### 2ac framework

#### Resolved before the colon means reserved – it’s the starting point for discussion

**Evans, 1** (Nathan Kirk, CEDA Debate, “A2: Jeff P-Is the resolution a question?,” http://cedadebate.org/pipermail/mailman/2001-February/030719.html)

The resolution is not a question. It is a statement that has "resolved" on one side and a normative statement on the other separated by a colon. What is the meaning of "resolved?" I know Bill Shanahan has made the argument that "resolved" means "reserved," in which case the resolution doesn't require you to arrive at any certainty about the truth of the normative statement. 2. The resolution has no intonation. Thus, various types of ironic and non-serious advocacies could be possible, none of which would prove the "truth" of the resolution: they might prove the opposite. 3. Why all this focus on truth? Language also has "performative" value: it does things. To take an example from Austin, the founder of "performativity" theory, the statement "I do" is not simply a statement of fact. In the context of a marriage ceremony, it does something--it binds a couple in matrimony. Or to take another example, hate speech has effects that can be evaluated outside questions of truth/falsity. Debaters could thus evaluate the performative effect of the resolution outside of its truth value. For example, saying/performing the resolution might be productive even if the resolution is untrue. (Several months ago I wrote out a fairly lengthy explanation of performativity which I could send out if people are still confused about what I mean.) 4. How important is the resolution? Could the resolution just be a springboard for discussion rather than being the prime motivator of debates? There's no debate rule-book that says debates always have to be won or lost on the resolution. If both teams are having a fair and productive debate about DA within the GHA, hasn't the resolution's purpose been served? I know you might not think these possibilities make for the best debate. My point, however, is that there is a debate to be had about what the meaning of the debate forum is and you should allow debaters to have that debate rather than pre-deciding the issue. The difference between debaters being judged and students having their papers graded is that in the latter example students are generally unable to argue in their papers that the standards by which their papers are graded should itself be changed. Debaters, however, have that opportunity.

#### Economic engagement is academic analysis of economic areas

Bond and Paterson, 5 – \*lecturer in Sociology in the School of Social and Political Studies, University of Edinburgh AND \*\*professor of educational policy at the University of Edinburgh (Ross and Lindsay, “Coming down from the ivory tower? Academics’ civic and economic engagement with the community”; September 2005)

We now turn our attention to a more specific form of interaction with the nonacademic community: economic engagement. As stated earlier, this should not be thought of as completely distinct from civic engagement. Nevertheless, given the contemporary interest in academia’s economic role outlined above, economic engagement merits separate and detailed analysis. Our definition here is somewhat different from that of civic engagement, in that we will consider the extent to which the more routine academic activities of research and teaching, as well as those which transcend these areas, are perceived to have economic relevance. Importantly, we will also consider beliefs about the extent to which they should have economic relevance.

#### The lens of environmental justice is the most productive approach to the topic – all other explanations fail

Schlosberg 13 (David Schlosberg; Environmental Politics Volume 22, Issue 1, 2013 Special Issue: Coming of Age? Environmental Politics at 21; “Theorising environmental justice: the expanding sphere of a discourse”; pages 37-55; KDUB)

Horizontal and vertical expansion If there has been a single major development in the framing of environmental justice in the past decade, it has been the way the use of the concept, as an organising theme or value by a range of movements, has expanded spatially (Sze and London 2008, Walker 2009). While there has been a continued focus on the original core of environmental justice issues in the distribution of toxins – or environmental bads more generally – in the United States, environmental justice discourse and literature has been extended in both topical and geographic scope. As Sze and London (2008) note in their important overview, environmental justice has seen the expansion into new issues and constituencies on the one hand, and new places and spatial analyses from the local to the global on the other. They celebrate this expansion, arguing that this attention to the expanding spatial realm of environmental justice has been the focus of many crucial researchers in the field, from politics to sociology to geography.5 This expansion has been more than simply an exercise in academic interdisciplinarity – it has led to a broad extension of the foci of environmental justice scholarship. Environmental justice may have been originally focused on the inequity of the distribution of toxics and hazardous waste in the United States, but it has moved far beyond this. Perhaps, however, such a broadening is not new, but a longstanding characteristic of the movement. Cole and Foster’s (2001) now classic study of the movement discussed the various ‘tributaries’ that make up the environmental justice movement. They included the civil rights and antitoxics movements, but also indigenous rights movements, the labour movement (including farm labour, occupational health and safety, and some industrial unions), and traditional environmentalists. Faber and McCarthy (2003) added the solidarity movement and the more general social and economic justice movements. We could easily add immigrant rights groups and urban environmental and smart growth movements, as well as local foods and food justice movements, to the list. Environmental justice as an organising frame has been applied not only to the initial issues of toxins and dumps, but also analyses of transportation, access to countryside and green space, land use and smart growth policy, water quality and distribution, energy development and jobs, brownfields refurbishment, and food justice.6 Questions of the role of scientific expertise, and the relationship between science and environmental justice communities, have also been examined.7 There has also been more thorough examination of the roles of under-examined groups in the environmental justice movement, or exposed to environmental hazards – indigenous peoples, Asian and Latino workers, women and youth,8 illustrating the broadening range of foci of environmental justice scholarship in the United States. I do not mean to imply that all of these studies offer similar or unproblematic analyses of the issues, but simply to note the longstanding and continuing trend of the expanding topical space of the environmental justice frame. In addition to the expansion of issues, there has been a push to globalise environmental justice as an explanatory discourse. There are two distinct moments to this expansion: the application of the frame to movements in a variety of countries, and the examination of the globalised and transnational nature of environmental justice movements and discourse. Walker (2009) sees this development as both a horizontal diffusion of environmental justice ideas, meanings, and framings, along with the vertical extension of an environmental justice frame beyond borders, and into relations between countries and truly global issues. As for the first, the applications of my own theoretical framework of environmental justice have been more broad than I would have imagined, including cases of postcolonial environmental justice in India, waste management in the United Kingdom, agrarian change in Sumatra, nuclear waste in Taiwan, salmon farming and First Nations in Canada, gold mining in Ghana, oil politics in Ecuador, indigenous water rights in Australia, wind farm development in Wales, pesticide drift in California, energy politics in Mexico, and many more.9 In addition, there have been collections on environmental justice focused on issues and movements in Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and the exSoviet Union.10 Walker (2009, p. 361) lists no fewer than 37 countries in which the environmental justice frame has been applied. Clearly, the discourse of environmental justice has expanded horizontally, and been engaged by both activists and academics involved in issues across the globe. The vertical extension of an environmental justice framework is evidently illustrated by the use of environmental justice as an organising theme by a number of global movements, such as food security, indigenous rights, and anti-neoliberalism (Schlosberg 2004). This global approach has been thoroughly analysed in Pellow’s (2007, 2011) enlightening work on the global toxics trade and both local community and global non-governmental organisation (NGO) resistance to it. Offering both a thorough analysis of the international production of waste, and keen observation of the transnational movement(s) that have risen in response, Pellow’s work brings attention to the global potential of environmental justice analysis. The essence of transnational networks, he argues, is found in their critique of environmental inequities, the disruption of social relations that produce such inequities, and the articulation of ecologically sustainable and socially just institutions and practices (Pellow 2011, p. 248). Such an analysis focuses on both the nature of the injustice and the creative and crucially networked response on the part of movements. Mohai et al. (2009) note a number of additional transnational issue networks that have environmental justice as an organising theme, from those concerned with e-waste to the movement for climate justice. Carmin and Agyeman (2011) bring both of these elements of expansion together in a recent collection that focuses both on specific issues and movements and a larger global framework of analysis. Clearly, environmental justice analysis continues to expand in scope and scale.

