#### Nuclear power results in a fraction of the emissions

Gronlund 7 Nuclear power in a Warming world: Assessing the Risks, Addressing the Challenges, Lisbeth Gronlund; David Lochbaum; Edwin Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists, <http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear_power/nuclear-power-in-a-warming-world.pdf>

Nuclear power plants do not produce global warming emissions when they operate. However, producing nuclear power requires mining and processing uranium ore, enriching uranium to create reactor fuel, manufacturing and transporting fuel, and building plants—all of which consume energy. Today much of that energy is provided by fossil fuels (although that may change if the United States takes steps to address global warming). However, the global warming emissions associated with nuclear power even now are relatively modest. Indeed, its life cycle emissions are comparable to those of wind power and hydropower. While estimates of life cycle greenhousegas emissions vary with different assumptions and methodologies, the basic conclusions of most analyses are consistent: for each unit of electricity generated, natural gas combustion results in roughly half the global warming emissions of coal combustion, while wind power, hydropower, and nuclear power produce only a few percent of emissions from coal combustion. The life cycle emissions of photovoltaics (PVs) are generally somewhat higher than those for wind power, hydropower, and nuclear power, because manufacture of PVs entails greater global warming emissions.5 The greenhouse gas emissions stemming from nuclear power depend greatly on the technology used to enrich uranium. The technology now used in the United States—gaseous diffusion—requires a large amount of electricity: roughly 3.4 percent of the electricity generated by a typical U.S. reactor would be needed to enrich the uranium in the reactor’s fuel. 6 Because fossil fuels generate 70 percent of U.S. electricity, emissions from that enrichment would account for some 2.5 percent of the emissions of an average U.S. fossil fuel plant. However, in the near future, U.S. uranium will be enriched using gaseous centrifuge technology, which consumes only 2.5 percent of the energy used by a diffusion plant. Thus this part of the nuclear power life cycle would result in very low emissions. 7

#### An increase in nuclear reactors has an inverse relationship with aggregate emissions

Gronlund 7 Nuclear power in a Warming world: Assessing the Risks, Addressing the Challenges, Lisbeth Gronlund; David Lochbaum; Edwin Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists, <http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear_power/nuclear-power-in-a-warming-world.pdf>

Today 104 reactors produce some 20 percent of U.S. electricity. If demand for electricity in 2050 is roughly that of today—because energy conservation offsets increases in demand—another 100 reactors would be required to produce an additional 20 percent of U.S. electricity in 2050. Because electricity production contributes roughly a third of U.S. global warming emissions today, those additional 100 reactors would reduce emissions by 6–7 percent relative to today. Recall that to avoid dangerous climate change, the United States and other industrialized nations will need to reduce emissions at least 80 percent by midcentury, compared with 2000 levels (which are comparable to today’s levels). Thus an additional 100 reactors would contribute roughly 8 percent of the total required U.S. reduction (6–7 percent of the required 80 percent), under the assumption that efficiency and conservation measures could offset any growth in electricity demand. (Without additional conservation and efficiency measures, U.S. electricity consumption is projected to almost double by 2050.) All energy sources entail risks to the environment and human health. For example, the risks of carbon capture and storage—which would reduce the net global warming emissions from using fossil fuels to generate electricity—include gas explosions and the release of large amounts of previously stored carbon dioxide, which could undo previous emissions reductions. However, this report focuses on the risks of nuclear power and how to reduce them.

#### Neoliberal risk calculus replicates all impacts

Kurasawa ‘4

(Fuyuki, Assistant Prof. of Sociology @ York University, Cautionary Tales, *Constellations* Vol. 11, No. 4, Blackwell Synergy)

The variations on these themes are numerous. One is the oft-stated belief that prevention is a luxury that we can scarcely afford, or even an unwarranted conceit. Accordingly, by minimizing the urgency or gravity of potential threats, procrastination appears legitimate. Why squander time, energy, and resources to anticipate and thwart what are, after all, only hypothetical dangers? Why act today when, in any case, others will do so in the future? Why not limit ourselves to reacting to cataclysms if and when they occur? A ‘bad faith’ version of this argument goes even further by seeking to discredit, reject, or deny evidence pointing to upcoming catastrophes. Here, we enter into the domain of deliberate negligence and “culpable ignorance,”25 as manifest in the apathy of US Republican administrations toward climate change or the Clinton White House’s disengenuous and belated responses to the genocides in ex-Yugoslavia and Rwanda. At another level, instrumental-strategic forms of thought and action, so pervasive in modern societies because institutionally entrenched in the state and the market, are rarely compatible with the demands of farsightedness. The calculation of the most technically efficient means to attain a particular bureaucratic or corporate objective, and the subsequent relentless pursuit of it, intrinsically exclude broader questions of long-term prospects or negative side-effects. What matters is the maximization of profits or national self-interest with the least effort, and as rapidly as possible. Growing risks and perils are transferred to future generations through a series of trade-offs: economic growth versus environmental protection, innovation versus safety, instant gratification versus future well-being.

