Their prolif bad impacts are all based on racist assumptions about Third World nukes that apply equally to the Western bomb- you should be suspicious of all their impact claims

Gusterson ’99, (Hugh, Anthropologist @ MIT, Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the Western Imagination, *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 14, No. 1 Feb. 1999 pp. 111-143, JSTOR)

Following Anthony Giddens (1979), I define ideology as a way of constructing political ideas, institutions, and behavior which (***1***) makes the political structures and institutions created by dominant social groups, classes, and nations appear to be naturally given and inescapable rather than socially constructed; (2) presents the interests of elites as if they were universally shared; (3) obscures the connections between different social and political antagonisms so as to inhibit massive, binary confrontations (i.e., revolutionary situations); and (4) legitimates domination. The Western discourse on nuclear proliferation is ideological in all four of these senses: (***1***) it makes the simultaneous ownership of nuclear weapons by the major powers and the absence of nuclear weapons in Third World countries seem natural and reasonable while problematizing attempts by such countries as India, Pakistan, and Iraq to acquire these weapons; (2) it presents the security needs of the established nuclear powers as if they were everybody's; (3) it effaces the continuity between Third World countries' nuclear deprivation and other systematic patterns of deprivation in the underdeveloped world in order to inhibit a massive north-south confrontation; and (4) it legitimates the nuclear monopoly of the recognized nuclear powers. In the following pages I examine four popular arguments against horizontal nuclear proliferation and suggest that all four are ideological and orientalist. The arguments are that (***1***) Third World countries are too poor to afford nuclear weapons; (2) deterrence will be unstable in the Third World; (3) Third World regimes lack the technical maturity to be trusted with nuclear weapons; and (4) Third World regimes lack the political maturity to be trusted with nuclear weapons. Each of these four arguments could as easily be turned backwards and used to delegitimate Western nuclear weapons, as I show in the following commentary. Sometimes, in the specialized literature of defense experts, one finds frank discussion of near accidents, weaknesses, and anomalies in deterrence as it has been practiced by the established nuclear powers, but these admissions tend to be quarantined in specialized discursive spaces where the general public has little access to them and where it is hard to connect them to the broader public discourse on nuclear proliferation.(FN7) In this article I retrieve some of these discussions of flaws in deterrence from their quarantined spaces and juxtapose them with the dominant discourse on the dangers of proliferation in order to destabilize its foundational assumption of a secure binary distinction between "the West" and "the Third World." It is my argument that, in the production of this binary distinction, possible fears and ambivalences about Western nuclear weapons are purged and recast as intolerable aspects of the Other. This purging and recasting occurs in a discourse characterized by gaps and silences in its representation of our own nuclear weapons and exaggerations in its representation of the Other's. Our discourse on proliferation is a piece of ideological machinery that transforms anxiety-provoking ambiguities into secure dichotomies.

Prolif good arguments avoid orientalist rhetoric and provide regional stability- they are the alternative to neo-colonial nuclear hierarchies

Gusterson ’99, (Hugh, Anthropologist @ MIT, Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the Western Imagination, *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 14, No. 1 Feb. 1999 pp. 111-143, JSTOR)

So, where does this leave us? This article has set out to critique not a particular policy but the way our conversations about policy choices on the nuclear issue may unthinkingly incorporate certain neocolonial hierarchies and assumptions that, when drawn to our attention, many of us would disown. Nor is this just a matter of policing language, for the embedded orientalist assumptions I have been critiquing here underpin a global security regime that sanctifies a particular kind of Western military dominance in the world. Because I have set out to criticize a particular kind of policy talk rather than a specific policy, I will conclude not with a prescribed policy but by suggesting that there are three different discursive positions on proliferation, each pointing in the direction of a very different global security regime, that do not embody the double standard I have been concerned to criticize here. I call them "exclusion," "participation," and "renunciation."     The strategy of exclusion is based pragmatically in the conventions of realpolitik. It involves the candid declaration that, while nuclear weapons may be no more dangerous in the hands of Muslims or Hindus than in those of Christians, they are a prerogative of power, and the powerful have no intention of allowing the powerless to acquire them. This is a position that, in its rejection of easy racism and phony moralism, is at least honorable in its frankness. It is the position of New York Times columnist Flora Lewis in her remark that "the 'rights' of nations are limited, and the limits must be imposed by those who can. They may not be more virtuous, but they must strive for it. That is the reason to keep insisting on nonproliferation" (1990:23). The second position, participation, is based on Kenneth Waltz's argument that all countries benefit from acquiring nuclear weapons. This position may have more appeal in certain parts of the Third World than in the West. It is the position of India, Israel, and Pakistan, for example, who have, like the older nuclear nations, sought to maximize their power and freedom by acquiring a nuclear capability. These countries pursued nuclear weapons in search of greater security vis-à-vis regional rivals and out of a desire to shift the balance of power in their client relationships with the superpowers.