#### You are not a policy-maker—pretending you are absolves individual responsibility for violence – makes serial policy failure inevitable and is an independent reason to vote affirmative

Kappeler, 1995 (Susanne, The Will to Violence, p. 10-11)

We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival­ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe­nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens even more so those of other nations have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the respons­ibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or­ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' our readiness, in other words, to build ident­ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence. “destining” of revealing insofar as it “pushes” us in a certain direction. Heidegger does not regard destining as determination (he says it is not a “fate which compels”), but rather as the implicit project within the field of modern practices to subject all aspects of reality to the principles of order and efficiency, and to pursue reality down to the finest detail. Thus, insofar as modern technology aims to order and render calculable, the objectification of reality tends to take the form of an increasing classification, differentiation, and fragmentation of reality. The possibilities for how things appear are increasingly reduced to those that enhance calculative activities. Heidegger perceives the real danger in the modern age to be that human beings will continue to regard technology as a mere instrument and fail to inquire into its essence. He fears that all revealing will become calculative and all relations technical, that the unthought horizon of revealing, namely the “concealed” background practices that make technological thinking possible, will be forgotten. He remarks: The coming to presence of technology threatens revealing, threatens it with the possibility that all revealing will be consumed in ordering and that everything will present itself only in the unconcealedness of standing-reserve. (QT, 33) [10](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194)  Therefore, it is not technology, or science, but rather the essence of technology as a way of revealing that constitutes the danger; for the essence of technology is existential, not technological. [11](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194) It is a matter of how human beings are fundamentally oriented toward their world vis a vis their practices, skills, habits, customs, and so forth. Humanism contributes to this danger insofar as it fosters the illusion that technology is the result of a collective human choice and therefore subject to human control. [12](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194)

#### The justification for an action is itself an action

Risman 2004 (Barbara J. Risman is Associate Professor of Sociology and Found Director of Women 's Studies at North Carolina State University, “Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism” Gender and Society, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Aug., 2004), pp. 429-450 Jstor)

Giddens's (1984) structuration theory adds considerably more depth to this  analysis of gender as a social structure  with his emphasis on the recursive  relation ship between social structure  and individuals.  That is, social structures  shape individuals, but simultaneously, individuals shape the social structure. Giddens  embraced  the transformative  power of human action. He insisted that  any structural theory must be concerned with reflexivity and actors' interpretations of their own  lives. Social structures  not only act on people; people act on social structures.  Indeed,  social structures  are created  not by mysterious  forces but by human action.  When people act on structure, they do so for their  own reasons.  We must, therefore,  be concerned with why actors choose their acts. Giddens insisted that  concern with meaning must go beyond the verbal justification easily available from actors because so much of social life is routine and so taken for granted that actors will not articulate, or even consider, why they act. This nonreflexive habituated  action is what I refer to as the cultural component  of the social structure:  The taken  for granted  or cognitive image rules that  belong to  the situational  context (not only or necessarily to the actor's personality).  The cul tural  component of the social structure  includes the interactional expectations  that  each of us meet in every social encounter.  My aims are to bring women and men  back into a structural theory where gender is the structure  under analysis and to  identify when behavior is habit (an enactment of taken for granted  gendered cul tural norms) and when we do gender consciously, with intent, rebellion, or even  with irony. When are we doing gender and re-creating inequality without intent?  And what happens to interactional dynamics and male-dominated institutions  when we rebel?  Can we refuse to do gender or is rebellion simply doing gender  dif ferently, forging alternative masculinities and femininities?  Connell (1987) applied Giddens's (1984) concern with social structure  as both  constraint  and created by action in his treatise on gender and power (see particu larly chapter  5). In his analysis, structure  constrains action,  yet "since human  action  involves free invention  ... and is reflexive, practice  can be turned  against  what con strains it; so structure  can deliberately  be the object of practice"  (Connell 1987, 95).  Action may turn against structure  but can never escape it. We must pay attention both to how structure shapes individual choice and social interaction  and to how  human agency creates, sustains, and modifies current  structure.  Action itself may change the immediate or future  context. A theory of gender as a social structure  must integrate  this notion of causality as  recursive with attention to gender  consequences at multiple  levels of analysis. Gen der is deeply embedded  as a basis for stratification  not just in our personalities,  our  cultural  rules, or institutions  but in all these, and in complicated ways. The gender  structure  differentiates  opportunities  and constraints based on sex category and  thus has consequences on three dimensions: (1) At the individual level, for the  development  of gendered  selves; (2) during  interaction  as men and women face dif ferent cultural  expectations even when they fill the identical structural  positions;  and (3) in institutional domains where explicit regulations regarding resource  distribution  and material  goods are gender specific.

#### Questions of methodology are the most important ones - they dictate how conclusions are achieved

Bartlett, 1990 (Katharine, professor of law at Duke University, 103 Harvard Law Review 829, February, lexis)

Feminists have developed extensive critiques of law n2 and proposals for legal reform. n3 Feminists have had much less to say, however, about what the "doing" of law should entail and what truth status to give to the legal claims that follow. These methodological issues matter because methods shape one's view of the possibilities for legal practice and reform. Method "organizes the apprehension of truth; it determines what counts as evidence and defines what is taken as verification." n4 Feminists cannot ignore method, because if they seek to challenge existing structures of power with the same methods that [\*831] have defined what counts within those structures, they may instead "recreate the illegitimate power structures [that they are] trying to identify and undermine." n5

#### Situatedness determines efficacy

**Dillon ‘99** (Bumblebee Dillon, Prof of Politics, University of Lancaster, Moral Spaces, p. 97-98)

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other regional modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

### ---a2 switch side

#### Dissent turns switch side

Feinberg & Nemeth 08 (Matthew Feinberg and Charlan J. Nemeth Department of Psychology University of California, Berkeley Institute for Research on Labor and Employment The “Rules” of Brainstorming: An Impediment to Creativity? <http://www.irle.berkeley.edu/workingpapers/167-08.pdf>)

In contrast to such literature, there is some theoretical reasons and recent evidence to suggest that these rules and, in particular, the rule “not to criticize” may actually inhibit creativity. Rather, there is evidence of the value of debate even criticism in the stimulation of creative thought. A variety of studies demonstrates that exposure to a persistent minority dissenter sparks more flexible, open-minded, and multi-perspective thinking which, in turn, produces less conformist and more creative outcomes (e.g., Peterson & Nemeth, 1996; Nemeth & Chiles, 1988; Nemeth & Kwan, 1985). This line of research maintains that the benefits of dissent stem from the cognitive conflict it generates; the dissent compels those in the majority to search for possible explanations as to why the dissenter is willing to openly disagree and suffer the rejection that often accompanies such disagreement. This search for explanations then fosters thinking on all sides of the issue (Nemeth, 2003). People search for information on all sides of the issue, use multiple strategies in problem solving and detect solutions that otherwise would have gone undetected (Nemeth, 1995).

#### Switch-side debate creates worse decision making by lending credibility to Rightist fascism

Kahn, 10 (Richard Kahn, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations and Research at the University of North Dakota, Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement, 2010, pp. 9-11)