**Romney is making gains- momentum will continue to a win**

**Silver 10/6** “Oct. 6: Romney Maintains Poll Momentum” http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/06/oct-6-romney-maintains-poll-momentum/#more-35637

Mitt Romney continues to show improved numbers in polls published since the presidential debate in Denver on Wednesday and has now made clear gains in the FiveThirtyEight forecast. The forecast gives him roughly a 20 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from about 15 percent before the debate. Mr. Romney’s gains in the polls have been sharp enough that he should continue to advance in the FiveThirtyEight forecast if he can maintain his numbers over the next couple of days.¶ Four of the five national polls published on Saturday showed improvement for Mr. Romney. In the Rasmussen Reports tracking poll, which conducted about two-thirds of its interviews after the debate, we went from a two-point deficit against Barack Obama to a two-point lead. Mr. Romney gained two points in the Gallup tracking poll, which now shows him down by three. He also gained roughly 1.5 percentage points in the RAND Corporation’s online tracking poll, reversing a gain that Mr. Obama had made on Friday. And a companion pair of polls published by [Clarus Research Group](http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/poll-apparent-slide-for-obama-following-debate-20121005) just before and after the debate showed a five-point swing toward Mr. Romney. He trailed Mr. Obama by four points in a poll that Clarus Research Group conducted on Tuesday night, before the debate, but led him by one point in a poll they conducted on Thursday.¶ All of these national surveys except for the Clarus Research Group poll still contain some predebate interviews, meaning that they may underestimate the gains that Mr. Romney may eventually realize. This particularly holds for the Gallup and RAND Corporation tracking polls, which use seven-day filed periods; only about 30 percent of the interviews in those polls postdate the debate. In general, the surveys seem to be consistent with a universe in which Mr. Romney has been polling about evenly with Mr. Obama nationwide in interviews conducted after the debates.¶ There were few state polls published on Saturday, but a Gravis Marketing poll of Colorado also showed a sharp reversal toward Mr. Romney. He led in its newest survey, which was conducted on Thursday after the debate, by 3.5 percentage points. Although Gravis Marketing polls have had a very strong Republican lean so far this cycle, the trend in the poll is nevertheless extremely favorable for Mr. Romney, since he had trailed Mr. Obama by roughly five percentage points in a poll it conducted in September.¶

#### Obama will suffer from a modified Bradley effect – voters will tell pollsters they’ll vote, but won’t turn up without seeing real change.

Wilder ‘12

L. DOUGLAS WILDER was governor of Virginia from 1990 to 1994. He was the nation’s first elected African-American governor. 5/14/12 Obama best look for variation in ‘Bradley effect’ http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76274.html

So is the Bradley effect dead? I would argue that Team Obama should tread cautiously when looking at where the president stands in the polls. Since a variation of the Bradley effect should be anticipated.¶ The New York Times has noted this, with a recent article, “4 Years Later, Race Is Still Issue for Some Voters.”¶ One Ohio law enforcement official, John Corrigan of Jefferson County, talked about this. “Certain precincts in this county,” Corrigan said, “are not going to vote for Obama. I don’t want to say it, but we all know why.”¶ Jason Foreman, also interviewed for this article, had no trouble discussing the reason why, “I’ll say it: It’s because he’s black.”¶ The article continued describing how race in non-urban/nonsuburban areas of swing states — even those populated by union members normally supportive of Democratic candidates — still have a problem supporting Obama, due to his mixed-race heritage.¶ The article made me think of the Bradley effect — and why its classic sense from the 1980s may now be inoperative. Voters today do feel comfortable telling a pollster that they won’t vote for a minority candidate. They are able to do just this in the Times — with their names, hometowns and occupations cited.¶ That’s not the concern in what may be a modernized Bradley effect.¶ This time it’s minorities, students and marginal independent voters who are in the grasp of the effect. In 2008, those groups turned out in large numbers for Obama. When pollsters called, they proudly announced their plans to take part in a national movement — one that would elect Obama to the White House. Some seasoned election watchers questioned whether these groups would actually show up in the overwhelming numbers predicted. On Election Day, they did.¶ So Obama won. And he won big — becoming the first person, black or white, to win more that 51 percent of the vote since 1988. (He won 53 percent of the ballots cast in 2008.)¶ What about 2012?¶ When pollsters call these voting blocs now, many people will likely proclaim their continued loyalty to the president.¶ They won’t be lying to pollsters about whom they really want to vote for. The issue will be whether they actually go to the booth and vote for Obama.¶ Many voted in 2008 with the desire to see racism and racists humiliated by having a qualified black man elected president. Especially after eight years of what was not, and still is not, perceived as a successful presidency.¶ Now, many of these same voters still feel an allegiance to Obama — and he’s their theoretical choice in the election. But along with feeling some allegiance, they also may be left feeling disappointment. And that can lead to a disconnect with what pollsters hear compared with the voters who actually show up on Election Day.¶ What I am hearing from around the country is that many black and brown voters, whom the president might consider his strongest base, feel left behind, taken for granted and largely ignored.¶ The people who need jobs, help with educational costs and improved wages question when their bailout is coming. They question why they were not included in the first stimulus package. They wonder whether this is the best that can be achieved where they are concerned. They wonder why, when they ask these questions, it is considered “whining.” Yet when others make the same “noise,” they get the mother’s milk of politics: money from Washington.¶ Have the president and his administration tended astutely to the special concerns of these voters, who placed so much hope in him and his ability to make life different or better? Too often the answer I hear is, “No.”¶ Will the people who voice such sentiments storm the gates for the Republican nominee? Again, the answer I hear is, “No.”¶ But will a large portion of them feel less likely to make lines unusually long come Election Day 2012 to match what they did in 2008? The answer to that question, might be, “Yes.”¶ And with that, a version of the Bradley effect may be reborn as the Obama effect. Voters who tell pollsters the candidate they support, wanting to still be a part of a post-racial American tableau — but unmotivated to vote by former feelings of hope that saw too little real change.

