## Drought

**Lack of resources causes more violence/ destroys the ability for groups to form grassroots movements**

**Fiske 98**

[Jennifer Lynn Eberhardt, Sociology, Stanford University, Susan T. Fiske, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, “Confronting racism: the problem and the response” 1998, \\wyo-bb]

**Research from a number of disciplines, including anthropology, political science, and sociology, support realistic conflict theory by stressing the roles of competition and resource scarcity. For example, violence between groups increases under conditions of overpopulation and food shortage, when groups must compete for scarce resources (Divale & Harris. 1976; GÍeick. 1993: Homer-Dixon. 1991, 1994; Wilson. 1973). Intergroup conflict can erupt even in times of resource abundance, as groups compete for resource control and allocation (Cummings, 1980). Real-world dilemmas provoke group categorization and** differentiation**. thereby contributing to social prejudice. Macrolevel phenomena such as economic threat, land disputes. and environmental disasters exacerbate people’s basic tendency to identify with a group and enhance their group’s status. Prejudice Inhibition Like stereotyping, prejudice can be controlled. People with internalized egalitarian values can regulate their emotional and evaluative responses to out-group members (Monteith. 1993). Overcoming prejudice is a long process, perhaps more difficult than inhibiting stereotypes. This takes practice, patience, and constant self-monitoring, but is very possible (see Chapter 10. this volume). But, like stereotyping, we will argue that power hinders this process. • Summary Racial prejudice represents the combination of fundamental psychological processes, such as the need to belong (Baumeister & Leary. 1995). along with perceived or actual competition between groups. The mere classification of people into racial categories engenders and encourages the tendency to differentiate one’s in-group as superior to the out-group. The perception of resource scarcity contributes co feelings of intergroup competition and threat. Racial prejudice thus follows from the social and historical forces that have rendered intergroup boundaries meaningful and conflictual.**

#### Human interference is inevitable—Eco-pragmatism solves better by integrating environmental approaches and uniting human and environmental wellbeing.

Mintz 2004

[Joel A., Prof. law @ Nova Southeastern University, “Some Thoughts on the Merits of Pragmatism as a Guide to Environmental Protection, 31 B.C. Envtl Aff. L. Rev. 1, LN//uwyo-ajl]

