Romney and Obama, as well as one between the respective vice presidential nominees. They could make a difference, but history does not show that debates have much impact.

#### Plan undermines Obama’s campaign against Congressional obstruction – this accesses every single link and turn

Williams, Fox News Political Analyst, 12 (Juan, June 11, “Opinion: President Obama’s campaign takes a page from Truman’s playbook,” http://thehill.com/opinion/columnists/juan-williams/231959-opinion-president-obamas-campaign-takes-a-page-from-trumans-playbook, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

President Obama is already blaming lack of action from Boehner’s Republican majority in the House of Representatives for the poor economy. And that campaign strategy is just getting started. The question is how much political power accusations of “Republican obstructionism” will have with voters in the final stretch of the campaign. What is certain is that as the House, Senate and presidential campaigns enter the summer months, every argument from now on will center on what the politically paralyzed Congress has failed to do on economic issues. The trend started last week with President Clinton’s declaration that President Obama should just go ahead and give Republicans in Congress another extension of the Bush tax cuts — though not permanently — in order to avoid an end of the year economic cliff. And Washington Post columnist Ezra Klein speculated last week that one reason to vote for a Republican president was that it would eliminate all excuses and force the GOP House majority to take action on the economy. The assumption at the heart of what Klein and Clinton are saying is congressional Republicans are currently playing politics while the economy burns. Stephanie Cutter, Obama’s reelection spokeswoman, said last week there are “a million jobs on the table in Congress right now that they could move on.” Mitt Romney and congressional Republicans are quick to point out that the GOP-controlled House has passed some 30 “jobs” bills that have not been acted upon in the Senate. But those “jobs” bills are loaded with political poison pills for Democrats. They are not serious proposals with potential to be the basis for a deal that could be worked out in conference. The best political defense of GOP inaction on Capitol Hill comes from Ed Gillespie, senior adviser to Romney’s campaign and former chairman of the Republican National Committee. He said Congress is right to do nothing because the Obama White House has created “a hostile environment for job creation in our economy and that’s why … the only thing that’s going to change it are changing the policies, and that means changing the person in the White House.” The Obama campaign team’s response to the Gillespie defense is straight out of Harry Truman’s political playbook. In the 1948 race, the Democrat ran against a do-nothing, obstructionist Republican Congress and stunned his opponent with an upset win. The Obama team is already showing signs of going beyond the Truman playbook. In a charge unprecedented in modern American presidential politics, they are accusing Republicans in Congress, working in coordination with Romney’s campaign, of not only “rooting for failure,” but of sabotaging the economy for political gain. A recent poll by ABC/Washington Post asked Americans who they thought was more responsible for the country’s current economic problems — President Obama or President Bush. The Republican president still gets 49 percent of the blame, while the Democrat who succeeded him is held responsible by 34 percent. But a November 2011 poll by a bipartisan group found 94 percent of Americans think congressional inaction is hurting the economy. That fits with Congress’s dismal job approval ratings. That is the opening for President Obama to play Harry Truman. Why is unemployment still so high? A big part of the reason is that public sector jobs are continually being lost at the federal, state and local level. Government payrolls dropped by 13,000 in May. By contrast, the private sector added 82,000 jobs. Yet the GOP Congress refuses to invest in public sector spending to steady the fragile economy. Obama has already cut taxes and reduced the number of public sector jobs since he took office. This is not a matter of opinion. It is an economic fact. But the GOP never acknowledges it and refuses to work on his plan for creating new jobs. The facts are there to build an argument. But is it enough for President Obama to stage a revival of the 1948 campaign, when the Democrat incumbent won reelection by attacking a do-nothing Congress? This time the chant will be, “Give ‘em hell, Barack!”