Worse still, though, is that here environmental literacy has not only been co-opted by corporate state forces and morphed into a progressively-styled, touchy-feely method for achieving higher scores on standardized tests like the ACT and SAT, but in an Orwellian turn it has come to stand in actuality for a real illiteracy about the nature of ecological catastrophe, its causes, and possible solutions. As I will argue in this book, our current course for social and environmental disaster (though highly complex and not easily boiled down to a few simple causes or strategies for action) must be traced to the evolution of: an anthropocentric worldview grounded in what the sociologist Patricia Hill Collins (1993) refers to as a matrix of domination (see chapter 1); a global technocapitalist infrastructure that relies upon market-based and functionalist versions of technoliteracy to instantiate and augment its socio- economic and cultural control (see chapters 2 and 3); an unsustainable, reductionistic, and antidemocratic model of institutional science (see chapter 4); and the wrongful marginalization and repression of pro-ecological resistance through the claim that it represents a “terrorist” force that is counter to the morals of a democratic society rooted in tolerance, educational change, and civic debate (see chapter 5). By contrast, the environmental literacy standards now showcased at places like the Zoo School as “Hall- marks of Quality” (Archie, 2003, p. 11) are those that consciously fail to develop the type of radical and partisan subjectivity in students, that might be capable of deconstructing their socially and environmentally deleterious hyper-individualism or their obviously socialized identities that tend toward 10 Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis state-sanctioned norms of competition, hedonism, consumption, marketization, and forms of quasi-fascistic patriotism. Just as Stapp (1969) theorized environmental literacy as a form of political moderation that could pacify the types of civic upheaval, that occurred during the Civil Rights era, now too during the tendentious political atmosphere that has arisen as the legacy of the George W. Bush presidency, being environmentally literate quite suspiciously means learning how to turn the other cheek and listen to “both sides” of an issue—even when the issue is the unprecedented mass extinction of life taking place on the planet. In a manner that accords more with Fox News than Greenpeace, a leading environmental literacy pamphlet (Archie, 2003) emphasizes that “Teaching and learning about the environment can bring up controversies that must be handled in a fair and balanced manner in the classroom” (p. 11). Later in the document a teacher from Lincoln High School in Wisconsin is highlighted in order to provide expert advice in a similar fashion: “I’d say the most important aspect of teaching about the environment is to look at all aspects involved with an issue or problem. Teach from an unbiased position no matter how strong your ideas are about the topic. Let the kids make decisions for themselves” (p. 12), she implores. This opinion is mirrored by the Environmental Education Division of the Environmental Protection Agency (a federal office, created by the Bush administration, dedicated to furthering environmental literacy), which on its own website underscores as “Basic Information” that “Environmental education does not advocate a particular viewpoint or course of action. Rather, it is claimed that environmental education teaches individuals how to weigh various sides of an issue through critical thinking and it enhances their own problem-solving and decision-making skills.”10 Yet, this definition was authored by an administration trumping for a wider right-wing movement that attempts to use ideas of “fair and balanced” and “critical thinking” to occlude obvious social and ecological injustices, as well as the advantage it gains in either causing or sustaining them. This same logic defending the universal value of nonpartisan debate has been used for well over a decade by the right to prevent significant action on global warming. Despite overwhelming scientific acceptance of its existence and threat, as well as of its primarily anthropogenic cause, those on the right have routinely trotted out their own pseudo-science on global warming and thereby demanded that more research is necessary to help settle a debate on the issue that only they are interested in continuing to facilitate. Ecopedagogy: An Introduction 11 Likewise, within academic circles themselves, powerful conservatives like David Horowitz have the support of many in government who are seeking to target progressive scholars and viewpoints on university and college campuses as biased evidence of a leftist conspiracy at work in higher education (Nocella, Best & McLaren, Forthcoming). In order to combat such alleged bias, “academic freedom” is asserted as a goal in which “both sides” of academic issues must be represented in classrooms, departments, and educational events. The result of this form of repressive tolerance (see chapter 5) is simply to impede action on matters worth acting on and to gain further ideological space for right-wing, corporate and other conservative-value agendas.11 It is clear, then, that despite the effects and growth of environmental education over the last few decades, it is a field that is ripe for a radical reconstruction of its literacy agenda. Again, while something like environmental education (conceived broadly) should be commended for the role it has played in helping to articulate many of the dangers and pitfalls that modern life now affords, it is also clear that it has thus far inadequately surmised the larger structural challenges now at hand and has thus tended to intervene in a manner far too facile to demand or necessitate a rupture of the status quo. What has thereby resulted is a sort of crisis of environmental education generally and, as a result, the prevailing trends in the field have recently been widely critiqued by a number of theorists and educators who have sought to highlight their limitations.

### ---Topical version

#### Causes passivity, tyranny and denies agency

**Antonio 95** (Robert J Antonio, PhD in sociology, professor of sociology at the University of Kansas, July 1995, “Nietzsche’s Antisociology: Subjectified Culture and the End of History,” *American Journal of Sociology* Volume 101 Number 1, GENDER MODIFIED)

According to Nietzsche, the "subject" is Socratic culture's most central, durable foundation. This prototypic expression of ressentiment, master reification, and ultimate justification for slave morality and mass disci- pline "separates strength from expressions of strength, as if there were a neutral substratum . . . free to express strength or not to do so. But there is no such substratum; there is no 'being' behind the doing, ef- fecting, becoming; 'the doer' is merely a fiction added to the deed" (Nietzsche 1969b, pp. 45-46). Leveling of Socratic culture's "objective" foundations makes its "subjective" features all the more important. For example, the subject is a central focus of the new human sciences, ap- pearing prominently in its emphases on neutral standpoints, motives as causes, and selves as entities, objects of inquiry, problems, and targets of care (Nietzsche 1966, pp. 19-21; 1968a, pp. 47-54). Arguing that subjectified culture weakens the personality, Nietzsche spoke of a "re- markable antithesis between an interior which fails to correspond to any exterior and an exterior which fails to correspond to any interior" (Nietzsche 1983, pp. 78-79, 83).¶ The "problem of the actor," Nietzsche said, "troubled me for the longest time."'12 He considered "roles" as "external," "surface," or "foreground" phenomena and viewed close personal identification with them as symptomatic of estrangement. While modern theorists saw dif- ferentiated roles and professions as a matrix of autonomy and reflexivity, Nietzsche held that persons (especially male professionals) in specialized occupations overidentify with their positions and engage in gross fabrica- tions to obtain advancement. They look hesitantly to the opinion of oth- ers, asking themselves, "How ought I feel about this?" They are so thoroughly absorbed in simulating effective role players that they have trouble being anything but actors-"The role has actually become the character." This highly subjectified social self or simulator suffers devas- tating inauthenticity. The powerful authority given the social greatly amplifies Socratic culture's already self-indulgent "inwardness." Integ- rity, decisiveness, spontaneity, and pleasure are undone by paralyzing overconcern about possible causes, meanings, and consequences of acts and unending internal dialogue about what others might think, expect, say, or do (Nietzsche 1983, pp. 83-86; 1986, pp. 39-40; 1974, pp. 302-4, 316-17). Nervous rotation of socially appropriate "masks" reduces persons to hypostatized "shadows," "abstracts," or simulacra. One adopts "many roles," playing them "badly and superficially" in the fashion of a stiff "puppet play." Nietzsche asked, "Are you genuine? Or only an actor?¶ A representative or that which is represented? . . . [Or] no more than an imitation of an actor?" Simulation is so pervasive that it is hard to tell the copy from the genuine article; social selves "prefer the copies to the originals" (Nietzsche 1983, pp. 84-86; 1986, p. 136; 1974, pp. 232- 33, 259; 1969b, pp. 268, 300, 302; 1968a, pp. 26-27). Their inwardness and aleatory scripts foreclose genuine attachment to others. This type of actor cannot plan for the long term or participate in enduring net- works of interdependence; such a person is neither willing nor able to be a "stone" in the societal "edifice" (Nietzsche 1974, pp. 302-4; 1986a, pp. 93-94). Superficiality rules in the arid subjectivized landscape. Neitzsche (1974, p. 259) stated, "One thinks with a watch in one's hand, even as one eats one's midday meal while reading the latest news of the stock market; one lives as if one always 'might miss out on something. ''Rather do anything than nothing': this principle, too, is merely a string to throttle all culture. . . . Living in a constant chase after gain compels people to expend their spirit to the point of exhaustion in continual pretense and overreaching and anticipating others."¶ Pervasive leveling, improvising, and faking foster an inflated sense of ability and an oblivious attitude about the fortuitous circumstances that contribute to role attainment (e.g., class or ethnicity). The most medio- cre people believe they can fill any position, even cultural leadership. Nietzsche respected the self-mastery of genuine ascetic priests, like Socra- tes, and praised their ability to redirect ressentiment creatively and to render the "sick" harmless. But he deeply feared the new simulated versions. Lacking the "born physician's" capacities, these impostors am- plify the worst inclinations of the herd; they are "violent, envious, ex- ploitative, scheming, fawning, cringing, arrogant, all according to cir- cumstances. " Social selves are fodder for the "great ~~man~~ [person] of the masses." Nietzsche held that "the less one knows how to command, the more ur- gently one covets someone who commands, who commands severely- a god, prince, class, physician, father confessor, dogma, or party conscience. The deadly combination of desperate conforming and overreaching and untrammeled ressentiment paves the way for a new type of tyrant (Nietzsche 1986, pp. 137, 168; 1974, pp. 117-18, 213, 288-89, 303-4).