REPROCESSING

# 2AC Renewables Trade-Off DA

Current investments sufficient signal to alter investment trends

Biello 2012 (David Biello, journalist at Scientific American, April 19, 2012, Missourians for a Better Energy Future, http://www.moenergyfuture.org/news/small-reactors-make-a-bid-to-revive-nuclear-power/)

Small may be beautiful for the nuclear power industry So argue a host of would-be builders of novel nuclear reactors. While the U.S. government has not given up on investing in large units that boast conventional designs, the Department of Energy has also announced the availability of $450 million in funds to support engineering and licensing of so-called "small modular reactors."¶ "The Obama Administration and the Energy Department are committed to an all-of-the-above energy strategy that develops every source of American energy, including nuclear power," said Secretary of Energy Steven Chu in a statement announcing the funding, which aims to get such modular reactors hooked into the grid by 2022. "The Energy Department and private industry are working to position America as the leader in advanced nuclear energy technology and manufacturing."

#### Only trades off with FF

Loudermilk 2011 (Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375)

Pursuing a carbon-free world Realistically speaking, a world without nuclear power is not a world full of increased renewable usage, but rather, of fossil fuels instead. The 2007 Japanese Kashiwazaki-Kariwa nuclear outage is an excellent example of this, as is Germany’s post-Fukushima decision to shutter its nuclear plants, which, despite immense development of renewable options, will result in a heavier reliance on coal-based power as its reactors are retired, leading to a 4% increase in annual carbon emissions. On the global level, without nuclear power, carbon dioxide emissions from electricity generation would rise nearly 20% from nine to eleven billion tons per year. When examined in conjunction with the fact that an estimated 300,000 people per year die as a result of energy-based pollutants, the appeal of nuclear power expansion grows further.¶ As the world copes simultaneously with burgeoning power demand and the need for clean energy, nuclear power remains the one consistently viable option on the table. With this in mind, it becomes even more imperative to make nuclear energy as safe as possible, as quickly as possible—a capacity which SMRs can fill with their high degree of safety and security. Additionally, due to their modular nature, SMRs can be quickly constructed and deployed widely. While this is not to say that small reactors should supplant large ones, the US would benefit from diversification and expansion of the nation’s nuclear energy portfolio.

#### Key to renewables penetration

Loudermilk 2011 (Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375)

Limitations of renewables Renewable energy technologies have made great strides forward during the last decade. In an increasingly carbon emissions and greenhouse gas (GHG) aware global commons, the appeal of solar, wind, and other alternative energy sources is strong, and many countries are moving to increase their renewable electricity generation. However, despite massive expansion on this front, renewable sources struggle to keep pace with increasing demand, to say nothing of decreasing the amount of energy obtained from other sources.¶ The continual problem with solar and wind power is that, lacking efficient energy storage mechanisms, it is difficult to contribute to baseload power demands. Due to the intermittent nature of their energy production, which often does not line up with peak demand usage, electricity grids can only handle a limited amount of renewable energy sources—a situation which Germany is now encountering. Simply put, nuclear power provides virtually carbon-free baseload power generation, and renewable options are unable to replicate this, especially not on the scale required by expanding global energy demands.¶ Small nuclear reactors, however, like renewable sources, can provide enhanced, distributed, and localized power generation. As the US moves towards embracing smart grid technologies, power production at this level becomes a critical piece of the puzzle. Especially since renewable sources, due to sprawl, are of limited utility near crowded population centers, small reactors may in fact prove instrumental to enabling the smart grid to become a reality.¶

#### Prevents investment crash

Aflaki 2012 (Sam Aflaki, Assistant Professor Operations Management & Information Technology at HEC Paris, and Serguei Netessine, The Timken Chaired Professor of Global Technology and Innovation, Professor of Technology and Operations Management, Research Director of the INSEAD-Wharton, June 1, 2012, “Strategic Investment in Renewable Energy Sources,” INSEAD Working Paper, http://www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/research/doc.cfm?did=49970)