#### Romney will bomb Iran his first month in office

Kidd 12 (Dr. Billy, research psychologist and long-term political activist, June 14, ‘Romney Strategist Prepare for War Against Iran,’ <http://www.opposingviews.com/i/politics/foreign-policy/crisis-gaza/romney-strategists-prepare-war-against-iran>)

The Emergency Committee for Israel is running an advertisement urging an immediate war with Iran. This organization was founded by Weekly Standard creator, and Romney strategist, William Kristol.  Its message is that the evil, Jewish-hating Persian theocracy must be obliterated to make way for Israeli expansion.  Sound preposterous? Well, the ploy, here, is to make Romney look like a Delta Team 6 super-commando. This supposedly will take Jewish voters away from Obama in the November election. The other purpose is to sanctify the execution of a million Iranians when Romney orders the bombing come next January.

#### Attacking Iran causes full-scale war with Russia

 Conway January 17, 2012 Alvin Conway Author, blogger he cites Russia’s former ambassador to NATO and the Arab Times “Iranian Crisis: escalating series of troubling events sliding world towards war” <http://theextinctionprotocol.wordpress.com/2012/01/17/iranian-crisis-escalating-series-of-troubling-events-sliding-world-towards-war/>

Russian response could lead to WWIII: Russia would regard any military intervention linked to Iran’s nuclear program as a threat to its own security, Moscow’s departing ambassador to NATO warned on Friday. “Iran is our neighbor,” Dmitry Rogozin told reporters in Brussels. “And if Iran is involved in any military action, it’s a direct threat to our security.” –Arab Times

#### That’s the only scenario for nuclear extinction

Bostrom 2002 Nick Bostrom Professor, Faculty of Philosophy, Oxford University“Existential Risks” Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2002). <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.
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#### Text: The fifty states and all relevant United States territories should <plan>

#### States solve nuclear

Ben-Moshe 2009 (Sony Ben-Moshe, Jason J. Crowell, Kelley M. Gale, Breton A. Peace, Brett P. Rosenblatt, and Kelly D. Thomason, attorneys in the Project Finance Practice Group in the San Diego office of Latham & Watkins, 2009, “FINANCING THE NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE: THE BENEFITS AND POTENTIAL PITFALLS OF FEDERAL & STATE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES AND THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN CALIFORNIA,” Energy Law Journal, Volume 30, Number 2, online)

In addition to federal subsidies, various states have passed legislation to promote the development of new nuclear power plants that supplement the financial incentives provided by the DOE. The most commonly used incentive for nuclear construction in states with rate-regulated utilities are regulations which allow utilities to recover their capital costs and construction work in progress (CWIP) in rate-bases utilized to determine the regulated rates utilities charge to consumers either during construction or once the plant is either put in service or abandoned. The states that do not permit costs to be recovered during construction have a process by which a state commission can annually approve costs on a non-appealable basis for inclusion in the rate-base at commercial operation or abandonment.¶ Both rate-regulated and restructured states also provide tax credits or exemptions for new nuclear construction. Kansas exempts new nuclear facilities from state property taxes while Texas permits school districts to enter into agreements with developers of new nuclear plants to limit the appraised value of the plants for purposes of assessing school district maintenance and operations property taxes.¶ The following Table provides a summary of the key features of the various state programs providing financial incentives for new nuclear power development.¶ Legislation is also currently pending in Indiana and Oklahoma that would provide cost recovery mechanisms for new nuclear construction.156 Other states have recently implemented legislation or regulations indicating their support for construction of nuclear power plants through programs aside from direct financial incentives. Utah passed a bill establishing a state position of ―energy officer‖ and a policy to promote ―the study of nuclear power generation.‖157 Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota and Wisconsin all currently have legislation pending to overturn state moratoria on the construction of new nuclear plants.158¶ Finally, Georgia and Kentucky have issued general resolutions to support development of new nuclear power plants, while many other state or local governments have issued resolutions to support the construction of particular nuclear plants. The many states that have recently implemented financial incentives for construction of new nuclear power plants to supplement federal programs, and the states that have released policies in support of nuclear development signify the increasing and widespread support for new nuclear power.
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#### TEXT: The United States Federal Government should eliminate all financial incentives for nuclear energy that favor a reactor type.

