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## Warming

#### Warming is reversible, even if we temporarily cross a tipping point—inertia

Dyer 9

[Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ Senior Lecturer in War Studies at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst, Climate Wars //Wyo-BF]

There is no need to despair. The slow-feedback effects take a long time to work their way through the climate system, and if we could manage to get the carbon dioxide concentration back down to a safe level before they have run their course, they might be stopped in their tracks. As Hansen et al. put it in their paper: A point of no return can be avoided, even if the tipping level [which puts us on course for an ice-free world] is temporarily exceeded. Ocean and ice-sheet inertia permit overshoot, provided the [concentration of carbon dioxide] is returned below the tipping level before initiating irreversible dynamic change.... However, if overshoot is in place for centuries, the thermal perturbation will so penetrate the ocean that recovery without dramatic effects, such as ice-sheet disintegration, becomes unlikely. The real, long-term target is 350 parts per million or lower, if we want the Holocene to last into the indefinite future, but for the remainder of this book I am going to revert to the 450 parts per million ceiling that has become common currency among most of those who are involved in climate change issues. If we manage to stop the rise in the carbon dioxide concentration at or not far beyond that figure, then we must immediately begin the equally urgent and arduous task of getting it back down to a much lower level that is safe for the long term, but one step at a time will have to suffice. I suspect that few now alive will see the day when we seriously start work on bringing the concentration back down to 350, so let us focus here on how to stop it rising past 450.

## Ports

#### 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.

Growth inevitable- hardwired in human psyche

Zey 1 (Dr. Michael G., 2001, “THE EXPANSIONARY THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT”, http://www.zey.com/perspective.htm, ) ET

The emerging picture of early Earth is one of a planet brimming with activity, virtually forcing life into existence. As soon as the molecules had the chance, they attempted to establish the conditions for life. This self-organization of molecules made life, and the evolution of life forms, possible. It is the contention here that the same inclination to self-organize, to intentionally evolve oneself from the simple to the complex, exists on the biological level as well as the molecular. And the human species is the finest example of this process. Alfred Russell Wallace, a contemporary of Darwin who concurrently developed a similar theory of natural selection, discussed a major mystery in human evolution. It seems that between Homo habilis and Homo erectus the human brain undergoes a gigantic jump in its size. The earlier hominid has a brain only slightly larger than that of an ape. Homo erectus, which existed for a million years starting around 1.5 million years ago, has a cortex as large as ours. Wallace contends that the human brain was overdesigned for its primitive uses and thus could not have been a production of natural selection. He said that natural selection could only have endowed savage man with a brain a few degrees superior to that of an ape, whereas he actually possesses one very little inferior to that of a philosopher. Robert Orenstein, a biologist specializing in brain research, is similarly curious about why Homo erectus possessed a brain that he ostensibly had little use for. Our brain expanded to a size for which there was little functional use at the time. According to Orenstein, (in his book The Evolution of Consciousness) Homo erectus' brain was complex enough to invent a microprocessor, even though all that was needed at the time was a brain that could figure out how to hammer out the first few stone tools. "Why be able to fly to the moon when no one has even understood how to make iron?", Orenstein asks.

## Politics

#### Non-unique, ITC extension gives offshore wind momentum for new construction

Kessler Jan 3

[Kessler, Richard A.: U.S. Online Editor at Recharge Newspaper. "In Depth: Tax credit may allow US offshore wind lift-off in 2013." *Recharge Politics*. Recharge, 3 Jan 2013. Web. 3 Jan 2013. <http://www.rechargenews.com/business\_area/politics/article330202.ece>. //Wyo-BF]