#### The plan opens a space for these voters to enter the discussion. This breaks down this social invisibility. This means they’re more likely to vote. That’s Nixon and Szentes.

#### High income voters are already voting for Romney.

Zeleny 12, Jeff Zeleny, New York Times, 9/14/12, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/14/poll-obama-holds-narrow-edge-over-romney/

Mr. Obama has an advantage among likely voters of 12 percentage points among women, the poll found, while Mr. Romney holds the upper hand among men by eight percentage points. Mr. Obama leads his Republican rival across all ages of voters, except those who are 65 or older, who favor Mr. Romney by 15 percentage points.¶ The poll found that Mr. Obama holds an advantage of 21 percentage points over Mr. Romney among voters whose household income is under $50,000. Mr. Romney has an edge in higher income groups, including leading Mr. Obama by 16 percentage points among voters whose household income is more than $100,000.¶ Among a wider sample of registered voters, which included fewer voters who identified themselves as Republicans, Mr. Obama has a stronger command of the race. The poll found that 51 percent of those voters supported Mr. Obama and Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., while 43 percent supported Mr. Romney and Representative Paul D. Ryan of Wisconsin.

#### Both candidates support nuclear expansion

Wood 12

Elisa Wood September 13, 2012 What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/

Fossil fuels and renewable energy have become touchy topics in this election, with challenger Mitt Romney painting President Barack Obama as too hard on the first and too fanciful about the second – and Obama saying Romney is out of touch with energy's future. But two other significant resources, nuclear power and energy efficiency, are evoking scant debate. What gives? Nuclear energy supplies about 20 percent of US electricity, and just 18 months ago dominated the news because of Japan's Fukushima Daiichi disaster – yet neither candidate has said much about it so far on the campaign trail. Romney mentioned nuclear power only seven times in his recently released white paper, while he brought up oil 150 times. Even wind power did better with 10 mentions. He pushes for less regulatory obstruction of new nuclear plants, but says the same about other forms of energy. Obama's campaign website highlights the grants made by his administration to 70 universities for research into nuclear reactor design and safety. But while it is easy to find his ideas on wind, solar, coal, natural gas and oil, it takes a few more clicks to get to nuclear energy. The Nuclear Energy Institute declined to discuss the candidates' positions pre-election. However, NEI's summer newsletter said that both "Obama and Romney support the use of nuclear energy and the development of new reactors."

#### Polls consistently show the economy is the key issue

Galston 12

William A. Galston is the Ezra K. Zilkha Chair in Governance Studies and senior fellow at Brookings May 10, 2012

Six Months To Go: Where the Presidential Contest Stands as the General Election Begins http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/5/10%20obama%20campaign%20galston/Where%20the%20Presidential%20Contest%20Stands.pdf

Every survey finds that economic issues dominate public concerns. The most recent survey of the Pew Research Center asked respondents to rank eighteen issues on a four-point scale from “very” to “not at all” important. Eighty-six percent said that the economy was very important, with jobs a close second at 84 percent. By contrast, four hot-button social issues—immigration (42 percent), abortion (39 percent), birth control (34 percent), and gay marriage (28 percent)— came in at the bottom. While defense and foreign policy issues ranked somewhat higher than social issues, none were regarded as very important by even 60 percent of the people. And the Obama administration’s vigorous prosecution of the fight against Al Qaeda, capped by the bold decision that resulted in bin Laden’s death, seems to have neutralized the longstanding Republican advantage in this area. There is nothing at present to suggest that Republicans will be able to turn defense and foreign policy concerns into politically effective attacks on President Obama. (A major confrontation with Iran, North Korea, or China could change this, of course.) The most recent CBS/New York Times survey proceeded differently, asking respondents to select the single issue they regard as the most important. Twenty-six percent named “jobs,” and 22 percent “the economy.” No other issue broke into double digits; defense, foreign policy, and social issues barely registered.

#### More evidence – empirically proven

Stehli 11

Jean-Sébastien Stehli, 10/21 Le Figaro Newspaper, France, “Obama, Gadhafi and the Election”, http://watchingamerica.com/News/126970/obama-gadhafi-and-the-election/

Currently, only 42 percent of Americans approve of Barack Obama's performance. He has been saddled with an economy that is struggling to restart, partly thanks to Republican efforts to block any and all actions to rescue the economy. See, for example, Congress' vote last week to reject the president's jobs plan. According to the classic formula, Americans vote with their wallets. But the death of the Libyan, which didn't require the United States to get dragged into another conflict, could provide a little boost for Barack Obama's sagging popularity. Last May, just after bin Laden's death, his popularity increased to 56 percent according to a joint Pew Center-Washington Post poll — a figure that the 44th president would love to regain. But today, according to an ABC News poll, 51 percent of Americans say that the only thing that matters is the health of the economy. "The election is much more about Americans losing their jobs than about Gadhafi losing his head," explains Glen Bolger, a pollster working for Mitt Romney. Foreign policy is truly foreign for the majority of Americans. After the first Gulf War, won in 100 hours by the elder George Bush, analysts claimed that Bush would be unbeatable in the 1992 elections a year later. But the economy took a nosedive, and Bill Clinton arrived at the White House.