Overall, our analysis indicates that the intermittency of renewable energy sources is a problematic feature that handicaps investment decisions in these technologies. Although raising carbon taxes is meant to improve the attractiveness of renewables, we show that this is probably not an effective policy. A more effective approach to increasing capacity investment in renewables would be to reduce intermittency. There are various options to achieve this goal. The first option is storage, for which various (relatively new technologies) are available.13 These technologies include pumped- storage hydropower, which stores electricity in the form of potential energy, and pumped heat electricity storage, which uses argon gas to store power in the form of heat. There are many recent papers that consider the problem of optimal storage policies while taking installed generation capacity as fixed (for a comprehensive review, see Faghih et al. 2012). Other options besides storage include the “curtailing” of intermittent generation (as described in Wu and Kapuscinski 2012) and the pooling of multiple generation units (possibly with different technologies) whose supply is not perfectly correlated. This latter approach may be possible only for large generators with enough resources to invest in multiple wind farms in different geographical regions. So even though there are no economies of scale in wind electricity generation, clearly there are statistical economies of scale in terms of reduced intermittency. Our analysis is a first step toward further research on an integrated framework that will combine these solutions with an explanation of how long- run capacity decisions are affected by the cost structure of renewables. Our results suggest the possibility of additional value to these solutions if generation capacity decisions are taken into account.

#### Global investment solves

Cuttino 2012 (Phyllis Cuttino, Director of the Pew Clean Energy Program, May 15, 2012, “The Future of Renewable Energy Is Bright,” National Journal, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/boom-and-bust-renewable-energy.php)

Similarly, U.S. policy uncertainty will not deter other markets from flourishing. China, India, Brazil, and other emerging economies have strong and consistent clean energy policies to encourage private investment in and deployment of clean energy. These are the markets where most of the 2 billion people without modern energy services live and where demand growth will be greatest in the next 20 to 30 years. Clean energy offers African countries, for example, the opportunity to provide electricity to households and communities without transmission wires, just as cell phones allowed that continent to leapfrog landline phones. Residential solar already is the cheapest energy option in many parts of the world.

#### Renewables fail

Forsberg 2011 (Charles Forsberg, executive director of the MIT Nuclear Fuel Cycle Study in the Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering at MIT and former Corporate Fellow at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, October 6, 2011, “What alternatives to nuclear energy?,” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/roundtables/nuclear-energy-different-other-energy-sources#rt8801)

For those opposed to nuclear energy, the belief is that there are alternative energy sources -- a faith in alternatives, ironically, as strong as some of the early advocates for nuclear power in the 1950s. But no such options exist in a world that will soon have 10 billion people (see Forsberg, "Mutually Assured Energy Independence"). That fundamental reality dictates the need for nuclear energy.¶ Climate change, fossil fuels, and famine. We have fossil fuels; however, the burning of fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere with the potential for large changes in (1) climate and (2) pH (acidity) of water and soil. Both threaten agricultural productivity, because the changing climate moves agriculture to less productive soils. A consistent climate is critical in the formation of fertile soils -- a several-thousand-year process. Climate change also may entail rebuilding much of man’s infrastructure, which is designed for specific climate and sea-level conditions. Betting on fossil fuels is a high-risk strategy for world agriculture and food supplies. While carbon dioxide sequestration will work in a few locations, it's unlikely to be a universal solution.¶ Renewables: latitude counts. We live on a globe circling the sun that creates seasons. That reality means that renewable systems must address how to store energy on a daily, weekly, and seasonal basis. It also drives the design of future energy systems.¶ At MIT, we examined electricity-storage requirements for California assuming three energy futures: (1) all electricity produced by nuclear reactors operating at constant output, (2) all electricity produced by wind assuming California wind conditions and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) wind model, and (3) all electricity produced by solar using the NREL solar-trough model that includes limited energy storage. Table 1 shows the fraction of electricity that has to go into storage at times of excess electricity production to provide electricity when demand exceeds supply.¶ The hourly storage requirements were determined by using the hourly demand curves for electricity and the hourly electricity outputs of solar or wind or nuclear in California. The weekly storage requirements assumed that smart grids, pumped storage, and other technologies could result in each week having a uniform electricity demand, but different weeks have different electricity demands. It is thus a measure of the seasonal storage requirements that needs to be identified, assuming different energy sources with seasonal storage requirements measured in 10s to 100s of gigawatts per year depending upon the electricity prod uction technology.¶ Two-thirds of our electricity is base-load electricity; base-load nuclear energy has low electricity storage requirements. The storage requirements for solar and wind, however, are higher. In fact, the situation is even worse than indicated in Table 1, because the calculations assumed perfect storage systems. Real seasonal storage systems have just 50 percent efficiency but may ultimately increase to 70 percent. In other words, serious wind and solar energy initiatives require massive seasonal storage systems.¶ There are seasonal energy storage technologies being developed, such as nuclear-geothermal gigawatts per year and hydrogen systems. In a nuclear-geothermal energy storage system at times of low electricity demand, nuclear energy is used to heat a 500-meter cube of rock a kilometer or more underground to create an artificial geothermal heat source for peak power production. However, there is no way to insulate rock a kilometer underground. The heat losses are only a few percent on a large system but prohibitive in smaller systems -- that is, it is a technology that only couples to large-scale nuclear energy.¶ The potentially viable seasonal electricity storage technologies (including hydrogen) either couple to nuclear plants or involve synergistic combinations of nuclear and renewables -- but viable storage technologies do not couple efficiently to wind and solar. Renewable advocates point to Denmark and Germany -- countries whose wind systems depend upon Scandinavian hydro. However, there is not enough hydro worldwide to make a serious dent in the storage challenge. An all-renewables world will remain unaffordable -- even if the cost of renewables drop because of the larger challenge of energy storage to match production with demand.¶ Conclusions. Our energy challenge requires nuclear and renewables -- technologies that are complementary in many applications. Energy is over 10 percent of the global GNP, so economics matters because mankind needs more than energy to prosper. The risks of nuclear energy are small compared with the alternatives of oil wars, climate change, or unaffordable energy.