### 2ac disad

**Theorizing human extinction challenges the ideology of anthropocentrism**

Kochi and Ordan 2008, (Tarik is a lecturer in the School of Law, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland. Noam is a linguist and translator, conducts research in Translation Studies at Bar Ilan University, Israel. 'An argument for the global suicide of humanity', Borderlands, December)

<http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_6981/is_3_7/ai_n31524968/?tag=content;col1>

In 2006 on an Internet forum called Yahoo! Answers a question was posted which read: "In a world that is in chaos politically, socially and environmentally, how can the human race sustain another 100 years?" The question was asked by prominent physicist Stephen Hawking (Hawking, 2007a). While Hawking claimed not to know 'the solution' he did suggest something of an answer (Hawking, 2007b). For Hawking the **only way for the human race to survive** in the future **is to** develop the technologies that would allow humans to **colonise other planets** in space beyond our own solar system. While Hawking's claim walks a path often trodden by science fiction, his suggestion is not untypical of the way humans have historically responded to social, material and environmental pressures and crises. By coupling an imagination of a new world or a better place with the production and harnessing of new technologies, humans have for a long time left old habitats and have created a home in others. The history of our species, homo sapiens, is marked by population movement aided by technological innovation: when life becomes too precarious in one habitat, members of the species take a risk and move to a new one. Along with his call for us to go forward and colonise other planets, Hawking does list a number of the human actions which have made this seem necessary. [1] What is at issue, however, is his failure to reflect upon the relationship between environmental destruction, scientific faith in the powers of technology and the attitude of speciesism. That is, it must be asked whether population movement really is the answer. After all, Hawking's suggestion to colonise other planets does little to address the central problem of **human action** which **has destroyed**, and continues to destroy, **our habitat on the earth**. While the notion of cosmic colonisation places faith in the saviour of humanity by technology as a solution, it lacks a crucial moment of reflection upon the manner in which human action and human technology has been and continues to be profoundly destructive. Indeed, **the colonisation of other planet**s would in no way solve the problem of environmental destruction; rather, it **would** merely **introduce this problem into a new habitat. The destruction of one planetary habitat is enough**--we should not naively endorse the future destruction of others. Hawking's approach to environmental catastrophe is an example of a certain modern faith in technological and social progress. One version of such an approach goes as follows: As our knowledge of the world and ourselves increases humans are able to create forms of technology and social organisation that act upon the world and change it for our benefit. However, just as there are many theories of 'progress' [2] there are also many modes of reflection upon the role of human action and its relationship to negative or destructive consequences. The version of progress enunciated in Hawking's story of cosmic colonisation presents a view whereby the solution to the negative consequences of technological action is to create new forms of technology, new forms of action. New action and innovation solve the dilemmas and consequences of previous action. Indeed, the very act of moving away, or rather evacuating, an ecologically devastated Earth is an example at hand. Such an approach involves a moment of reflection--previous errors and consequences are examined and taken into account and efforts are made to make things better. The idea of a better future informs reflection, technological innovation and action. However, is the form of reflection offered by Hawking broad or critical enough? Does his mode of reflection pay enough attention to the irredeemable moments of destruction, harm, pain and suffering inflicted historically by human action upon the non-human world? There are, after all, a variety of negative consequences of human action, moments of destruction, moments of suffering, which may not be redeemable or ever made better. Conversely there are a number of conceptions of the good in which humans do not take centre stage at the expense of others. What we try to do in this paper is to draw out some of the consequences of reflecting more broadly upon the negative costs of human activity in the context of environmental catastrophe. This involves re-thinking a general idea of progress through the historical and conceptual lenses of speciesism, colonialism, survival and complicity. Our proposed conclusion is that **the** only appropriate **moral response** to a history of human destructive action **is to give up** our claims to **biological supremacy** and to sacrifice our form of life so as to give an eternal gift to others. From the outset it is important to make clear that **the argument for the global suicide of humanity is** presented as **a thought experiment.** The purpose of such a proposal in response to Hawking is to help show how a certain conception of modernity, of which his approach is representative, is problematic. Taking seriously the idea of global suicide is one way of **throwing into question an ideology** or dominant discourse **of** modernist-**humanist action**. [3] By imagining an alternative to the existing state of affairs, **absurd as it may seem to some readers** by its nihilistic and radical 'solution', **we wish to open up** a ground for **a critical discussion of modernity** and its **negative impacts on both human and non-human animals**, as well as on the environment. [4] In this respect, by giving voice to the idea of a human-free world, we attempt to draw attention to some of the asymmetries of environmental reality and to give cause to question why attempts to build bridges from the human to the non-human have, so far, been unavailing. Subjects of ethical discourse One dominant presumption that underlies many modern scientific and political attitudes towards technology and creative human action is that of 'speciesism', which can itself be called a 'human-centric' view or attitude. The term 'speciesism', coined by psychologist Richard D. Ryder and later elaborated into a comprehensive ethics by Peter Singer (1975), refers to the attitude by which humans value their species above both non-human animals and plant life. Quite typically humans conceive non-human animals and plant life as something which might simply be used for their benefit. Indeed, this conception can be traced back to, among others, Augustine (1998, p.33). While many modern, 'enlightened' humans generally abhor racism, believe in the equality of all humans, condemn slavery and find cannibalism and human sacrifice repugnant, many still think and act in ways that are profoundly 'speciesist'. Most individuals may not even be conscious that they hold such an attitude, or many would simply assume that their attitude falls within the 'natural order of things'. Such an attitude thus resides deeply within modern human ethical customs and rationales and plays a profound role in the way in which humans interact with their environment. The possibility of the destruction of our habitable environment on earth through global warming and Hawking's suggestion that we respond by colonising other planets forces us to ask a serious question about how we value human life in relation to our environment. The use of the term 'colonisation' is significant here as it draws to mind the recent history of the colonisation of much of the globe by white, European peoples. Such actions were often justified by valuing European civilisation higher than civilisations of non-white peoples, especially that of indigenous peoples. For scholars such as Edward Said (1978), however, the practice of colonialism is intimately bound up with racism. That is, colonisation is often justified, legitimated and driven by a view in which the right to possess territory and govern human life is grounded upon an assumption of racial superiority. **If we were to colonise other planets**, what form of 'racism' would underlie our actions? **What higher value would we place upon** human life, upon **the human race, at the expense of other forms of life** which would justify our taking over a new habitat and altering it to suit our prosperity and desired living conditions? Generally, the animal rights movement responds to the ongoing colonisation of animal habitats by humans by asking whether the modern Western subject should indeed be the central focus of its ethical discourse. In saying 'x harms y', animal rights philosophers wish to incorporate in 'y' non-human animals. That is, they enlarge the group of subjects to which ethical relations apply. In this sense such thinking does not greatly depart from any school of modern ethics, but simply extends ethical duties and obligations to non-human animals. In eco-ethics, on the other hand, the role of the subject and its relation to ethics is treated a little differently. The less radical environmentalists talk about future human generations so, according to this approach, 'y' includes a projection into the future to encompass the welfare of hitherto non-existent beings. Such an approach is prevalent in the Green Party in Germany, whose slogan is "Now. For tomorrow". For others, such as the 'deep ecology' movement, the subject is expanded so that it may include the environment as a whole. In this instance, according to Naess, 'life' is **not** to be understood **in "a biologically narrow sense". Rather** he argues that the term 'life' should be used in a comprehensive non-technical way such that it refers **also to things biologists may classify as non-living**. This would include **rivers**, landscapes, cultures, **and ecosystems**, all understood as "**the living earth**" (Naess, 1989, p.29). From this perspective the statement 'x harms y' renders 'y' somewhat vague. What occurs is not so much a conflict over the degree of ethical commitment, between "shallow" and "deep ecology" or between "light" and "dark greens" per se, but rather a broader re-drawing of the content of the subject of Western philosophical discourse and its re-definition as 'life'. Such a position involves differing metaphysical commitments to the notions of being, intelligence and moral activity. This blurring and re-defining of the subject of moral discourse can be found in other ecocentric writings (e.g. Lovelock, 1979; Eckersley, 1992) and in other philosophical approaches. [5] In part our approach bears some similarity with these 'holistic' approaches in that we share dissatisfaction with the modern, Western view of the 'subject' as purely human-centric. Further, we share some of their criticism of bourgeois green lifestyles. However, our approach is to stay partly within the position of the modern, Western human-centric view of the subject and to question what happens to it in the field of moral action when environmental catastrophe demands the radical extension of ethical obligations to non-human beings. That is**, if we** stick with the modern humanist subject of moral action, and **follow seriously the extension of** ethical **obligations to non-human** beings, **then** we would suggest that what we find is that **the utopian demand of modern humanism turns** over **into** a **utopian anti-humanism**, with suicide as its outcome. One way of attempting to re-think the modern subject is thus to throw the issue of suicide right in at the beginning and acknowledge its position in modern ethical thought. This would be to recognise that the question of suicide resides at the center of moral thought, already. What survives when humans no longer exist? There continues to be a debate over the extent to which humans have caused environmental problems such as global warming (as opposed to natural, cyclical theories of the earth's temperature change) and over whether phenomena such as global warming can be halted or reversed. Our position is that regardless of where one stands within these debates it is clear that humans have inflicted degrees of harm upon non-human animals and the natural environment. And from this point we suggest that it is the operation of speciesism as colonialism which must be addressed. One approach is of course to adopt the approach taken by Singer and many within the animal rights movement and remove our species, homo sapiens, from the centre of all moral discourse. Such an approach would thereby take into account not only human life, but also the lives of other species, to the extent that the living environment as a whole can come to be considered the proper subject of morality. We would suggest, however, that this philosophical approach can be taken a number of steps further. If the standpoint that we have a moral responsibility towards the environment in which all sentient creatures live is to be taken seriously, then we perhaps have reason to question whether there remains any strong ethical grounds to justify the further existence of humanity. For example, if one considers the modern scientific practice of experimenting on animals, both the notions of progress and speciesism are implicitly drawn upon within the moral reasoning of scientists in their justification of committing violence against nonhuman animals. The typical line of thinking here is that because animals are valued less than humans they can be sacrificed for the purpose of expanding scientific knowledge focussed upon improving human life. Certainly some within the scientific community, such as physiologist Colin Blakemore, contest aspects of this claim and argue that experimentation on animals is beneficial to both human and nonhuman animals (e.g. Grasson, 2000, p.30). Such claims are 'disingenuous', however, in that they hide the relative distinctions of value that underlie a moral justification for sacrifice within the practice of experimentation (cf. LaFollette & Shanks, 1997, p.255). If there is a benefit to non-human animals this is only incidental, what remains central is a practice of sacrificing the lives of other species for the benefit of humans. Rather than reject this common reasoning of modern science we argue that it should be reconsidered upon the basis of species equality. That is, modern science needs to ask the question of: 'Who' is the best candidate for 'sacrifice' for the good of the environment and all species concerned? **The moral response to the** violence, suffering and **damage humans have inflicted** upon this earth and its inhabitants might then be to argue for the sacrifice of the human species. The moral act **would be the global suicide of humanity**.