#### Free market control ensures the right recycling technologies are used

Jack Spencer, Research Fellow, Nuclear Energy Policy The Heritage Foundation, “A Free Market Approach to Managing Used Nuclear Fuel,” The Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future, September 3, 2010, http://brc.gov/sites/default/files/meetings/attachments/brc\_summary\_jack\_spencer.pdf, accessed 8-12-2012.

Advantages of Privatizing Used Nuclear Fuel Management Sustainable over time. Nuclear operators have the greatest interest in a successful fuel disposition program. A safe and economical used fuel strategy allows them to maximize the economic benefits of their investments. If given the opportunity, they will develop a sustainable strategy. Economically rational. Permanent geological storage capacity is a finite resource, which would carry a very high value if subjected to the market. Commoditizing this resource will allow its value to rise as its availability decreases. This will empower nuclear operators to consider the actual costs of geologic storage and integrate other technologies, such as recycling, into their overall waste management strategies in an economically rational way. Promotes competition. Private sector control of used fuel management promotes competition throughout the fuel cycle. An inflexible government approach can artificially limit how used fuel is produced, i.e. what type of reactor, to meet government used fuel standards. This limits competition for nuclear reactor technologies. The private sector could choose to pursue other reactor technologies that better fit into their waste management models.

#### Pyro-processing developed for commercial use and solves

Tom Blees, 5-31-2011, is the author of Prescription for the Planet, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Idaho Samizdat: Nuke Notes, “Critique of MIT Nuclear Fuel Cycle Report,” <http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2011/05/critique-of-mit-nuclear-fuel-cycle.html>

The public views adequate nuclear waste management as a critical linchpin in further development of nuclear energy. The technical community, therefore, needs to provide a practical approach to deal with the waste issue. The Fukushima accidents call attention to the importance of managing spent fuel safely. It appears the best technical approach is extracting the actinides from spent fuel, which reduces the effective lifetime of nuclear wastes from ~300,000 years to ~300 years. Extracting actinides (and using them to generate power) is by far the best technical approach to dealing with nuclear wastes. The MIT Study fails to mention this important possibility. If actinide extraction is chosen as a pathway for waste “disposal,” the recovered actinides still must be transmuted to fissile material or fissioned directly. This can be done only in fast reactors. Actinides can be burned in fast reactors, generating energy and at the same time creating more fissile material for the future. A key advantage of fast reactors is that they can be utilized as “burners” when excess plutonium inventories exist, and then converted to “breeders” whenever needed. Only fast reactors can satisfy the waste-disposal mission simply and effectively while extending utilization of the uranium resources by more than two orders of magnitude. Thermal reactors—such as LWRs and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors—utilize less than 1% of uranium resources, even with recycling of plutonium and some of the uranium. Thermal-spectrum reactors, even optimized, can extend the resource utilization only marginally, and they cannot burn actinides effectively. Actinide recycling also requires an efficient processing technology, with improved economics and nonproliferation characteristics. The pyroprocessing technique based on electrorefining, developed in the IFR program, has the potential to recover the actinides from LWR spent fuel as well as to fully recycle fuel in fast reactors. The fundamentals of pyroprocessing have already been demonstrated – this is not new science. The technology is now ready for pilot-scale demonstration, and it should be given the highest priority. We do not need decades of R&D to pursue all esoteric ideas. We already have in our hands on the most advanced technology, technology that no other countries possess. The MIT Study also talks about the inter-generational equity considerations. We believe that our generation should demonstrate the technologies that will solve the energy supply and waste management problems, rather than proposing a century-long interim storage of the spent nuclear fuel.