Environmental pragmatism is a relatively new direction in modern philosophy. n34 A product of the late 1980s and 1990s, it attempts to connect the precepts and methods of philosophical pragmatism to the solution of real environmental issues. n35The most comprehensive collection of essays by environmental pragmatists may be found in Environmental Pragmatism, edited by Andrew Light and Eric Katz. n36 In their introduction to this work, Light and Katz accurately observe that environmental pragmatism refers to "a cluster of related and overlapping concepts," as opposed to a single view. n37 They note that it may take at least four distinct forms: (1) examinations into the connection between classical American philosophical pragmatism and environmental issues; (2) the articulation of practical strategies for bridging gaps between environmental theorists, policy analysts, activists, and the public; (3) theoretical investigations into the overlapping normative bases of specific environmental organizations and movements in order to provide grounds for the convergence of activists on policy choices; and (4) general arguments for theoretical and meta-theoretical moral pluralism in environmental normative theory. n38What all of the environmental pragmatist approaches share, however, is a rejection of the view that "adequate and workable environmental ethics must embrace non-anthropocentrism, holism, moral monism, and, perhaps, a commitment to some form of intrinsic value." n39 [\*7] For Kelly Parker, the principal insight of environmental pragmatism is that "the human sphere is embedded at every point in the broader natural sphere, that each inevitably affects the other in ways that are often impossible to predict, and that values emerge in the ongoing transactions between humans and environments." n40 Parker defines environment as "the field where experience occurs, where my life and the lives of others arise and take place." n41 He believes that pragmatism commits us to treating all places where experience unfolds, i.e., all environments, with "equal seriousness." n42 Moreover, under Parker's pragmatic approach, people are encouraged to "restructure our social institutions" so that the public is afforded "a real voice in determining the kinds of environments we inhabit." n43Like Parker, Sandra B. Rosenthal and Rogene A. Buckholz also emphasize the organic unity of the individual embedded in his or her environment. n44 To them, human beings are biological creatures, part of, and continuous with, nature. n45 In light of this, the philosophical argument over anthropocentrism is meaningless since no real line may be drawn between human and environmental well-being. n46 Rosenthal and Buckholz see the "systematic focus" of pragmatism as being on "science as method, or as lived through human activity, on what the scientist does to gain knowledge." n47 Humans exist in the world as active experimenters who create knowledge and formulate ethical values by integrating "potentially conflicting values and viewpoints." n48Another leading environmental pragmatist, Bryan G. Norton, also advocates a pluralistic approach. n49 In Norton's opinion: The goal of seeking a unified, monistic theory of environmental ethics represents a misguided mission, a mission that was formulated under a set of epistemological and moral assumptions that harks back to Descartes and Newton. . . . The search for a "Holy Grail" of unified theory in environmental [\*8] values has not progressed towards any consensus regarding what inherent value in nature is, what objects have it, or what it means to have such a value. n50Norton's expressed preference is for the integration of multiple values on three "scales" of human concern and valuation: (1) locally developed values that reflect the preferences of individuals; (2) community values that protect and contribute to human and ecological communities; and (3) global values, which express a hope for the long-term survival of our species. n51 As Norton views it: A good environmental policy will be one that has positive implications for values associated with the various scales on which humans are in fact concerned, and also on the scales on which environmentalists think we should be concerned if we accept responsibility for the impacts of our current activities on the life prospects and options--the "freedom" of future generations. n52 One particularly provocative aspect of environmental pragmatic thought is its desire for compatibilism, i.e., a philosophical framework within which competing environmental theories may be compatible in practice. n53 Andrew Light is an advocate for this view. n54 Light contrasts the views of social ecologists and materialists, such as Murray Bookchin and Herbert Marcuse, n55 who view environmental degradation as presupposed by a capitalist economy, and ontologists, including "deep ecologists" like Arne Naess, n56 whose focus is on reform of the self, and one's relationship with the non-human world, as expressed in individual identity. n57 To harmonize these mutually antagonistic schools of environmental thought, Light proposes a pragmatic "principle of tolerance." n58 [\*9] Under it, theorists and practitioners are required to communicate a "straightforward public position" that endorses the considerations on which they agree, and the practices best suited to meeting their mutually desired goals, while leaving some questions that divide them to private dispute. n59

## Warming

**It isn’t enough to just be aware: empirically proven that awareness and consciousness fail to translate into urgency or action ensuring the alt fails.**

**Krakoff 11**

(Sarah, Professor and Associate Dean for Research, University of Colorado Law School, Selected Works from Sarah Krakoff, “Planetarian Identity Formation and the Relocalization of Environmental Law,” January 2011, <http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=sarah_krakoff//wyo-mm>)

**For a** brief **period between 2005-2008, several factors seemed to heighten both awareness and concern about climate change**. The fourth IPCC report 62 and increased media discussion of climate change in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, among other causes, seemed to increase public knowledge and concern. 63 **Yet awareness and concern have failed to translate into a widespread sense of urgency. Even more troubling, public acceptance that climate change is occurring and is caused by human activity has again declined**. A study by the Pew Center for Research and the Press found that public acceptance that climate change was occurring dropped from seventyone percent in April, 2008 to fifty-seven percent from in October, 2009. During the same period, **public acceptance that any warming was caused by human activity dropped from forty-seven percent to thirty-six percent**. 64

## K

**First, Our Interpretation: The resolution asks the question of desirability of USFG action. The Role of ballot is to say yes or no to the action and outcomes of the plan.**

**Second, is reasons to prefer:**

**(\_\_\_) A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac**

**(\_\_\_) B. It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action**

**(\_\_\_) C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another**

**Finally, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving**

#### Our method is similar to de Mesquita’s game theory which is 90% accurate

De MESQUITA ’11

(Bruce Bueno; Silver Professor of Politics – New York University and Senior Fellow – Hoover Institution, "Fox-Hedging or Knowing: One Big Way to Know Many Things," [http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/18/bruce-bueno-de-mesquita/fox-hedging-or-knowing-one-big-way-to-know-many-things/-http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/18/bruce-bueno-de-mesquita/fox-hedging-or-knowing-one-big-way-to-know-many-things/](http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/18/bruce-bueno-de-mesquita/fox-hedging-or-knowing-one-big-way-to-know-many-things/-http:/www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/18/bruce-bueno-de-mesquita/fox-hedging-or-knowing-one-big-way-to-know-many-things/), 7/18)