By extending the renewable energy investment tax credit (ITC) one year through 31 December on more favorable terms for developers, Congress has increased chances that construction of the first US offshore wind projects can begin in 2013, industry leaders tell Recharge. They believe that CapeWind, which has 77.5% of its proposed 468MW nameplate capacity under long-term contract, and Deepwater Wind’s 30MW Block Island demonstration project off Rhode Island with full output sold, will start being built this year. Developer Energy Management Inc. is believed to be scheduling a 2013 construction start. “Extension of the ITC is an extremely positive step for the wind industry in general and for Block Island,” says Deepwater Wind chief executive Jeffrey Grybowski. Last year, it submitted final state and federal permit applications for the project. He notes it is important that Congress recognizes offshore wind as a new industry that merits continued support through the tax code. Construction work is also possible this year on Fishermen’s Energy 25-30MW pilot project 2.8 miles (4.5km) off Atlantic City, New Jersey, if the developer can find a power buyer and win state eligibility for taxpayer financing through an offshore wind renewable energy credit (OREC) programme. Fishermen’s Energy spokeswoman Rhonda Jackson says the ITC extension helps give the project momentum and will allow the state to “capture the economic benefits of offshore wind at a significantly lower cost.” These include creation of hundreds of jobs and new manufacturing capacity. The move was part of a last-minute political compromise late Tuesday on fiscal measures that allow the US to avoid automatic and deep spending cuts by the deficit-ridden federal government. The bill, which President Barack Obama says he will sign into law, changes eligibility to offshore wind projects that begin construction before ITC expiration from those under the prior law that had been “placed in service.” The ITC, which provides developers with a credit equivalent to 30% their project costs, has been available since Obama took office in 2009. None have been able to qualify given long project lead times and lengthy federal permitting delays. Industry executives and investors are now seeking clarity on how the federal government defines “begin construction” for offshore projects that could qualify for the ITC. Their initial view is that the Obama administration will retain the prior Treasury 1603 grant programme rule that an applicant must begin “physical work of a significant nature,” or pay or incur 5% or more of the project’s eligible basis by the “begin construction” deadline. The 5% of capital expenditure payment, however, would be a difficult barrier for a developer to surmount without a revenue stream from a long-term binding power purchase agreement that would underpin project financing, industry officials say. “We’ve begun looking at what we need to qualify Block Island for the investment tax credit,” Grybowski says, adding that he believes construction can begin this year if the Treasury 1603 eligibility guidelines are kept. Lawmakers’ support for an ITC extension will also allow the industry to open some distance with its onshore counterpart, which is overly-reliant on the controversial production tax credit that Congress also renewed for one year. “The ITC extension was very significant as it lets us stand on our own,” says Jim Lanard, who heads the Offshore Wind Development Coalition (OWDC), an industry group based in Washington, DC. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the PTC renewal will cost taxpayers $12.1bn over the next decade, a number that stands out as official Washington grapples with runaway budget deficits the remainder of this decade. Fiscal conservatives in Congress are likely to resume efforts later this year to phase out the PTC, now in its 21st year. By contrast, “You don’t phase out the ITC before it is phased in,” notes Lanard. “The ITC is just starting.” The industry intends to lobby Congress for a multi-year ITC extension for the first 3GW of projects that would be available to developers on a “first come, first use” basis, he says. A 2011 bipartisan bill introduced in the Senate would have given developers five years to build a project once eligible for the tax credit.

#### Offshore wind is bi-partisan

NAW, 11

North American Wind “New Bipartisan Legislation Proposes Offshore Wind Energy Tax Credit” <http://www.nawindpower.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.8790>, accessed 11/7/12,WYO/JF

U.S. Reps. Bill Pascrell Jr., D-N.J., and Frank LoBiondo, R-N.J., [have introduced](http://pascrell.house.gov/list/press/nj08_pascrell/pr101820112.shtml) bipartisan legislation to encourage offshore wind power investment off the coast of New Jersey. The Incentivizing Offshore Wind Power Act (H.R.3238) proposes to provide a 30%tax credit on investment in the first 3,000 MW of offshore wind. The secretary of the Treasury would have to consult with the secretaries of Energy and the Interior when establishing this credit.

#### PC no: Obama’s negotiating skills aren’t strong enough to persuade staunch Republicans to bridge deals

McGregor 1/2

(Richard, China Confidential, “Fiscal fights threaten US policy goals,” January 2, 2013, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/8f8ef804-5501-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html?ftcamp=published\_links%2Frss%2Fworld%2Ffeed%2F%2Fproduct#axzz2GsGpVteO//wyo-mm)

But on everything else, with the Republicans remaining in control of the House, Mr Obama needs all the skills of cajoling, seducing and manipulating Congress that he has so far shown no signs of developing. “I find it remarkable that the president apparently continues to believe that he will not have to deal with people that he does not agree with,” said Mr Galston. “A president who is not disdainful of the art of legislating can get things done.” Forging a consensus on issues such as gun control and climate change, if the White House does take them on, will require Mr Obama to do more than just persuade some Republicans to support him. Many Democrats are wary of such reforms or oppose them outright, and a second-term president with declining political capital will face an uphill battle to shift their views.