### Past the threshold- means can’t solve warming

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU

Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, 2010, “Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change,” pg 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows 1 have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

### And, consensus of experts agree no impact to warming

Hsu ‘10

Jeremy, Live Science Staff, July 19, pg. http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

**EPA regs can’t solve china – China and India key to solve warming**

**Hale 11**—PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow at LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics (Thomas, © 2011 Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly, 34:1 pp. 89-101, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing,” http://www.twq.com/11winter/docs/11winter\_Hale.pdf, )

Intergovernmental efforts to limit the gases that cause climate change have all but failed. After the unsuccessful 2010 Copenhagen summit, and with little progress at the 2010 Cancun meeting, it is hard to see how major emitters will agree any time soon on mutual emissions reductions that are sufficiently ambitious to prevent a substantial (greater than two degree Celsius) increase in average global temperatures. It is not hard to see why. **No deal excluding the United States and China**, which together emit more than 40 percent of the world’s greenhouse gases (GHGs), **is worth the paper it is written on**. But domestic politics in both countries effectively block ‘‘G-2’’ leadership on climate. In the United States, the Obama administration has basically given up on national cap-and-trade legislation. Even the relatively modest Kerry-Lieberman-Graham energy bill remains dead in the Senate. The Chinese government, in turn, faces an even harsher constraint. Although the nation has adopted important energy efficiency goals, the Chinese Communist Party has staked its legitimacy and political survival on raising the living standard of average Chinese. Accepting international commitments that stand even a small chance of reducing the country’s GDP growth rate below a crucial threshold poses an unacceptable risk to the stability of the regime. Although the G-2 present the largest and most obvious barrier to a global treaty, they also provide a convenient excuse for other governments to avoid aggressive action. Therefore, the international community should not expect to negotiate a worthwhile successor to the Kyoto Protocol, at least not in the near future.

## States

#### Perm do both – states can supplement federal incentives

Ben-Moshe’ 09 Financing the Nuclear renaissance: The Benefits and Potential Pitfalls of Federal and State Government Subsidies and the Future of Nuclear Power in California, Sony Ben-Moshe, JOason Crowell, Kelly Gale, Breton Peace, Brett Rosenblatt, Kelly Thomason, Energy Bar Association 2009

7. State Financing of Nuclear Energy¶ 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.¶ Florida¶ Georgia¶ Idaho¶ Iowa¶ Kansas¶ Louisiana¶ Michigan¶ Mississippi¶ North¶ Carolina¶ South¶ Carolina¶ Texas¶ Utah¶ Virginia¶ 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.159 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.¶ Additionally, certain local municipalities and counties have discussed¶ adding nuclear power to their local clean/sustainable energy initiatives. For¶ example, Calvert County in Maryland entered into an agreement with a nuclear¶ power developer providing for a fifty percent tax credit against property taxes for¶ fifteen years so long as the developer invests at least $2.5 million in¶ improvements or equipment in the county and creates at least twenty-five new¶ jobs with salaries above the county median salary.160 It is interesting to note that¶ the Calvert County action reflects a growing recognition that nuclear energy will¶ boost the number of high paying professional jobs in the markets where new¶ nuclear power plants are located.161¶ Having described a number of state-level policies aimed at spurring new¶ development, arguably the most important of all state-level policy initiatives¶ aimed at promoting development of new nuclear power plants is the same policy¶ initiative that drives renewable projects, the renewable portfolio standard, which¶ we describe in detail in the next section

#### Only the federal government can enforce compliance, create uniform standards, and fund long-term commitments.

Byrne, et al., ‘7

(John, Kristen Hughes, Lado Kurdgelashvili, Wilson Rickerson, all from the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy (CEEP), “American policy conflict in the greenhouse: Divergent trends in federal, regional, state, and local green energy and climate change policy”, 2-19-7, RSR)

Effective global mitigation of climate change will require strong leadership by national governments, including that of the US. More specifically, **national governments remain vital in mandating and enforcing compliance among diverse actors** within their jurisdiction. **Only national governments can promote uniform standards for compliance and related programs, thus ensuring achievement of policy goals with maximum fairness and minimal costs** (Rabe, 2002). **National funding also remains vital to underwrite long-term commitments** needed to meet ever more challenging climate action targets (Rabe, 2002).

#### Federal government best for nuclear power – government action needed to repair past mistakes.

Karlow, ‘6

(Edwin, PhD Department of Physics at La Sierra University, February, Physics Today, <http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_59/iss_2/11_1.shtml>, accessed 8-1-12, RSR)

The US has substantial precedence and rationale for governmental support of the next generation of nuclear power plants (see "Nuclear Power Needs Government Incentives, Says Task Force," PHYSICS TODAY, May 2005, [page 28](http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_58/iss_5/28_1.shtml)). The early commercial nuclear plants were built with direct federal subsidies and loan guarantees; an example is the Yankee Rowe nuclear power plant built in 1960 under the Atomic Energy Commission's power-demonstration reactor program. The aim of those early demonstration plants was to prove to a fledgling industry that such facilities could be built and operated economically. A significant era for US nuclear funding was the 1970s and 1980s, when nuclear units came in at costs often many times the original estimates. Some plants with billions of dollars invested were never completed. The overspending and stalled projects stemmed from government actions often in response to activists or legal maneuvering. Organizations and individuals with specific agendas took advantage of the Three Mile Island accident to exploit unrelated issues.[1](http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_59/iss_2/11_1.shtml#ref) Plants already under construction were stymied by new requirements that caused tremendous uncertainty both in building and in the actual start-up of power production. The Long Island Lighting Co's Shoreham nuclear plant, for example, was completed at a cost of $5.6 billion, brought briefly to criticality, and then decommissioned, all because of activism and political demagoguery.[2](http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_59/iss_2/11_1.shtml#ref) Today, the reasons for government loan guarantees and other support programs are somewhat different. Vendors having gained experience with overseas projects know how to build advanced nuclear plants, although some of their advanced designs have yet to be implemented. Not surprisingly, any vendor or electric utility, before investing huge amounts, would want some assurance that it would be allowed to complete the plant at a reasonable cost and then operate it. Particularly important is that safety rules and systems requirements not change drastically during construction without very compelling reasons. Given the way governmental entities contributed to the problems of past nuclear power plant construction, it is only fitting that the federal government share substantially in the investment risk. Building nuclear plants is in the nation's interest.