Given what we know today and given the problems inherent in dealing with human interaction, what is a leading contender for making accurate, discriminating, useful predictions of complex human decisions? In good hedgehog mode I believe one top contender is applied game theory. Of course there are others but I am betting on game theory as the right place to invest effort. Why? Because game theory is the only method of which I am aware that explicitly compels us to address human adaptability. Gardner and Tetlock rightly note that people are “self-aware beings who see, think, talk, and attempt to predict each other's behavior—and who are continually adapting to each other’s efforts to predict each other’s behavior, adding layer after layer of new calculations and new complexity.” This adaptation is what game theory jargon succinctly calls “endogenous choice.” Predicting human behavior means solving for endogenous choices while assessing uncertainty. It certainly isn’t easy but, as the example of bandwidth auctions helps clarify, game theorists are solving for human adaptability and uncertainty with some success. Indeed, I used game theoretic reasoning on May 5, 2010 to predict to a large investment group’s portfolio committee that Mubarak’s regime faced replacement, especially by the Muslim Brotherhood, in the coming year. That prediction did not rely on in-depth knowledge of Egyptian history and culture or on expert judgment but rather on a game theory model called selectorate theory and its implications for the concurrent occurrence of logically derived revolutionary triggers. Thus, while the desire for revolution had been present in Egypt (and elsewhere) for many years, logic suggested that the odds of success and the expected rewards for revolution were rising swiftly in 2010 in Egypt while the expected costs were not. This is but one example that highlights what Nobel laureate Kenneth Arrow, who was quoted by Gardner and Tetlock, has said about game theory and prediction (referring, as it happens, to a specific model I developed for predicting policy decisions): “Bueno de Mesquita has demonstrated the power of using game theory and related assumptions of rational and self-seeking behavior in predicting the outcome of important political and legal processes.” Nice as his statement is for me personally, the broader point is that game theory in the hands of much better game theorists than I am has the potential to transform our ability to anticipate the consequences of alternative choices in many aspects of human interaction. How can game theory be harnessed to achieve reliable prediction? Acting like a fox, I gather information from a wide variety of experts. They are asked only for specific current information (Who wants to influence a decision? What outcome do they currently advocate? How focused are they on the issue compared to other questions on their plate? How flexible are they about getting the outcome they advocate? And how much clout could they exert?). They are not asked to make judgments about what will happen. Then, acting as a hedgehog, I use that information as data with which to seed a dynamic applied game theory model. The model’s logic then produces not only specific predictions about the issues in question, but also a probability distribution around the predictions. The predictions are detailed and nuanced. They address not only what outcome is likely to arise, but also how each “player” will act, how they are likely to relate to other players over time, what they believe about each other, and much more. Methods like this are credited by the CIA, academic specialists and others, as being accurate about 90 percent of the time based on large-sample assessments. These methods have been subjected to peer review with predictions published well ahead of the outcome being known and with the issues forecast being important questions of their time with much controversy over how they were expected to be resolved. This is not so much a testament to any insight I may have had but rather to the virtue of combining the focus of the hedgehog with the breadth of the fox. When facts are harnessed by logic and evaluated through replicable tests of evidence, we progress toward better prediction.

#### Without making predictions you for-close on the possibility of solving warming

Mazo, 10 [Jeffrey Mazo, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 29], accessed 10/19/12,WYO/JF

The inherent uncertainty of climate projections is of a part with a more general problem of uncertainty in strategic planning, and defense planning in particular. On the one hand, the future is impossible to predict; on the other, without some guidance as to what is likely to happen planning becomes impossible too. There is always a temptation to rely on quantitative models for such guidance, on the principle that, although undoubtedly inaccurate in detail, they are better than nothing. But this may not be the case, if they draw attention to the wrong places. Rather than focus on particular cases, planners need to expect the unexpected, and focus on an increasing range of variability rather than simply the direction of the underlying trend**.** Militaries are particularly good at planning for such wide variability; although it is easy to point to specific failures for organizational or personality-related reasons, successes are often invisible.17

**Overemphasis on method destroys effectiveness of the discipline**

**Wendt**, Handbook of IR, **2k2** p. 68

It should be stressed that **in advocating a pragmatic view we are not endorsing method-driven social science. Too much research in international relations chooses problems or things to be explained with a view to whether the analysis will provide support for one or another methodological ‘ism’.** But **the point of IR scholarship should be to answer questions about international politics that are of great normative concern, not to validate methods. Methods are means, not ends in themselves. As a matter of personal scholarly choice it may be reasonable to stick with one method and see how far it takes** us. But since we do not know how far that is, **if the goal of the discipline is insight into world politics then it makes little sense to rule out one or the other approach on a priori grounds. In that case a method indeed becomes a tacit ontology, which may lead to neglect of whatever problems it is poorly suited to address**. Being conscious about these choices is why it is important to distinguish between the ontological, empirical and pragmatic levels of the rationalist-constructivist debate. We favor the pragmatic approach on heuristic grounds, but we certainly believe a conversation should continue on all three levels.

#### Conflict is caused by human nature and is inevitable

Joseph K. **Clifton 11**,

Claremont McKenna College “DISPUTED THEORY AND SECURITY POLICY: RESPONDING TO “THE RISE OF CHINA”,” 2011, <http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1164&context=cmc_theses>, accessed 12/12/12,WYO?JF

Also known as “human nature realism,”14 classical realism posits that conflict between states is primarily a product of the aggressiveness of human nature. Hans J. Morgenthau is the canonical author of classical realism with his work Politics Among Nations, which was influential after World War II.15 As Morgenthau argues, “political realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature.”16 That nature in the international arena translates to a state’s “interest defined in terms of power.”17 In other words, states seek as much political power as possible because they are social institutions, and therefore follow the drives of human nature. Given the premise that people (and states) will experience a conflict of interest in their pursuit of power, the goal of politics is to achieve “the realization of the lesser evil rather than of the absolute good.”18 This “lesser evil” is pursued through the balance of power, in which states try to maintain an existing equilibrium or construct a new equilibrium.

**Racism not the root cause of all violence**

**Mertus 99**

(Professor Julie Mertus is the co-director of Ethics, Peace and Global Affairs. She has written widely on human rights and gender, conflict, the Balkans, U.S. foreign policy and U.N. institutions. She is the author or editor of ten books, including Bait and Switch: Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy, named "human rights book of the year" by the American Political Science Association) and, most recently Human Rights Matters: Local Politics and National Human Rights Institutions and The United Nations and Human Rights. Before entering academia, she worked as a researcher, writer and lawyer for several human rights and humanitarian organizations., J.D., Yale Law School; B.S. Cornell University, International Council on Human Rights Policy, “THE ROLE OF RACISM AS A CAUSE OF OR FACTOR IN WARS AND CIVIL CONFLICT”, http://www.ichrp.org/files/papers/167/112\_-\_The\_Role\_of\_Racism\_as\_a\_Cause\_of\_or\_Factor\_in\_Wars\_and\_Civil\_Conflict\_Mertus\_\_Julie\_\_1999.pdf)

**This paper examines the role of racism as a cause of or factor in wars and civil conflicts.** “Racism” as understood here is defined broadly to encompass acts and processes of dehumanisation. The conflicts in **Rwanda and Kosovo serve as case studies; the former illustrates a case where the racist nature of the conflict has been clear to most observers, and the latter represents a case where racism plays an important yet overlooked role. Racism did not cause either conflict. Rather, the conflicts were the outcome of political manipulation and enlargement of already existing group classification schemes and social polarisation, a history of real and imagined oppression and deprivation, the absence of the rule of law and democratic structures, and state monopoly over the provision of information. Under such conditions, political élites could use racist ideology as a method of gaining power and, when necessary, waging war.**

**Extinction is the worst impact—prioritizing anything else puts the cart before the horse**

**Schell** **1982**

(Jonathan, Professor at Wesleyan University, The Fate of the Earth, pages 136-137 uw//wej)