#### Expansion of unsafe status quo reprocessing tech produces a multiplier effect for nuclear theft.

John Deutch & Ernest Moniz, 2003, CO CHAIR Institute Professor Department of Chemistry, MIT, and Ernest Moniz a co-chair in the Department of Physics, MIT Director of Energy Studies, Laboratory for Energy and the Environment, The Future of Nuclear Power – an interdisciplinary MIT Study, The Future of Nuclear Power: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study, “Chaired Effort to Identify Barriers and Solutions for Nuclear Option in Reducing Greenhouse Gases,” <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/>

In addition to the risk of nuclear weapons capability spreading to other nations, the threat of acquisition of a crude nuclear explosive by a sub-national group has arisen in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. The report of interest in nuclear devices by the terrorist Al Qaeda network especially highlights this risk. Terrorist or organized crime groups are not expected to be able to produce nuclear weapons material themselves; the concern is their direct acquisition of nuclear materials by theft or through a state sponsor. This places the spotlight on the PUREX/MOX fuel cycle as currently practiced in several countries, since the fuel cycle produces during conventional operation nuclear material that is easily made usable for a weapon. The sub-national theft risk would be exacerbated by the spread of the PUREX/MOX fuel cycle, particularly to those countries without the infrastructure for assuring stringent control and accountability.

#### Impact is global nuclear war – only the CP solves.

Patrick F. Speice, Jr., Feburary 2006, is an associate in Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher's Washington, D.C. office, works in the firm’s International Trade Regulation and Compliance Department, focusing on export controls, foreign regulations, and economic sanctions, earned his J.D. in 2006 from the Marshall-Wythe School of Law at the College of William & Mary, William and Mary Research Fellowpolitical science, Wake Forest University, authored or co-authored professional articles, includes representation of clients in Foreign Corrupt Practices matters and securities investigations, “Negligence and Nuclear Nonproliferation,” William & Mary Law Review, Lexis Nexis

Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. 50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. 51 This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, 52 as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons. 53

### Case

#### Util is good and doesn’t devalue life

Richard L. Revesz (Dean and Lawrence King Professor of Law at New York University School of Law, JD Yale Law School) and Michael A Livermore. (JD NYU School of Law, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Integrity, and Managing director of the NYU Law Review). Retaking Rationality How Cots-Benefit Analysis Can Better protect the Environment and Our Health. 2008. P. 1-4.