#### Federal government is key to offset major hurdles to construction- investors only trust federal backing due to its control over licensing and regulations.

-Solves government regulations/red tape

NEI 11

Nuclear Energy Institute, Policy Brief Financing New Nuclear Power Plants, May

Loan guarantees are important to financing new nuclear energy projects because of the enormous financial demands facing electric utilities—most of which are relatively small companies—and the business risk associated with licensing the first new nuclear facilities in many years. Nuclear energy projects are very large compared to electric utility companies. The largest electric utility building a nuclear facility has a market value of approximately $34 billion, but most are much smaller. New nuclear energy facilities are expected to cost $6 billion to $8 billion each. The relatively small electric power companies do not have the financing capability to finance nuclear power projects without project partners and limited investment incentives. The loan guarantee program helps offset the disparity in scale between the electric utilities and these large nuclear facility projects. Many regulated electric companies, especially those pursuing multiple power plant and transmission projects at the same time, may be limited in their ability to finance projects without project finance capability because of substantial pressure on credit quality and debt ratings. Electric companies in deregulated markets will be hard-pressed to build nuclear energy facilities and other large capital-intensive baseload projects except on a project finance basis, with the debt financing secured by the federal government. In addition to the magnitude of the investment challenge facing electric utilities, potential investors are concerned that new nuclear facilities could face political and regulatory risks. The risk may be low, but the potential consequences of licensing delays are high. Although the federal government has created a more efficient and predictable licensing process, which should reduce licensing risk, investors remain concerned because of the high cost and long development times for nuclear energy facilities. The industry can build investor confidence by ensuring that licensing and construction of advanced reactor designs is completed on schedule and within budget. However, since the licensing risk is a function of the federal government’s regulatory process, only the federal government—through the loan guarantee program—can offset that risk.

#### States CPs are a voter they skew the topic away from merits of energy and policy and forces us to debate every round about the USFG. Unified Actor FIAT is bad-completely unrealistic and places a huge research burden on the aff. Voter for fairness and education.

**Way too expensive for states- Obama has asked for over 100 billion.**

**Mosche 09** (Sony Ben-Mosche, Energy Law Journal, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.lw.com%2FthoughtLeadership%2Ffinancing-the-nuclear-renaissance-in-california&ei=okNwUOfuOarK0AHimYHYDQ&usg=AFQjCNF-TqH\_QJQlbBKg9k1lCAA-EglM9g)

Moreover, the sheer magnitude of debt needed to finance a multi-billion dollar reactor will likely require multiple tranches of debt designed to tap different markets in order to raise sufficient capital.22 Each tranche of debt will price construction and other risks relative to its return and expect sponsor or government support to mitigate any risk in excess of its risk profile. Some studies analyzing projected costs of construction of new nuclear power facilities indicate that due to high capital costs and cost recovery, without federal incentives and with all else remaining equal, nuclear power cannot be economically competitive with other forms of energy such as coal or natural gas.23 These simple facts alone drive an obvious conclusion: the historic single-tranche, simple lockbox project finance model, which has served renewable energy projects in the wind, solar, geothermal, ethanol, biofuel, and related spaces so well, simply will not work for new nuclear power projects without substantial customizing. The incentive structures designed to promote renewables, which are predicated on this simple project finance model and serve as the basis for many of the government subsidies that have been proposed for nuclear power, should also be substantially rethought or customized for nuclear power in order to achieve the greatest efficiency possible.2

#### California’s budget is on the brink of collapse- any new spending would devastate it. And California’s budget is key to the US economy. CNBC 12 (accessed 10/9/12 <http://www.cnbc.com/id/31923599>)

#### California is on the verge of an economic meltdown. The state, with the second highest foreclosure rate in the nation, is being hammered by the deep recession, rising unemployment and a growing multi-billion dollar budget deficit. CNBC takes you inside California's economic crisis… speaking to government officials, CEOs, economists and traders. The ramifications of a financial failure here will affect the entire US economy as well as companies and investors worldwide. And, while California may be the biggest state in trouble, it isn't alone.