#### Endorsing a policy of environmental protection in the face of disadvantages reframes ecological assumptions

Hovden 99 (Eivind Hovden; Senior Research Fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway; 1999; “As if nature doesn't matter: Ecology, regime theory and¶ international relations”; Environmental Politics, 8:2, 50-74; KDUB)

As far as regime theory goes, it contains few explicit claims to the effect¶ that the world we live in is preferable to alternative scenarios,9 but again, it¶ is the implicit epistemological stance which, as the limiting clause, provides¶ this conservatism. David Long has criticised the neo-liberal institutionalist¶ theory of Keohane and Moravcsik on exactly these grounds. Their¶ theoretical limitations have analytical consequences, but perhaps more¶ worryingly, there are political consequences too: neo-liberal institutionalism¶ is conservative 'in terms of the focus on the state, and in terms of the¶ method, as a positivistic social scientific approach works with the status quo¶ ante without questioning its origins or development' [Long, 1995: 504].¶ The positivist-inspired epistemology implicitly or explicitly adopted by¶ regime theorists effectively limits the scope for intellectual inquiry, and the¶ effect for the analysis of environmental issues is that the modernity of¶ environmental problems remain un-examined. This is exactly the type of¶ ecological conservatism which ecological thought seeks to challenge, and¶ the specifically modern character of environmental degradation is the very¶ issue which ecological thought is so anxious to address.¶ Of course, environmental issues often provide good examples of how¶ questions of value are embedded in what have traditionally been conceived¶ as fact-oriented or 'technical' questions. For example, when choosing one¶ policy over another, costs are usually of paramount importance. The¶ calculation of the costs of various options has traditionally been the job of¶ economists, and is not thought to entail value-judgements. However, a large¶ number of environmentalists (from the most radical to the more¶ mainstream) have pointed out that the pricing itself is ecologically¶ problematic.10 This is because price generally fails to take into account the¶ environmental costs of particular activities or products, and even if it does,¶ one tends to run into an even more complex problem: the valuation of the¶ environment tends to be very anthropocentric, that is, valuing the¶ environment merely according to how humans happen to value it." As¶ Michael Redclift has pointed out in a recent book, it is often argued that¶ increased environmental protection will jeopardise the creation of wealth.¶ However, implicit in such a statement are a host of assumptions about how we place value, and only a reconsideration of these assumptions will allow¶ us to look at the environmental challenge in a different, and perhaps more¶ optimistic light [Redclift, 1996: 51, and passim]. This would be a task well¶ beyond the self-imposed boundaries of regime theory, or, at the very least,¶ would involve a clear rejection of the positivist conception of social inquiry.¶ On the other hand, one of the central contentions of ecological thought is¶ that the way in which we assign value to animals, plants, and other natural¶ objects is historically contingent, highly anthropocentric, and therefore¶ problematic. Clearly, therefore, a judgement about the costs of a particular¶ policy is - and this is especially pertinent with regard to environmental¶ issues - intrinsically tied to how we chose to value things around us. We are¶ therefore in the realm of morality and ethics, as much as science. As¶ Hayward puts it, we have to address the general question of how we value¶ before we can address debates in specific spheres of value [Hayward, 1994:¶ 53].n

#### Their impact calculus is just moral prejudice—the burden is on them to prove why humans are the center of value.

Regan 90 (Tom, Professor of Philosophy at NC State, “Christianity and Animal Rights: The Challenge and Promise” 1990)

Those who oppose or resist the animal rights position might seize upon these two differences in an effort to justify themselves in accepting extreme positions regarding rape and child abuse, for example, while rejecting the "extremism" of animal rights. But neither of these differences will bear the weight of justification. That a view, whether moral or otherwise, is very generally accepted is not a sufficient reason for accepting it as true. Time was when the shape of the earth was generally believed to be flat, and time was when the presence of physical and mental handicaps were very generally thought to make the people who bore them morally inferior. That very many people believed these falsehoods obviously did not make them true. We don’t discover or confirm what’s true by taking a vote. The reverse of the preceding also can be demonstrated. That a view, moral or otherwise, is not generally accepted is not a sufficient reason for judging it to be false. When those lonely few first conjectured that the earth is round and that women are the moral equals of men, they conjectured truly, notwithstanding how grandly they were outnumbered. The solitary person who, in Thoreau’s enduring image, marches to a different drummer, may be the only person to apprehend the truth. The second difference noted above is more problematic. That difference cites the fact that child abuse and rape, for example, involve evils done to human beings, while the animal-rights position claims that certain evils are done to nonhuman animals. Now there is no question that this does constitute a difference. The question is, Is this a ***morally***relevant difference -- a difference, that is, that would justify us in accepting the extreme opposition we judge to be appropriate in the case of child abuse and rape, for example, but which most people resist or abjure in the case of, say, vivisection? For a variety of reasons I do not think that this difference is a morally relevant one. Viewed scientifically, this second difference succeeds only in citing a biological difference: the victims of rape and child abuse belong to one species (the species Homo sapiens) whereas the victims of vivisection and trapping belong to another species (the species *canis lupus,*for example). But biological differences ***inside***the species Homo sapiens do not justify radically different treatment among those individual humans who differ biologically (for example, in terms of sex, or skin color, or chromosome count). Why, then, should biological differences ***outside***our species count morally? If having one eye or deformed limbs does not disqualify a human being from moral consideration equal to that given to those humans who are more fortunate, how can it be rational to disqualify a rat or a wolf from equal moral consideration because, unlike us, they have paws and a tail? Some of those who resist or oppose the animal-rights position might have recourse to "intuition" at this point. They might claim that one either sees that the principal biological difference at issue (namely, species membership) is a morally relevant one, or one does not see this. No reason can be given as to why belonging to the species Homo sapiens gives one a superior moral status, just as no reason can be given as to why belonging to the species canis lupus gives wolves an inferior moral status (if wolves have a moral status at all). This difference in moral status can only be grasped immediately, without making an inference, by an exercise of intuitive reason. This moral difference is self-evident -- or so it will be claimed by those who claim to intuit it. However attractive this appeal to intuition may seem to some, it woefully fails to bear the weight of justification. The plain fact is, people have claimed to **intuit** differences in the comparative moral standing of individuals and groups *inside*the human species, and these alleged intuitions, we all would agree, are painful symptoms of unquestioned and