Governmental decisions are also fundamentally different from personal decisions in that they often affect people in the aggregate. In our individual lives, we come into contact with at least some of the consequences of our decisions. If we fail to consult a map, we pay the price: losing valuable time driving around in circles and listening to the complaints of our passengers. We are constantly confronted with the consequences of the choices that we have made. Not so for governments, however, which exercise authority by making decisions at a distance. Perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of governmental decisions is that they require a special kind of compassion—one that can seem, at first glance, cold and calculating, the antithesis of empathy. The aggregate and complex nature of governmental decisions does not address people as human beings, with concerns and interests, families and emotional relationships, secrets and sorrows. Rather, people are numbers stacked in a column or points on a graph, described not through their individual stories of triumph and despair, but by equations, functions, and dose-response curves. The language of governmental decisionmaking can seem to—and to a certain extent does—ignore what makes individuals unique and morally important. But, although the language of bureaucratic decisionmaking can be dehumanizing, it is also a prerequisite for the kind of compassion that is needed in contemporary society. Elaine Scarry has developed a comparison between individual compassion and statistical compassion.' Individual compassion is familiar—when we see a person suffering, or hear the story of some terrible tragedy, we are moved to take action. Statistical compassion seems foreign—we hear only a string of numbers but must comprehend "the concrete realities embedded there."' Individual compassion derives from our social nature, and may be hardwired directly into the human brain.' Statistical compassion calls on us to use our higher reasoning power to extend our natural compassion to the task of solving more abstract—but no less real—problems. Because compassion is not just about making us feel better—which we could do as easily by forgetting about a problem as by addressing it—we have a responsibility to make the best decisions that we can. This book argues that cost-benefit analysis, properly conducted, can improve environmental and public health policy. Cost-benefit analysis—the translation of human lives and acres of forest into the language of dollars and cents—can seem harsh and impersonal. But such an approach is also necessary to improve the quality of decisions that regulators make. Saving the most lives, and best protecting the quality of our environment and our health—in short, exercising our compassion most effectively—requires us to step back and use our best analytic tools. Sometimes, in order to save a life, we need to treat a person like a number. This is the challenge of statistical compassion. This book is about making good decisions. It focuses on the area of environmental, health and safety regulation. These regulations have been the source of numerous and hard-fought controversies over the past several decades, particularly at the federal level. Reaching the right decisions in the areas of environmental protection, increasing safety, and improving public health is clearly of high importance. Although it is admirable (and fashionable) for people to buy green or avoid products made in sweatshops, efforts taken at the individual level are not enough to address the pressing problems we face—there is a vital role for government in tackling these issues, and sound collective decisions concerning regulation are needed. There is a temptation to rely on gut-level decisionmaking in order to avoid economic analysis, which, to many, is a foreign language on top of seeming cold and unsympathetic. For government to make good decisions, however, it cannot abandon reasoned analysis. Because of the complex nature of governmental decisions, we have no choice but to deploy complex analytic tools in order to make the best choices possible. Failing to use these tools, which amounts to abandoning our duties to one another, is not a legitimate response. Rather, we must exercise statistical compassion by recognizing what numbers of lives saved represent: living and breathing human beings, unique, with rich inner lives and an interlocking web of emotional relationships. The acres of a forest can be tallied up in a chart, but that should not blind us to the beauty of a single stand of trees. We need to use complex tools to make good decisions while simultaneously remembering that we are not engaging in abstract exercises, but that we are having real effects on people and the environment. In our personal lives, it would be unwise not to shop around for the best price when making a major purchase, or to fail to think through our options when making a major life decision. It is equally foolish for government to fail to fully examine alternative policies when making regulatory decisions with life-or-death consequences. This reality has been recognized by four successive presidential administrations. Since 1981, the cost-benefit analysis of major regulations has been required by presidential order. Over the past twenty-five years, however, environmental and other progressive groups have declined to participate in the key governmental proceedings concerning the cost-benefit analysis of federal regulations, instead preferring to criticize the technique from the outside. The resulting asymmetry in political participation has had profound negative consequences, both for the state of federal regulation and for the technique of cost-benefit analysis itself. Ironically, this state of affairs has left progressives open to the charge of rejecting reason, when in fact strong environmental and public health pro-grams are often justified by cost-benefit analysis. It is time for progressive groups, as well as ordinary citizens, to retake the high ground by embracing and reforming cost-benefit analysis. The difference between being unthinking—failing to use the best tools to analyze policy—and unfeeling—making decisions without compassion—is unimportant: Both lead to bad policy. Calamities can result from the failure to use either emotion or reason. Our emotions provide us with the grounding for our principles, our innate interconnectedness, and our sense of obligation to others. We use our powers of reason to build on that emotional foundation, and act effectively to bring about a better world.

#### Language doesn’t create reality

Michelle Fram-Cohen, pub. date: 1985, translator and interpreter between Hebrew and English, translation philosopher, “Reality, Language, Translation What Makes Translation Possible,” <http://enlightenment.supersaturated.com/essays/text/michelleframcohen//possibilityoftranslation.html>

The idea that language is created inside one's mind independently of outside experience eliminates the possibility that the external world is the common source of all languages. But a common source of all languages underlies any attempt to explain the possibility of translation. Chomsky suggests that the common basis of all languages is universal phonetics and semantics, with the result that "certain objects of human thoughts and mentality are essentially invariable across languages." (13) To the best of my knowledge Chomsky did not develop this idea in the direction of explaining the possibility of translation. In contrast, linguist Eugene Nida insists that outside experience is the common basis of all languages when he writes that "each language is different from all other languages in the ways in which the sets of verbal symbol classify the various elements of experience." (14) Nida did not provide the philosophical basis of the view that the external world is the common source of all languages. Such a basis can be found in the philosophy of Objectivism, originated by Ayn Rand. Objectivism, as its name implies, upholds the objectivity of reality. This means that reality is independent of consciousness, consciousness being the means of perceiving reality, not of creating it. Rand defines language as "a code of visual-auditory symbols that denote concepts." (15) These symbols are the written or spoken words of any language. Concepts are defined as the "mental integration of two or more units possessing the same distinguishing characteristic(s), with their particular measurements omitted." (16) This means that concepts are abstractions of units perceived in reality. Since words denote concepts, words are the symbols of such abstractions; words are the means of representing concepts in a language. Since reality provides the data from which we abstract and form concepts, reality is the source of all words--and of all languages. The very existence of translation demonstrates this fact. If there was no objective reality, there could be no similar concepts expressed in different verbal symbols. There could be no similarity between the content of different languages, and so, no translation. Translation is the transfer of conceptual knowledge from one language into another. It is the transfer of one set of symbols denoting concepts into another set of symbols denoting the same concepts. This process is possible because concepts have specific referents in reality. Even if a certain word and the concept it designates exist in one language but not in another, the referent this word and concept stand for nevertheless exists in reality, and can be referred to in translation by a descriptive phrase or neologism. Language is a means describing reality, and as such can and should expand to include newly discovered or innovated objects in reality. The revival of the ancient Hebrew language in the late 19th Century demonstrated the dependence of language on outward reality. Those who wanted to use Hebrew had to innovate an enormous number of words in order to describe the new objects that did not confront the ancient Hebrew speakers. On the other hand, those objects that existed 2000 years ago could be referred to by the same words. Ancient Hebrew could not by itself provide a sufficient image of modern reality for modern users.

#### Ontology does not come first.

David Owen Millennium Journale of international studies 2002 “Re-Orientation Internatioal Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning”

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theoryto recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity.

#### personal engagement fails

Collins, professor of sociology at the University of Cinncinnati, 1997 (Patricia Hill, Fighting Words, p. 135-136)

In this sense, postmodern views of power that overemphasize hegemony and local politics provide a seductive mix of appearing to challenge oppression while secretly believing that such efforts are doomed. Hegemonic power appears as ever expanding and invading. It may even attempt to “annex” the counterdiscourses that have developed, oppositional discourses such as Afrocentrism, postmodernism, feminism, and Black feminist thought. This is a very important insight. However, there is a difference between being aware of the power of one’s enemy and arguing that such power is so pervasive that resistance will, at best, provide a brief respite and, at worst, prove ultimately futile. This emphasis on power as being hegemonic and seemingly absolute, coupled with a belief in local resistance as the best that people can do, flies in the face of actual, historical successes. African-Americans, women, poor people, and others have achieved results through social movements, revolts, revolutions, and other collective social action against government, corporate, and academic structures. As James Scott queries, “What remains to be explained…is why theories of hegemony…have…retained an enourmous intellectual appeal to social scientists and historians” (1990, 86). Perhaps for colonizers who refuse, individualized, local resistance is the best that they can envision. Overemphasizing hegemony and stressing nihilism not only does not resist injustice but participates in its manufacture. Views of power grounded exclusively in notions of hegemony and nihilism are not only pessimistic, they can be dangerous for members of historically marginalized groups. Moreover, the emphasis on local versus structural institutions makes it difficult to examine major structures such as racism, sexism, and other structural forms of oppression. Social theories that reduce heirarchical power relations to the level of representation, performance, or constructed phenomena not only emphasize the likelihood that resistance will fail in the face of a pervasive hegemonic presence, they also reinforce perceptions that local, individualized micropolitics constitutes the most effective terrain of struggle. This emphasis on the local dovetails nicely with increasing emphasis on the “personal” as a source of power and with parallel attention to subjectivity. If politics becomes reduced to the “personal,” decentering relations of ruling in academia and other bureaucratic structures seems increasingly unlikely. As Rey Chow opines, “What these intellectuals are doing is robbing the terms of oppression of their critical and oppositional import, and thus depriving the oppressed of even the vocabulary of protest and rightful demand” (1993, 13).

###