#### And, California’s economic growth is key to new policies to combat greenhouse gas growth- its linear.

Roland-Holst in ‘6

[David, UC Berkely, August 2006, “Economic Growth and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation in California,” http://calclimate.berkeley.edu/Growth\_Strategies\_Full\_Report.pdf]

The California economy has an enviable record of technological progress, and the challenge presented by climate change is a new opportunity for the state to demonstrate its talent for combining advances in public policy and private sector innovation to enhance environmental quality and economic growth. This research note offers preliminary results on the link between greenhouse gas (GHG) abatement strategies and economic growth from on-going research with a forecasting model of the California economy. The Berkeley Energy and Resources (BEAR) model is a detailed empirical simulation tool that can evaluate the complex linkages between climate policy and economic activity. In the analysis presented here, eight targeted GHG emission policies are combined with an overall cap to meet the state’s targets for 2020. No specific implementation of the cap is assumed; these results can be interpreted as the result of an efficient combination of policies. Examining alternative scenarios for state climate policy over the next fifteen years, a few salient conclusions emerge:

#### And, climate change is the largest risk of extinction- happens before 2050.

U of L in ‘4

[University of Leeds, “Climate Change Threatens A Million Species with Extinction,” 7 January 2004, http://www.leeds.ac.uk/media/current/extinction.htm]

The study found that 15 to 37% of all species in the regions considered could be driven extinct from the climate change that is likely to occur between now and 2050 (i.e., for mid-range climate warming scenarios). The scientists believe that extinctions due to climate change are also likely to occur elsewhere. “If the projections can be extrapolated globally, and to other groups of land animals and plants, our analyses suggest that well over a million species could be threatened with extinction as a result of climate change,” said lead author Chris Thomas of the University of Leeds, England. “This study makes clear that climate change is the biggest new extinction threat,” said co-author Lee Hannah, at Conservation International (CI) in Washington DC. “The combination of increasing habitat loss and climate change together is particularly worrying. Increases in temperature can force a species to move toward its preferred, usually cooler, climate range. If habitat destruction has already altered those habitats, the species will have no safe haven.”

### AT: Cap K

**Perm do the plan and non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative**

**Plan reformulates capitalist risk analysis- it forces the rich to take responsibility for its excess consumption, which raises the costs of ignoring and exploiting the poor- that’s the basis of the majority of existing structural violence from cap**

**This debate is an important space for subverting ideology-only the plan unifies criticism with advocacy needed to subvert the hegemonic epistemology of capitalism**

Todd **Gordon in 2011** teaches political science at York University in Toronto, Imperialist Canada: An Interview with Todd Gordon<http://poserorprophet.wordpress.com/2011/01/27/imperialist-canada-an-interview-with-todd-gordon/>

It seems that you have spent a fair bit of time engaging themes of power, oppression, and resistance from within the domain of the Academy.  Yet the Academy itself seems to have a very close relationship to imperialist powers.  I wonder if you could spend a bit of time explaining how you view the nature of your relationship to this context.

The university system plays an important role in reproducing capitalistic and imperialistic domination, whether via scientific research contributing to militarization or ideological justifications for inequality, among other things.  That shouldn’t surprise us, given that we’re in a capitalist and imperialist country. Most of the social sciences were developed in the 19th and 20th centuries to facilitate the extension of colonialism abroad and inequality – in terms of race, class, gender, ability and so on – at home. I think though that it’s possible to carve out spaces to challenge this, and to develop alternative ideas and analyses. Historically, where successful, this has been done through mass struggle, of students and of unions. Like in other areas of society, we don’t want to concede this space to the powerful and privileged. We need to challenge them. But in doing so we need to be cognizant of the limits of the university institution – that it can potentially be a space to challenge power and inequality, but in the end it’s not a space for liberation. It can – or progressive spaces within the university can – potentially contribute to those movements of liberation, but the intellectual work I and others do can’t be a substitute for those movements, which exist within and, importantly, beyond universities in workplaces and communities.

Race and economic based explanations are both necessary to explain environmental discrimination.

Lazarus ‘94

Richard J. Lazarus Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri SYMPOSIUM: DISTRIBUTION IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: IS THERE A MIDDLE GROUND? 9 St. John's J.L. Comm. 481 SPRING, 1994

At the outset, I must abandon "the Center." It is very hard to hold on to the Center when you have Dr. Greve on the panel because he pushes things so far over that the Center ends up being pretty far to the Left. To try, nonetheless, to bring things back to the Center, what I would like to do is take up the question that Professor Gregory raised in the first instance, and that is the challenge of the very title of this panel - "Racism or Economics" - which presents a false dichotomy.

It is a misguided and false dichotomy at three different levels. The factors, racism and economics, are not mutually preclusive; they are not unrelated; and the dichotomy misapprehends what environmental justice is all about. [n1](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n1)

First, the factors are not mutually preclusive. Why not both? Why not sometimes racism, sometimes economics, and sometimes both? Why does not the possibility of "both" mean the problem may be twice as large, rather than half as large, as one might think. Why one and not the other? I do not doubt that there are instances when it is more racism than economics, and that there are instances when it is more economics than racism. But I would like to see somebody defend the thesis that it is just economics. What would make environmental protection so special that it  [\*482]  would somehow be immune from the kinds of racist attitudes ranging from the most venal to the most subconscious stereotypical decisionmaking that we know otherwise influence decisionmaking on a day to day basis? [n2](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n2)

Why should we suppose that environmental protection law policymakers are somehow unencumbered by those same kinds of attitudes? We know that such attitudes affect who is hired, who is fired in the employment sector. We know they affect where one attends school. We know they affect the level of health care that is obtained. We know that they affect the price that one pays for a car. We know that they affect the interest rate one gets for a loan. We know that they affect the extent to which one is arrested, convicted, and the sentence that one receives, including, many believe, the death sentence. We know these attitudes affect who one dates, who one marries. (I have yet to see an interracial couple on the Love Connection). [n3](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n3)

What is so special about environmental pollution and law? Why would environmental pollution and environmental protection be somehow immune from all these attitudes? [n4](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n4) Why would the distribution, the benefits, and burdens associated with it, unlike all these other well-established areas, not suffer from these same well-established tendencies? [n5](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n5) I doubt it. And I think that the recent studies that suggest there is an economic dimension to who is subject to pollution and who benefits from cleanup do not question that there is simultaneously a racial dimension.