#### Look at their impact through a lens of skepticism – possibility does not result in probability

Gross and Gilles 12 (Matthew Barrett Gross is the editor of the Glen Canyon Reader and is a media strategist who has worked for Howard Dean's groundbreaking 2004 presidential campaign and Jon Tester's successful campaign for U.S. Senate in Montana. More Matthew Barrett Gross.Mel Gilles is a writer and a former advocate for victims of domestic abuse. Her essay, "The Politics of Victimization," went viral in 2004, reaching more than 2 million readers, The Last Myth: What the Rise of Apocalyptic Thinking Tells Us About America, pp123---125; http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/04/how-apocalyptic-thinking-prevents-us-from-taking-political-action/255758/; Kristof)

Flip through the cable channels for long enough, and you'll inevitably find the apocalypse. On Discovery or National Geographic or History you'll find shows like MegaDisasters, Doomsday Preppers, or The Last Days on Earth chronicling, in an hour of programming, dozens of ways the world might end: a gamma ray burst from a nearby star peeling away the Earth's ozone layer like an onion; a mega-volcano erupting and plunging our planet into a new ice age; the magnetic poles reversing. Turn to a news channel, and the headlines appear equally apocalyptic, declaring that the "UN Warns of Rapid Decay in Environment" or that "Humanity's Very Survival" is at risk. On another station, you'll find people arguing that the true apocalyptic threat to our way of life is not the impending collapse of ecosystems and biodiversity but the collapse of the dollar as the world's global currency. Change the channel again, and you'll see still others insisting that malarial mosquitoes, drunk on West Nile virus, are the looming specter of apocalypse darkening our nation's horizon. How to make sense of it all? After all, not every scenario can be an apocalyptic threat to our way of life -- can it? For many, the tendency is to dismiss all the potential crises we are facing as overblown: perhaps cap and trade is just a smoke screen designed to earn Al Gore billions from his clean-energy investments; perhaps terrorism is just an excuse to increase the power and reach of the government. For others, the panoply of potential disasters becomes overwhelming, leading to a distorted and paranoid vision of reality and the threats facing our world -- as seen on shows like Doomsday Preppers. Will an epidemic wipe out humanity, or could a meteor destroy all life on earth? By the time you're done watching Armageddon Week on the History Channel, even a rapid reversal of the world's magnetic poles might seem terrifyingly likely and imminent. The last time apocalyptic anxiety spilled into the mainstream to the extent that it altered the course of history -- during the Reformation -- it relied on a revolutionary new communications technology: the printing press. In a similar way, could the current surge in apocalyptic anxiety be attributed in part to our own revolution in communications technology? The media, of course, have long mastered the formula of packaging remote possibilities as urgent threats, as sociologist Barry Glassner pointed out in his bestseller The Culture of Fear. We're all familiar with the formula: "It's worse than you think," the anchor intones before delivering an alarming report on date-rape drugs, stalking pedophiles, flesh-eating bacteria, the Ebola virus (née avian flu cum swine flu). You name it (or rename it): if a threat has even a remote chance of materializing, it is treated as an imminent inevitability by television news. It's not just that if it bleeds, it leads. If it might bleed, it still leads. Such sensationalist speculation attracts eyeballs and sells advertising, because fear sells -- and it can sell everything from pharmaceuticals to handguns to duct tape to insurance policies. "People react to fear, not love," Richard Nixon once said. "They don't teach that in Sunday school, but it's true." Nothing inspires fear like the end of the world, and ever since Y2K, the media's tendency toward overwrought speculation has been increasingly married to the rhetoric of apocalypse. Today, nearly any event can be explained through apocalyptic language, from birds falling out of the sky (the Birdocalypse?) to a major nor'easter (Snowmageddon!) to a double-dip recession (Barackalypse! Obamageddon!). Armageddon is here at last -- and your local news team is live on the scene! We've seen the equivalent of grade inflation (A for Apocalypse!) for every social, political, or ecological challenge before us, an escalating game of one-upmanship to gain the public's attention. Why worry about global warming and rising sea levels when the collapse of the housing bubble has already put your mortgage underwater? Why worry that increasing droughts will threaten the supply of drinking water in America's major cities when a far greater threat lies in the possibility of an Arab terrorist poisoning that drinking supply, resulting in millions of casualties? Yet not all of the crises or potential threats before us are equal, nor are they equally probable -- a fact that gets glossed over when the media equate the remote threat of a possible event, like epidemics, with real trends like global warming.

#### Emphasizing the legal and technical minutiae of environmentalism disempowers local communities who are rendered passive in the face of expertise debate

**Shutkin in 2000** (William, Urban Studies and Planning at M.I.T., The Land That Could Be: Environmentalism And Democracy In The Twenty-First Century, P. Ebook)

**With its emphasis on legal and technical solutions, mainstream-professional environmentalism has failed to encourage active political and civic participation. The legal and technical nature of mainstream-professional environmentalism has given it the appearance of being almost apolitical**—beyond politics and **in the realm of neutral expertise.** Viewed as a high-powered elite with access to government and industry leaders, mainstream-professional environmentalists have inadvertently disempowered local constituencies, who are often left feeling they are not heard in determining environmental outcomes and that the issues that matter to them are generally not of concern to mainstream-professional environmentalists. With its direct mail machinery, centralized structure, and top-down decision making, mainstream-professional environmentalism has cultivated a largely passive constituency and in the process has stripped itself of the ability to activate and inspire robust political participation and civic engagement, the very forces that can hold decision makers accountable, prevent environmental harms, and institute local and regional environmental strategies like smart growth and brownfields redevelopment. ¶ This kind of environmentalism has relied on legal and advocacy tools often at the expense of other techniques, such as community and regional planning, which both engages local stakeholders and establishes meaningful environmental and social goals. Planners and their expansive toolbox of ideas and practices aimed at building livable, health communities comprise a separate tradition from mainstream-professional environmentalism. In the light of the traditional disjunction between environmental law and policy on the one hand and land use and planning on the other, the failure of environmentalism to embrace proactive, planning-oriented strategies is understandable, though unfortunate. The ideas of visionary planners, from Frederick Law Olmsted, Lewis Mumford, and Jane Jacobs, to Benton MacKaye, Ian MacHarg, and Robert Yaro, have remained outside the sphere of mainstream-professional environmental advocacy, resulting in a largely after-the-fact approach to environmental problem-solving. ¶ Moreover, without an engaged constituency behind them, mainstream-professional environmentalists have been at a disadvantage in dealing with the influence of corporations and other private actors on the design and enforcement of environmental laws. As new initiatives like Project XL and ERP demonstrate, **even the most well-intentioned policies can falter in the absence of the full participation of community stakeholders**. Mainstream-professional environmentalists have not prepared these stakeholders to participate in initiatives like Project XL or ERP and have failed to marshal the broad-based political power necessary to level the playing field of environmental law and policy. ¶ The elitism and homogeneity of traditional environmentalism is further evidence of the movement's democratic deficits. Only recently bothering to reach out across racial or economic lines, mainstream-professional environmentalism has alienated racial minorities and the working class, who traditionally have not identified with environmentalists. Moreover, notwithstanding the progress of the past several decades, environmental harms have not let up in lower-income and minority communities, revealing a gap in mainstream-professional environmentalism's advocacy agenda or, worse, **confirming the success of the environmental law and policy system.** As environmental justice attorney Luke Cole writes, ¶ Environmental laws are not designed by or for poor people. The theory and ideology behind environmental laws ignores the systemic genesis of pollution. Environmental statutes actually legitimate the pollution of low-income neighborhoods. Further, those with political and economic power have used environmental laws in ways which have resulted in poor people bearing a disproportionate share of environmental hazards.... ¶ Mainstream environmentalists see pollution as the failure of government and industry—if the environmentalists could only shape up the few bad apples, our environment would be protected. But grassroots activists come to view pollution as the success of government and industry, success at industry's primary objective: maximizing profits by externalizing environmental costs. Pollution of our air, land, and water that is literally killing people is often not in violation of environmental laws. 54