#### And Debt Ceiling fight tanks immigration- GOP resentment kills it

Kurtz 1 Jan

[Kurtz, Howard: The Daily Beast and *Newsweek*’s Washington bureau chief. "Obama Fiscal Cliff Victory Could Invite Years of Warfare With the GOP." *The Daily Beast*. The Daily Beast, 1 Jan 2013. Web. 2 Jan 2013. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/01/obama-fiscal-cliff-victory-could-invite-years-of-warfare-with-the-gop.html>. //Wyo-BF]

But since the coming weeks and perhaps months will now be devoted to the next round of the budget battle, another problem for the president is that this could encroach on his second-term agenda. In the afterglow of his reelection victory, Obama talked about making a serious push for immigration reform just as some Republicans were softening their opposition to a path toward citizenship for illegal immigrants. He also spoke of mounting an effort on climate change. And in the wake of the Newtown school massacre, the president promised to lead a legislative effort on gun control. Yet he will need Republican support if any of those initiatives are to become reality. And a constant state of warfare over budget battles will make it hard to enlist Boehner’s cooperation—without which Obama could be left without a signature second-term achievement. One White House figure who emerges with enhanced stature from the budget mess is Joe Biden. Called off the bench when the action shifted to the Senate, the vice president showed a deft hand—and the experience of growing up in that institution—in quickly hammering out a deal with Minority Leader Mitch McConnell.

#### PC irrelevant—gridlocked congress after fiscal cliff

McGregor 2 Jan

[McGregor, Richard: reporter for the Financial Times. "Fiscal fights threaten US policy goals." *Financial Times*. Fnancial Times, 2 Jan 2013. Web. 2 Jan 2013. <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/8f8ef804-5501-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html?ftcamp=published\_links/rss/world\_us/feed//product>. //Wyo-BF]

Moments after the fiscal cliff was averted, President Barack Obama strode to the White House podium to thank congressional leaders from both parties and remind them of other policy challenges ripe for bipartisan co-operation. What followed was an ambitious list of second-term priorities: immigration reform, climate change, lifting domestic energy production, and gun control, on top of perhaps the most important issue, finding ways to lift the economy and incomes. “It’s not just possible to do these things, it’s an obligation to ourselves and to future generations, and I look forward to working with every single member of Congress to meet this obligation in the new year,” he said. The measured peace offering from Mr Obama to Republicans in Congress, however, will run up against a much more rancorous reality on Capitol Hill and promises to make any second-term gains painfully difficult. The confrontation over the fiscal cliff has further undermined relations between Mr Obama and his most important negotiating partner in Congress, John Boehner, the Republican House speaker. “I don’t think either of them regards the other as being able to deliver his own troops,” said William Galston, a former Clinton administration official, now at the Brookings Institution. Within Congress, relations between the Democratic and Republican Senate leaders, Harry Reid and Mitch McConnell, two old warhorses who can usually find ways to do business, also foundered in the fiscal cliff talks. In the short term, fiscal fights will dominate politics for months to come and threaten to crowd out serious consideration of other issues, with a large potential downside for the economy in 2013. The fiscal cliff compromise alone will act as a drag on the economy, largely because of the end of the payroll tax holiday, which had added substantially to middle-class incomes, economists said.

#### Latin America isn’t stable—political unrest dominates the region—the plan isn’t the tipping point

Bosworth 2 Jan

[Bosworth, James: freelance writer and consultant working on *Latin American* politics, security, economics and technology issues. "2013 elections in Latin America: Does victory at the polls ensure a full democratic term? ." *Christian Science Monitor*. Christian Science Monitor, 2 Jan 2013. Web. 3 Jan 2013. <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/Latin-America-Monitor/2013/0102/2013-elections-in-Latin-America-Does-victory-at-the-polls-ensure-a-full-democratic-term>. //Wyo-BF]