Second, race and economics is a false dichotomy because the two are clearly interrelated. Racism and economics are not independent variables. They are dependent variables. Economics is unrelated to race no more than politics is unrelated to race, which is another false dichotomy I have seen in this area.  [\*483]

There was a notable Wall Street Journal Op-Ed piece recently, which said, "it's not racism, it's just politics." [n6](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n6) Those two are no more related or unrelated than yellow is to green. There is, at bottom, a relationship between the two. Yellow is after all part of green, and race is part of the economy. Race is part of politics.

The fact that African-Americans and persons of color generally have less economic power, less choice, are less able to resist the risks caused by environmental degradation; is that unrelated to racism? [n7](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n7) To say that their immediate cause may, in some instances, be market forces is not to say it is unrelated to race.

After all, a fairly fundamental reason why persons of color have less economic power is related to decades of de jure legalized racist laws in this country and their continuing vestiges, which cause African-Americans and other persons of color to have less economic power and less political power. [n8](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n8) It is no more sensible to say that the distribution of such power is unrelated to race than to posit that school segregation patterns are unrelated to race, and just a matter of economics. Can one fairly posit that the reason why there are fewer persons of color in the wealthy suburban schools is merely because they just do not happen to live there, because it costs more to live there? It is therefore simply the result of economics. It is not race. I doubt it.

**Their alt can’t solve without reformulating risk analysis- absent the aff forcing the rich to confront their practice of dumping environmental harm on the poor, the alt will just get coopted by rich people who buy insurance to guard their privilege against even the strongest revolution**

**Totalizing analysis of capitalism just fragments resistance- our approach is better**

**Gibson-Graham, 96** [J.K. Gibson-Graham, Professor of Human Geography at the Australian National University and Professor of Geosciences at the University of Massachusates, Amherst, 1996 (The End of Capitalism (As We Know It))]

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

Alt Fails: The alternative is a fantasy- all your impact are scare tactics that should be ignored

**Gibson-Graham, 96** [J.K. Gibson-Graham, Professor of Human Geography at the Australian National University and Professor of Geosciences at the University of Massachusates, Amherst, 1996 (The End of Capitalism (As We Know It))]

If the unity of Capitalism confronts us with the mammoth task of systemic transformation it is the singularity and totality of Capitalism that makes the task so hopeless. Capitalism presents itself as a singularity in the sense of having no peer or equivalent, of existing in a category by itself; and also in the sense that when it appears fully realized within a particular social formation, it tends to be dominant of alone. As a sui generis economic form, Capitalism has no true analogues. Slavery, independent commodity production, feudalism, socialism, primitive-communism and other forms of economy all lack the systemic properties of Capitalism and the ability to reproduce and expand themselves according to internal laws. Unlike socialism, for example, which is always struggling to be born, which needs the protection and fostering of the state, which is fragile and easily deformed, Capitalism takes on its full form as a natural outcome of an internally driven growth process. Its organic unity gives capitalism the peculiar power to regenerate itself, and even to subsume its moments of crisis as requirements of its continued growth and development. Socialism has never been endowed with that mythic capability of feeding on its own crises; its reproduction was never driven from within by a life force but always from without; it could never reproduce itself but always had to be reproduced, often an arduous if not impossible process. Other modes of production that lack the organic unity of Capitalism are more capable of being instituted or replaced incrementally and more likely to coexist with other economic forms. Capitalism by contrast tends to appear by itself. Thus, in the United States, if feudal or ancient classes exist, they exist as residual forms; if slavery exists, it exists as a marginal form if socialism or communism exists, it exists as a pre-figurative form. None of these forms truly and fully coexists with Capitalism. Where Capitalism does coexist with other forms, those places (the so-called Third World, for example, or backward regions in what are known as the “advanced capitalist” nations) are seen as not funny “developed”. Rather than signaling the real possibility of Capitalism coexisting with non-capitalist economic forms, the coexistence of capitalism with non-capitalist economic forms, the coexistence of capitalism with non-capitalism marks the Third World as insufficient and incomplete. Subsumed to the hegemonic discourse of Development, it identifies a diverse array of countries as the shadowy other of the advanced capitalist nations. One effect of the notion of capitalist exclusivity is a monolithic conception of class, at least in the context of “advanced capitalist” countries. The term “class” usually refers to a social cleavage along the axis of capital and labor since capitalism cannot coexist with any but residual or pre-figurative non-capitalist relations. The presence and fullness of the capitalist monolith not only denies the possibility of economic or class diversity in the present but prefigures a monolithic and modernist socialism – one in which everyone is a comrade and class diversity does not exist. Capitalism’s singularity operates to discourage projects to create alternative economic institutions and class relations, since these will necessarily be marginal in the context of Capitalism’s exclusivity. The inability of Capitalism to coexist thus produces not only the present impossibility of alternatives but also their future unlikelihood – pushing socialist projects to the distant and unrealizable future.

#### Neoliberal hegemony uses exceptionalism to render its violent side effects invisible, ensuring environmental destruction and global conflict- guarantees we always exercise managerialism.