#### Apocalyptic focus causes paranoiac denialism because people don’t want to grasp the severity of their actions

Foust et al. 8 (Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, et al., with William O. Murphy, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and Chelsea Stow, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 2008, “Global Warming and Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Critical Frame Analysis of US Popular and Elite Press Coverage from 1997-2007,” Paper Submitted to the Environmental Communication Division of the National Communication Association Convention in San Diego, 11/20, p. 22-23)

Elements of an apocalyptic frame could be said to exist in most of the articles we read, though all elements were not present in each article. Nonetheless, apocalyptic framing should give us pause, for it threatens to hinder progress in forming a political will to change the carbon-based energy economy (and thus mitigate the consequences of global warming). To announce the coming of the apocalypse creates despair as people feel they cannot stop such an event, but can only hope that they are among the chosen few to be saved (if they believe in the immanence of the end). Apocalyptic framing also creates denial, as when people fail to exit the movie theater because they have heard fire yelled once too often. There may also be a sense of denial in terms of the effectiveness of solutions: Why make changes to our lifestyle, if the world is going to end [end page 22] quickly and our actions don’t make a difference anyway? If the end is, indeed, the total destruction of earth, won’t our efforts to make change now be in vain? As Brummett suggests of pre-millennial apocalyptic rhetoric (which assumes that the world will be destroyed after a judgment day), the cosmically mandated telos of catastrophe overshadows any efforts to change the trajectory of the narrative. The only place for human agency within such rhetoric is the capacity to agree with prophesies, against the polarized opposition of non-believers. By agreeing with the prophesies, “believers” feel a sense of control over the situation because they are “right,” not necessarily because they are taking collective and personal steps to resolve the issue.

### 2ac pre-empt pic

#### Detaching theory and practice mean they don’t solve

Schlosberg 13 (David Schlosberg; Environmental Politics Volume 22, Issue 1, 2013 Special Issue: Coming of Age? Environmental Politics at 21; “Theorising environmental justice: the expanding sphere of a discourse”; pages 37-55; KDUB)

This focus on the relationship between practice and theory has also been central to my attempts to understand the ‘justice’ of environmental justice (Schlosberg 2004, 2007). Many attempts to define environmental or climate justice have been too detached from the actual demands of social movements that use the idea as an organising theme or identity. This does assume that there is a value to movement practice – that theory can, and should, actually learn from the language, demands, and action of movements. Why, the more purist academic or sceptic might ask, should we prioritise what activists believe or do? But the question should not be about who is the best judge of a conception of justice – activists or theorists. The point is that different discourses of justice, and the various experiences and articulations of injustice, inform how the concept is used, understood, articulated, and demanded in practice; the engagement with what is articulated on the ground is of crucial value to our understanding and development of the concepts we study. It continues to be unfortunate that there are those in the study of environmentalism, or in the theoretical realm, who simply cannot see the importance, and range, of these articulations at the intersection of theory and practice – especially when movement innovation is as broad and informative as it is in environmental justice.

### luke

#### Explanations of managerialism are overly SIMPLISTIC and insufficient – an ecological approach is comparatively better in the context of Maquiladoras

Orihuela and Hageman 11 (Balachandran Orihuela, Sharada, and Andrew Carl Hageman. "The Virtual Realities Of US/Mexico Border Ecologies In Maquilapolis And Sleep Dealer." Environmental Communication 5.2 (2011): 166-186. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. 3 Sept. 2013. KDUB)

First, it would be simple enough to assert that the protagonists of both films¶ become part of the machines. This could mean that they become part of the physical¶ machines with which they produce commodities or perform construction labor, or it¶ could mean that they are interchangeable components in the machine of the factory,¶ or, on an even larger scale, components of global capitalism itself. Without analytical¶ specificity, the overused and undertheorized assertion of humans becoming parts, or¶ cogs, in the machine can be more obfuscating than clarifying. Thus, a brief¶ explanation of what we mean by this phrase is necessary. There is a long and diverse¶ history of the figure of humans being turned into a part of the machine. Perhaps,¶ most famous are Karl Marx’s passage in Volume I of Capital, when he writes, ‘‘in¶ handicraft, the worker makes use of tools; in the factory, the machines make use of¶ him’’ (1990, p. 548), and ‘‘they distort the worker into a fragment of a man, they¶ degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, they destroy the actual¶ 174 S. B. Orihuela and A. C. Hageman¶ content of his labor by turning it into a torment . . .’’ (1990, p. 799). And in The¶ Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels write:¶ Owing to the extensive use of machinery, and to the division of labour, the work of¶ the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for¶ the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most¶ simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him¶ (2003, p. 131).¶ Other theorists (Max Weber, Herbert Marcuse, and Hannah Arendt, to name a few)¶ have rehearsed this human becoming part of the machine figure, but one of the most¶ significant historical developments in this line of theorizing human/machine¶ interfaces is the way Taylorization equally served the seemingly contrary ideologies¶ of capitalism and communism in the 1920s1930s. Fredrick Taylor’s program of¶ tuning human efficiency and productivity served the ideologies of both the American¶ assembly-line industrial capitalist production and Stalinist soviet production. In both¶ cases, to serve as an appendage of the machine was a positive state of being, at least¶ from the point of view of the capitalist owner and the communist social engineer.¶ Today, however, becoming part of the machine conjures an almost exclusively¶ pejorative connotation, labeled as a figure of an exploitative attitude that facilitates¶ dehumanization and unsustainable use of the nonhuman elements of the biophysical¶ material world.¶ The laborers’ state of becoming part of the machine in Maquilapolis is illustrated¶ strikingly in the multiple scenes in which they pantomime their machine-tending¶ work outdoors. Because the laborers have no way to document the machines and¶ their interfacing with them inside the policed maquiladoras, they must demonstrate¶ their labor uncoupled from the machines when engaged in political protests. From¶ one point of view, their movements could look like an odd version of Chinese¶ taijiquan,3 but the pace and pressures of factory production easily dispel any¶ comparison to that meditative exercise. Instead, the spectator sees a group of human¶ beings performing strange routines that illustrate the internalization of their labor,¶ including their interfacing with machines. Thus, it seems that the automation of their¶ labor is what makes this spectacle horrifying. Revealed in these scenes is a state of¶ being in which the humanness of laborers is displaced by enforced automation that¶ rebuilds each one of them as a machine.¶ However, if we can interrogate this phobia of automation, a different horror comes¶ into view. Gilbert Simondon has suggested in On the Mode of Existence of Technical¶ Objects that machines have historically been designed and modified under the control¶ of the market. The machines are, no less than their human laborer counterparts,¶ slaves to market forces and thereby to the modes of production of which they are¶ constituents; or, as Simondon puts it, ‘‘In order to make a machine automatic, it is¶ necessary to sacrifice many of its functional possibilities and many of its possible¶ uses’’ (1980, p. 13). To be automated is for the machine to be de-mechanized just as¶ the laborers pantomiming appear to be dehumanized through their automatic¶ movements. By absenting the machines from view, Maquilapolis allows the spectator¶ Virtual Realities of Maquilapolis and Sleep Dealer 175¶ to visualize and think awry the machine production in these factories. Rather than¶ being dazzled by the fascinating movements of complex machines, the spectator is¶ liberated to conceptualize this mode of production as effects. Because there is no¶ machine here against which to rage, we can see and think about the laborers in relation¶ to the maquiladora machines that are poisoning the watershed, including these people¶ and their families. The point is not to dismiss the notion of dehumanization, but to¶ shift the focus to the way the machines we are not shown are not neutral objects. Yet,¶ the machines are negative objects because of their participation in structures that¶ exploit labor and commit mass acts of ecological degradation.

