=1NC=

===Securitizing the environment cedes authority to military and security experts, which trades off with focus on the environment and instead justifies militaristic buildup.===

Brzoska 8

Michael Brzoska ~'8, Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg ~~["The securitization of climate change and the power of conceptions of security," Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Convention 2008,~~]

In the literature on securitization it is implied that when a problem is securitized it

AND

for climate change, both policy areas are in competition for scarce resources.

===(2/3)Militarism~'s logical conclusion is extinction; historical trends show an ever increasing amount of violence and devastation in military solutions that threatens all of existence===

Mészáros 3 (István, June 2003, Phil. @ U of Sussex, Monthly Review Volume 55, Number 2)

It is not for the first time in history that militarism weighs on the consciousness

AND

no return if we accept the ongoing course of development.3/3

===3/3Understanding how our rhetoric affects the way we make policy is a prerequisite to the policy itself, otherwise they are will be doomed to fail.===

Loge 2005

Peter Loge ~~[The George Washington University; Former Director, The Justice Project~~] Publisher: Drake University Law Review ~~[53 Drake L. Rev. 693~~] Lexis-Nexis

"A critical piece in the politics of the policy puzzle is language - how

AND

. As such, political language and issue framing is hotly contested ground."

===The Alternative is to reject the rhetoric of the 1AC and its underpinnings as functions of environmental securitization; the policies of the past have failed to stop the impacts of climate change and the AFF perpetuates failed policies===

Barnett 2

Barnett, Fellow in the School of Social and Environmental Enquiry at University of Melbourne, 2001 (Jon, and a New Zealand Sci and Tech Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Canterbury and serves on the editorial boards of several scholarly journals, May 4, The Meaning of Environmental Security: Ecological Politics and Policy in the New Security Era, pg.1 p2 – pg. 2 p1)

The concept of environmental security has become increasingly popular since the end of the Cold

AND

security concept that is better able to comprehend environmental problems and inform policy.

=E-waste=

====Current policies attempt to control the amount of electronic waste being created. The federal government is a prime example.====

\*\*Kaye 12\*\*

(Leon Kaye is the editor of GreenGoPost.com, he also contributes to Triple Pundit and the UK~'s Guardian Sustainable Business.)

Feds Shift Focus to E-waste http://earth911.com/news/2012/07/06/new-federal-electronic-waste-regulation/

This summer, the U.S. government has become a global leader in

AND

older electronics to other agencies, offer them to schools or sell them.

====Increasing energy efficiency historically hasn~'t reduced energy consumption, it actually increases consumption as consumption is based off of human behavior. Increasing energy efficiency results in rebound effects that could rollback all changes resulting in Jevon~'s paradox.====

\*\*Sorrell 10\*\*

Sorrell, Steven. "Energy, economic growth and environmental sustainability: Five propositions." Sustainability 2.6 (2010): 1784-1809.

It is commonly assumed that historical improvements in energy efficiency have reduced energy consumption below

AND

suggested by Jevons ~~[8~~] and is commonly termed ―Jevons Paradox.

====E-waste releases dangerous chemicals into the air when dumped into landfills and incinerated, damaging the environment and increasing global warming.====

\*\*Pacebutler 13\*\*

How Does ewaste Effect Global Warming? January 17th, 2013 http://www.pacebutler.com/blog/how-does-ewaste-effect-global-warming/

When the e-waste is used as a landfill, many toxins are administered

AND

dioxides to enter the atmosphere causing many health problems and ultimately Global Warming.

=Case=

===Econ===

No nuclear war from collapse.

====No double dip – employment and consumer confidence are increasing====

Gautam \*\*Godhwani 8-15\*\*-2012; CEO, SimplyHired.com "Signs Of Resilience In Our Economy" http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gautam-godhwani/us-economy-jobs\_b\_1778664.html

These days, it~'s rare to see a day pass without hearing some sort of

AND

nearly a 10 percent increase from last year. Sounds promising, right?

====Energy production doesn~'t solve jobs ====

\*\*Levi 12 \*\*

Senior Fellow (at CFR) for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Michael, July/August, "Think Again: The American Energy Boom" [[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom?page=full-http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom?page=full]]) Jacome

"The U.S. Energy Boom Will Create Millions of New Jobs."

