#### Extra Topicality isn’t a voting issue

#### A. Increases NEG ground through DA links

#### B. They can always CP out or simply sever extra-topical parts

#### C. Increases policy analysis and education – every plan includes some extra topical part

REASONABILITY K:

NOT EFFECTS T

The K fails to account for the complexity of the decision making process in Native American tribes. Siding solely with the environmental movement fails to interrogate the larger problems involved in decisions about mines and waste storage.

Yamamoto and Lyman 1

Eric K, Hawaii Law School law prof., and Jen-L W, UC Berkeley visiting law prof., University of Colorado Law Review, 72 U. Colo. L. Rev. 311, Spring, p. 311-313, ln

For example, as Native communities endeavor to ameliorate conditions of poverty and social dislocation by encouraging the economic development of tribal lands, some increasingly find themselves in conflict with environmentalists, who are sometimes but not always environmental justice advocates. In the mining industry, several Native American tribes are attempting to tap mineral resources on their reservations. [n50](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937#n50) Urged by the increased emphasis on economic self-determination in federal Native American policy in the 1970s, the tribes formed the Council of Energy Resource Tribes to deal  [\*322]  with both the siting of new mines on Native American lands and the environmental and the cultural problems that might result. [n51](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937#n51) Those efforts met stiff opposition from some environmental groups concerned mainly with land degradation and pollution. The environmentalists' seeming lack of understanding of the economic and cultural complexity of the Native American groups' decisions have led some Native Americans to express cynicism about environmentalists who sometimes treat them as mascots for the environmental cause. [n52](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937#n52)

#### We cannot condemn all decisions to store nuclear waste as misguided and wrong. We should at least consider the notion that Native Americans are making calculated decisions balancing social and economic needs with health and environmental concerns.

Yamamoto and Lyman 1

Eric K, Hawaii Law School law prof., and Jen-L W, UC Berkeley visiting law prof., University of Colorado Law Review, 72 U. Colo. L. Rev. 311, Spring, p. 311-313, ln

Some commentators on environmental racism treat the meaning of race with sophistication. [n101](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n101) The established framework, however, tends to engender formal-race analysis and thus to encourage writing about environmental racism without  [\*329]  explanation of, or sometimes even use of, the term, "race." [n102](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n102) By not acknowledging race and racial context, these writings are limited. However otherwise illuminating, they do not address: (1) racial groups' (or subgroups') differing understandings of "the environment," and of "race" itself; (2) groups' differing spiritual, cultural, and economic connections to the environment; and (3) the importance of the environment to the groups' identities. By treating all racial groups alike, they fail to provide analytical and organizational frameworks for understanding specific environmental justice problems and for tailoring actual remedies to meet the needs and goals of different racial communities. The writings tend to embody a one-size-fits-all approach, overlooking distinct historical experiences of particular communities of color and their current cultural and economic concerns. [n103](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n103)

In doing so, the writings sometimes ignore the distinct sovereignty-based claims of Native Americans. [n104](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n104) For example,  [\*330]  stories of waste disposal on Native American reservations recently inspired a series of derisively titled news articles, "Dances with Garbage." [n105](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n105) The Campo Band in California decided to build a waste landfill on its reservation, sparking vehement protest not from tribal members, but from non-Native local residents. [n106](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n106) In New Mexico, the Mescalero Apaches are negotiating with a private company to locate a monitored, retrievable storage nuclear waste facility on their lands, inciting the wrath of non-Native neighbors. [n107](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n107)

These stories turn sideways traditional environmentalist notions of Native Americans as the primitive foot soldiers in the war against pollution. The disputes also destabilize the conventional wisdom of the environmental justice movement that opposes as discriminatory the siting of the same sort of waste disposal facilities that some Native tribes are cautiously inviting onto their lands. [n108](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n108) Viewed paternalistically, the question might be: Are the tribes acting against their better judgment, imperiling both the environment and themselves? Viewed critically, the question might be different: Are the tribes, after calculation, exercising rights of self-determination  [\*331]  in order to build an economic base to assure cultural and political survival?

Context is key here in framing the relevant question. In the Campo Band's situation, poverty, poor land quality, and location played important roles. [n109](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n109) But other factors contributed, including the tribe's ability to dictate contractual terms, to establish health and safety standards [n110](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n110) and, significantly, to counter the ongoing assault on tribal economic sovereignty by non-Natives outside the reservation. [n111](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n111) According to their attorneys, the major problem facing tribes seeking to build commercial waste disposal projects is not the "environment," but "power and race." [n112](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n112) The "clear implication [from outsiders] is that Indians lack the intelligence to balance and protect adequately their own economic and environmental interests. [But w]e need the support and understanding of the environmental community, not its protection." [n113](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348080173825&returnToKey=20_T15565693953&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.92817.33560959937" \l "n113) Contextual analysis, thus, reveals different questions: How might a tribe's decision to site such a facility on its lands enhance tribal efforts to improve education, health, elder care, housing, and care for other tribal lands? With what social and economic tradeoffs? And who should make the judgment call?

#### 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.

#### Nuclear facilities are the main substitute in a carbon-free model

Verrastro 10 (The Geopolitics of Energy: Emergin trends, changing landscape, uncertain times, October 2010, Frank Verrastro/Sarah Ladislaw/Mathew Frank/Lisa Hyland, Center for Strategic International Studies, <http://dspace.cigilibrary.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/30101/1/The%20Geopolitics%20of%20Energy.pdf?1>) JD

Based on efforts to promote the use of environmentally “cleaner” (i.e., emissions-free or low-emission) fuels, a similar case can be made for the expansion of nuclear energy use on a global scale. Nuclear reactors are a proven and reliable source of clean energy, accounting for a majority of the emissions-free electricity that is produced around the world today. Though reactors presently account for 6 percent of current global energy consumption, the construction of nuclear facilities is expected to grow substantially under certain carbon-constrained projections-not only to replace facilities that are due to be decommissioned in the next few decades, but also to meet incremental increases in demand for electricity.

#### Nuclear is the only option quick enough to reverse the impacts of warming

McCarthy 4 (Michael McCarthy, Lovelock: 'Only nuclear power can now halt global warming'¶ Published May 23 2004 by [Independent UK](http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/environment/story.jsp?story=524313), Archived May 23 2004, <http://www.energybulletin.net/node/320>) JD

On that basis, he says, there is simply not enough time for renewable energy, such as wind, wave and solar power - the favoured solution of the Green movement - to take the place of the coal, gas and oil-fired power stations whose waste gas, carbon dioxide (CO2), is causing the atmosphere to warm. He believes only a massive expansion of nuclear power, which produces almost no CO2, can now check a runaway warming which would raise sea levels disastrously around the world, cause climatic turbulence and make agriculture unviable over large areas. He says fears about the safety of nuclear energy are irrational and exaggerated, and urges the Green movement to drop its opposition.¶ In today's Independent, Professor Lovelock says he is concerned by two climatic events in particular: the melting of the Greenland ice sheet, which will raise global sea levels significantly, and the episode of extreme heat in western central Europe last August, accepted by many scientists as unprecedented and a direct result of global warming

#### 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.
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### 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.