**1NC**

**Pingry negates**

**First framing**

**Prioritize impacts that alleviate violence against Indigenous people. Two warrants**

**First is policymaker bias. Risk assessment and the evaluation of impacts is inherently biased towards privileged policymakers who have crafted a system of decision making biased to their own understandings and experiences, discounting the severity of everyday violence against the Indigenous**

### **Him ‘22** Deana Around Him, Deana Around Him, DrPH, ScM, is a research scholar leading the development of Child Trends’ applied research agenda to advance the well-being of Indigenous children, youth, and families, et al. “Federal Policies That Contribute to Racial and Ethnic Health Inequities and Potential Solutions for Indigenous Children, Families, and Communities.” ChildTrends, Nov. 2022, www.childtrends.org/publications/federal-policies-contribute-racial-ethnic-health-inequities-potential-solutions-indigenous-children-families-communities.

### 

### **Federal Effort**s to Achieve Racial and Ethnic Equity for Indigenous Peoples**Should Emphasize Decolonization and Support Tribal Sovereignty** and Self-determination Much of **federal policy**, statute, and case law (especially Federal Indian Law and past and present policies) **affects the health of Indigenous Nations**, Peoples, and communities **in the United States** and U.S. territories. **Colonization**, which **is** ongoing and **pervasive in federal policy**, continues to [negatively affect the health](https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Indigenous+Peoples+and+Colonialism%3A+Global+Perspectives-p-9780745672519) of Indigenous Peoples and communities. Relationships between Indigenous Peoples and foreign governments [began with treaties](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Nation_to_Nation/M8NvDwAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0) (many which have since been broken) **and continue** today **in case law, statute, and policy. This body of policy**, also known as [Federal Indian Law](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Handbook_of_Federal_Indian_Law/0ywwE-r3ELcC?hl=en&gbpv=0), **directly impacts the health of Indigenous communities** (Image 1). Research**] demonstrates a loss of both sovereignty and the ability for Indigenous Peoples to practice their self-determinatio**n (defined by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the right of Peoples to “[freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development](https://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html)”) in Indigenous communities.

Indigenous Nations are [inherently sovereign](https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1525/ae.2005.32.2.239) based on their governments’ existence prior to colonization; however, Federal Indian Law places [“practical” limits on Tribal sovereignty](https://scholarworks.alaska.edu/bitstream/handle/11122/10492/Gordon_H_2019.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y), in that the U.S. government provides their own interpretation of how it can exist. The U.S. federal government [only recognizes the sovereignty of 574 Tribal Nations](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/01/28/2022-01789/indian-entities-recognized-by-and-eligible-to-receive-services-from-the-united-states-bureau-of). Dozens more Tribes are unrecognized by the federal government and may be [working toward recognition](https://www.bia.gov/as-ia/ofa), including some Tribes that lost recognition during [the Termination Era](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED277536) (1945-1960)—when the federal government took away federal recognition and land in an attempt to dissolve Tribal governments and assimilate their populations (Native Hawaiians, Other Pacific Islanders, and Taino descendants do not have any federal recognition of their sovereignty) Earlier case law also aimed to take land. Three U.S. Supreme Court cases known as the [Marshall Trilogy](https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/guild65&div=26&id=&page=) ([Johnson v. McIntosh in 1823](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/21/543), [Cherokee Nation v. Georgia in 1831](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/30/1), and [Worcester v. Georgia in 1832](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/31/515)) took Indigenous lands through the [Doctrine of Discovery](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/doctrine_of_discovery#:~:text=The%20doctrine%20of%20discovery%20refers,acquires%20rights%20on%20that%20land.). The cases [limited who Tribes could sell or cede land to](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/21/543) (only the federal government); characterized Tribes as “[domestic dependent nations](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/30/1)” and related them to the United States as a “[ward to his guardian](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/30/1),” such that the United States had trustee responsibilities to protect their resources and well-being and provide educational services; and determined that, although considered “dependent” on the U.S. government, Tribes have the “[right to self-government](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/31/515).” While these cases restricted the external powers of Indigenous Peoples, they also recognized limited but persistent Tribal sovereignty over Tribal lands and members. In 1886, the U.S. Supreme Court decided [United States v. Kagama](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/118/375), which gave the U.S. Congress “plenary power” to extinguish Tribal sovereignty (in the practical sense) at any time. Beyond limiting sovereignty, **federal policy has** also **caused great harm to Indigenous Peoples’ health and well-being through** [warfare](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Massacres_of_the_Mountains/vjdQ7sVCmHMC?hl=en&gbpv=0),[**disease**](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Beyond_Germs/LlpcCgAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0), [deceitful treaties](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Nation_to_Nation/M8NvDwAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0),[**slavery**](https://read.dukeupress.edu/ethnohistory/article-abstract/64/1/91/63354/Why-Shall-Wee-Have-Peace-to-Bee-Made-Slaves-Indian)**, and forced relocation**—practices [considered justified by the Doctrine of Discovery](https://escholarship.org/content/qt3cj6w4mj/qt3cj6w4mj.pdf?t=po79hi). The [Indian Removal Act of 1830](https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/jacksons-message-to-congress-on-indian-removal) forced tens of thousands of American Indians from their homelands in the southeastern United States to lands roughly 1,000 miles away. Thousands died from disease, winter weather, and starvation along what is now described as the [Trail of Tears](https://books.google.je/books?id=xyS9GtYci7IC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false). The [1887 Dawes Act](https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/dawes-act) further disrupted Indigenous communities when it deliberately broke up reservation land and sold it to non-Native people. In 1968, Congress passed the [Indian Civil Rights Act (ICRA)](https://www.law.cornell.edu/topn/indian_civil_rights_act_of_1968), which described the limited governmental powers Indigenous Nations are allowed to possess, according to their colonizer, the U.S. government.