AND

another decade, these will mostly come at the expense of jobs elsewhere.

====Lowering energy costs wouldn~'t lead to a manufacturing boom ====

\*\*Levi 5-7 –\*\* Senior Fellow (at CFR) for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Michael, July/August, "Think Again: The American Energy Boom (Michael, "Oil and Gas Euphoria Is Getting Out of Hand" [[http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/05/07/oil-and-gas-euphoria-is-getting-out-of-hand/-http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/05/07/oil-and-gas-euphoria-is-getting-out-of-hand/]]) Jacome

But there is more. Ignatius~'s column isn~'t just about energy; it~'s also about

AND

close to what~'s needed for U.S. manufacturing to broadly thrive.

====No impact to the trade deficit – doesn~'t affect or correlate negatively with growth====

\*\*Fisher Investments \*\*9-15-20\*\*11\*\*; Trade Gap Irrelevant for U.S. Economic Growth [[http://www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html-http://www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html]]

NEW YORK (TheStreet) — International trade is an important and volatile component of

AND

trade can be more instructive regarding overall economic health than the trade deficit.

Studies and empirics prove no war impact

Miller, 2k (Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa~'s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, "Poverty as a cause of wars?" p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a

AND

to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort

===Heg===

====Heg doesn~'t solve war====

Barbara \*\*Conry\*\* (former associate policy analyst, was a public relations consultant at Hensley Segal Rentschler and an expert on security issues in the Middle East, Western Europe, and Central Asia at the CATO Institute) \*\*and\*\* Charles V. \*\*Pena\*\* (Senior Fellow at the Independent Institute as well as a senior fellow with the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, and an adviser on the Straus Military Reform Project at the CATO Institute) \*\*2003\*\* "47. US Security Strategy" CATO Handbook for Congress, http://www.cato.org/pubs/handbook/hb108/hb108-47.pdf

Another rationale for attempting to manage global security is that a world without U.

AND

security can save the world from political, economic, or military conflagration.

====Empirically proven====

Christopher J. \*\*Fettweis\*\* (Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College) \*\*2010\*\* "Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy," Survival, Volume 52, Issue 2 April 2010 , pages 59 – 82

One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly:

AND

to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.

====International \*\*system\*\* resilient – no conflict====

Christopher \*\*Preble\*\* (director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute) August \*\*2010\*\* "U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?" http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be

AND

this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over

===Env===

====A. Magnitude – species loss collapses ecosystems necessary for human survival – that~'s Warner====

====B. Probability – the impact is linear - the more we destroy the more likely the impact====

Diner, Judge Advocate~'s General~'s Corps of US Army, 1994

(David, Military Law Review, Winter, L/N)

Why Do We Care? — No species has ever dominated its fellow species as

AND

an aircraft~'s wings, 80 mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

====C. Turns all war scenarios - magnifies the risk of any conflict====

Sweezy, founding editor of the magazine Monthly Review, 2004

(Paul, "Capitalism and the environment" October, [[http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1132/is\_5\_56/ai\_n6338575/pg\_2/?tag=content;col1-http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1132/is\_5\_56/ai\_n6338575/pg\_2/?tag=content;col1]], ldg)

We live in and from a material environment consisting of land, water,

AND

there is no reason to assume any unusual change in the foreseeable future.

When it comes to destruction by human agency, however, things are different

AND

a matter of time until the human species irredeemably fouls its own nest.

===China===

\*\*====Sino War not advantageous for China====\*\*

\*\*Goldstein 11\*\*

(Joshua Goldstein. Sept 2011. Foreign Policy. Think Again: War. [[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think\_again\_war-http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think\_again\_war]])

What about China, the most ballyhooed rising military threat of the current era?

AND

and debtor) would impede China~'s global trading posture and endanger its prosperity.

Since Chairman Mao~'s death, China has been hands down the most peaceful great power of its time. For all the recent concern about a newly assertive Chinese navy in disputed international waters, China~'s military hasn~'t fired a single shot in battle in 25 years.