

lion each, for first two new reactors, caused by the regulatory process or litigation, and 50% of the delay costs for each of the next four plants, up to \$2 billion in total, will be covered.

In recognition of the fact that nuclear power is the most capital-intensive energy technology, the law provides for a production tax credit of 1.8 cents per kilowatt-hour, for the first 6,000 megawatts of new nuclear capacity, for the first 8 years of each plant's operation. Loan guarantees are available for up to 80% of the project cost, to be repaid within 30 years.

A phrase that became popular in the counter-culture "me first" ideology of the past 30 years, in response to the announcement that a project was to be built was: "Not in my back yard." However, communities that are home to an operating nuclear plant know that the taxes the utility pays on the high-value plant pay for their schools and other services, and provide highly skilled, well-paying jobs that create additional indirect employment.

Finally, two decades after the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant, where no one was even injured, more and more Americans have begun to realize they had been

taken for a ride. Nuclear is, in fact, the safest way to generate electricity, and even prominent members of the "environmental" movement, such as Greenpeace's Patrick Moore, have tossed aside silly visions of windmills defacing the landscape, and are backing the nuclear renaissance.

Now, *per contra*, there is a competition between towns and states to try to entice utilities to build new nuclear plants in their "back yards." The Louisiana Public Service Commission passed a resolution last July, to support the addition of a new reactor at River Bend in St. Francisville, as did the local Chamber of Commerce. The Calvert County Board of County Commissioners, in Maryland, passed a resolution last summer supporting the selection of Calvert Cliffs for a new reactor. Similar resolutions have been passed by the city of Oswego, New York, in Fort Gibson, Mississippi, and in Claiborne County, Mississippi.

On Feb. 4, two state legislators from Wisconsin announced that they will introduce a bill to make it easier to build new nuclear plants in their state. The state Department of Administration reports that Wisconsin could face an elec-

Mexican LYM: Use 'Nuclear Option' To Stop Fascism

The policy statement excerpted here was released by the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) of Mexico on Feb. 7:

No, not a nuclear *bomb*. Nuclear energy.

In late January, Mexico's Energy Minister announced that the Fox government would promote the building of a single, new nuclear energy plant in the country, in a location to be decided before Fox leaves office in December 2006.

The LaRouche Youth Movement of Mexico does not think that we should be building *one* nuclear plant: We need 20! We have to return to the nation-building policies of ex-President José López Portillo, including building 20 nuclear energy plants, dozens of new industrial cities especially near the coastline, and in general exchanging our oil for advanced technology. We have to rapidly industrialize, achieve food self-sufficiency, and—most important of all—create millions of new productive jobs, and educate and train the new generations of young Mexicans for them, so that our nation's most valuable resource, its people, stay at home to contribute to national development.

Ya basta with the brain-drain, where our population is being dumped into slave labor conditions in the United States!

Such a nuclear-centered development program is the

key to Mexico's 2006 Presidential elections. This is the opportunity for Mexico to end the nightmare of the last two decades of neo-liberal economic policies; to drive all vestiges of synarchism from national politics and return to its republican roots; and to resume its rightful, historical role as a leader in Ibero-America. This is the opportunity to put an end to the fascist economic policies of the synarchist international bankers globally. . . .

Why Nuclear?

Natural gas is fine. Hydroelectric plants are okay. But the only path to true energy independence and technological advance is *nuclear energy*. . . .

But there is a deeper reason for going nuclear. When we choose an energy source, the critical consideration is what the physical economist Lyndon LaRouche has called "energy flux density." This means that the way the source of energy is *organized*—its density of economic application—is as important as the absolute amount. For example, it is not the same thing to have 60 kilowatts of energy in the form of a thousand 60-watt light bulbs, as it is to organize those same 60 kilowatts in the form of a *laser beam*. The laser can do *work* that a thousand light bulbs cannot. (It's sort of like the difference between having a real President, versus a dim bulb, in the Presidential palace). . . .

Lyndon LaRouche and José López Portillo were right—and Mexicans should have the courage to admit it. We have been on the wrong path for the last 25 years, and 2006 is the year to change that. Stop acting like Sancho Panza: Only a burro refuses to budge, when his actions for the last 25 years have proven to be a mistake.