Ecuador, Paraguay, Honduras, and Chile will hold presidential elections in 2013. We'll deal with Chile later. The other three represent three of the least stable countries in the hemisphere. Ecuador had seven different presidents in the decade before President Rafael Correa and the current president faced his own odd coup attempt in September 2010. While President Correa remains popular, the tensions within the political system have led to protests and tension among the branches of government. After several years of coup threats and rumors, Paraguay controversially impeached President Fernando Lugo last year. It sets a bad precedent that the first post-Colorado [the political party which ran Paraguay for six decades] president failed to finish his term. Honduras had its coup against President Manuel Zelaya in 2009. President Profirio Lobo has had his share of institutional turmoil. The country is also hit hard by corruption, organized crime, and violent crime. So three countries that have had one or several irregular power transitions in the past decade are all going to hold elections this year. An optimist might see these elections as a big win for democracy. Indeed, the fact that the hemisphere now expects a quick return to regular elections, even in the face of coups and quasi-coups, is a victory over the trends of decades past. But democracy has its bookends in an election and inauguration on one side and a peaceful, normal power transfer while stepping down on the other. The ability and normality of handing off power to the next elected leader may be a bigger symbol of democracy than the elections. Given their recent histories, there should be doubts whether all three of the presidents elected will make it to the finishing point of their democratic term. I'm sure various international organizations will send observers to the 2013 elections in these countries and declare them free and fair and wonderful victories for democracy in countries that have faced so many problems. Then those observers will leave and the real questions about democratic stability will begin.

#### Latin American relations are bad—the plan isn’t going to destabilize the region because it won’t be perceived

Weisbrot 19 Dec

[Weisbrot, Mark: economist and co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research. "Obama Signals Four More Years of Bad Relations with Latin America." *Venezuela Analysis*. Al Jazeera, 19 Dec 2012. Web. 3 Jan 2013. <http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/7566>. //Wyo-BF]

President Obama went too far in throwing gratuitous insults at President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela on Friday, in an interview in Miami. By doing so, he not only offended the majority of Venezuelans, who voted to re-elect their president on October 7, but even many who did not. Chavez is fighting for his life, recovering from a difficult cancer operation; in Latin America, as in most of the world, this wholly unnecessary vilification of Chavez by Obama is a breach not only of diplomatic protocol but also of ordinary standards of civility. Perhaps even more importantly, Obama's ill-timed aspersions sent an unpleasant message to the rest of the region. While Obama can get away with anything in the major media outlets, you can be sure that his remarks were noticed by the presidents and foreign ministries of Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, Bolivia, and others. The message was clear: Expect four more years of the same failed, Cold War policies toward Latin America that President George W Bush championed and Obama continued in his first term. These presidents see Chavez as a close friend and ally, someone who has helped them and the region; like millions of Venezuelans they are praying for his recovery. They also see Washington as responsible for the bad relations between the US and Venezuela (as well as the hemisphere generally), and these unfortunate remarks are additional confirmation. At the 2012 Summit of the Americas, Obama found himself as isolated as George W Bush was at the notorious 2005 summit. It was a sea change from the 2009 Summit, where everyone - including Chavez - greeted Obama warmly and saw in him the potential for a new era of US-Latin American relations. To these governments, Obama's broadsides about Chavez's "authoritarian policies" and "suppression of dissent" have a bad smell, even ignoring the offensive timing. Venezuela just had an election in which the opposition, which has most of the income and wealth of the country, as well as most of the media, mobilised millions of voters. The turnout was 81 percent of registered voters, with about 97 percent of the voting-age population registered. The government did not "suppress dissent", nor has it done so in other elections; or even when the dissenters shut down the oil industry and crippled the economy in 2002-2003 - actions which would have been illegal and blocked by the force of the state in the United States. Peaceful protesters in Venezuela are far less likely to get beaten or tear-gassed or shot with rubber bullets by security forces than they are in Spain, and probably most other democracies. Yes, there have been abuses of authority in Venezuela, as in all of the hemisphere - as President Obama should know. It was Obama who defended the imprisonment without trial for more than two-and-a-half years, and abuse in custody, of Bradley Manning, which was condemned by the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on Torture. It is Obama who has refused to grant freedom to Native American activist Leonard Peltier, widely seen throughout the world as a political prisoner, now in a US prison for 37 years. It is Obama who claims the right, and has used it, to kill American citizens without arrest or trial.