Implicit in everything that I have said so far about the nuclear predicament there has been a perplexity that I would now like to take up explicitly, for it leads, I believe, into the very heart of our response-or, rather, our lack of response-to the **predicament. I have pointed out that our species is the most important of all the things that, as inhabitants of a common world, we inherit from the past generations, but it does not go far enough to point out this superior importance, as though in making our decision about ex- tinction we were being asked to choose between, say, liberty, on the one hand, and the survival of the species, on the other. For** **the species not only overarches but contains all the benefits of life in the common world, and to speak of sacrificing the species for the sake of one of these benefits involves one in the absurdity of wanting to de- stroy something in order to preserve one of its parts, as if one were to burn down a house in an attempt to redecorate the living room,** or to kill someone to improve his character. ,but even to point out this absurdity fails to take the full measure of the peril of extinction, for mankind is not some invaluable object that lies outside us and that we must protect so that we can go on benefiting from it; rather, it is we ourselves, without whom everything there is loses its value. To say this is another way of saying that extinction is unique not because it destroys mankind as an object but because it destroys mankind as the source of all possible human subjects, and this, in turn, is another way of saying that extinction is a second death, for one's own individual death is the end not of any object in life but of the subject that experiences all objects. Death, how- ever, places the mind in a quandary. One of-the confounding char- acteristics of death-"tomorrow's zero," in Dostoevski's phrase-is that, precisely because it removes the person himself rather than something in his life, it seems to offer the mind nothing to take hold of. One even feels it inappropriate, in a way, to try to speak "about" death at all, as. though death were a thing situated some- where outside us and available for objective inspection, when the fact is that it is within us-is, indeed, an essential part of what we are. It would be more appropriate, perhaps, to say that death, as a fundamental element of our being, "thinks" in us and through us about whatever we think about, coloring our thoughts and moods with its presence throughout our lives.

**Perm Do both- Our process of truth-seeking is good: using decision theory of comparing evidence of the best possible outcome is key to reducing dangers of unintended consequences.**

**Polasky et al 11**

(Stephen, Stephen R. Carpenter, Carl Folke and Bonnie Keeler, Department of Applied Economics & Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, University of Minnesota, Center for Limnology, University of Wisconsin, Beijer Institute, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Institute on the Environment, University of Minnesota, Trends in Ecology and Evolution, “Decision-making under great uncertainty: environmental management in an era of global change,” August 2011, <http://www.urbaneco.washington.edu/sbs/docs/data/3313_PolaskyetalDecisionMakingTREE.pdf//wyo-mm>)

We begin with a brief review of **decision theory**, which provides a systematic approach to decision-making under uncertainty. Decision theory **is a powerful tool for providing advice on which management alternative is optimal given the available information. Decision theory**, however, **requires information about probabilities of various outcomes under alternative management options and the desirability of those outcomes**. Such information is unlikely to be readily available in the context of global change issues. We next discuss threshold approaches that focus attention on critical values and try to limit the chance that these values will be exceeded. We then review scenario planning and resilience approaches. **These approaches are well suited to scoping problems from broad perspectives and from multiple viewpoints and so can reduce the danger of unforeseen events or unintended consequences**.

#### The alternative fails, it just adds another voice in the mix, but leaves foundational assumptions unchallenged

Shome, 1996

[Raka, Doctoral candidate at univ of Georgia, “Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An “other” view.” Communication theory, Vol. 6 issue 1, February, 40-59, Accessed Online via Wiley Online Library,] /Wyo-MB

In fact, **even when we do sometimes try to break out of the Eurocen- tric canons informing contemporary academic scholarship by including alternate cultural and racial perspectives in our syllabi, we often do not realize that instead of really breaking free of the canon, all that we do is stretch it, add things to it. But the canon remains the same and unchal- lenged. Our subject positions in relation to the canon remain the same and unchallenged.** Instead of examining how the canon itself is rooted in a larger discourse of colonialism and Western hegemony, we fre- quently use the canon to appropriate “other” voice^.^

**Disad to the alt- Using scientific consensus solves the alt by disrupting our existing economic relationships and is infinitely better than the squo- leaving the framing of the status quo intact enables the elites to dominate the system.**

**Coplan 12**

(Karl S., Professor of Law at Pace Law School and Co-Director of its Environmental Litigation Clinic since 1994 and practiced land use and environmental litigation for eight years, “Climate Change, Political Truth, and the Marketplace of Ideas,” 2012, Social Science Research Network//wyo-mm)