#### Luke concludes that institutional change is necessary to stop extinction – their alternative fails

Luke, 97 – professor of political science at Virginia polytechnic

Timothy, “Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy, and Culture”, pg 126-127

It may be true that “the actions of those now living will determine the future and possibly the very survival of the species”, but it is, in fact, mostly a mystification. Only the actions of a very small handful of the humans who are now living, namely, those in significant positions of decisive managerial power in business or central executive authority in government, can truly do something to determine the future. Hollander’s belief that thousands of his readers, who will replace their light bulbs, water heaters, automobiles, or toilets with ecologically improved alternatives, can decisively affect the survival of the species is pure ideology. It may sell new kinds of toilets, cars, appliances, and light bulbs, but it does not guarantee planetary survival. Hollander does not stop here. He even asserts that everyone on the planet, not merely the average consumers in affluent societies, is to blame for the ecological crisis. Therefore, he maintains, rightly and wrongly, that “no attempt to protect the environment will be successful in the long run unless ordinary people—the California executive, the Mexican peasant, the Soviet [*sic*] factory worker, the Chinese farmer—are willing to adjust their life-styles and values. Our wasteful, careless ways must become a thing of the past.” The wasteful, careless ways of the California executive plainly must be ecologically reconstituted, but the impoverished practices of Mexican peasants and Chinese farmers, short of what many others would see as their presumed contributions to “overpopulation,” are probably already at levels of consumption that Hollander happily would ratify as ecologically sustainable if the California executive could only attain and abide by them. As Hollander asserts, “every aspect of our lives has some environmental impact,” and, in some sense, everyone he claims, “must acknowledge the responsibility we were all given as citizens of the planet and act on the hundreds of opportunities to save our planet that present themselves every day.” Nevertheless, the typical consumer does not control the critical aspects of his or her existence in ways that have any major environmental impact. Nor do we all encounter hundreds of opportunities every day to do much to save the planet. The absurd claim that average consumers only need to shop, bicycle, or garden their way to an ecological failure merely moves most of the responsibility and much of the blame away from the institutional center of power whose decisions actually maintain the wasteful, careless ways of material exchange that Hollander would end by having everyone recycle all their soda cans.

#### Rejection of managerialism is just as dangerous – their author

Luke, 97 – professor of political science at Virginia polytechnic

Timothy, “Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy, and Culture”, pg. 80

Although resource managerialism can be criticized on many levels, it has provisionally guaranteed some measure of limited protection to wilderness areas, animal species, and watercourses in the United States. And, whatever its flaws, the attempt to extend the scope of its oversight to other regions of the world probably could have a similar impact. Resource managerialism directly confronts the existing cultural, economic, and social regime of transnational corporate capitalism with the fact that millions of Americans, as well as billions of other human beings, must be provisioned from the living things populating Earth’s biosphere (the situation of all these other living things, of course, is usually ignored or reduced to an aesthetic question). And, if they are left unregulated, as history as shown, the existing corporate circuits of commodity production will degrade the biosphere to the point that all living things will not be able to renew themselves. Other ecological activists can fault resource managerialism, but few, if any, of them face these present-day realities as forthrightly in actual practice, largely because the prevailing regimes of state and corporate power, now assuming the forms of the “wise-use” movement often regard even this limited challenge as far too radical. Still, this record of “success” is not a license to ignore the flawed working of resource managerialism. In fact, this forthright engagement with resource realities raises very serious questions, as the global tactics of such agencies as the Worldwatch Institute reveal.

### nietzsche

#### The only way we can become the Übermensch is by embracing the finitude of our lives and the enormousness of nature

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 73, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

Here Rank joins Kierkegaard in the belief that one should not stop and circumscribe his life with beyonds that are near at hand, or a bit further out, or created by oneself. One should reach for the highest beyond of religion: man should cultivate the passivity of renunciation to the highest powers no matter how diffcult it is. Anything less is less than full development, even if it seems like weakness and compromise to the best thinkers. Nietzsche railed at the Judeo-Christian renunciatory morality; but as Rank said, he “overlooked the deep need in the human being for just that kind of morality… .”34 Rank goes so far as to say that the “need for a truly religious ideology … is inherent in human nature and its fulfillment is basic to any kind of social life.”35 Do Freud and others imagine that surrender to God is masochistic, that to empty oneself is demeaning? Well, answers Rank, it represents on the contrary the furthest reach of the self, the highest idealization man can achieve. It represents the fulfillment of the Agape love-expansion, the achievement of the truly creative type. Only in this way, says Rank, only by surrendering to the bigness of nature on the highest, least-fetishized level, can man conquer death. In other words, the true heroic validation of one’s life lies beyond sex, beyond the other, beyond the private religion—all these are makeshifts that pull man down or that hem him in, leaving him torn with ambiguity. Man feels inferior precisely when he lacks “true inner values in the personality,” when he is merely a reflex of something next to him and has no steadying inner gyroscope, no centering in himself. And in order to get such centering man has to look beyond the “thou,” beyond the consolations of others and of the things of this world.36

#### Acting and assumptions are key to survival

Nietzsche 1882 (The Gay Science, Kaufmann translation. TL)

Origin of the logical.- How did logic come into existence in man's head? Certainly out of illogic, whose realm originally must have been immense. **Innumerable beings who made inferences in a way different from ours perished**; for all that, their ways might have been truer. **Those**. for example, **who did not** know how to **find** often enough what is "equal" as regards both **nourishment and hostile animals**-those. in other words, **who subsumed things too slowly and cautiously-were favored with a lesser probability of survival than those who guessed immediately upon encountering similar instances that they must be equal.** The dominant tendency. however, to treat as equal what is merely similar-an illogical tendency. for **nothing is really equal**-is what ·first created any basis for logic. In order that the concept of substance could originate which is indispensable for logic although in the strictest sense nothing real corresponds to it- it was likewise necessary that for a long time one did not see nor perceive the changes in things. **The beings that did not see so precisely had an advantage over those that saw everything "in flux”.** · At bottom, every high degree of caution in making inferences and **every skeptical tendency constitute a great danger for life. No living beings would have survived if the opposite tendency-to affirm** rather than suspend judgment, to err and make up things rather than wait, to assent **rather than negate.** to pass judgment rather than be just-**had not been bred to the point where it became extraordinarily strong.** The course of logical ideas and inferences in our brain today corresponds to a process and a struggle among impulses that are, taken singly, very illogical and unjust. **We generally experience only the result of this struggle** because this primeval mechanism now runs its course so quickly and is so well concealed.

#### Ressentiment is silly—avoiding it by rejecting active compassion is life-negating

Frazer 6

The Review of Politics (2006), 68: 49-78 Cambridge University Press

Michael Frazer's research focuses on Enlightenment political philosophy and its relevance for contemporary political theory. His current book project, “The Enlightenment of Sympathy: Justice and the Moral Sentiments in the Eighteenth Century and Today,” defends a psychologically holistic approach to political reflection through an examination of such authors as David Hume, Adam Smith and J. G. Herder. Dr. Frazer has also published articles on Maimonides, Nietzsche, John Rawls and Leo Strauss in such journals as "Political Theory" and "The Review of Politics." After receiving his B.A. from Yale University and his Ph.D. from Princeton University, Dr. Frazer spent the 2006-7 academic year as a postdoctoral research associate in the Political Theory Project at Brown University.

Assistant professor – HARVARD

There is a second way in which the painful experience of compassion can threaten human excellence. Not only do we risk developing contempt for all but the suffering masses, but we also risk developing contempt for the compassion that forces us to suffer with them. The terrible experience of shared suffering might lead some of the would-be great on a futile quest to abolish human misery. Others, however, are likely to conclude that their sympathetic pain could be most efficiently relieved by extirpating the faculties responsible for it. When we do not hate the suffering of others, but only our own sharing of this suffering, we seek only to banish compassion from our own breasts. Doing so, however, requires us to shield ourselves from the troubling awareness of our fellows' plight, to sever the imaginative and emotional bonds which connect us to others. It requires that we turn against our own strength of intelligence and imagination, that we sacrifice knowledge for ignorance by denying our insights into the human condition. Some of us might succeed in turning ourselves into such isolated, unthinking beings, but such individuals are not destined for creative achievement.

By contrast, the natural philosopher, poet, or psychologist—the born and inevitable unriddler of human souls—could no more destroy his own sense of compassion than he could abolish the human suffering which compassion compels him to share. A futile quest to extirpate his sympathetic sentiments would only turn such an individual against the world, against life, and against himself; in the end, it might even destroy him. Zarathustra does not pass the greatest test of his strength by purging compassion from his psyche. To the contrary, he affirms his painful experience of the emotion as creativity-enhancing and life-promoting. In doing so, Nietzsche's protagonist warns against those who unduly oppose compassion as well as those who unduly celebrate it. Both sides treat pain as something to be soothed away rather than harnessed for creative purposes; they differ only in whether the pain to be alleviated is our own or that of others. From the ethically authoritative perspective of life, both can be seen as opponents of human flourishing.