Twitter Thread by The Cosmist Insurrection, Inc. ™

The Cosmist Insurrection, Inc. ™
@yungneocon

All the leftists in the comments like oh no prageru made a good point lol

> Nuclear energy:
>
> Safe? \u2705
>
> Clean? \u2705
>
> Efficient? \u2705
>
> Scalable? \u2705
>
> Why is it not receiving more political support?
>
> — PragerU (@prageru) February 17, 2021

Polls consistently show conservative support for nuclear energy. It also has high support among elites. The myth that it is unpopular in general isn't true—although it is unpopular in almost every specific case where they need to site it

Article is old but yeah https://t.co/BUEQa1RhGE

This study finds that risk & benefit predict individual opinion the most, followed by the share of nuclear energy already extant, followed by ideology (conservatives support more) https://t.co/oWCmOnD1RM

This one finds that journalists attitude affect public perceptions, but that energy consultants, nuclear engineers, bureaucrats, and the military show the highest support for nuclear energy https://t.co/nkGHbFVc0O

Why focus on public opinion attitudes at all, after all, they dont influence policy unless they agree with elites:

https://t.co/Sjr5N7KD6M

And are shaped heavily by media which conservatives dominate

https://t.co/zP0OtYTGva

Conservatives distrust science the most, liberals trust it more. Yet here scientists (pay attention bc all these papers use a bait switch for scientists !) & conservatives are United. https://t.co/3NV47BVjJ7

While environmentalist protest predicts some change independent of opinion

https://t.co/ss2hQaFlpd

& publicopinion predicts incremental change inEurope

https://t.co/bA1V0pJahT
On net environmentalism is a total failure
https://t.co/OryUcy7CEL

In part this has to do with the conflicts between growth & the environment https://t.co/ACmQIvj2de
Despite pleading otherwise https://t.co/Jv5Q6LhL0F
The two remain in conflict
https://t.co/VnT7xQ6Fw2

Thus, conservatives, military people, elites, much public opinion, and bureaucrats support nuclear. Several of these influence policy heavily, others at best incrementally. The influence of environmentalism is small. Growth dominates. So why no nuclear?

Because nuclear energy has never been profitable:

https://t.co/nFm3gRl3wb

https://t.co/fL7duqdzl9

Massive Subsidies are necessary

https://t.co/CJgLGHpkpg

https://t.co/4cj0SS5lma

Nuclear energy was pursued because it offered a comparative marginal advantage in international policy & military. Once generalized, it lost this relative effect and became a security risk. https://t.co/YA6tNCFpcD

This comprehensive pro nuclear report finds its future is dim—costs are high, specific support is low, government support is necessary, a massive carbon price is necessary, and a very low discount rate is necessary https://t.co/geVpaRYG7w

The political, practical, ecological, and resource constraints on nuclear are quite strict https://t.co/PxUzlneKSP

Pro nuclear leftists insists an oligarchy not public opinion controls policy on all issues but this one. It is widely acknowledged environmentalists have no impact except on this one. It is widely accepted self interest predicts belief except here.

It is widely known media shapes opinion based on elite interests, that elites disseminate propaganda & scapegoat others, especially those opposed to state & capital, except here.

Instead, it is proposed that environmentalists & a misinformed stupid public are the cause of the decline in nuclear. This simply cannot be sustained. Political, military, economics, & cultural Elites support nuclear. Conservatives support nuclear.

Leftists, environmentalists, public opinion, and protest have some influence on & with public opinion, and on & with policy, especially where they cohere with elite interests, but usually only incrementally, with sustained effort, and the maximal impact is quite small.

Most of the time their effect is nil or the opposite. Why do people who claim to analyze state & capital suddenly do a volte face here? Profit, policy, military & difficulty drive the decisions here more thoroughly than even other places

In reality, elites wanted & want nuclear energy, but it's not particularly profitable or marginally militarily useful when aggregated. These drove the declines. They then blamed environmentalists & people all bought it. They had their cake & ate it too.

Now a couple of caveats

people make the claims about public opinion, and science and environmentalism. It's fine if we call bullshit on that research, but then we can't use it either way, but if one is going to use it, one have to accept which direction it points

—i think the constructs of public opinion, how these papers operationalize ideology, policy, protest, opinion, & 'scientist' are mostly insufficient (at best) or bs (at worst) . But it doesn't matter—as it is others who use these results to make the argument.

I am responding to an argument based in public opinion research and a thesis about public influence & so on. Drawing on those assumptions, we can see a different conclusion follows than the one being proceeded. But we can reject these assumptions, frames & methods.

If we reject these assumptions, frames and methods we lose much of the ability to discuss the subject in these terms either way which is fine with me but we need to construct our debate differently

Which is to say starting from PragerU & many others assumptions & methods we are forced to draw opposite conclusions. We can adopt other assumptions & methods but this is a different conversation