**Centering discussions ignored by utilitarian calculus educates debaters in round which educates them on how to look at policymaking in the future. Debate has real-world implications to our relationship with marginalized communities, evidenced by the many debaters who have become advocates.**

**Second is slow violence. Conventional interpretations of violence are event focused and time bound, which causes us to severely misevaluate how much harm we actually do.**

**Hughes-04** (Nancy Scheper-Hughes, Phillipe Bourgois, 2004, [Hughes is Chancellor’s Professor of Anthropology @ Berkeley, Co-Founder & Director @ Organs Watch, B.A. & P.hD @ Berkeley, Postdoc @ Harvard; Bourgeois is Professor of Anthropology @ UCLA, Richard Perry University Professor @ UPenn, P.hD & M.A. @ Stanford, B.A. @ Harvard],  “Introduction: Making Sense of Violence,”  Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology. http://www.philippebourgois.net/articles/Scheper-Hughes%20et%20al%202004%20Introduction.pdf //vy)

We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such **existential** leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even **greater** **risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves**, in **misrecognizing** **protogenocidal** **practices** and **sentiments daily enacted** as **normative behavior** by “**ordinary” good-enough citizens**. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), **constitute** the “**small wars and invisible genocides**” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. These are “**invisible**” **genocides** **not because** they are **secreted away** or **hidden from view**, but **quite** the **opposite**. As Wittgenstein observed, the **things that are hardest** to **perceive** **are** **those which are right before our eyes** and **therefore taken for granted.** In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially **the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror** and s**tate repression**, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. **Peacetime** **crimes** **suggests** the **possibility** that **war crimes** are **merely ordinary, everyday crimes** of **public** **consent** **applied** **systematically** and **dramatically** in the **extreme context of war**. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible. Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States **are** needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002). In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include,therefore, all expressions of radical **social exclusion, dehumanization**, **depersonal**- **ization**, **pseudospeciation**, and **reification** **which normalize atrocious behavio**r and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm -of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life. The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence.Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families.  Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence **that is** **often** “**nus-recognized**” for **something** **else**, usually something good. **Everyday violence** is **similar** to what Taussig (1989) calls “**terror as usual.**” All these terms are **meant to reveal a public secret** - the **Hidden links between violence** in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989). Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate. While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They **harbor** the **early “warning signs**” (Charney 1991), the “**priming**” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “**genocidal** **continuum**” (as we call it) **that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms** of **human** **life** and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the **militarization** of **everyd**ay life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization).

**The impact is never-ending, slow violence—that’s a threat multiplier and outweighs existential impacts**

**Nixon** **11** – Currie C. and Thomas A. Barron Family Professor in the Humanities and the Environment, MPhil and PhD at Columba [Rob, Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 2-3, DKP]

Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink-politically, imaginatively, and theoretically-what I call "slow violence." By **slow violence** I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of **delayed destruction** that is **dispersed across time and space**, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. Violence is customarily conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility. We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. **The long dyings-the staggered** and staggeringly discounted **casualties**, both human and ecological that result from war's toxic aftermaths or climate change-are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, **requires rethinking** our accepted **assumptions** of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that **we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as** a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is **event focused, time bound**, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions-from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, **slow violence is** often not just attritional but also exponential, operating as **a** **major threat multiplier; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts** in situations where the conditions for sustaining life become increasingly but gradually degraded.

**Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to vote for the team who best prevents the destruction of Indigenous communities and way of life**

**Our Sole Contention is Protecting Indigenous Communities**

**Nuclear energy is on the decline**

**Leppert ‘24** [Rebecca Leppert (Rebecca Leppert is a copy editor at Pew Research Center) and Brian Kennedy (Brian Kennedy is a senior researcher at the Pew Research Center. He received his Ph.D. in political science at Michigan State University, where his work focused on cross-national attitudes about climate change. Kennedy received his bachelor’s degree at Davidson College), 8-5-2024, “Majority of Americans support more nuclear power in the country”, Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/08/05/majority-of-americans-support-more-nuclear-power-in-the-country/> DOA 3/8/25] // SH

**The U.S. currently has 94 nuclear power reactors**, including one that just began operating in Georgia this spring. Reactors collectively generated 18.6% of all U.S. electricity in 2023, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. About half of the United States’ nuclear power reactors (48) are in the South, while nearly a quarter (22) are in the Midwest. There are 18 reactors in the Northeast and six in the West, according to data from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). **The number** of U.S. reactors **has steadily fallen since peaking at 111 in 1990.** Nine Mile Point-1, located in Scriba, New York, is the oldest U.S. nuclear power reactor still in operation. It first connected to the power grid in November 1969. Most of the 94 current reactors began operations in the 1970s (41) or 1980s (44), according to IAEA data. (The IAEA classifies reactors as “operational” from their first electrical grid connection to their date of permanent shutdown.) **Within the last decade, just three new reactors joined the power fleet. Three times as many shut down over the same timespan. One of the many reasons** nuclear power projects have dwindled in recent decades **may be the perceived dangers following nuclear accidents** in the U.S. and abroad. For example, the 2011 Fukushima Daiichi accident led the Japanese government to greatly decrease its reliance on nuclear power and prompted other countries to rethink their nuclear energy plans. **High construction costs and radioactive waste storage issues are also oft-cited hurdles to nuclear energy advancement.**

**But unfortunately nuclear power plants are fueled by uranium**

**Office of Nuclear Energy ‘23** [Office of Nuclear Energy (The Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) is an agency of the United States Department of Energy which promotes nuclear power as a resource capable of meeting the energy, environmental, and national security needs of the United States by resolving technical and regulatory barriers through research, development, and demonstration), 8-2-2023, “NUCLEAR 101: How Does a Nuclear Reactor Work?”, US Department of Energy, <https://www.energy.gov/ne/articles/nuclear-101-how-does-nuclear-reactor-work#:~:text=Reactors%20use%20uranium%20for%20nuclear,to%20form%20a%20fuel%20assembly>. DOA 3/8/25] // SH

The main job of a reactor is to house and control nuclear fission—a process where atoms split and release energy. **Reactors use uranium for nuclear fuel.** The uranium is processed into small ceramic pellets and stacked together into sealed metal tubes called fuel rods. Typically, more than 200 of these rods are bundled together to form a fuel assembly. A reactor core is typically made up of a couple hundred assemblies, depending on power level. Inside the reactor vessel, the fuel rods are immersed in water which acts as both a coolant and moderator. The moderator helps slow down the neutrons produced by fission to sustain the chain reaction.

**An investment in nuclear energy would increase the amount of uranium mining**

**Robbins ‘24** Jim Robbins Is A Veteran Journalist Based In Helena, Montana. A Regular Contributor To Yale Environment 360, He Has Written For The New York Times, Conde Nast Traveler, and Numerous Other Publications. His Latest Book Is The The Wonder Of Birds, 4-4-2024, "A Nuclear Power Revival Is Sparking a Surge in Uranium Mining", Yale e360, https://e360.yale.edu/features/us-uranium-mining-nuclear-power

**A push for nuclear power**is**fuel[s]**ing**demand for uranium, spurring the opening of new mines**. The industry says new technologies will eliminate pollution from uranium mining, but its toxic legacy, particularly in the U.S. Southwest, leaves many wary of an incipient mining boom.

**The majority of US uranium deposits are found on native land**

**Keyanna ‘23** [Keyanna, Teracita, et al, Teracita Keyanna, a community member and member of the Red Water Pond Road Community Association. She grew up near an abandoned uranium mine in New Mexico The Health Impacts of Uranium Mining in Native American Communities Policy Brief. <https://nabpi.unm.edu/assets/documents/research/health-impacts-uranium-mining-policy-brief-final.pdf> DOA 3/8/25]

Up to **two thirds of the uranium deposits** that the United States claims **is on tribal land, and 80% of nuclear fuel cycles take place on tribal land** Additionally, **the workforce for uranium mining** and milling **has disproportionately been made up of Native American workers.** As a result, uranium extraction has remained outside of general public discourse in spite of the major intergenerational health impacts that are heavily concentrated in Indigenous communities and have often been brushed aside as collateral damage. Although Native American reservations make up only 5.6% of land area in the American West, **approximately one in five uranium mines are located within 6 miles of a reservation**, and more than **75% of uranium mines are located within 50 miles of a reservation. The disproportionate concentration of uranium extraction** and processing, coordinated misinformation, lack of safety measures, as well as federal and corporate inaction throughout uranium site life cycles, including after their abandonment, these mines **have left a legacy of health injustices in Indigenous communities**.10,

**Expanding uranium production harms indigenous communities in two ways. First through mining**

**Empirically, Indigenous uranium miners have been exploited and misinformed**

**Fouse ‘20** [Siena Fouse, Intern, Research and Publications 6-24-2020, "An Ongoing Battle: Fighting the Impacts of Uranium Mining in Southwestern Indigenous Communities", No Publication, <https://www.eli.org/vibrant-environment-blog/ongoing-battle-fighting-impacts-uranium-mining-southwestern-indigenous>]

Indigenous communities in the Southwestern United States have been battling the impacts of uranium mining since the early 1940s. The geology of the Colorado Plateau was found to be rich in the radioactive mineral and drew mining to the area. **The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) sought uranium to** [**develop nuclear weapons**](https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3263/5/1/15/htm) **during the Cold Wa**r, which fueled the interest of mining companies that opened uranium mines and mills on and around indigenous land. This was the start of an environmental justice issue spanning generations and continuing to impact indigenous communities today.**Indigenous communities were** [**not told**](https://www.liberationnews.org/resource-extraction-of-the-american-indigenous-population-uranium/) **about the health risks uranium and radiation posed even though scientists and government officials knew of its hazards at the time. Tribes agreed to host mine sites and were hired as miners. Indigenous miners were underpaid, unethically treated as test subjects, and forced to do dangerous work** without protective equipment. **Miners** and their families **were exposed to uranium** and radiation, **causing** [**health issues**](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-06/documents/atsdr_uranium_and_radiation_health_dec_2014.pdf) **like bone cancer, kidney damage, and lung cancer.**

**This leads to a myriad of health problems**

**Folkers 22** Cindy Folkers; Cindy@Beyondnuclear.Org, 10/07/2022, "Radioactive releases from the nuclear power sector and implications for child health", PubMed Central (PMC), https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9557777/ /HS

Although radioactivity is released routinely at every stage of nuclear power generation, the regulation of these releases has never taken into account those potentially most sensitive—women, especially when pregnant, and children. **From uranium mining** and milling, to fuel manufacture, electricity generation and **radioactive waste management,** children in frontline and **Indigenous communities can be disproportionately harmed** due to often **increased sensitivity of developing systems to toxic exposures, the lack of resources and racial and class discrimination**. The reasons for the greater susceptibility of women and children to harm from radiation exposure is not fully understood. **Regulatory practices,** particularly **in the establishment of protective exposure standards, have failed to take this difference into account.** Anecdotal evidence within communities around nuclear facilities suggests an association between radiation exposure and **increases in birth defects, miscarriages and childhood cancer**s. A significant number of academic studies tend to ascribe causality to other factors related to diet and lifestyle and dismiss these health indicators as statistically insignificant. In the case of a major release of radiation due to a serious nuclear accident, children are again on the frontlines, with a noted susceptibility to thyroid cancer, which has been found in significant numbers among children exposed both by the 1986 Chornobyl nuclear accident in Ukraine and the 2011 Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear disaster in Japan. The response among authorities in Japan is to blame increased testing or to reduce testing. More independent studies are needed focused on children, especially those in vulnerable frontline and Indigenous communities. In conducting such studies, greater consideration must be applied to culturally significant traditions and habits in these communities.

**This increasing the likelihood of death**

**Ansede 23** Manuel Ansede, 8/16/2023, "A study with 300,000 workers in the nuclear industry suggests an increased risk of death from cancer", EL PAÍS English, https://english.elpais.com/science-tech/2023-08-17/a-study-with-300000-workers-in-the-nuclear-industry-suggests-an-increased-risk-of-death-from-cancer.html//HS

**Prolonged exposure to low doses of ionizing radiation is associated with a higher risk of death from cancer** than previously thought, **according to a study of** nearly **310,000 nuclear industry workers** in **France, the U**nited **K**ingdom, **and the** **U**nited **S**tates. The **mortality rate** from solid **tumors increases by 52%** at 10 years for each accumulated gray, a unit of absorbed radiation that is equivalent to 1,000 millisieverts, or about 10,000 chest X-rays. The individual risk, however, remains very low. Epidemiologist Amy Berrington, who was not involved in the research, provides an example. “For every 1,000 people exposed to 100 millisieverts of ionizing radiation — most nuclear workers are exposed to less than 10 millisieverts — there could be an extra 10 deaths, instead of five, on top of the more than 200 expected deaths from tumors produced by other causes,” Berrington explained to the Science Media Centre portal. “Twice a small risk is still a small risk,” stressed the epidemiologist, from the Institute for Cancer Research, in London.

**Uranium mining independently represents a slow genocide of indigenous populations**

**Fegadel ‘23** [Averi R. Fegadel (Doctor of Philosophy, Investigator at Capital Collateral Regional Counsel), February 2023, “**Green Victimization of Native Americans: Uranium Mining** a**s a Form of** Toxic Colonialism and **Genocide** Abstract and Figures”, ResearchGate, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368715906_Green_Victimization_of_Native_Americans_Uranium_Mining_as_a_Form_of_Toxic_Colonialism_and_Genocide> DOA 3/18/25] // SH

Criminological scholarship has explored environmental justice issues in Black communities, such as urban exposure to toxins; yet, this research orientation has not been expanded to include peoples in different locations. In the United States (U.S.), this draws attention to the green victimization of Native Americans. In short, existing criminological research has largely ignored the social, economic, and environmental injustices experienced by Native Americans. This study addresses this research gap by confronting historic and current struggles endured by Native Americans in their resistance to ecocide, genocide, and capitalism by focusing on uranium mining in the Southwest U.S. Research suggests that **the majority of uranium mines and mills that ever existed in the U.S. were located on or near tribal lands,** and how **that circumstance creates an unequitable distribution of ecological harms, while environmental and social injustices for Native Americans have been ignored.** Native American victimization and resistance: an examination of uranium mining in the Northwest and Northern PlainsAveri R. Fegadel and Michael J. LynchAbstractPurpose –The purpose of this study is to explore **the genocidal impacts of uranium mining for Native Americans** in the Northwest and Northern Plains, as well as their resistance to historical andcontemporary acts of colonialism.Design/methodology/approach –Using a case study approach, this study gathered qualitative datafrom various government, tribal and news sources to investigate the extent of ecological violenceexperienced by Native Americans specific to uranium mining processes on Spokane Indian Reservation,Pine Ridge Reservation and Wind River Reservation.Findings –**Native Americans** in the Northwest and Northern Plains **are victimized by the capitalism-genocide involved in uranium production.** The consequences of **the uranium** industry boom in the1950s–1980s **has left Native Americans with degraded lands, polluted water** sources **and** a legacy of **adverse health effects**, **including some of the highest rates of cancer.** Social implications –The work discussed in this paper offers possibilities for collaborating with NativeAmericans to develop more sustainable energy options for the USA to make the necessary shift away from fossil fuels and nuclear energy. Originality/value –Prior research has addressed the genocidal impacts of uranium mining for NativeAmericans in the Southwest USA and claimed these actions were direct consequences of toxic colonialism, capitalistic agendas and the treadmill of production (Fegadel, 2023). Most uranium was recovered from ore deposits within the Colorado Plateau, and most abandoned uranium mines (AUMs)are located within the same region. Tribes residing in the Northwest and Northern Plains have, however,experienced similar plights as those in the Southwest, but these issues have not been widely examined.Keywords Capitalism, Nuclear, Genocide, Colonialism, Environmental, Green energyPaper type Research paperIntroductionNative Americans have been victims of settler and toxic colonialism for centuries, resulting in a myriad of social, political, economic and ecological inequalities (Fegadel, 2023).Historical attempts of domination and elimination of Native Americans has been described by scholars as acts of environmentally violent injustice (Bacon, 2018;Norgaard andFenelon, 2021;Whyte, 2018). However, settler colonialism is used to not only describe historical discrimination but also refer to the ongoing power structure used to dominateNative systems and societies (Norgaard and Fenelon, 2021). Tribal land has been seized by power structures (e.g. the government) for a variety of uses, notably natural resourceextraction (Lynch et al.,2002,2019;Lynch and Stretesky, 2012), toxic waste dump sites(Chavis and Lee, 1987;EPA, 2018;Reed, 2009;Zender Environmental Science andPlanning Services, 2004) and military operations –including nuclear weapons testing(Hooks and Smith, 2004;Kauzlarich and Kramer, 1998). The ecological withdrawals andecological additions produced by these, and other, processes have direct and indirectAveri R. Fegadel is based at the Department ofSociology and Criminology,Arkansas State University,Jonesboro, Arkansas, USA.Michael J. Lynch is basedat the Department ofCriminology, University ofSouth Florida, Tampa,Florida, USA.Received 8 August 2023Revised 6 November 2023Accepted 10 November 2023DOI 10.1108/SC-08-2023-0034 ©Emerald Publishing Limited, ISSN 1757-8043 jSAFER COMMUNITIES j impacts for Native Americans. **Collectively, the harms and risks experienced by Native Americans are explained by the concept of ecological violence**. A consequence of the capitalism–genocide nexus, **ecological violence helps explain the ways in which Native Americans experience structural**ly produced **violence.** For example, actions such as the burning of crops (Brook, 1998), exposure to hazardous waste (Brook, 1998;Burger and Gochfeld, 2011;Lynch and Stretesky, 2012;Ruggiero and South, 2013) and oil spills (Lynch and Stretesky, 2012;Ruggiero and South, 2013) demonstrate how **environmental degradation violates Native relationships with the land** (Bacon, 2018;Norgaard and Fenelon, 2021;Whyte, 2018).Relatedly, settler acts designed to control Native Peoples and their lands can be describedas toxic colonialism, a concept defining the subjugation of people (i.e. Indigenous NativePeoples) while their lands were exploited and degraded by extractive industries (Bullard,1993;Reed, 2009). Toxic colonialism, while not included in any laws in the USA (due to therole of the USA as the colonizer and the shaping of laws by the power structure), has beenapplied to the Native American capitalism–genocide experience (Fegadel, 2023). Forexample, the targeting of and conflicts over natural resources on tribal lands by thegovernment and commercial industries has resulted in the destruction and pollution of triballands (Fegadel, 2023; Geddicks, 1993). One major form of toxic colonialism experienced byNative Americans involves uranium mining. Although determined by geological indicators,over 90% of the uranium mines and mills that ever existed in the USA were located on ornear tribal lands, predominantly across the Colorado Plateau which houses Reservations of32 federally recognized Tribes (Lewis et al., 2017). **The siting of uranium mills, wastedisposal sites and transportation routes are less determined by geological factors than minesiting, yet the location choices in relation to Tribal communities seem to be determined bysocial and economic factors.** Further, the failure to remediate abandoned uranium mine(AUM) sites results in significant harms and risks for Native Americans. **The environmental degradation and negative health effects associated with uranium mining processes are referred to “crimes of the nuclear state,” which emerged with the expansion of the US capitalist system** (Kauzlarich and Kramer, 1998).

**Second is through destroying indigenous culture**

**Heath ‘20** [Joe Heath (General Counsel of the Onondaga Nation), 8-19-2020, “The Violence of Nuclear Energy Against Indigenous Peoples, Land, Water and Air”, Sierra Club Atlantic Chapter, <https://www.sierraclub.org/atlantic/blog/2020/08/violence-nuclear-energy-against-indigenous-peoples-land-water-and-air#:~:text=The%20tailings%E2%80%94which%20are%20radioactive,sites%2C%20and%20contaminate%20drinking%20water>. DOA 3/8/25] // SH

The entire life cycle of the nuclear power industry has huge negative impacts on indigenous nations and peoples, from the mining of uranium in Indian country and the vast amounts of nuclear waste associated with the mining and milling of uranium, to the transportation of uranium and the proposed long-term storage of nuclear wastes on Indian country. **Negative impacts** continue and **will worsen due to** the current administration’s plan to **resume uranium mining**. There are three stages of conventional uranium mining: first, the ore is extracted from the ground. Next, a mill grinds the ore to sand, which is processed to remove uranium from the waste rock, known as “tailings.” The uranium is then concentrated and dried into “yellowcake” for commercial sale. The tailings—which are radioactive—must be secured and stored. **Uranium mining, milling and related industries destroy sacred sites, petroglyphs and ancestors’ unmarked burial sites**, and contaminate drinking water. **Traditional lifeways are made difficult or impossible because of contamination of water and land; sacred sites have been made inaccessible or dangerous to access; and Indigenous peoples are forced to leave homelands they have occupied for centuries.** Water contamination from uranium mining and tailings is widespread and especially damaging in southwestern states where water is scarce. Surface waters and aquifers are polluted by all phases of uranium mining and production. Water contamination includes various combinations of uranium, arsenic, copper, lead, molybdenum, selenium, sulfate, thorium, vanadium and radium. Prior to any uranium mining, **extensive explorations are conducted on**  Indian **[indigenous] country, such as drilling thousands of holes and cores, and construction of extensive roads and truck pads on undisturbed, pristine lands.** **Most of these exploratory holes are not sealed or capped and create pathways between groundwater aquifers, allowing contaminated water to pollute clean drinking water supplies.**

**This represents a form of cultural genocide**

**Bilsky and Klagsbrun 18** (Leora Bilsky is an Israeli full professor at the Faculty of Law and the Director of the Minerva Center for Human Rights at Tel Aviv University. Klagsbrun also works at Tel Aviv University. 7-23-2018, “The Return of Cultural Genocide?” OUP Academic,<https://academic.oup.com/ejil/article/29/2/373/5057075> , DOA 7-20-2023) CLS

**Before we begin our exploration, a few words are due on the definition of cultural genocide. As a legal concept in international law, cultural genocide was devised as a sub-category, or aspect, of genocide – the attempt to systemically and wilfully destroy a group – alongside physical genocide and biological genocide. It denoted the destruction of both tangible (such as places of worship) as well as intangible (such as language) cultural structures. It envisioned negative and positive responses – a criminal prohibition alongside restitutive and reparative measures. As we show later in this article, this concept eventually did not survive treaty negotiations in the 1940s and lay dormant until the 1990s. The original conceptualization of the crime of genocide, as presented by Raphael Lemkin, gave cultural genocide centre stage. In fact, Lemkin thought that a new legal category was needed precisely because genocide could not be reduced to mass murder.3** The novelty of the Nazi crime lay in the methodical attempt to destroy a group – well beyond typical war crimes and acts of repression. For Lemkin, therefore, **the essence of genocide was cultural – a systematic attack on a group of people and its cultural identity; a crime directed against difference itself.** Ironically, the final text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Genocide Convention) does not prohibit cultural genocide as such.4 Only a distant echo to this attempt is present in the Genocide Convention, where it prohibits the forced transfer of children (Article 2, paragraph e). How was it that cultural genocide disappeared from the Genocide Convention? What led to this almost total inversion of the original meaning of genocide, from a holistic concept of genocide to one limited to its physical and biological aspects? How was the cultural essence of genocide detached from the international crime of genocide and then narrowed down to attacks on ‘cultural property’ or ‘cultural heritage’, protected under international humanitarian law,5 human rights law and indigenous-protection law?6 **What happened in the process to the original understanding that puts the cultural group in the centre and sees genocide as a collective, multi-dimensional crime that requires a structural response for its elimination?**

**2NC**

**CANE ‘24** Climate Action Network Europe, March 18 2024, “POSITION PAPER: The nuclear hurdle to a renewable future and fossil fuel phase-out,” <https://caneurope.org/position-paper-nuclear-energy/> //SBB

Over half of the French nuclear reactor fleet was not available during at least one-third of the year, one-third was not available for more than half of the year, and 98% of the year 10 reactors or more did not provide any power for at least part of the day. **The myth of the need for nuclear baseload has been debunked for years. The energy system can be reliably and safely managed with 100% renewables and system flexibility.** Blocking renewables integration into the electricity grid **The inflexibility of nuclear, caused by technical limitations, safety requirements and economic factors, prevents the feed-in of renewable electricity into the grid, causing grid congestion and curtailment.** Nuclear’s dominance over grid capacity can block the connection of new renewable energy projects, where even announced and then abandoned plans for a new nuclear unit can delay renewable projects connection, allowing for continued fossil fuel usage. **Grid structures designed for large-scale, centralised nuclear power, make it more challenging, time-consuming and costly to introduce small-scale distributed renewable power.** An example can be found in Romania where Cernavodă 3 and 4 reactors have reserved grid capacity for years, blocking new renewable energy projects in the Dobrogea region, the most wind-intensive region in the country. Delayed grid investments, due to uncertainty of new nuclear units, have also meant that capacity bottlenecks exist today for renewables online. In the Netherlands, the only current nuclear power station, Borssele is competing for landing space for off-shore electricity. Post-Fukushima, r**enewables were blocked from connecting to the grid in Japan as the government considered restarting the reactors**, despite public opposition to nuclear restarts and support for renewables. Rather than taking the opportunity to invest in grids and integrate renewables twenty years ago**, Japan still heavily relies on fossil** fuels today. Prolonging the inevitable with nuclear extensions While European governments may be tempted to prolong existing nuclear reactors beyond their original foreseen lifespans, in the context of phasing out Russian gas, costly upgrades to the ageing nuclear fleet, just like investing in new ones, risks diverting investment away from more cost-effective solutions such as renewables, energy efficiency, and system flexibility, in addition to risking lowered safety standards and security of supply as ageing increases unplanned outages. **Any prolongation of existing nuclear power plant units risks the continued crowding out of renewable energy sources from the electricity grid, preventing their price-dampening effects on the market.**

**Jacobson ‘21** Mark Z. Jacobson, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering & Director, Atmosphere/Energy Program, Stanford University, “The 7 reasons why nuclear energy is not the answer to solve climate change,” April 26, 2021, <https://eu.boell.org/en/2021/04/26/7-reasons-why-nuclear-energy-not-answer-solve-climate-change> //SBB

To recap, new nuclear power costs about 5 times more than onshore wind power per kWh (between 2.3 to 7.4 times depending upon location and integration issues). Nuclear takes 5 to 17 years longer between planning and operation and produces on average 23 times the emissions per unit electricity generated (between 9 to 37 times depending upon plant size and construction schedule). In addition, it creates risk and cost associated with weapons proliferation, meltdown, mining lung cancer, and waste risks. Clean, renewables avoid all such risks. Nuclear advocates claim nuclear is still needed because renewables are intermittent and need natural gas for backup. However, nuclear itself never matches power demand so it needs backup. Even in France with one of the most advanced nuclear energy programs, the maximum ramp rate is 1 to 5 % per minute, which means they need natural gas, hydropower, or batteries, which ramp up 5 to 100 times faster, to meet peaks in demand. Today, in fact, batteries are beating natural gas for wind and solar backup needs throughout the world. **A dozen independent scientific groups have** further found **that it is possible to match intermittent power demand with clean, renewable energy supply and storage, without nuclear, at low cost.** Finally, many existing nuclear plants are so costly that their owners are demanding subsidies to stay open. For example, in 2016, three existing upstate New York nuclear plants requested and received subsidies to stay open using the argument that the plants were needed to keep emissions low. However, subsidizing such plants may increase carbon emissions and costs relative to replacing the plants with wind or solar as soon as possible. Thus, subsidizing nuclear would result in higher emissions and costs over the long term than replacing nuclear with renewables.

#### Lori Bird, **Bird 25** 02/21/2025, US Clean Power Development Sees Record Progress, As Well As Stronger Headwinds, World Resources Institute, <https://www.wri.org/insights/clean-energy-progress-united-states#:~:text=Adding%20it%20up:%20Is%20the,in%202024%2C%20growth%20has%20slowed> //Bruce

#### 

#### Solar deployment and electric vehicle (EV) sales broke records in 2023 and 2024. Renewables now dominate new power generation capacity, while new domestic clean energy manufacturing facilities are popping up around the nation. Following the record-breaking outcomes of 2023, 2024 was another impressive year for clean energy deployment in the United States. These upward trends signal that clean electricity sources are an increasingly vital part of the U.S. economy and power system, with renewable sources and battery storage making up the vast majority of new additions to the grid. Solar surpassed 2023’s record installations in 2024, adding an estimated 39.6 gigawatts (GW) of capacity, compared to 27.4GW in 2023. Installed solar capacity in the U.S. now totals about 220 GW, enough to provide over 7% of the nation’s electricity. This continues a decade-long trend of rapid growth in solar power. **Battery storage nearly doubled in 2024,** with total installed capacity reaching almost 29 GW — **and projected to grow another 47% in 2025. This growth in capacity will help support the grid when variable renewable energy technologies, such as solar and wind, are unavailable**, making the U.S. power system more stable and secure.Taken all together, renewables vastly outpaced other generation sources and collectively accounted for around 90% of the United States’ new installed capacity in 2024. With the new projects online, renewables (including wind, solar, geothermal and hydropower) and battery storage now make up 30% of the country’s large-scale power generating capacity. In 2

**Jacobson ‘21** Mark Z. Jacobson, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering & Director, Atmosphere/Energy Program, Stanford University, “The 7 reasons why nuclear energy is not the answer to solve climate change,” April 26, 2021, <https://eu.boell.org/en/2021/04/26/7-reasons-why-nuclear-energy-not-answer-solve-climate-change> //SBB

There is a small group of scientists that have proposed replacing 100% of the world’s fossil fuel power plants with nuclear reactors as a way to solve climate change. Many others propose nuclear grow to satisfy up to 20 percent of all our energy (not just electricity) needs. They advocate that nuclear is a “clean” carbon-free source of power, but they don’t look at the human impacts of these scenarios. Let’s do the math... **One nuclear power plant takes on average** about **14-1/2 years to build**, from the planning phase all the way to operation. According to the World Health Organization, about 7.1 million people die from air pollution each year, with more than 90% of these deaths from energy-related combustion. So **switching** out our energy system **to nuclear would result in** about **93 million people dying, as we wait for** all the **new** nuclear **plants to be built** in the all-nuclear scenario. Utility-scale wind and solar farms, on the other hand, take on average only 2 to 5 years, from the planning phase to operation. Rooftop solar PV projects are down to only a 6-month timeline. So transitioning to 100% renewables as soon as possible would result in tens of millions fewer deaths. This illustrates a major problem with nuclear power and why renewable energy -- in particular Wind, Water, and Solar (WWS)-- avoids this problem. Nuclear, though, doesn’t just have one problem. It has seven. Here are the seven major problems with nuclear energy 1. Long Time Lag Between Planning and Operation