## Anthro

1. **Environmental collapse is the death of all life on earth, the biosphere not just humans. That’s our AFP 10 card. This outweighs the kritik**

#### Plan should be focus

#### 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

#### Perm do both

#### Perm do plan then the alt, the plan is a prerequisite to the survival of the biosphere

#### Perm do the alt, it results in plan action because it would want to preserve the biosphere

#### EXTINCTION OF THE SPECIES IS THE MOST HORRIBLE IMPACT IMAGINEABLE, PUTTING RIGHTS FIRST IS PUTTING A PART OF SOCIETY BEFORE THE WHOLE

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.

#### Their ethical framework is at loggerheads with itself—considerations for any ethical system necessarily presuppose a human benchmark to refer back to. Two impacts: either human-centric value is inevitable and they don’t solve, or their value schema is a backdoor anthropomorphic method of asserting value without warrant, turns the case\*\*

Hayward 97

[PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

But if the project of overcoming speciesism can be pursued with some expectation of success, this is not the case with the overcoming of anthropocentrism. What makes anthropocentrism unavoidable is a limitation of a quite different sort, one which cannot be overcome even in principle because it involves a non-contingent limitation on moral thinking as such. While overcoming speciesism involves a commitment to the pursuit of knowledge of relevant similarities and differences between humans and other species, the criteria of relevance will always have an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism about them. Speciesism is the arbitrary refusal to extend moral consideration to relevantly similar cases; the ineliminable element of anthropocentrism is marked by the impossibility of giving meaningful moral consideration to cases which bear no similarity to any aspect of human cases. The emphasis is on the ‘meaningful’ here: for in the abstract one could of course declare that some feature of the nonhuman world was morally valuable, despite meeting no determinate criterion of value already recognised by any human, but because the new value is completely unrelated to any existing value it will remain radically indeterminate as a guide to action. If the ultimate point of an ethic is to yield a determinate guide to human action, then, the human reference is ineliminable even when extending moral concern to nonhumans. So my argument is that one cannot know if any judgement is speciesist if one has no benchmark against which to test arbitrariness; and, more specifically, if we are concerned to avoid speciesism of humans then one must have standards of comparison between them and others. Thus features of humans remain the benchmark. As long as the valuer is a human, the very selection of criteria of value will be limited by this fact. It is this fact which precludes the possibility of a radically nonanthropocentric value scheme, if by that is meant the adoption of a set of values which are supposed to be completely unrelated to any existing human values. Any attempt to construct a radically non-anthropocentric value scheme is liable not only to be arbitrary – because founded on no certain knowledge – but also to be more insidiously anthropocentric in projecting certain values, which as a matter of fact are selected by a human, onto nonhuman beings without certain warrant for doing so. This, of course, is the error of anthropomorphism, and will inevitably, I believe, be committed in any attempt to expunge anthropocentrism altogether.

# 1AR

#### Perm solves—we must incorporate many theoretical approaches to environmental study to improve policy making and decisions

Alonsob et al, 2008

[Enrique Alonsob, Biodiversity UNESCO Chair, ESCET-Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain, and Pablo Martínez de Anguitaa, Department of Environmental Technology, ESCET-Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain, and María Ángeles Martínc, Department of Natural Resources, University San Pablo CEU, Madrid, Spain, “Environmental economic, political and ethical integration in a common decision-making framework.” Journal of Environmental Management, Volume 88, Issue 1, July 2008, Pages 154–164, Accessed online via science direct] /Wyo-MB

Environmental management necessitates various tools. Economic, ethical, legal or technical instruments are applied to solve environmental conflicts or problems in many cases without there being an underlying theory able to establish relationships between them. As relationships are found between these tools, more specific and wider models can be developed to provide integrated solutions. Many environmental managers begin the solving processes with a given system of values that are assumed but not included, nor even judged, as a component of the process. Environmental values are seen as separate from technical solutions. They are considered as starting points. However, values as well as tools can be integrated into the decision-making process and can be judged according to the results. Since Aldo Leopold wrote “The Land Ethic” there have been many attempts to incorporate environmental ethics into the economic and policy decision-making process. At first ethics were considered as a limitation to economics or politics. This article attempts to incorporate environmental ethics into the decision-making process by proposing a model to integrate environmental, economic and political sciences with environmental philosophical and ethical disciplines. It tries to provide a theory in order to determine, ordain and give coherence to the different environmental management decision-making levels.