#### No impact to CO2

Cunningham 2010 (Walter Cunningham, National Aeronautics and Space Administration - pilot of Apollo 7, graduate degrees from UCLA in physics and the Harvard Graduate School of Business, member of the Advisory Board for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2010 “Global Warming: Facts Versus Faith,” Science and Public Policy Institute, online)

More than 31,000 scientists in the United States have signed a petition saying “there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.”3 Debating Carbon DioxideThe advocates of AGW say the United States must impose a devastating tax scheme to force industry to emit less carbon dioxide, thereby reversing the warming trend. This policy prescription is based on three assumptions: (1) that CO2 is the cause of changes in the Earth’s temperature; (2) that a warmer Earth would be bad for the planet’s flora and fauna, including humans; and (3) that humans are capable of controlling the temperature of the Earth.In reality, water vapor has more than twice the impact on temperature as atmospheric CO2, aided and abetted by other greenhouse gases, like methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O). With CO2 representing just 3.6 percent of greenhouse gases, by volume, and human activity responsible for only 3.2 percent of that, we can influence only a tiny portion of the total greenhouse gases. Some studies have found CO2 levels are largely irrelevant to global warming. The true believers in AGW base their case on a broad and weak correlation between CO2 and global temperature in the last half of the twentieth century. They cannot be sure which is cause and which is effect. Looking at much longer periods of the Earth’s history, it becomes clear that temperature increases have preceded high CO2 levels by anywhere from 100 to 800 years, suggesting that higher temperatures cause CO2 levels to rise, rather than vice versa. The only other time in history that temperature and CO2 levels were this low, together, was 300 million years ago. There have been periods when atmospheric CO2 levels were as much as 16 times higher than they are now—periods characterized not by warming but by glaciations. (See Figure 4.) You might have to go back half-a-million years to match our current level of atmospheric CO2, but you have to go back only to the Medieval Warm Period, from the tenth to the fourteenth century, to find an intense global warming episode, followed immediately by the drastic cooling of the Little Ice Age. Neither of those events can be attributed to variations in CO2 levels. Since CO2 is a relatively minor constituent of “greenhouse gases,” and human activity contributes only a tiny portion of atmospheric CO2, why have alarmists made it the whipping boy for global warming? Probably because they know how fruitless it would be to propose controlling other atmospheric drivers of climate—water, methane, and nitrous oxide—notto mention volcanic eruptions, or ocean temperature, or solar activity, etc. So they wage war on man-made CO2, no matter how ridiculous it makes them appear. Without the greenhouse effect to keep our world warm, the planet would have an average temperature of -18 degrees Celsius. Because we do have it, the temperature is a comfortable +15 degrees Celsius. Other inconvenient facts ignored by the activists: Carbon dioxide is a non-polluting gas that is essential for plant photosynthesis. Higher concentrations of CO2 in the atmosphere produce bigger crop harvests and larger and healthier forests— results environmentalists used to like.

### 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 capitalisticand 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. Mostof 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, butthe intellectual workI and others do can’t be a substitute for those movements, which exist within and, importantly, beyond universitiesin 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.

# Case

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.
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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.
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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?