**Accepting (and acting upon) the conclusions of the scientific consensus on climate change would disrupt existing economic relationships and distributions** within American society. **Thus it is no surprise** that **climate science has powerful enemies in the fossil fuel, electrical generation, and automobile industries**.66 These **powerful economic interests have preferred access to mass media markets and public policy, both through control of media corporations, influence through advertising purchases, and through their lobbying power in Congress.** The fossil fuel interests have nearly limitless resources to buy media access and to push their message out to the public.67 The Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision, holding that the First Amendment protects a right of corporations to make unlimited independent expenditures for speech on political issues,68 will only increase the influence of established fossil-fuel based economic interests on the political marketplace of ideas. **The scientific community**, on the other hand, **is relatively impoverished, and must rely on news outlets** (and to some extent to government agencies and not-for-profits) **to get their message out. In addition, the scientific community does not view itself as participants in the political debate**.69 This preferential media access would seem inexorably to distort the marketplace of ideas against the acceptance of climate science.

**Elites will backlash at the revolution, resulting in extinction**

**Dasmann, 89**

Raymond F. Dasmann, PhD in Zoology, professor emeritus of ecology at UC-Santa Cruz, 1989, The Ends of the Earth, edited by Donald Worster and Alfred W. Crosby, p. 288

There is really little doubt that there is a growing awareness of the necessity for modifying human ways to ensure the survival of the natural world on which the future of the human race depends. There is a rapidly growing biosphere consciousness, which is reaching the higher levels of many governments and has often found its expression at the level of the United Nations. One regrets that it is less evident in the United States government than it has been in the past, but it is certainly expressed among many members of the Congress, and one can expect future changes in the national leadership which will reflect the growing public awareness. The real question is whether or not the human race can modify its ways of behavior rapidly enough, because the majority continues to pursue pathways that lead toward the ecological impoverishment of the planet. The increase in awareness does not keep pace with the rate of destruction of tropical forests, the spread of deserts, the erosion of agricultural soils, the depletion of wildlife, or the growing pollution of the atmosphere and hydrosphere. **Those who exercise the greatest political and military power still threaten a war that can bring the whole edifice built by civilization crashing down into the wreckage of the biosphere, while in the meanwhile dozens of little wars forestall efforts to achieve sustainable ways of life. There is also a reasonable fear that if the power and influence of those who work for conservation of nature, sustainable development** based on social justice and equity, and a more reasonable approach to human use of the biosphere, **begins to reach a critical mass there will be attempts at massive repression by those who feel threatened by such changes. In other terms, if we begin to approach the hundredth monkey level, the “international power structure” will declare an open season on monkeys. If that happens then the real question will be whether anyone will be left to write the environmental history of our times.**

#### Our Aff is not the type of consumption they criticize- Wind panels don’t consume anything rather are just a transfer energy into a different form

Cohen, 10

Dustin Cohen 2010 March 10 Some Notes on Heidegger’s Question Concerning Technology (Enframing, Standing Reserve and Virtual Technologies) http://cybject.wordpress.com/2010/03/11/some-notes-on-heidegger%E2%80%99s-question-concerning-technology-enframing-standing-reserve-and-virtual-technologies/

Martin Heidegger was concerned about the status of the human amidst modern technology. Tied to the changing status of the human is his assertion (and a major theme of Cybject) that modern technology displaces the “wordliness” of the world and puts a human-world in its place.¶ Heidegger uses the term “enframing” to explain the way humans, as users of modern technology, have come to relate to (and literally “frame”) the world. To demonstrate the characteristics of this modern technological “enframing” of the world he contrasts a windmill with a modern hydroelectric power plant. In describing how the windmill differs from the type of “revealing” that characterizes modern technology, he explains that the “old windmill’s…sails do indeed turn in the wind; [but are] … left entirely to the wind’s blowing. …the windmill does not unlock energy from the air currents in order to store it”.¶ In describing how the windmill differs from the type of revealing that characterizes modern technology, Heidegger explains: “But [do the the properties of contemporary technologies] not hold true for the old windmill as well? No. Its sails do indeed turn in the wind; they are left entirely to the wind’s blowing. But the windmill does not unlock energy from the air currents in order to store it.” With the windmill, the wind turns the turbines, the wind-energy instantaneously powers the turbines. At no point is the wind’s energy manipulated or stored up as a different kind of energy. The windmill only transfers motion, it “reveals” wind energy, but does not commandeer nature’s energy or store it for future use (Mitcham).