#### Case outweighs – prioritize action over ontological questioning

Santoni 85 - Maria Theresa Barney Chair Emeritus of Philosophy at Denison University (Ronald, “Nuclear War: Philosophical Perspectives” p 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth.  But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide.  In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we Simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the ams race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence.  Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.”  Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)?  Is this all we can do?  Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?”  Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift?  Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about out disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?”  In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”?  Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.”  He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.”  I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur.  (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.)  Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard.  In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be an early accomplice to the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its annihilation.  The Nuremburg tradition calls not only for a new way of thinking, a “new internationalism” in which we all become co-nurturers of the whole planet, but for resolute actions that will sever our complicity with nuclear criminality and the genocidal arms race, and work to achieve a future which we can no longer assume. We must not only “come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought” (Fox) but must act now - with a “new consciousness” and conscience - to prevent the unthinkable, by cleansing the earth of nuclear weaponry. Only when that is achieved will ultimate violence be removed as the final arbiter of our planet’s fate.

#### Renewable energy is a necessary stepping stone toward alt solvency

**Scatena 11**--German Honors/Communication Studies Major Film Studies minor Memorial University of Newfoundland (Debora, Environment and Technology: Finding a Solution within the Modern Framework and Human Responsibilities, International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, 1;2; September 2011, http://www.ijbhtnet.com/journals/Vol\_1\_No\_2\_September\_2011/12.pdf)

It is possible to move past the challenge solely after a process of democratization has been put into place, specifically that example has come into being in Germany in October 2008 when the Renewable Energy Act (EEG, 28.10.2008) was approved. The act enables companies as well as private to invest in renewable energies and profit from it. However regulations are in place to preserve the quality and well being of nature as well. It is possible to see the German Renewable Energy Act, as a step that Heidegger foresaw, when discussing the impact of technology within nature. It is also possible to see the Act as an expansion of a philosophy and way of being within nature that a certain culture has developed. Moreover it is interesting to see how throughout the Act people have limitations on the use of nature they can have as well, nature is protected as it is the element can allow humanity to continue its development and sustain itself. If nature was not preserved in the Act it would be only a new energy policy but it wouldn't be able to take culture as well as people forward. Even so it is possible to see how technology as illustrated by Heidegger can move people ahead and through it the contemplative state can be achieved and captured, so that humanity actually improves thanks to technology. Nevertheless Germany is also the only country that put such regulations ahead for its citizen and its environment, so the road ahead is pretty steep unless people start realizing that those are not solely ideas, but they can be put into place. It is also possible to see a certain level of nature democratization is the Renewable Energy Act in question, since right after each way that people can use to support themselves with natural energy there are also as many rules to make sure nature is protected and not hurt in the balance.

As a manmade Act it isn't perfect, but it is a possible way to create a unity front for both people and nature, also it is a beginning of the democratization of nature too. Latour states that “due process for the discovery of the common world” (Latour, 224) can be [hard] heard to get to**, but if a stepping stone is set**, certainly **people and nature can start a discourse which benefits both.** The realm of possibilities and solutions is achievable, but if the will of moving forward does not arise it is unlikely to reach a solution. Many things can be said and done, but it is important to always move towards the best ethics within a balance for humanity as well as nature. Technology is a tool that can enable men to get closer to the aim to be reached. It is also the tool that can move knowledge of the issue ahead, as it is seen in many reports released by institutions such as NASA and various Governments. In other words the road ahead is possible but not always straightforward. Heidegger as well as Latour present possible solutions, which as seen in Germany can be achieved, but they come with a series of challenges. Technology does reveal itself as a starting point to take humanity as well as knowledge and handling of the situation people are faced with more manageable, but it isn't the solution, it is the way to reach a two step solution. Nature does deserve the same level of democratization humanity is entailed to, for this reason it is possible to see the German approach through the Renewable Energy Act as a first step. How long until the rest of the world will catch up? Not an easy question to deal with, but a stepping stone to foresee how human future can co-exist with nature, through the use of technology and a new framework in approaching life. Not likely easy but possible, and by possible it is achievable with dignity by all parties. Solutions are out there, the contemplative status can lead people to reach the goal of overcoming the climate challenge as well as many more, **but steps need to be made to get started.**