Nixon ‘11

(Rob, Rachel Carson Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 33-36)

There are signs that the environmental humanities are beginning to make some tentative headway toward incorporating the impact of U.S. imperialism on the poor in the global South-Vitalis's book America's Kingdom: Mythmaking on the Saudi Oil Frontier (2008) is an outstanding instance, as are powerful recent essays by Elizabeth DeLoughrey on the literatures associated with American nuclear colonialism in the Pacific, Susie O'Brien on Native food security, colonialism, and environmental heritage along the U.S-Mexican border, and Pablo Mukherjee's groundbreaking materialist work on Indian environmental literatures,'? Yet despite such vitally important initiatives, the environmental humanities in the United States remain skewed toward nation-bound scholarship that is at best tangentially international and, even then, seldom engages the environmental fallout of U.S. foreign policy head on. What's at stake is not just disciplinary parochialism but, more broadly, what one might call superpower parochialism, that is, a combination of American insularity and America's power as the preeminent empire of the neoliberal age to rupture the lives and ecosystems of non- Americans, especially the poor, who may live at a geographical remove but who remain intimately vulnerable to the force fields of U.S. foreign policy. To be sure, the U.S. empire has historically been a variable force, one that is not monolithic but subject to ever-changing internal fracture. The U.S., moreover, has long been-and is increasingly-globalized itself with all the attendant insecurities and inequities that result. However, to argue that the United States is subject to globalization-through, for example, blowback from climate change-does not belie the disproportionate impact that U.S. global ambitions and policies have exerted over socioenvironmental landscapes internationally. Ecocritics-and literary scholars more broadly-faced with the challenges of thinking through vast differences in spatial and temporal scale commonly frame their analyses in terms of interpenetrating global and local forces. In such analyses cosmopolitanism-as a mode of being linked to particular aesthetic strategies-does much of the bridgework between extremes of scale. What critics have subjected to far less scrutiny is the role of the national-imperial as a mediating force with vast repercussions, above all, for those billions whom Mike Davis calls "the global residuum.'?" Davis's image is a suggestive one, summoning to mind the remaindered humans, the compacted leavings on whom neoliberalism's inequities bear down most heavily. Yet those leavings, despite their aggregated dehumanization in the corporate media, remain animate and often resistant in unexpected ways; indeed, it is from such leavings that grassroots antiglobalization and the environmentalism of the poor have drawn nourishment. As American writers, scholars, and environmentalists how can we attend more imaginatively how can we attend more imaginatively to the outsourced conflicts inflamed by our unsustainable consumerism, by our military adventurism and unsurpassed arms industry, and by the global environmental fallout over the past three decades of American-led neoliberal economic policies? (The immense environmental toll of militarism is particularly burdensome: in 2009, U.S. military expenditure was 46.5 percent of the global total and exceeded by 10 percent the expenditure of the next fourteen highest-ranked countries combined.)" How, moreover, can we engage the impact of our outsized consumerism and militarism on the life prospects of people who are elsewhere not just geographically but elsewhere in time, as slow violence seeps long term into ecologies-rural and urban-on which the global poor must depend for generations to come? How, in other words, can we rethink the standard formulation of neoliberalism as internationalizing profits and externalizing risks not just in spatial but in temporal terms as well, so that we recognize the full force with which the externalized risks are out sourced to the unborn? It is a pervasive condition of empires that they affect great swathes of the planet without the empire's populace being aware of that impact-indeed, without being aware that many of the affected places even exist. How many Americans are aware of the continuing socioenvironrnental fallout from U.S. militarism and foreign policy decisions made three or four decades ago in, say, Angola or Laos? How many could even place those nation-states on a map? The imperial gap between foreign policy power and on-the-street awareness calls to mind George Lamming's shock, on arriving in Britain in the early 1950s, that most Londoners he met had never heard of his native Barbados and lumped together all Caribbean immigrants as Jamaicans.'?' What I call superpower parochialism has been shaped by the myth of American exceptionalism and by a long-standing indifference-in the U.S. educational system and national media-to the foreign, especially foreign history, even when it is deeply enmeshed with U.S. interests. Thus, when considering the representational challenges posed by transnational slow violence, we need to ask what role American indifference to foreign history has played in camouflaging lasting environmental damage inflicted elsewhere. If all empires create acute disparities between global power and global knowledge, how has America's perception of itself as a young, forward-thrusting nation that claims to flourish by looking ahead rather than behind exacerbated the difficulty of socioenvironmental answerability for ongoing slow violence?" Profiting from the asymmetrical relations between a domestically regulated environment and unregulated environments abroad is of course not unique to America, But since World War II, the United States has wielded an unequalled power to bend the global regulatory climate in its favor. As William Finnegan notes regarding the Washington Consensus, "while we make the world safe for multinational corporations, it is by no means clear that they intend to return the favor."? The unreturned favor weighs especially heavily on impoverished communities in the global South who must stake their claims to environmental justice in the face of the Bretton Woods institutions (the World Bank, the IMF), the World Trade Organization, and the G8 (now G20) over which the United States has exercised disproportionate influence. That influence has been exercised, as well, through muscular conservation NGOs (the Nature Conservancy, the World Wild- life Fund, and Conservation International prominent among them) that have a long history of disregarding local human relations to the environment in order to implement American- and European-style conservation agendas. Clearly, the beneficiaries of such power asymmetries are not just American but transnational corporations, NGOs, and governments from across the North's rich nations, often working hand-in-fist with authoritarian regimes.

Case: