

Anthropocentrism K

Murray

1NC shell	1-3
2NC overview	4

Links

Animal rights	5-6
Borders	7-8
Environmental management	9
“Environment”	10
Humanism	11
Human stewardship	12
Law of the Sea	13
Mammal rights	14
MPAs	15-17
“Natural resources”	18-20
“Sentience”	21
Sustainable development	22-23
Technology	24-26
-A/T Tech solves environment	27-28
Utilitarianism	29
Whale rights	30

Impacts

Takes out case	31
Turns case	32
Social domination	33
Genocide	34
Imperialism	35
Systemic harm	36
Environmental destruction	37-39
Extinction	40-41
O/w war & terrorism	42

Alternative

Solves case	43-44
Critique Anthropocentrism	45
Recognize intrinsic value	46-47
Deep ecology	48
Value the planet	49
Reconnect with nature	50
MPAs specific alternative	51-52

A/T impact turns

“You let humans starve/die”	53-55
“K decreases respect for humans”	56

Misanthropic	57-58
Ecofascism	59-60
“Nazis were environmentalists”	61
Hunting	62
Space colonization	63
Animal research (Generic)	64-68
Animal research (AIDS)	69
Animal research (Cancer)	70
Bacteria	71-73
Dolphin minesweepers	74-77
Dolphin saboteurs	78
Anarchy	79

A/T Various defensive arguments

“Benign anthropocentrism”	80
Anthro inevitable	81
“No alternative”	82-83
Vague alternative	84

A/T Justifications for anthropocentrism

Animals don’t feel pain	85
Darwinism/Most successful	86-87
Tenacious moral instinct	88
Opposable thumbs	89
Language	90
Intelligence	91
Human ethics	92

Random stuff

Discourse shapes reality	93
A/T Permutation	94-97
A/T Pragmatism	98-99
A/T Specific policies good	100
A/T Fiat good	101-103
A/T Social ecology	104-106
A/T Ecofeminism	107

Aff Answers

Anthro is benign	108
A/T Anthro = social exploitation	109
Alt doesn’t solve	110-111
Alt = mysticism	112
Perm solvency	113-114
Perm solvency (Tech specific)	115
A/T Tech bad	116-117

<For more aff answers see Jake’s Anthro good file>

INC Shell

A. Links

- 1. The view of the natural world as a resource implies that non-human creatures exist solely for human consumption. This viewpoint results in the total alienation of humans from nature**

David Orton, coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group, 2000 [January, Earth First Journal, "Marine Protected Areas: A Human-centric concept"] <murray>

The Oceans Act uses the word "resource" to cover non-human creatures living in the oceans. The automatic assumption that nature is a resource for corporate and human use is an indication of our total alienation from the natural world. It implies a human- centered, utilitarian world view and that humans are somehow the pinnacle of evolution

- 2. The affirmative's view of marine biodiversity solely from the perspective of its value to humans is anthropocentric because it refuses to recognize that organisms have intrinsic value for their own sake**

Donald K. Anton Director of Policy and International Law @ University of Melbourn, Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, 1997

In order to appreciate the need for new international law to provide greater protection to marine biological diversity beyond the continental shelf and Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), it is necessary to appreciate the value of such diversity, why we care about conserving it, and why threats to it are a matter of concern. From some ethical points of view all forms of life, and the habitats that support them, can be considered as intrinsically valuable for their own sake.²⁴ Under this premise, it follows that protection and preservation ought to follow as a matter of course. However, excepting certain philosophical, religious or cultural [*347] systems,²⁵ the value of biological diversity overwhelmingly has been viewed from the narrow position of economic worth to humans.²⁶

Of course, this presents problems for the protection of biological diversity, because it has recognized value that cannot be calculated in dollar terms. Further, under current accounting systems, the cost of losing biodiversity is ordinarily shifted to society rather than internalized by private actors responsible for the loss.²⁷ The problem is even more acute in the case of marine biodiversity found beyond national jurisdiction because of its commons nature. Consequently, systems for valuing biodiversity need to use monetary valuation as one tool among many.

The debates surrounding the C.B.D. have suffered from this myopic economic view of the value of biodiveristy. Instead of focusing on the widespread protection and conservation of ecosystems, species, and genetic variability, the debates have primarily involved access to biological diversity and rights to profits generated through the exploitation of genetic material.²⁸

INC Shell

B. Implications

- ⑥ The extinction of all life on Earth is imminent due to human exploitation of nature, which is fueled by anthropocentric assumptions – rethinking this paradigm is necessary to prevent planetary destruction

Douglas Tompkins, President of the Foundation for Deep Ecology, 2002, [deepecology.org]
<murray>

We begin with the premise that life on Earth has entered its most precarious phase in history. We speak of threats not only to human life, but to the lives of all species of plants and animals, as well as the health and continued viability of the biosphere. It is the awareness of the present condition that primarily motivates our foundation's activities.

Without placing them into a hierarchy of lesser or greater importance, we believe that current problems are largely rooted in the following circumstances:

The loss of traditional knowledge, values, and ethics of behavior that celebrate the intrinsic value and sacredness of the natural world and that give the preservation of Nature prime importance. Correspondingly, the assumption of human superiority to other life forms, as if we were granted royalty status over Nature; the idea that Nature is mainly here to serve human will and purpose.

<continued...>

As our name suggests, we are influenced by the Deep Ecology Platform, which helps guide and inform our work. We believe that values other than market values must be recognized and given importance, and that Nature provides the ultimate measure by which to judge human endeavors.

Both as philosophy and activism, deep ecology views the survival of natural systems and the capacity of the planet for self-renewal as crucial to all life (human and nonhuman) and not to be compromised.

We accept that true ecological sustainability may require a rethinking of our values as a society. Present assumptions about economics, development, and the place of human beings in the natural order must be reevaluated. If we are to achieve ecological sustainability, Nature can no longer be viewed only for its commodity value; it must be seen as a partner and model in all human enterprise.

INC Shell

C. The alternative is a rejection of the 1AC's anthropocentric paradigm.

Rethinking fundamental anthropocentric assumptions is essential to combating the ecological crisis and opens up space to endorse specific policies like the plan without harmful justifications – the affirmative's paradigm of human centeredness perpetuates ecological degradation and planetary destruction

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <Murray>

The threat to planetary biodiversity caused by the technological, economic, and environmental policies of the last half century is only partly a scientific problem. For a practitioner of moral philosophy, the threat to biodiversity is primarily a crisis in moral values. Traditional assumptions about value and the normative principles that shape moral life need to be rethought and modified. In light of increasingly complex environmental and social problems, these traditional views are, at best, inadequate; at worst, they are contributing causes of the environmental crisis.

<continued...>

An anthropocentric value system that only regards natural processes as important for human survival cannot serve as the basis of a comprehensive environmental policy.

Anthropocentrism, in its narrow formulations of egoism, economic expediency, and utilitarianism, has been the primary force in the creation of the environmental crisis.

Broadening the concept, to include the instrumental importance of the natural world for the prevention of human extinction, is hardly adequate as a solution. It merely restates the problem of the environmental crisis: why is all value based on human goods and interests?

The real solution to problems in environmental policy lies in a specific transformation of values—the transcendence of human-based systems of ethics and the development of an "ecological ethic." Humanity must acknowledge that moral value extends beyond the human community to the communities within natural systems.² It is for this reason that the concept of "biodiversity" must be linked with "ecological justice." And it is for this reason that the problem of a diminishing planetary biodiversity is a crisis in moral value. Policies that ensure the preservation of planetary biodiversity must express values derived from a nonanthropocentric moral system, a normative theory of justice that is "ecological," i.e., a theory not based merely on human goods and interests.

<continued...>

Biodiversity and ecological justice are thus necessarily connected; my title is not, I think, a jumble of incompatible ideas. The preservation of planetary biodiversity will only be achieved by the transformation of human values. Our system of ethics has to include the notion of an ecological community; our system of justice has to include a global and nonhuman perspective. I believe that we are partway to that transformation; my hope is that the transformation will be completed before the diversity of the planetary system is destroyed.

2NC overview

The living organisms of the ocean are a “common heritage of humankind”. We must protect certain species in order to avoid adverse effects to humans. We must promote the “sustainable utilization” of Earth’s “resources” for the sake of economic growth. These ideas form the foundation of most current efforts to protect the ecosystem, and ironically, also constitute the root cause of the current ecological crisis.

The affirmative’s sole justification for the plan is not that we should protect species for their own sake, but rather that we should “conserve” these “resources” to promote human interests. Their exclusive focus on human concerns embraces an anthropocentric mindset that furthers ecological destruction. The idea that nature should be preserved for human benefit is also the mindset that justifies the destruction of living organisms that do not have any apparent benefit to humans. This results in the gradual destruction of the biosphere, which ultimately threatens all life on earth.

The alternative is to reject the affirmative’s anthropocentric justification for the plan. This first step away from a homocentric mindset is crucial to open up space that allows us to combat environmental problems through a biocentric lens that is much better suited to attack the root cause of ecological destruction. We don’t necessarily say that the plan is a bad idea, just that the way that the affirmative attempts to justify their plan is flawed because it perpetuates their harms.

Finally, the critique turns the case – Quick fix solutions that attack specific symptoms of environmental problems for the sake of human benefit cannot form the basis for a comprehensive policy to protect the environment because concern for the natural world will always take the back seat to the interests of humanity, that’s the conceded 1NC Katz evidence.

"Animal Rights" link

Extending human notions of rights to animals is anthropocentric because it presupposes the idea that humans are the steward of the natural world

Anthony Weston 1995

Postmodern Environmental Ethics, ed. Max Oelschlaeger

I begin by arguing that contemporary nonanthropocentric environmental ethics remains deeply dependent upon the thoroughly anthropocentrized setting in which it arises. Elsewhere I develop this argument in detail.³ Here there is only room to sketch some highlights.

For a first example, consider the very phrasing of the question that most contemporary environmental philosophers take as basic: whether "we" should open the gates of moral considerability to "other" animals (sometimes just: "animals"), and/or to such things as rivers and mountains. The opening line of Paul Taylor's *Respect for Nature*, for example, invokes such a model. Environmental ethics, Taylor writes, "is concerned with the moral relations that hold between humans and the natural world."⁴

Taylor's phrasing of "the" question may seem neutral and unexceptionable. Actually, however, it is not neutral at all. The called-for arguments address humans universally and exclusively on behalf of "the natural world." Environmental ethics, therefore, is invited to begin by positing, not by questioning, a sharp divide that "we" must somehow cross, taking that "we" unproblematically to denote all humans. To invoke such a divide, however, is already to take one ethical position among others. For one thing, it is largely peculiar to modern Western cultures. Historically, when humans said "we," they hardly ever meant to include all other humans. Moreover, they often meant to include some individuals of other species. Mary Midgley emphasizes that almost all of the ancient life patterns were "mixed communities," involving humans and an enormous variety of other creatures, from dogs (with whom, she says, we have a "symbiotic" relationship) to reindeer, weasels, elephants, horses, and pigs.⁵ One's identifications and loyalties lay not with the extended human species, but with a local and concretely realized network of relationships involving many different species.

Taylor might respond that his question is at least our question: the urbanized, modern, Westerner's question. So it is. But it is precisely this recog-

nition of cultural relativity that is crucial. "The" very question that frames contemporary environmental ethics appears to presuppose a particular cultural and historical situation—which is not the only human possibility, and which may itself be the problem. Cross-species identifications, or a more variegated sense of "the natural world," fit in awkwardly, or not at all. || 224

S

"Animal rights" links

The idea of humans bestowing rights upon animals perpetuates homocentric ideals that justify total exploitation of nature

Bill Devall and George Sessions 1985
Deep Ecology

// On the basis of contemporary western ethical theory, these philosophers argue that other animals besides humans, or at least the more highly evolved conscious ones, have some "rights" or that utilitarianism allows moral significance to those animals capable of suffering or experiencing pain. Deep ecology theorists are also very concerned about many of the issues which the animal liberationists address, but also believe that many of these problems are mainly symptoms of a more deep-seated malaise. Contemporary humanistic ethi-

cal theory is ineradicably anthropocentric, designed specifically to deal with the problems of human interaction. When the attempt is made to extend this theory to other animals (Moral Extensionism), they are accorded much less moral consideration (less intrinsic worth) than humans.

Under contemporary ethical theory, some beings, thought to have little or no sentience, together with the entire nonliving world, have no moral standing whatsoever. Thus, animal rights theorizing tends to violate the deep ecology insistence on "ecological egalitarianism in principle." As John Rodman remarks, "There is a pecking order in this moral barnyard." Rodman also points out that this theorizing is timid in that no challenge or examination is made of the basic assumptions of the urban/industrial worldview: "The attempt to produce a new ethics by the process of extension perpetuates the basic presuppositions of the conventional modern paradigm, however much it fiddles with the boundaries. . . . [the animal rights movement] while holding out promise of transcending the homocentric perspective of modern culture, subtly fulfills and legitimizes the basic project of modernity—the total conquest of nature by man." //

The affirmative's construction of animals as simply beneficiaries of humans perpetuates the idea that animal's value is purely instrumental
Robin Attfield, professor of philosophy at University of Whales, 1999 ["The Ethics of the Global Environment"]

It is the inability to understand the range of the moral sentiment (or practical reason) in any but an abstract extensional mode that seems to be the problem: the single-minded mapping of morality onto 'beneficiaries' and 'communities of ends' whose relation to their environment is still left outside except instrumentally. I am suggesting that our normative ethical theorizing, when it becomes substantive, is hostage to the complex question: If not one's own interests or dignity, then whose? 30

harmless

6

Borders link

Dividing up nature into political boundaries is anthropocentric – it assumes that the earth is just a “resource” to be divided up for human consumption, rather than deserving of value in its own right. It also makes effective protection impossible, turning case

Holmes **Rollstone**, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State University, **1995** [“A New Century for Natural Resource Management”, <http://www.ecospherics.net/pages/Global.htm>]

<There is one Earth; on it are 178 sovereign nations, a politically fragmented world. "The Earth is one but the world is not"(4). True, the one Earth is plural in its landmasses and supports myriads of diverse ecosystems, species, and peoples. Still, the really divisive troubles arise among the world states. The national sovereignties are not well adapted for harmonious relations with the Earth commons. The rights of nations, and rights as claimed by citizens of these political states, are not well aligned with the ecology and geography. In the 20th century, the commons problem became transnational; at the turn of the millennium it is becoming global. Our citizenship in nations is not well synchronized with our residence in geographic places, nor with our sense of global dwelling on our home planet.

<continued...>

Those in the G-7 nations who emphasize the earnings model tend to recommend to the G-77 nations that they produce more, often offering to help them by investments that can also be productive for the G-7 nations. Those in the G-77 nations realize that the problem is sharing too. A continually growing production can be as much part of the problem as part of the solution. One way to think of a circular pie chart of Earth goods is that this is planet Earth, and we do not have any way of producing a bigger planet. Maybe too, Earth is not just a big pie to be eaten up. Earth is valuable on its own and has produced fauna and flora that are worth construing for what they are in themselves.

The astronaut Michael Collins recalled being: "I remember so vividly . . . what I saw when I looked back at my fragile home—a glistening, inviting beacon, delicate blue and white, a tiny outpost suspended in the black infinity. Earth is to be treasured and nurtured, something precious that must endure" (16). The UN Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, closed the Earth Summit: "The Spirit of Rio must create a new mode of civic conduct. It is not enough for man [sic] to love his neighbour; he [sic] must also learn to love his world" (17).

Neither is thinking merely anthropocentrically of Earth as a big resource to be exploited for human needs, a pie to be divided up for human consumption. Rather, Earth is a precious thing in itself because it is home for us all; Earth is to be loved, as we do a neighbor, for an intrinsic integrity. The center of focus is not people, but the biosphere. But valuing the whole Earth and responsibilities to it are unfamiliar and need philosophical analysis.

7

Borders link

The idea that certain groups of people “own” parts of the natural world is anthropocentric

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, March 6 2003
[http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Key_Deep_Ecology_Ideas.html, Key Deep Ecology Ideas]
<murray>

4) Deep Ecology Opposes the Idea of “Private Property” in Nature. As Arne Naess said: “The ideology of ownership of nature has no place in an ecosophy.” I have written about “usufruct use” instead of so-called private ownership of the Natural world. This means that there is the “right of use,” but one is ultimately responsible and accountable to some form of ecocentric governance much wider than human society. Nature must remain a Commons and not be privatized.

8

Environmental management link

Environmental management perpetuates anthropocentrism and endorses a mindset that has created the global ecological crisis in the first place

Irvine, member of the Campaign for Political Ecology, 2001 [September 5, "Sustainable Development – The Last Refuge of Humanism?"] <murray>

Sustainable Development theory does advocate, of course, resource conservation - for the sake of human consumption at a later date. It is still trapped in a perspective which Canadian author Neil Evernden has christened 'resourcism'. It is about squeezing more out of Nature, albeit in less immediately hazardous or profligately wasteful ways. Environmental systems are simply there to be used as humans see fit to satisfy indiscriminate and open-ended needs. Even the very concept of environmental management - of predicting and controlling infinitely complex systems - may contain that very hubris which has done so much to create a planetary crisis in the first place.

'Resourcism' reveals itself both at an ideological and at a policy level. One Worldwatch Institute paper on forestry, for example, claims that 'better management of *natural* forests holds potential for increasing production of industrial wood' (my emphasis) with 'an effort akin to the agricultural green revolution of the sixties: a dedication to developing genetically improved tree species'. Absent here is any sensitivity to the fact that the few surviving old-growth forests are perfectly able to perform their most important ecological roles and to cater best for wildlife if kept free from further human exploitation. Also missing is any learning from the lessons taught by the social, economic and environmental side-effects of the introduction of high-yielding hybrid plants in farming.

[“Environment” link](#)

The word ‘environment’ is anthropocentric – it implies that nature is just a backdrop for humans – this attitude is the cause of the ecological crisis

Patrick Curry, BA in psychology, -September 3, 2001

(University of California at Santa Cruz, The Campaign for Political Ecology) <Murray>
Before turning to the different kinds, and degrees of "green"ethics,²⁰ a note on my choice of words: environment (environmental, environmentalism) as a word prejudges the issues in a particularly unfortunate way, insofar as it implies that the natural world is essentially merely a surround, backdrop, or setting for the main attraction: us. But that very attitude is integral to the present crisis. For this reason, I prefer ecology (ecological, and even the rather awkward ecologism²¹). True, ecology began life as a word coined in 1866 (from the Greek *oikos*, meaning home or household) to describe the study of biological interrelationships and their emergent effects; but there is no reason to allow scientists proprietary rights, and it is now commonly, and legitimately, also understood to refer to a metaphysical and/or political philosophy.

Humanism link

Humanism and its excessive focus on human concerns is putting all life on Earth at risk – an alternative ethical system is needed

Stan Rowe, Professor of Ecology, University of Saskatchewan 2000 [“An Earth Based Ethic For Humanity, <http://www.ecospherics.net/pages/RoweEarthEthics.html>] <murray>

Humanism served humanity well when numbers were small and technology limited. It is still valuable insofar as it teaches benevolence, justice, and mercy toward one another. Beyond that, humanism is a danger to the planet and to ourselves because of its excessive narrowness. It has outlived its usefulness. One species, infatuated with itself to the exclusion of 20 or 30 million other co-evolved life-forms and their life-giving milieu, is putting all Earth at risk.

A broader, more encompassing, outward-looking ethic is needed. Such a post-humanist ethic is unlikely to come from religious traditions that are inward-looking, centered on humanity. This essay explains the basis for a faith and an ethic focused not on the human species but on its source and support, the Earth. Ecology points the way.

Human stewardship link

Placing humans as stewards of nature is homocentric, and any short term ecological benefit gained from it is subsumed by long-term neglect and environmental degradation, turning case

Stan Rowe, Professor of Ecology, University of Saskatchewan 2000 ["An Earth Based Ethic For Humanity, <http://www.ecospherics.net/pages/RoweEarthEthics.html>] <murray>

The basic cause of global ecological disaster is homocentrism, and the best environmental ethic the homocentric faiths have been able to muster is stewardship as defined in the Genesis text: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." Stewardship puts humans firmly in charge as dressers and keepers, as managers tending Earth's assets in such ways as keep the goods flowing for the one preeminent species, perhaps saving a bit but only because it may be useful some rainy day.

Stewardship of Earth will fail because, sooner or later, those in political power lack the good sense to see ahead, or are forced by hard times to liquidate Earth's "resources" for the gratification of the moment. Humans fixated on their own welfare, whether on their bodies in this world or their souls in the next, cannot help but be injurious to Earth as the prime ethical reality. History shows that, rather than gratefully accepting the golden eggs, people have again and again killed the fabled goose for the best of all reasons: to make busy-work jobs, to make a minority rich, to satisfy frivolous wants far beyond the provision of necessities. The message is writ large in the current economic system that discounts the future and encourages grabbing what you can, because "For me the world was made" and I want my slice of it right now.

12

Law of the Sea link

Dividing up the ocean into exclusive economic zones is anthropocentric because it is based on the assumption that humans can own the Earth

David Orton, coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group, 2000 [January, Earth First Journal, "Marine Protected Areas: A Human-centric concept"] <murray>

According to the Oceans Act, MPAs rest on an assertion of ownership over the internal waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone. In a press release December 19, 1996, the federal fishing minister said the passage of the Oceans Act "reaffirms Canada's sovereign ocean rights..." Supporters of deep ecology believe no one can own the Earth, whether from a state, individual or collective point of view. Asserted ownership is ultimately a convenient social fiction deriving from a human society bent on enforcing a claim of control over other creatures and the Earth itself.

Mammal rights link

Exclusive focus on rights for mammals is bad – it prevents the development of an environmental ethic that would respect all life

Rowman and Littlefield, 1983 ["Ecological Ethics and Politics, p. 8-9]

Logically and psychologically, the best and easiest breakthrough past the traditional boundaries of interhuman ethics is made when confronting higher animals. Animals defend their lives; they have a good of their own and suffer pains and pleasures like ourselves. Human moral concern should at least cross over into the domain of animal experience. This boundary crossing is also dangerous because if made only psychologically and not biologically, the would-be environmental ethicist may be too disoriented to travel further. The promised environmental ethics will degenerate into a mammalian ethics. We certainly need an ethic for animals, but that is only one level of concern in a comprehensive environmental ethics.

229

MPA/~~Marine Protected Areas~~ link

Dividing up the ocean into marine protected areas is anthropocentric because it is based on the assumption that humans can own the Earth

David Orton, coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group, 2000 [January, Earth First Journal, "Marine Protected Areas: A Human-centric concept"] <murray>

According to the Oceans Act, MPAs rest on an assertion of ownership over the internal waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone. In a press release December 19, 1996, the federal fishing minister said the passage of the Oceans Act "reaffirms Canada's sovereign ocean rights..." Supporters of deep ecology believe no one can own the Earth, whether from a state, individual or collective point of view. Asserted ownership is ultimately a convenient social fiction deriving from a human society bent on enforcing a claim of control over other creatures and the Earth itself.

MPA link - holism

Establishment of marine protected areas fails to account for the interdependence of nature – such piecemeal preservationism is doomed to failure

Sandy Irvine, Published by the *Campaign for Political Ecology*, 1996
[<http://eco.gn.apc.org/resguide/index.html>] <murray>

Often the land set aside is too small to support viable population of threatened species. At the same time, air- and water-borne pollution can visit damage from outside the boundaries of protected areas. That many National Parks cannot tolerate the pressure of recreational activities emphasises the incompatibility of what might seem benign use and environmental conservation. General development controls are, claim environmentalists, insufficient and can encourage developers to keep coming back with their proposals, making minor modifications until they finally get their way.

For all the real good measures like the creation of national parks have done in specific situations, such piecemeal preservationism cannot cope with saturation levels of human pressure on the environment. Most 'development control' vainly tries to ameliorate the worst aspects of particular developments (often by a 'beauty strip' of trees and the like or diverting it away from the most sensitive sites). As such, it is like the little Dutch boy sticking his finger in the dike, when holes are proliferating all over the sea wall.

MPAs holism link

Marine protected areas fail because they arbitrarily divide up the oceans – we should endorse a holistic approach to global ocean protection instead

David Orton, coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group, 2000 [January, Earth First Journal, “Marine Protected Areas: A Human-centric concept”,] <murray>

MPAs cannot be just minor set-asides. We cannot have dead zones between them. MPAs are not about creating wildlife reservations, because the nature of our society influences life inside these areas. Wider phenomena, like global warming, do not stop at MPA boundaries. Therefore a new, global, marine vision is necessary. Why don't we set aside oceans giving them protected status and then have workshops and meetings about which small areas should be opened up for human exploitation, of course, done sustainably?

"Natural resources" link

The affirmatives preservation of marine natural resources is simply an excuse to exploit and colonize nature for the good of human society. This positing of humans as the masters of nature props up an ideology of anthropocentrism

Warwick Fox, Senior Lecturer in Philosophy, Univ. of Central Lancashire, 1990
Toward A Transpersonal Ecology

When attention is finally turned to the exploitation by humans of the nonhuman world, our arguments for the conservation and preservation of the nonhuman world continue to betray anthropocentric assumptions. We argue that the nonhuman world should be conserved or preserved because of its use value to

humans (e.g., its scientific, recreational, or aesthetic value) rather than for its own sake or for its use value to *nonhuman* beings. It cannot be emphasized enough that the vast majority of environmental discussion—whether in the context of public meetings, newspapers, popular magazines, reports by international conservation organizations, reports by government instrumentalities, or even reports by environmental groups—is couched within these anthropocentric terms of reference. Thus, even many of those who deal most directly with environmental issues continue to perpetuate, however unwittingly, the arrogant assumption that we humans are central to the cosmic drama; that, essentially, the world is made for us. John Seed, a prominent *nonanthropocentric* ecological activist, sums up the situation quite simply when he writes, "The idea that humans are the *crown of creation*, the source of all value, the measure of all things, is deeply embedded in our culture and consciousness."¹⁵ *10.41*

The idea that animals are simply a resource, to be protected simply to allow humans to use it in the future, justifies exploitation of nature

Peter Singer, 1985 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "In Defense of Animals"] <Murray>

The fundamental wrong is the system that allows us to view animals as *our resources* here for us – to be eaten, or surgically manipulated, or exploited for sport or money. Once we accept this view of animals – as our resources – the rest is as predictable as it is regrettable. Why worry about their loneliness, their pain, their death? Since animals exist for us, to benefit us in one way or another, what harms them really doesn't matter – or matters only if it starts to bother us, makes us feel a trifle uneasy when we eat our veal escalope, for example. So, yes, let us get veal calves out of solitary confinement, give them more space, a little straw, a few companions. But let us keep our veal escalope. *14.*

"Natural Resource" link

Portraying nature as a natural resource perpetuates anthropocentrism, which is the root of our current ecologically destructive practices

Mark Hathaway, 1998 [Theme 5, Paper 2: Pushing the Boundaries - Christian Action [www.faith-and-the-economy.org/Documents/Thm5Pap2-Oikonomia2.rtf, Ecological Perspectives on Economics]<Murray>

Anthropocentrism lies at the heart of our current anti-ecological practice of economics. Our very language - "raw materials," "natural resources," even "caring for the environment" - betrays us, underscoring the perception that the non-human world is at the service and disposal of humanity.

Most of us have never seriously questioned this understanding. It seems natural to view humanity as somehow above or apart from the rest of the Earth community. We believe we have the right to use the Earth, even if this harms or actually eliminates other species.

"Natural Resource" link

The idea that nature is simply a resource to be preserved for future human consumption is anthropocentric – it's the same mindset that justifies ecological destruction

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, March 6 2003

[http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Key_Deep_Ecology_Ideas.html, Key Deep Ecology Ideas]
<murray>

1) Non Human-centeredness. Humans do not have a privileged position. For me this is the central contribution of DE. As a species, we are just one member of a community of all beings. There is no belief in a hierarchy of organisms, with humans on top. Nature is not a “resource” for human use. We should share the planet on a basis of equality with all other life forms. We should have a humility attitude, “live and let live.” We have to adjust to the natural world, not the natural world to us. Our language is human-centered: trees, fish, etc. are “resources.” For industrial forestry, insects are “pests,” trees are described as “decadent” and “overmature” when they are considered past their prime from a human-use perspective. For wildlife here in Nova Scotia, we have a booklet called *“Hunting & Furharvesting Regulations.”* Morality just concerns “humans” in a human-centered universe, so it is not considered immoral by most to destroy wildlife through industrial forestry. For example, there isn't even a thought given to clearcutting in May and June when ground and tree birds are nesting. Naess says about the main characteristic of the DE movement:

“The main driving force of the Deep Ecology movement, as compared with the rest of the ecological movement, is that of identification and solidarity with all life.”

A Sentience *link*

The idea that rationality should determine the value of organisms is speciesist

Huey-li Li, Assistant Professor, Educational Philosophy, University of

Akron, 96, Philosophy of Education, On the Nature of Environmental

Education, http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/96_docs/li.html

Furthermore, animal liberationists' proposing "sentience," "rationality" and "consciousness" as the criteria to establish the relative intrinsic values of animals is another form of speciesism that shows prejudice and discrimination against plants and mountains. This also reflects a hierarchical structure of thinking which presumes that the human-related characteristics are morally more important than the rest of the living entities or non-living entities in nature.^[25] Therefore, Singer himself may not have escaped speciesism.

"Sustainable development" link

The idea of sustainable exploitation of Earth's so-called resources is a façade for environmental destruction and complete human domination over nature

Justice For Animals, No Date given [http://www.justiceforanimals.co.za/ethical_conservation.html]

Most people involved in wildlife "management" believe that animals do not have rights and exist primarily to serve the interests of humans.

How else can we explain the arbitrary manner in which some humans decide which animals shall live and which shall die? The individual animal's right to life or freedom is dismissed out of hand.

The currently popular buzz concept in orthodox conservation circles is "wise use", or as it is also known, "sustainable utilisation". This concept implies that any number of wild animals can be killed or captured just so long as the bio-diversity of the area is not compromised, or as long as the long-term viability of a species or population is not threatened by the killing or capture. Concern for the actual individual animal that is killed or captured is limited only to its value as a target for hunters, its ability to generate income from tourism or the profit it can earn when traded.

The same principle applies to all other components of the natural environment, which include trees, rivers, mountains and minerals.

In other words, wildlife is seen as a resource, to be used in any way that will earn money - trophy hunting; capture for zoos or circuses; capture for sale to research institutions; capture for slaughter and human consumption; trapping for furs, harpooning of whales and dolphins for their flesh and body oils; capture to supply the world trade in wild animals as pets and collectors items; use of body parts for medicinal purposes - these and many more are considered acceptable as long as the principle of "wise use" is adhered to.

Orthodox conservationists, who have bought into the "wise use" philosophy, tout this as the "sensible" way to manage wildlife so that wildlife habitat is not converted into agricultural land and so that rural people can benefit from conservation efforts and therefore be inclined to support such conservation efforts.

This is wishful thinking, and "wise use" is the most insidiously dangerous and animal-unfriendly concept to arise in the history of formal environmental conservation. Animals are relegated to the status of commodities that exist solely by the grace of humans, for humans.

“Sustainable development” link

“Sustainable development” is an anthropocentric attempt to evade natural limits on growth – this contributes to a global ecological meltdown

Irvine, member of the Campaign for Political Ecology, 2001 [September 5, “Sustainable Development – The Last Refuge of Humanism?”] <murray>

The realities of life on a finite planet suggest that the programme of sustainable development is indeed the last refuge of humanism since it represents the final attempt to evade the limits to growth. But it is doomed to be dashed on the rocks of ecological decline. The only way to avoid terrible consequences of ecological meltdown - a goal in the interests of all species, humans and non-humans - is to start putting the Earth first. Protection of the Earth's life-support systems, the conserver agenda, must become the overriding and all-pervading priority. Without such a paradigm shift, the most worthy social goals such as justice, tolerance and quality of life, goals to which humanism has made a real contribution (as have more theistic traditions), can never be realised on a durable basis.

The idea of “Sustainable” exploitation of resources is simply a smokescreen to justify ecological destruction

The Campaign for Political Ecology, September 30, 2001 [“Sustainable development”, <http://eco.gn.apc.org/SustainDev/index.html>] <Murray>

ECO's comment on sustainable development

Development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This was the original definition as popularized by the World Commission on Environment and Development, but in practice the term *sustainable development* means widely different things to different people.

There are many well intentioned sustainable development initiatives in which the people involved believe they are making a real contribution to sustainability. Equally, a large number of organisations are using it as a marketing tool, which is not altogether unreasonable if they are making a real effort in the direction of real sustainability. Unfortunately, the term is all too frequently hijacked and erected as a smokescreen behind which to carry on business as usual in the form of unsustainable growth.

Even amongst the genuinely well-intentioned, disappointingly few seem to have grasped the true implications of sustainability. There is a widespread misconception that a few add-on pollution controls plus a small increase in efficiency are all that is necessary to safeguard the future.

Technology link

Technological solutions to problems inevitably lead to environmental plundering, the enslavement of the natural world, and ultimately to biocide. Attempting to combine a deep ecological approach with technological solutions is doomed to failure

Berry, 1999 [Thomas, Cultural historian, "The Great Works"]

We know the story of the formation of the modern world, the dominant intellectual framework and its beginnings in the seventeenth century when Descartes established an absolute separation of the spiritual and the material worlds. Later in the seventeenth century Newton provided a view of the physical universe that came to dominate the Western mind until the time of Albert Einstein and Max Planck at the beginning of the twentieth century. This mechanistic view of the world encouraged the growth of technological invention and industrial plundering, culminating in the 1880s when the electronic and chemical research centers were established, scientific technologies were advanced, and the first modern commercial and industrial corporations were formed. The objective was to make human societies as independent as possible from the natural world and to make the natural world as subservient as possible to human decisions. Nothing was to be left in its natural state.

Only now can we appreciate the consequences of this effort to achieve human well-being in a consumer society by subduing the spontaneities of the natural world with human manipulation. We begin to realize that the devastation taking place cannot be critiqued effectively from within the traditional religions or humanist ethics. Nor can it be dealt with from within the perspectives of the industrial society that brought it about.

We find ourselves ethically destitute just when, for the first time, we are faced with ultimacy, the irreversible closing down of the Earth's functioning in its major life systems. Our ethical traditions know how to deal with suicide, homicide, and even genocide; but these traditions collapse entirely when confronted with biocide, the extinction of the vulnerable life systems of the Earth, and geocide, the devastation of the Earth itself.

May
anthro
Cap
tech:
Art
P
Po
ethic
W
Syste
techn
→ b

103 - 104

Tech link

Technological solutions to environmental problems prop up the false idea that something is being done about ecological destruction, while failing to truly solve the problems and negating the intrinsic value of nature

Bill Devall and George Sessions 1985

Deep Ecology

There are three main dangers to technocratic solutions. First is the danger in believing there is a complete or acceptable solution using modern dominant ideologies and technology. The second danger is the presentation of an impression that something is being done when in fact the real problem continues. Tinkering distracts from the "real work." Finally, there is the danger of assuming there will be new experts such as professional ecologists — who will provide the solution but who may in fact be constrained to be public relations spokespersons for the agenda of profit or power of some corporation or agency.

Ecological resistance is action from central principles of doing what is necessary, of witnessing nonviolently. It arises from a shift in consciousness. Ecological resisting is deeper, some would say more radical, than just reformism. Some of the reformist actions to mitigate some of the worst forms of air and water pollution (due to auto exhaust, for example) are motivated by concern only for human health and safety and not by the intrinsic values of the biosphere. But the limits of reformism are by now well known.



Tech link

Technological solutions to ecological problems fail to prevent ecological destruction, and they perpetuate anthropocentric colonization of nature

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <murray>

In this essay, I explore this "call of the wild"—our *attraction to value* that exists in a natural world outside of human control. To understand this value, we must understand the relationship between technology and the natural world, the ways in which humanity attempts to "fix" and mold nature to suit human purposes. Thomas Birch has described this project as the "control of otherness,"¹ a form of domination that includes the control of nature and all such outsiders of human society. Here I bring together several ideas about the philosophy of technology and the nature of artifacts, and combine them with themes raised by Birch. I argue that value exists in nature to the extent it avoids the domination of human technological practice. Technology can satisfy human wants by creating the artifactual products we desire, but it cannot supply, replace, or restore the "wild."

A/T Tech good

Technological solutions to environmental problems inevitably fail and will result in the extinction of all life on Earth
Manes, 1990 [Environmental philosopher, "Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization"] <Murray>

So far, the implications are less than flattering. Not only do the "solutions" of environmental policymakers lack the vision necessary to deal with the biological meltdown, they seem doomed to aggravate the situation when put into practice. To give an example, almost all national and international bodies dealing with the issue take it for granted that the way to stabilize ecological decline and population growth in the Third World is through technology transfer and modernization — in other words, replacing indigenous economies with market economies. Most environmental organizations have jumped onto the technology bandwagon more or less willingly, with the proviso that lending institutions link development loans to conservation efforts.³⁰

Leaving aside the suspicious fact that technology transfer fits perfectly into the industrialized nations' goal of creating a global market, the strategy has one conspicuous shortcoming: it amounts to ecological suicide. If the worldwide coterie of polluters and mass consumers is joined by Nigeria, Brazil, Peru, Malaysia, and a dozen other Third World countries that retain at least a semblance of their indigenous, Earth-harmonious economies, there is very little doubt that life on this planet will soon become intolerable. For the rest of the world to use as much energy (not to mention consumer goods) per capita as the United States does, it would have to burn 300 percent more coal, 500 percent more petroleum, and 1,100 percent more natural gas.³¹ What this would mean in terms of the greenhouse effect alone is not a comforting thought. The ecology of the planet is already coming undone from the production habits of that minority of countries that has industrialized; it cannot survive an India full of refrigerators.

Of course, the problem of Third World political economy is complex and directly related to the disruptions caused by colonialism and international markets in the first place. As sociologist William Catton says of the United Nations' hapless attempt to address the issue in its 1972 Conference on the Human Environment, "The luckier nations which happened to achieve industrial prodigality before the earth's savings became depleted had already infected the other nations with an insatiable desire to emulate that prodigality."³² Nonetheless, from an ecological perspective — which in the long run is the only one that matters — industrial societies must be considered a fleeting, unpleasant mirage on the landscape rather than a vision of the future to be emulated.

The dilemma of technological culture is that its solutions inevitably raise problems more pressing than those it purports to solve. The environmental crisis makes this apparent as never before. A naive faith in technology, however, still pervades much of the environmental debate. In 1973 one author, anxious to discredit "ecocultists" and "technophobes," wrote the following with unfailing prophetic inaccuracy:

A/T Tech solves environment

Technology may be a short-term cure to ecological problems, but it simply makes the ecological crisis worse in the long term

Alan Drengson, environmental philosopher. 1995 (THE DEEP ECOLOGY MOVEMENT. AN INTRODUCTORY ANTHOLOGY. p. 81)

Powerful techniques solve many problems but eventually often generate problems of their own.
These techniques of modern science and technology are prone to create higher level problems
when their limits are reached; technology tends to become itself the prime concern of modern
industrial culture.

Utilitarianism link

Utilitarianism is anthropocentric – it's myopic viewpoint takes into account only the needs of humans, and it fundamentally contradicts with principles of ecological protection

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <murray>

I argue that Martin's view is wrong, that utilitarianism in its most basic forms cannot explain or justify the preservationist position in the preservation vs. development debate—although it often appears to do so. In fact, the widespread use of utilitarian arguments to justify policy decisions about the protection of the environment is detrimental to preservation. The essential elements of utilitarianism only provide a justification for the satisfaction of human need, for this satisfaction is the standard by which utilitarianism measures goodness or moral worth. But human needs and the needs of the natural environment are not necessarily similar or in harmony; thus, any ethical theory—such as utilitarianism—which tries to explain the preservation of the natural environment by means of the satisfaction of human wants, need, and desires will be only contingently true: it will depend on the factual circumstances, the actual desires of the human community at any given time. This empirical limitation does not bode well for the security of the preservationist argument.

Whale rights links

The idea that whales should be protected because they are more intelligent than other species is also the justification for anthropocentrism and extermination of other species

Anthony Matera 2000

13 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 23

One argument for the protection of whales that has received the most support now that the moratorium is no longer justified by the need to protect whales from extinction is based on the intelligence and uniqueness of whales. n121 Critics of this position claim that to garner support from the public, the environmental movement and anti-whaling organizations have created an image of the "super-whale" by taking the specific characteristics of different species of whale and combining them when describing whales in general. n122 Proponents of this position justify whale protection because whales have large brains and are able to engage in complex communication with each other as well as in inter-species communication with other cetaceans like dolphins. n123 However, the converse of giving a species a greater right to life than another species just because it is intelligent would be to say that if whales were not intelligent, killing them would be justifiable. n124

30

Anthro Impact - takes out case

Critique takes out case – exclusively human-centered goals are incapable of justifying policies that are effective in combating ecological destruction

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <murray>

The primary justifications for an environmental ethic are instrumental: they attempt to reveal the purposes behind environmental protection, and to show why these purposes are beneficial and moral. But not all instrumental values are acceptable to an environmental ethicist; one major goal of an environmental ethic is to show that exclusively human-centered goals are not capable of justifying environmental policies. Within this project of justification, the intrinsic value of natural entities can be used to limit or to map out the range of appropriate instrumental values. The basic goal of developing a nonanthropocentric justification for environmental policies is aided by the existence of nonhuman intrinsic value. Human purposes, desires, and interests will not be the only possible justifications of action. This supportive function of the concept of nonhuman intrinsic value is a far cry from the central or primary justification of an environmental ethic. Environmental ethics, in short, does not rest on the development of a theory of a nonhuman natural intrinsic value; it merely uses this intrinsic value to clarify appropriate instrumental values.

Anthro turns case

The kritik turns the case - anthropocentrism leads to exploitation of global ecosystems, including the oceans, and is the root cause of the current environmental crisis

Robin Attfield, professor of philosophy at University of Whales, 1999 ["The Ethics of the Global Environment"]

The upshot is that the dominant ethical systems of our times, those clustered as the Western ethic and other kindred human chauvinistic systems, are far less defensible, and less satisfactory, than has been commonly assumed, and lack an adequate and nonarbitrary basis. Furthermore, alternative theories are far less incoherent than is commonly claimed, especially by philosophers. Yet although there are viable alternatives to the Dominion thesis, the natural world is rapidly being preempted in favor of human chauvinism—and of what it ideologically underwrites, the modern economic-industrial superstructure—by the elimination or overexploitation of those things that are not considered of sufficient instrumental value for human beings. Witness the impoverishment of the nonhuman world, the assaults being made on tropical rainforests, surviving temperate wildernesses, wild animals, the oceans, to list only a few of the victims of man's assault on the natural world. Observe also the associated measures to bring primitive or recalcitrant peoples into the Western consumer society and the spread of human-chauvinist value systems. The time is fast approaching when questions raised by an environmental ethic will cease to involve live options. As things stand at present, however, the ethical issues generated by the preemptions especially given the weakness and inadequacy of the ideological and value-theoretical basis on which the damaging chauvinistic transformation of the world is premised and the viability of alternative environmental ethics—are not merely of theoretical interest but are among the most important and urgent questions of our times, and perhaps the most important questions that human beings, whose individual or group self-interest is the source of most environmental problems, have ever asked themselves.

• 157

Anthro justifies social domination

Anthropocentrism justifies racism, sexism, and other forms of social domination – rejecting this mentality is a prerequisite to true human rights

Weebler, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, “The Irrefutable Animal Rights Argument Page”, <http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>]
<murray>

The most basic animal rights/compassion philosophy stems from a realization that throughout history humans have discriminated against others according to various standards of value, such as race, religion, gender, appearance, and wealth; and that species is merely another example used to justify the oppression and exploitation of others, based upon standards of worth conveniently determined by those who stand to benefit from the discrimination. An animal activist seeks to apply the same ethical principle of fairness and justice that many of us have come to assume in our relationship with other humans to our relationship with non-human life: trying to be as compassionate and fair as possible to others, as opposed to being as cruel and unfair as possible to others. If you believe in human rights, then (if for no other reason than as a matter of ethical consistency) you must believe in animal rights.

If you argue that humans are superior in value as a species to others, and are deserving of special moral consideration that allows then to enslave, imprison, torture, and kill members of other species for a variety of purposes that would be deemed atrocities if carried out against even the most despised criminals, you have to be able to show human superiority to be true as an absolute, objective, universal fact. Why? Because a subjective and narrow argument would be no different in principle from those used by racists or religious bigots who say that their group is superior to others based on a standard of skin colour, language, nationality, interpretation of scripture etc. If species-based discrimination is just as biased as any other form of discrimination, then you can't criticize racists and sexists for doing what you yourself are doing without being morally bankrupt and a hypocrite.

Impact - Genocide

The anthropocentric idea that non-humans do not have intrinsic value is the root justification for genocide and oppression within the human world

D'amato and Chopra 1991 (The American Journal International Law, 85 A.J.I.L. 21,
Anthony, member of the board of Editors of the Journal, and Sudhir, staff attorney for the EPA)

Thus, a combination of overinclusiveness and underinclusiveness renders the Cartesian thesis arbitrary and unpersuasive. Throughout history, the denial that other persons -- outsiders, minority groups -- as well as other animals, have a consciousness equivalent to our own has been the foundational philosophy for genocide and enslavement. This kind of denial of humanity to minority groups is the clearest form of inhumanity. The base evil of genocide, torture, or enslavement of minority or defenseless groups is matched only by the pseudo-rationalization that the victims are less than human. Charles Darwin saw clearly the empathic connection between opposition to slavery and opposition to cruelty to animals.

According to his son, "The two subjects which moved my father perhaps more strongly than any others were cruelty to animals and slavery. His detestation of both was intense, [*27] and his indignation was overpowering in case of any levity or want of feeling on these matters." n32 Those who would deny whales the right to live use a similar rationalization. To be sure, whales are not human, but are they "less" than human? The mind set that exults in the killing of whales and the "sports" hunting of endangered wildlife species overlaps with the mind set that accepts genocide of "inferior" human being.

Conversely, the extension of rights to whales resonates deeply with the historical-legal extensions of equal rights to women and to minority groups. We believe that the phrase "human rights" is only superficially species chauvinistic. n33 In a profound sense, whales and some other sentient mammals are entitled to human rights or at least to *humanist rights*--to the most fundamental entitlements that we regard as part of the humanitarian tradition. They are entitled to those fundamental rights not because they're "less" than human but because they are "different" from humans in various respects that do not affect or qualify the rights in question. In this article we argue only for extending the single most fundamental of all human rights--the right to life--to whales. n34

Anthro impact - imperialism

Anthropocentrism is imperialist and chauvinistic

Elliot Miller, Christian Research Institute, 1994

[<http://www.mustardseed.net/html/toecology.html>] <murray>

Anthropocentrism is described by deep ecologists as both chauvinism and imperialism, only -- unlike other expressions of these evils -- it is rarely noticed. Even when concerns about environmental abuse are raised, arguments are couched in terms of preserving human resources rather than preserving nature for its own sake or for its value to nonhuman beings. "Thus, even many of those who deal most directly with environmental issues continue to perpetuate, however unwittingly, the arrogant assumption that we humans are central to the cosmic drama; that, essentially, the world is made for us. John Seed...writes: 'The idea that humans are the crown of creation, the source of all value, the measure of all things is deeply embedded in our culture and consciousness'" (11).

Anthro impact – systemic harm

Anthropocentrism leads to an enormous systemic harm – about 200 million animals are killed without cause each year due to animal testing

Peter Singer, 1985 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "In Defense of Animals"] <Murray>

It has been estimated that between 100 million and 200 million animals die in laboratories around the world each year.

The best statistics have been kept by the Home Office in Britain, where the 1983 figures reveal that 4,221,801 experiments on living animals were licensed in the previous year. Of these, most involved the testing or development of veterinary, medical or dental drugs and other products, but 32,979 were for the testing of pesticides, 15,122 for the testing of herbicides, 66,185 for the testing of substances used in industry, 13,934 for testing household substances, 18,864 for the testing of cosmetics and toiletries, 20,125 for the testing of food additives and 3,214 for testing tobacco and its substitutes. The experiments were performed mainly on rodents (2,442,702 mice, 932,335 rats, 154,740 guinea pigs, 164,993 rabbits) but included 5,654 on primates (monkeys or apes), 13,146 on dogs, 251,818 on birds and 165,833 on fish.

Experiments involving the deliberate induction of psychological stress numbered 43,529; 1,652 involved burning or scalding; 144,322

involved exposure to ionizing irradiation; 14,949 involved the use of aversive stimuli such as electric shock; 19,124 involved the application of substances to the eye; and 86,179 involved interference with the brain or other parts of the central nervous system (other than those areas controlling special senses). 160-81

Anthro impact – Environmental destruction

Anthropocentrism has resulted in the total plunder of Earth's ecosystems – a rejection of this mindset is necessary if we are to avoid environmental apocalypse

David Watson, The internationalist 1997, Deep Ecology Theorist [Empire of Extinction, <http://www.newint.org/issue288/empire.htm>]

Farley Mowat, in his book *Sea of Slaughter*, gives us a dizzying description of the carnage perpetrated on the animals of the North American eastern seaboard by explorers and entrepreneurs. He points out that the Great Auk co-existed with human hunters for millennia. But it succumbed in a couple of hundred years to the mechanized, market-driven empire that was only a quaint precursor to our own. We can remain agnostic about whether or not our distant ancestors foolishly fouled their nest. It is pretty much irrelevant to the reality we face now: an immensely brutal and thoroughly anthropocentric civilization ravaging the earth, ostensibly in our interest. The scale and scope of such devastation is unprecedented in the history of our species.

This civilization's arrogance is evident in our scientific tradition's urge to expand what Francis Bacon called 'the empire of man'. But it goes back even further. The Judaeo-Christian biblical edict granted us 'dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.' Now many animals mentioned in the Bible are going the way of the Dodo – Jonah's whale, the Persian Wild Ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem, the Nubian Ibex, the Arabian Oryx which Isaiah tells us was trapped in nets.

Human dominion has done these creatures little good; most have fallen forever into our nets. The image of a human imperium oppressing the rest of nature is no mere metaphor. It conforms to an actual pattern of imperial conquest, plunder, eventual exhaustion and collapse. Our century has given a privileged layer of humanity an industrially organized life more opulent, more wasteful yet also more frenetic, alienated and depressed than that of any ancient hierarch. We've transformed the earth into a giant mine and waste pit, its forests and meadow lands into enormous feed lots for billions of stock animals, its waters into cesspools devoid of life, its skies into orbiting junkyards of contaminated rocket debris. The world's tallest mountains are littered with expedition trash. Ships at sea do not go a single day without seeing plastic garbage. Giant nets 30 miles long drag the oceans killing millions of sea creatures, including birds and mammals. These are simply 'by-products' to be tossed overboard. The whole planet has become a war zone generating a bio-crisis not just for individual species, but for entire webs of life.

Human beings are now altering the basic physiology of the planet. Industrial smog can be found everywhere over the oceans, and weather patterns are so distorted that climatologists now discuss climate death. Industrial contamination is pervasive, even in the fat cells of Antarctic penguins. The rain is not only acid but toxic. Whether industrialism warms or cools the atmosphere, its unprecedented chemical experiment threatens to reconfigure life in ways barely imaginable, but undoubtedly for the worse.

<continued...>

Yet meaningful subversion of the 'empire of man' requires more than enlightened self-interest or even social justice. It means real transformation, a cultural practice that considers all life a larger community deserving of our solidarity. In the process, people may discover that limiting our numbers and consumption, living more simply so that others (human and non-human) may simply live, brings ineluctable rewards of its own.

Anthro impact – Environmental collapse

The globe is facing a massive ecological crisis as a result of our anthropocentric mindset – many causes prove ecological collapse is inevitable within the current paradigm

Andrew McCracken, environmental philosopher, [On Environmental Ethics,
<http://members.aol.com/wutsamada2/ethics/essays/mccracken.htm>] December 31, 2001

Humans don't exactly hold the best track record for environmental protection and preservation. Throughout time we have exploited nature and its creatures for our own benefit. We have made technological advances that threaten and disrupt the environment with total disregard for that fact. We took slipshod short cuts that are now catching up to us today, and we can think of no available alternatives that will remedy the problem quickly and usefully.

We have developed a huge and thriving society; and in the process we deforest huge sections of land for living and livestock grazing. This decreases oxygen and increases carbon dioxide in the atmosphere; possibly adding to global warming though the greenhouse effect. This mass population produces mass amounts of waste, so to deal with that we just throw it into the ground, which in turn contaminates our water supply and contributes to further deforestation. We develop motorized transportation; and then burn non-renewable fossil fuels that put lead, carbon monoxide, sulfur and nitrogen oxides, ozone, excess carbon dioxide, and other harmful particulates into the atmosphere (Skjel & Whorton 95-108). This produces dangers like smog and cancer and contributes to global warming. In the production of fuel we exhaust oil reserves and pollute the oceans through spills from tankers. This endangers wilderness and wildlife. We produce an inert, easily producible propellant for aerosols; and then realize it's only inert on the ground. Once it's bombarded by UV ray in the upper atmosphere it releases a highly destructive ion that wreaks havoc on the protective ozone layer shielding us from those same deadly UV rays, creating a hole in the layer allowing the radiation through, increasing cancer and other genetic defects. We build rockets capable of going into space and breaking the earth's gravitational pull; and then immediately start to pollute this new environment with spent rockets and boosters along with other miscellaneous particles of debris (Curran and Haw 3).

Anthro = ecological decline

Anthropocentrism justifies global ecological destruction, turning case

M. Allen Kazlev, Editor, Eco-Gnosis Magazine, 2/15/**2000** ["Anthropocentrism,"
<http://www.kheper.net/topics/worldviews/anthropocentrism.html>

However you look at it, anthropocentrism is more than a little absurd. The idea that one little species on some speck of dust in the infinite universe should be the most important entity around really reminds me of the old Ptolemaic cosmology, with the sun and all the planets revolving around the Earth. Indeed, Anthropocentrism is nothing but a modern and socially and intellectually acceptable version of geocentrism. We know of course that the Earth revolves around the sun, not the other way around (although there are apparently a few crazy flat-earthers out there somewhere). But we can still see our own species as superior to everything else. It gives us a bloated sense of self-importance in the infinite cosmos, panders little egos and allows insensitive individuals to abuse and destroy other life-forms on this globe

Which brings us to the dark side of Anthropocentrism. The dark side of Anthropocentrism is similiar to the dark side of chauvinism. Any beings that do not belong to the human race are devalued, abused, oppressed, murdered or tortured for the slightest human whim, whether for fashion, palete, or simply sport. All of the ugliness of man's treatment of nature comes from the arrogant assumption that man [sic] has a god-given right to do as he [sic] wishes

Anthro impact – extinction

Anthropocentrism will inevitably result in the extinction of all life due to environmental destruction – we must rethink these chauvinistic assumptions to avoid ecological collapse
Berry, 1999 [Thomas, Cultural historian, "The Great Works"]

Now our concerns for the human community can ~~only be fulfilled~~ by a concern for the integrity of the natural world. The planet cannot

support its human presence unless there is a reciprocal human support for the life systems of the planet. This more comprehensive perspective we might identify as macrophase ethics. This is something far beyond our ordinary ethical judgments involving individual actions, the actions of communities, or even of nations. We are presently concerned with ethical judgments on an entirely different order of magnitude. Indeed, the human community has never previously been forced to ethical judgments on this scale because we never before had the capacity for deleterious action with such consequences.

As indicated by Brian Swimme in *The Hidden Heart of the Cosmos*, humans, through our scientific insight and our technological skills, have become a macrophase power, something on the level of the glaciations or the forces that caused the great extinctions of the past. Yet we have only a microphase sense of responsibility or ethical judgment. We need to develop a completely different range of responsibility.

It is not easy for us to move beyond those basic points of reference that have guided our way of life in former times, for these have given us our human identity and directed our religious and cultural traditions over the past millennia. These traditions have determined our language, our intellectual insights, our spiritual ideals, our range of imagination, our emotional sensitivities. Yet these classical traditions of the Eurasian and American worlds are all proving inadequate in dealing with the disintegrating influence we are now having on the life systems of the Earth. Yet we experience a kind of paralysis in our critical judgment of what is happening and what we need to do at this time to avoid an extensive crash of the biosystems of the planet.

Much of the wisdom of the past becomes inadequate in the present.

<continued...>

Anthro impact- extinction

<continued....>

One of the difficulties is in our language. Our traditional European ~~ant~~ languages express the anthropocentrism of ~~our past orientation~~. Our ~~exp~~ Western imagination is filled with images derived from these same ~~of~~ sources. Our traditional spiritual values are disorienting by their ~~bic~~ insistence on the unsatisfactory nature of the existing order of things ~~ab~~ and the need for relief by reference to some transearthly experience. ~~rea~~

continued... ▶

In evaluating our present situation, E. O. Wilson of Harvard University tells us: "In the end it will all come down to a decision of ethics, how we value the natural world in which we have evolved and now—increasingly—how we regard our status as individuals" (Wilson, *Biodiversity*, p. 16). Paul Ehrlich, professor of biological sciences at Stanford University, has suggested that "scientific analysis points, curiously, toward the need for a quasi-religious transformation of contemporary cultures" (in Wilson, *Biodiversity*, p. 26). *101-103*

Anthro o/w war and terrorism

Anthropocentrism results in massive ecological harm that far outweighs war and terrorism

Paul Watson, Captain in the US military, 2002 [Terrorism is as Terrorism Does : a Short Little Essay on My Perspective on the Concerns about Terrorism.

<http://www.ecospherics.net/pages/watson2.htm>] <murray>

I think the wholesale destruction of our oceans and forests and the incredible assault on bio-diversity is terrorism of the highest order - terrorism that is accepted by anthropocentric culture as normal. The fact is that we will lose more species of plants and animals between 1980 and 2040 than have gone extinct over the last 65 million years. This mass extinction is of greater significance, and will have a far greater consequence than the present terrorist attacks by all sides upon each other.

<continued...>

The world i.e. Planet Earth is more important than our problems. Americans will survive the attacks in New York and the Afghans will survive the attacks in their country and the Israeli's will survive the attacks in Israel - they will survive with losses but the species Homo Sapiens will not in the long run survive our assault on bio-diversity, nor will millions of other species, other Earthlings.

42

Alternative solves case

Alternative solves the case – rejecting anthropocentrism serves as the most effective justification for ecological protections

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <murray>

In these essays I have chosen this second path. My basic critical idea is that human-centered (or "anthropocentric") ethical systems fail to account for a moral justification for the central policies of environmentalism. From this negative account of anthropocentrism I derive my fundamental position in environmental ethics: *the direct moral consideration and respect for the evolutionary processes of nature*. I believe that it is a basic ethical principle that we must respect Nature as an ongoing subject of a history, a life-process, a developmental system. The natural world—natural entities and natural ecological systems—deserves our moral consideration as part of the interdependent community of life on Earth. Hence the title of this collection. I consider Nature as analogous to a human subject, entitled to moral respect and subject to traditional ethical categories. I do not anthropomorphize Nature; I do not ascribe human feelings and intentions to the operations of natural processes. I do not consider natural processes to be sentient or alive. I merely place Nature within the realm of ethical activity. The basis of a moral justification of environmental policy is that we have ethical obligations to the natural world, just as we have ethical obligations to our fellow human beings. In these essays I explain and analyze this nonanthropocentric perspective in environmental philosophy.

Alternative solves case

Alternative solves the case – recognizing the value of non-human life is necessary to prevent exploitation of the world's oceans

Stan Rowe, Professor of Ecology, University of Saskatchewan '88 [“Ethics and the Sea”,
<http://www.ecospherics.net/pages/RoEthSea.html>] <murray>

When the essential ecological message is understood, that the Ecosphere, the home-sphere, the Home of all homes, is of surpassing importance, then ethics will be eco-centric and people will not allow the world to be damned. Then love and respect for the world will bring sensitive, compassionate, ethical treatment of its land, atmosphere, and seas.

The land will be maintained in beauty and health because it is venerated, and not for the crops it produces. The air will be kept clean, fresh, and unpolluted, not because of anti-asthma campaigns and fears of greenhouse gases but because of its intrinsic value. And the ocean will be revered not for the riches of its waters but as the mysterious heart of the planet that continually draws us back to its shores.

Alternative – critique anthropocentrism

Criticizing anthropocentrism results in the creation of a new ethical system in which humans live with nature rather than dominate it

Elliot and Gare, 1983 [Robert and Arran, "Environmental Philosophy: A Collection of Readings"]

This strictly homocentric (human-centered) view of morality is currently challenged from two seemingly disparate directions. On the one hand, environmentalists argue that because humanity is only one part of the natural world, an organic species in the total, interdependent, planetary biosystem, it is necessary for consistency to view all of the elements of that system, and not just its human elements, as worthy of moral concern in themselves, and not only because of their usefulness to us. The ecologist Aldo Leopold was one of the first and most influential exponents of the view that not only human beings, but plants, animals and natural habitats, have moral rights. We need, Leopold argued, a new ethical system that will deal with our relationships not only with other human individuals and with human society, but also with the land, and its nonhuman inhabitants. Such a "land ethic" would seek to change "the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land community to plain member and citizen of it".² It would judge our interaction with the nonhuman world as "right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community", and "wrong when it tends otherwise".³

an
in
on
is
dom
ove
nat

104

Alternative – Recognize intrinsic value

The recognition of intrinsic value to all life forms is a prerequisite to preventing species and habitat destruction that will inevitably cause the end of all life on earth

Florence Shepard, DEEP ECOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, 2003

[<http://www.newdimensions.org/online-journal/articles/deep-ecology.html>] <murray>

The diverse voices of leading ecologists and activists inspire us to renew our efforts to bring ecological harmony to Planet Earth. They bring us hope that though direct involvement in our own bioregions, at the same time staying abreast of world-wide problems, we can help turn around the global ecological disasters that seem imminent. Although unique, each viewpoint shares the common, ethical tenets of deep ecology: The community of companions on Planet Earth is egalitarian, they tell us. The lives of all creatures are of intrinsic value. The quality of life on earth for all species depends on mindful, tempered actions by humans, the dominant organism interdependently joined to all others and to the air, water, and terrain.

Deep Ecology is not a political or economic ideology yet it affects all of our actions and decisions. It is a spiritual, egalitarian orientation to life on Earth that can and must be embraced by all peoples of all beliefs, if we are to turn the tide of human population growth and massive habitat and species destruction on Planet Earth. There is really no other way out of the crisis we face. It is a matter of conscience, ethics, and action. Although we must act locally, we must look beyond our own gardens and recycling bins. For Kirkpatrick Sale this means moving from an individualistic to a community orientation. With their deconstruction of so-called "free-trade," Jerry Mander and Helena Norberg-Hodge explain how global commerce is destroying local economies and cultures. Sessions suggests that changes will require radical alterations in our life styles and must include action at the personal and local level as well as thoughtful involvement in global issues.

Alternative – recognize intrinsic value

Intrinsic value theory is a key bulwark against anthropocentrism

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <murray>

However, one problem that is not a cause for despair is the pursuit of the concept of intrinsic value for natural entities. This concept is not the ground of all environmental obligation. Intrinsic value plays only a small role in the formation of an environmental ethic—it serves to limit the exclusive reliance on anthropocentric instrumental values. The existence of intrinsic value needs to be acknowledged, to serve as the limit to anthropocentric instrumentalism; but this value need not be totally articulated or justified, for it is not the ground of all obligation. The problem of intrinsic value in nature is a problem that does not require a solution; it is enough to know that some kind of nonanthropocentric value exists, even if the description of this value remains unclear. What is clear, nevertheless, is that we cannot accept the solution offered by anthropocentric pragmatism. Basing our environmental obligations on the human "system of desires" offered us by the pragmatic theory of value would doom an environmental ethic to the contingent feelings of people who "experience nature" in the "correct" manner. That method of justifying ethical obligations is a prescription for real despair in the development of an environmental ethic.

Alternative – Deep Ecology

A deep ecological perspective is necessary to combat the biosphere destruction caused by industrialism, preventing inevitable planetary annihilation

Andrew McLaughlin, Deep Ecology Theorist, Deep Ecology for the Twenty-first Century, 1995
<murray>

In the last few hundred years, industrial society has encircled the earth and, in requiring massive disruptions of ecological processes for its ordinary functioning, threatens all forms of life on this planet. Both capitalist and socialist variants of expansionary industrialism routinely require the destruction of species and ecosystems. Industrialism now threatens to disrupt atmospheric conditions fundamental to the whole biosphere. If ecological problems have roots in industrialism, then a perspective that takes industrialism itself as part of the problem is needed.

The transformation of industrialism will, I believe, involve a multifaceted struggle over several generations. The changes required are of the magnitude of the agricultural and industrial revolutions.

Deep Ecology is one perspective that beckons us in the right direction. In just two decades, Deep Ecology, as a theory, has become a benchmark in defining varieties of environmental philosophies.

Alternative – Value the planet

The alternative of rejecting human-centeredness opens up space for assigning an intrinsic value to the Earth and its non-human inhabitants, which is a prerequisite to solving global ecological destruction

Stan Rowe, Professor of Ecology, University of Saskatchewan 1994 [The Trumpeter, Spring, Ecocentrism: the Chord that Harmonizes Humans and Earth] <murray>

Because ethical problems revolve around values and their relative importance, we must examine our values to help reform our ethical sensibilities. Aldo Leopold preached the need for a land ethic (1), but that new ethic can only come when land is valued. If very little or no importance is attached to the idea of "land", then ideas about land as a physical entity will not make it an object of ethical concern. It will fail the test of being a moral object and exhortations to respect it will ultimately be ignored. In the crunch, when choices are made, whatever is relatively valueless will be sacrificed to the more valuable. The planet, its land and water and air surface, is being beaten and poisoned to death because, compared to people, it is considered to be relatively unimportant. We have developed little feeling for it as a valuable thing. Nature study has barely made it into our school and college agendas and our natural attraction to the world remains uneducated, diffuse and unrefined.

The key question for environmental ethics, therefore, is how shall we value the Ecosphere? Does it deserve our sympathy and care? What is its importance relative to other things we value? Can we make it a moral object? Certainly its significance is gaining ground as air, water, soil, food, plant and animal life deteriorate, goading us into action, but as an admired thing, a loved thing, it is far from displacing people, animals and plants from centre-stage. George Bush spoke for the majority in conceptualizing a future "where self-determination and individual freedom replace coercion and tyranny, where economic liberty replaces economic controls and stagnation, and where lasting peace is reinforced by common respect for the rights of man."(2) He envisioned the triumph of human rights, which superficially is well and good--except that their full flowering may mark the death knell of the planet and its rights. And when no Home Place worthy of the name is left for our species, human rights will be only an empty ideal.

The Ecosphere is degenerating because of our people-first attitude, and a dual problem for environmental ethics is how to elevate the importance of the Ecosphere while putting a damper on the overweening pride and self-aggrandizement that plague our species. To value the Earth more and to value people differently--not less but as an essential collaborative part of it--seems necessary if over-exploitation of the globe is to be stopped. As long as the needs and wants of people have first priority, we will continue to pummel the second priority--the planet. Relative values set the priorities.

Alternative – reconnect with nature

We must develop an ecological sensibility and reconnect with nature

Zimmerman, Michael E., Professor of Philosophy at Tulane University,
1997 [Contesting Earth's Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity. Page
Netlibrary]

An ecological sensibility must be developed. Many deep ecologists would agree with Roszak that humankind must be liberated "from the death grip of the urban-industrial dominance. Nothing less than a revolution of the sensibilities will serve our purpose, whatever social revolutions we may also have to undertake."¹⁰¹ Although emphasizing the particular and local, Roszak also maintains that the achievement of "transpersonal subjectivity" will require a "planetary consensus," a universal convergence of "great souls and teachings [that] arise from all corners of the planet."¹⁰² Transcending the alienating condition of dualistic perception, ecological sensibility directly apprehends the interrelatedness of all things. Since humans are only a part of the living cosmic order, genuine self-realization involves the self-realization of all beings.

SO

MPA specific alternative

The alternative is to reject the affirmative's anthropocentric justification for marine protected areas because such a justification inevitably fails to protect the marine ecosystem; Our rejection of homocentric justification for marine protected areas opens up space for the development of marine protected areas under an ecocentric paradigm

David Orton, coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group, 2000 [January, Earth First Journal, "Marine Protected Areas: A Human-centric concept"] <murray>

The proposal to establish Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), made by the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), under the new 1996 Oceans Act needs to apply deep ecology to an actual environmental issue. The literature that I have seen on MPAs seems to appeal to human economic self-interest, such as how fishers can benefit. Yet fishers seem to feel that they have some proprietary lock on the oceans from which the public is excluded. It seems a stupid strategy to try and mollify fishers while trying to establish MPAs. In order to create fully protected, extensive ocean sanctuaries which are not undercut by fishing or fossil fuel interests there must be a new social base, including more than just fisher people. Conservation must raise an all-species perspective and oppose anthropocentrism. The primary issue in any MPA discussion should be philosophical, trying to change how humans look at the oceans and their life forms.

Choices in life are driven by philosophy, although few of us think about how our actions and philosophies are related. Those who support deep ecology believe that there has to be a fundamental change in consciousness of how humans relate to the natural world. This requires a change from an anthropocentric to an ecocentric perspective-seeing humans as a species with no superior status. All other species have a right to exist, irrespective of their usefulness to the human species. Humans cannot presume dominance over all non-human species of life and see nature as a resource for our utilization. We have to extend the ethical circle outwards, towards the oceans and the Earth. All life is one.

The true conservationist, or Earth-citizen, must be prepared to oppose his/her own self-interest for the benefit of other creatures and their habitats. The justification for MPAs should not be one of self-interest. Protection of marine areas should not be based on which (human) shareholders shout the loudest in opposition. A fundamental question about MPAs is whether to appeal to economic interests or to rise above this, by promoting overall ecological and social interests.

A Marine Protected Area must mean full ecological protection from human exploitative interests, otherwise the term itself becomes debased. Degrees of restriction of the human use of an oceans area could be encompassed, using another term such as Marine Regulated Area, rather than using, and debasing, the term "protected area."

MPA specific alternative

The key question surrounding marine protected areas is how we justify the policy – it must be endorsed in an ecocentric, rather than anthropocentric, paradigm

David Orton, coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group, 2000 [January, Earth First Journal, "Marine Protected Areas: A Human-centric concept"] <murray>

The nature of our capitalist society influences how we think about MPAs. I support protecting marine areas, but free of human exploitation. MPAs need to become a reflection of ecocentric thinking. The question is: Will MPAs be the beginning of a new ecological way of preservation or a subterfuge for the continued industrial exploitation of the oceans using greenwashing?

A/T You justify letting humans starve

Rejecting anthropocentrism doesn't lead to human starvation – an ecological ethic is actually necessary to prevent the loss of all natural systems, including those that humans rely on for food

Rolston. Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State University, 1996 [World Hunger and Morality, "feeding people versus saving nature?"] <murray>

We have to be circumspect. To isolate so simple a trade-off as hungry people versus nature is perhaps artificial. If too far abstracted from the complex circumstances of decision, we may not be facing any serious operational issue. When we have simplified the question, it may have become, minus its many qualifications, a different question. The gestalt configures the question, and the same question reconfigured can be different. So we must analyze the general matrix, and then confront the more particular people-versus-nature issue.

Humans win? Nature loses? After analysis, sometimes it turns out that humans are not really winning, if they are sacrificing the nature that is their life support system. Humans win by conserving nature—and these winners include the poor and the hungry. "In order to achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in Isolation from it." (2) After all, food has to be produced by growing it in some reasonably healthy natural system, and the clean water that the poor need is also good for fauna and flora. Extractive reserves give people an incentive to conserve. Tourism can often benefit both the local poor and the wildlife, as well as tourists. One ought to seek win-win solutions wherever one can. Pragmatically, these are often the only kind likely to succeed.

A/T "We can't kill to eat"

Our critique rejects the exploitation and killing of life forms purely for human convenience, but laws of natural competition between species still apply so we can kill in self-defense

Alan Drengson is an Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Victoria in British Columbia, Canada., 2002, [deepecology.org]

Another dispute has centered on the critique of anthropocentrism offered by some supporters of the deep ecology movement. "Anthropocentrism" has a number of different meanings. We must not let verbal misunderstandings be divisive. When we defend our loved ones or are moved more by human suffering than the suffering of other beings, we are acting as descendants, parents, friends, lovers, etc. One can support the deep ecology movement consistent with such feelings. What is inconsistent is refusing to recognize the inherent worth of other beings to the extent that one is willing to allow unmerciful exploitation and destruction of life forms purely for human convenience and profit. Anthropocentrism as a bias against other life forms fails to recognize that we are part of these lives and they are part of ours. Our human self in the deepest sense cannot be separated from the earth from which we have grown. Anthropocentrism is objectionable when it emphasizes "humans first!" regardless of the consequences to other beings.

A/T "self-defense/food good" turn

Self-defense is not inconsistent with the idea of nature's intrinsic value

Weeblер, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism",
<http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>]

Question: "What if you were attacked by a bear? Would you let the bear kill you? If you wouldn't--and you kill the bear--then you can't be for animal rights."

- a) If i enter known bear territory than it is up to me to know better. But assuming it was unavoidable, defending yourself is a matter of self interest. If you commit an act in self interest it does not mean you are against the rights of others.

Obviously some degree of killing is inevitable and necessary for survival; however, we have an obligation to minimize such exploitation as much as possible, or we justify racism and other forms of social domination

Weeblер, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism",
<http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>] <murray>

REFUTING THE "YOU CANNOT AVOID KILLING COMPLETELY" ARGUMENT

The issue is not about avoiding all killing but avoiding it as much as possible. Some may counter that plants are living beings too, and to eat them would be unethical. No ethical view--no matter how consistent--can take into account the interests of everyone at all times. One can certainly say the line of moral regard is not drawn at animals--that it is wrong to exploit trees and other plants (an argument found in the philosophy of Fruitarianism). If there are problems in implementing such a policy, then it is true of all potential beneficiaries of moral conduct. No one can be perfect, either in compassion or cruelty.--especially when you come down to a microscopic level. Refuting the Human Supremacy argument doesn't mean the line is drawn at animals--one can say that it is wrong to exploit trees and other plants...the problem is in implementing such a policy--yet that is true of all potential beneficiaries of moral conduct. No one can be perfect, either in compassion or cruelty. BUT the failure to be morally perfect does not then mean one has to fall back to some safe line like species to focus one's discrimination practices. If one argues for that--then there is no reason why the line cannot be drawn at race, or religion, or intelligence etc. Thus, the need to prove human supremacy still applies. The human supremacist is shackled to it.

All you can do as a compassionate person is to try your best according to each situation, following a moral standard that endeavors to be fair and just--allowing you to be as compassionate as possible, as opposed to the alternative.

A/T K decreases respect for humans

The argument that anthropocentrism is key to respect for humans is empirically denied – some of the worst atrocities in history against humans mirrored destruction of the natural world

Weebler, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism", <http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>] <murray>

Question: "If we give respect or rights to animals we will diminish our own rights and respect for humans."

a) Sumer, one of the earliest and most powerful of the ancient Mesopotamian city-states, managed its slaves the same way it managed its livestock. The Sumerians castrated the males and put them to work like domesticated animals, and they put the females in work and breeding camps. The Sumerian word for castrated slave boys--amar-kud--is the same word the Sumerians used for young castrated donkeys, horses, and oxen."

--from Chapter 1 Charles Patterson's Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust <http://www.powerfulbook.com/excerpts.html>

b) "Although the purpose of the German killing centers was the extermination of human beings, they operated in the larger context of society's exploitation and slaughter of animals, which to some extent they mirrored. The Germans did not stop slaughtering animals when they took up slaughtering people. Auschwitz, which its commandant Rudolf Hoss called "the largest human slaughterhouse that history had ever known," had its own slaughterhouse and butcher's shop. The other death camps likewise kept their personnel well supplied with animal flesh. Sobibor had a cow shed, pigpen, and henhouse, which were next to the entrance to the tube that took Jews to the gas chambers, while Treblinka had a stable, pigpen, and henhouse located near the camp barracks of the Ukrainian auxiliaries.-from Charles Patterson's Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust Chapter 5
<http://www.powerfulbook.com/excerpts.html>

A/T misanthropic

The critique is not misanthropic – it is based on respect for all life, including humans

Alan Drengson is an emeritus professor at the University of Victoria in British Columbia, Canada., 2002, [deepecology.org] <murray>

Unfortunately, some vociferous environmentalists who claim to support the movement have said and written things that are misanthropic in tone. Supporters of the deep ecology movement are not anti-human, as is sometimes alleged. Naess's platform principle Number 1 begins with recognizing the inherent worth of all beings, including humans. Gandhian nonviolence is a tenet of deep ecology activism in word and deed. Supporters of the deep ecology movement deplore anti-human statements and actions.

A/T Alt = misanthropic

A rejection of anthropocentrism is anything but misanthropic – it promotes the interests of all beings, including humans, and prevents social systems of domination within the human community

Stan Rowe, Professor of Ecology, University of Saskatchewan 88[“”Ethics and the Sea”,
<http://www.ecospherics.net/pages/RoEthSea.html>] <murray>

Levi-Strauss (1962) criticized Western anthropocentrism and championed the humble animistic viewpoint of tribal people. For them "a well-ordered harmony does not begin with the self, but rather places the world before life, life before man, the respect for other beings before the love of self." To place the world and life ahead of humanity is not misanthropy, said Levi-Strauss, but rather a critique of the strutting and shameless arrogance that makes man [sic] the lord and master of creation. The rights that one can and should recognize for mankind are only a special case of those rights that must be granted to the creative force of life. Care about mankind [sic] without simultaneous solidarity-like caring for all other forms of life, he said, leads mankind [sic] to self-oppression and self-exploitation. The anchor-point for a "principled humility" must be found in a greater-than-human reality, one that transcends every culture and every ingrown morality.

Ecocentrism is not misanthropic

Patrick Curry, BA in psychology, -September 3, 2001
(University of California at Santa Cruz, The Campaign for Political Ecology) <Murray>

But ecocentrism does not necessarily exclude humanity, and there are powerful reasons - strategic as well as ethical - why it should not. Warwick Fox is right that "being opposed to human-centredness is logically distinct from being opposed to humans per se."¹⁴ And misanthropy is as unjustifiable as it is unattractive. As Robin Eckersley writes, respecting the Earth's bounty, "The principle of common entitlement makes it clear that humans are not expected to subvert their own basic needs in order to enable other life-forms to flourish".¹⁵

A/T ecofascism

Anthropocentric environmental destruction, not ecocentric perspectives, is ecofascism

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000

[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

What seems to have happened with “ecofascism”, is that a term whose origins and use reflect a particular form of **human** social, political and economic organization, now, with a prefix “eco”, becomes used against environmentalists who generally are sympathetic to a particular non-human centered and Nature-based radical environmental philosophy - deep ecology. Yet supporters of deep ecology, if they think about the concept of ecofascism, see the ongoing violent onslaught against Nature and its non-human life forms (plant life, insects, birds, mammals, etc.) plus indigenous cultures, which is justified as economic “progress”, as ecofascist destruction!

An ethic of respect for nature does not cause ecofascism

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000

[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

Social Ecology and Ecofascism

Since the mid 80's, some writers linked with the human-centered theory of social ecology, for example Murray Bookchin, have attempted to associate deep ecology with “ecofascism” and Hitler's “national socialist” movement. See his 1987 essay “*Social Ecology Versus ‘Deep Ecology’*” based on his divisive, anti-communist and sectarian speech to the National Gathering of the US Greens in Amherst Massachusetts (e.g. the folk singer Woody Guthrie was dismissed by Bookchin as “a Communist Party centralist”). There are several references by Bookchin in this essay, promoting the association of deep ecology with Hitler and ecofascism. More generally for Bookchin in this article, deep ecology is “an ideological toxic dump.”

At its crudest, it is argued by such writers that, because SOME supporters of German fascism, liked being in the outdoors and extolled nature and the “Land” through songs, poetry, literature and philosophy and the Nazi movement drew from this, or because some prominent Nazis like Hitler and Himmler were allegedly “strict vegetarians and animal lovers”, or supported organic farming, this “proves” something about the direction deep ecology supporters are heading in. Strangely, the similar type argument is not made that because “socialist” is part of “national socialist”, this means all socialists have some inclination towards fascism! The writers by this argument also negate that the main focus of fascism and the Nazis was the industrial/military juggernaut, for which all in the society were mobilized.

A/T ecofascism

Anthropocentrism IS ecofascism

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000
[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

- the second justification, the one that I feel has some ecofascist echos, is that “the larger good” requires such research and any negatives to the “researched” animals have to be accepted from this perspective. (This larger good is defined variously as the goals of the Wildlands Project; the health of the wildlife populations being studied; the well being of the ecosphere; or work towards implementing the goals of the Deep Ecology Platform.) One thinks here of the fascist goals of “the nation” or “the fatherland” as justification to sacrifice the individual human or groups of humans considered expendable. For me, the defense of intrusive research on nonhuman life forms and their expendability, in the name of a human-decided larger good, although couched in ecological language, is the ultimate anthropocentrism and could legitimately be called an example of ecofascism.

The idea that a critique of anthropocentrism is ecofascism is a false accusation made by competing sections of the ecology movement for political gain

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000
[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

Conclusion

This bulletin has shown that the concept of “ecofascism” can be used in different ways. It has looked at how some social ecology supporters have used this term in a basically unfounded manner to attack deep ecology and the ecological movement, and it also looked at what can be called ecofascist attacks against the environmental movement. So we can say that the term “ecofascism” can be used:

- Illegitimately. This is the use of the term which has been advanced by some social ecologists who have tried to link those who defend the Natural world, particularly deep ecology supporters, with traditional fascist political movements - especially the Nazis. The “contribution” of these particular social ecologists has been to thoroughly confuse what ecofascist really means and to slander the new thinking of deep ecology. This seems to have been done from the viewpoint of trying to discredit what some social ecologists apparently see as an ideological ‘rival’ within the environmental and green movements. This social ecology sectarianism has resulted in ecofascism becoming an attack term against those environmentalists who are out in the trenches being attacked by real ecofascists! I have also defended the late Rudolf Bahro against the charge of being an ecofascist or Nazi sympathizer.

A/T Nazis were environmentalists

The fact that Nazis liked to plant trees does not mean environmentalists are fascists

Sandy Irvine, Published by the *Campaign for Political Ecology*, 1996
[<http://eco.gn.apc.org/resguide/index.html>] <murray>

Perhaps the most common tactic, however, is to point to instances where, say, the Nazis encouraged tree planting or experimented with organic farming ("the nostrums of 'radical ecologists' were put into practice in Nazi Germany"-Richard Gott, **The Guardian**, 17/3/89). Yet the overall ideology and policy of a political movement are what count. Those of ecologism are dramatically different from the expansionist, centralised, militaristic, exterminationist realities of Hitler's régime.

A/T Hunting good turn

Hunting is a cruel and ineffective way to regulate animal populations – natural checkssolve better

Weebler, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism",
<http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>] <murray>

Question: "If we weren't hunting deer they would overpopulate and start dying horrible deaths because of the lack of food"

- a) If there is lack of food the animal population will not grow as much. If there is less food there are going to be less animals.
- b) humans have overpopulated many areas of the earth which has resulted in lack of food and poor living conditions, yet we do not hunt and execute them.
- c) In recent years, deer populations have increased to numbers unsupportable by wildlife habitat alone. Many researchers believe that this increase results from continued human incursion into deer habitat, and the mismanagement of deer populations by forest and wildlife authorities who see hunting as the primary means of population control. Wildlife and land management agencies purport to effectively limit deer populations to numbers sustainable by their natural habitat. In reality, the policies of such agencies exacerbate deer overpopulation, serving only to provide a population large enough to suit sport hunters. The overpopulation of deer stems not only from the specific mismanagement of deer populations, but from the mismanagement of our forestlands and natural areas. Currently, there are approximately eight does for every buck in the wild. Laws restrict the number of does that hunters may kill. Deer do not have monogamous mating relationships, and bucks will often mate with more than one female. As a result, the ratio of does to bucks sets the stage for a population explosion. Allowing hunters to kill more does, however, does not resolve population problems. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the open hunting of does left fawns without mothers, and removed too many females from the breeding population. Sport hunting decimated deer populations in many states. As a result, states passed laws restricting the hunting of does. These policies have contributed to the overpopulation of deer.
<http://www.idausa.org/facts/deercontrol.html>
- d) Hunting does remove some animals from the population, but it does not keep deer populations at a continually reduced level. Immediately after a hunt, the remaining animals flourish because less competition for food exists, allowing the remaining animals to live healthier lives, and resulting in a higher reproductive rate. Left alone by humans, the ratio of does to bucks would be approximately equal. In Defense of Animals believes that sport hunting is not only an ineffective wildlife management tool, but a cruel and unnecessary practice. Sport hunting should be banned, allowing deer populations to regulate themselves naturally. <http://www.idausa.org/facts/deercontrol.html>

A/T space col. Turn

<insert link turns to animal research>

Space travel to other planets capable of supporting life is impossible – space debris and energy requirements

Drake, professor of astronomy and astrophysics at the University of California, and Brownlee, professor of astronomy of the University of Washington July 2002

[http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/rare_earth_5_020729.html]

Frank Drake: Every discussion of alien intelligence assumes that they will come visit us. But the expense and danger of space travel are formidable. A strong reason why such enterprises are not carried out may be that radio communication works so much better, is far cheaper, and you get your answers at the speed of light.

Any reasonable transport of creatures across space calls for travel speeds that are a substantial fraction of the speed of light, otherwise it takes too long to go even to the nearest stars. But this exposes the spacecraft to serious hazards. Probably the most serious is the potential for collision with debris -- and we are learning that space is full of debris.

At relativistic speeds [approaching the speed of light], even a collision with a particle of a few grams results in something close in energy to a nuclear bomb blast. Not good news for the space travelers.

Also the energy requirements are ridiculous, at least to us. To send a spacecraft the size of a small airliner at one-tenth the speed of light requires as much energy as the U.S. now produces in more than a hundred years. And that just gets you someplace -- it doesn't provide for a landing or a return home.

To put it another way, it takes 10 million times as much energy to move a small space colony to another star as it takes to establish the same colony in the home system. And there is plenty of room at home. It is easily calculated that the energy of the Sun is enough to sustain more than ten thousand billion billion humans. That seems like enough. Why go to the great expense and danger of going to other stars? Truly intelligent life would laugh at the idea. The only ones who might try are the dumb ones, and they don't know how.

<continued...>

Donald Brownlee: I am sorry that David considered my previous comments about Star Trek and UFOs to be a cheap shot, but I really do believe that the difficulty of practical interstellar travel is horrendously underestimated. In my opinion, the public is being bilked by wishful thinkers that like to write books and muse about futures that we would like to believe are our logical destinies.

Perhaps I take too much of a hard-nosed and practical view of this, but doing even simple things in space is difficult, unforgiving, and exceedingly expensive.

I am aware of the studies of anti-matter rockets, beamed energy, interstellar ram jets, etc., but all of these ideas have severe problems. As I see it, known physics will never deposit living people on Earth-like planets around other stars. Doing so would require "warp speed" and/or harnessing exotic phenomena such as wormholes or zero-point energy. Unless such radical developments occur, mundane ideas such as anti-matter rockets will not do the job.

We have gone to the Moon, we can go to Mars, but that is likely to be the limit that our resources and foreseeable technology will allow. At our current rate of progress, humans may not even make it beyond the International Space Station. Our bounds in space may be as limited as they are on Earth. We have covered the Earth but it seems highly unlikely that we will ever live more than a kilometer above or a few kilometers beneath its surface.

A/T Animal Research turn (generic)

Eliminating animal testing results in the development of alternatives that solve disease better

Kaufman, 1989 [Stephen, Animal Rights activist, "Animal Rights: Opposing Viewpoints"]
<murray>

Increasing numbers of scientists and clinicians have criticized animal research on scientific grounds. Animal studies have always been unreliable and of tenuous value, but proponents have argued that there were no alternatives. Today, there are many alternatives that are less expensive and more valid. However, we continue to waste billions of tax dollars on irrelevant, often misleading animal research. This situation, which is tragic for both people and animals, occurs in large part because the thousands of scientists who make a living doing animal research defend the status quo vigorously and effectively. They claim that animal research has been valuable to human health and that it will continue to benefit human patients.

Scientists frequently make statements such as, "Animal experimentation is an essential component of biomedical and behavioral research, a critical part of efforts to prevent, cure, and treat a vast range of ailments."¹ However, Reines showed that most of the key discoveries in several areas, such as heart disease and cancer, were made by clinical research, observations of patients, and human autopsies.² Animal research served primarily to "prove" in animals what had already been demonstrated in people.

 **Historical Impact of Animal Research**

The scientific tradition that medical hypotheses must be "proven" in the lab has had unfortunate consequences. Frequently, effective therapies have been delayed because of the difficulty of finding an animal model that "works." For example, research with the animal model of polio resulted in a misunderstanding of the mechanism of infection. This delayed the development of the tissue culture, which was critical to the discovery of a vaccine.³

Misleading animal tests can be devastating for human health. For example, prior to 1963, every prospective and retrospective study of human patients, dozens in all, demonstrated that cigarette smoking causes cancer. Unfortunately, health warnings were delayed for years, and thousands of people subsequently died of cancer, because laboratory results were conflicting. In fact, a leading scientist wrote in the 1950s, "The failure of many investigators . . . to induce experimental cancers, except in a handful of cases, during fifty years of trying, cast serious doubt on the validity of the cigarette-lung cancer theory."⁴

T/
an.
rst
=
Les
effc

*
X
X
X
X
X

64

A/T Animal research turn

Should not use animals for research – testing on humans solves disease better, and is no more morally reprehensible

Kelly Godel , writer for the Animal Liberation Front, 1997 [The evasive tactics and deceptive arguments of animal research proponents,
http://www.animalliberationfront.com/Saints/Stories/how_to_vivisection_vivisectors.htm] <murray>

"Anthropocentric Myopia." That is, the ethical and practical arguments they use in an attempt to justify the harm caused to animals, fail to address and counter the effects these very same arguments would have if applied fairly and equally to humans. It is this oversight which poses the greatest challenge to the animal research defense, and the greatest opportunity for the animal activist. Anthropocentrism and the myth of human superiority will be addressed in more detail later on, however it is worthwhile to remember its importance as we examine the following pro-vivisection arguments.

Anthropocentric Myopia: By stating that medical research is of the utmost importance the animal research proponent is faced with answering this dilemma:

Why not use other humans, either volunteers(offered substantial financial benefits to themselves and families) or criminals for medical experiments since the results would presumably be faster and safer than using non-human subjects who differ in physiology from the human patients? If the goal is to find cures for diseases, and if it is of the utmost importance, would not the best course of action be an obligation?

Most vivisectors would quickly respond with alarm or disgust, answering that they would never use other humans even if they could cure cancer by experimenting upon one human test subject. This betrays their argument that medical research is of the utmost importance.

A/T Animal research turn

Animal research fails, 3 reasons

Weebler, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism",
<http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>]

Question: *"If we weren't using animals in research we wouldn't be able to find cures for diseases and cancers./Animal research is necessary if we hope to cure diseases and help sick children."*

- a) Saying animal research is necessary in order to cure human diseases makes as much sense as saying that one needs to conduct research on humans in order to cure rat diseases (there would almost seem to be a Neo-Darwinian myth at work, that by testing on so called "simpler" animals one can move up the "Evolutionary ladder" until you reach the complexity of human beings). You can remove the animal from medical research but you still need humans in research. If you wanted to cure leukemia in cats--working on dogs would not help much.
- b) if that's the case why haven't we cured the common cold? Humans have been experimenting on animals non stop for at least 150 years and yet we are still plagued by diseases. new ones surface and old ones become drug resistant. So much for success through animal research.
- c) Animals used in experiments become so stressed that their blood chemistry changes, invalidating the science.

A/T Animal research turn (generic)

182

Getting rid of animal testing leads to more effective alternatives

Peter Singer, 1975 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "Animal Liberation"] <Murray>

It would not be appropriate here to go into the alternatives to animal experiments that are already available. The subject is a highly technical one, more suited for researchers than for the general reader. But we already have the means to reduce greatly the number of animals experimented upon, in techniques like tissue culture (the culture of cells or groups of cells in an artificial environment); mathematical or computer models of biological systems; gas chromatography and mass spectrometry; and the use of films and models in educational instruction. Considering how little effort has been put into this field, the early results promise much greater progress if the effort is stepped up.⁸⁶

Abandoning animal testing leads to development of effective alternatives

Peter Singer, 1975 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "Animal Liberation"] <Murray>

It should not be thought that medical research would grind to a halt if the test I have proposed were applied, or that a flood of untested products would come onto the market. So far as new products are concerned it is true that, as I have already said, we would have to make do with fewer of them, using ingredients already known to be safe. That does not seem to be any great loss. But for testing really essential products, as well as for other areas of research, alternative methods not requiring animals can be and would be found. Some alternatives exist already and others would develop more rapidly if the energy and resources now applied to experimenting on animals were redirected into the search for alternatives.

A/T Animal research turn (generic)

1A12

Most animal research is for trivial things that are not important to medicine

Peter Singer, 1975 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "Animal Liberation"] <Murray>

Of this vast number of experiments, only a few contribute to important medical research. Huge numbers of animals are used in university departments from Forestry to Psychology, and many more are used for commercial purposes, to test new cosmetics, shampoos, food coloring agents and other inessential items. All this can go on only because of our prejudice against taking seriously the suffering of a being that is not a member of our own species. The typical defender of experiments on animals does not deny that animals suffer. He cannot use this argument because he needs to stress the similarities between humans and other animals in order to claim that his experiment may have some relevance for human purposes. The researcher who forces rats to choose between starvation and electric shock to see if they develop ulcers (they do) does so because he knows that the rat has a nervous system very similar to man's, and presumably feels an electric shock in a similar way.

Alternatives to animal research are better

Peter Singer, 1985 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "In Defense of Animals"] <Murray>

Using computer models of bodily function, physical models or films for teaching purposes, tissue cultures (i.e. growing living cells in a test tube), organ cultures, gas chromatography and mass spectrometry are all examples of techniques which have had the effect of successfully replacing some animals in research. Many of these techniques are more accurate and less expensive than using animals. Others need further research and development in order to become as good as existing methods. Some, like the simple culturing of human cells, are inexpensive, while others require the purchase of new equipment which can be costly. 3

Eliminating animal testing leads to alternatives that solve better

Kaufman, 1989 [Stephen, Animal Rights activist, "Animal Rights: Opposing Viewpoints"]
<murray>

Redirect Animal Research Funds

In conclusion, it appears that, for political reasons, the historical value of animal research has been grossly overstated. Not all animal research is irrelevant, but its value is severely limited by anatomical, physiological, and pathological differences between people and nonhuman animals. Most of the billions of dollars invested annually in animal research could be used much more effectively in clinical research or public health programs. 76

68

A/T Animal research turn (AIDS)

Animal research doesn't solve AIDS, but eliminating it leads to alternatives that solve better
Kaufman, 1989 [Stephen, Animal Rights activist, "Animal Rights: Opposing Viewpoints"]
<murray>

Recently, researchers have advocated use of animal models of AIDS. However, no immunologically normal animal besides man (sic)

develops the AIDS syndrome. Only chimpanzees can be infected with the virus, but they develop a mild flu-like illness only. Furthermore, since AIDS is an infectious disease, the chimpanzees must be kept in isolation. This is very stressful for chimpanzees, who are social animals. Since stress affects the immune system and since AIDS attacks the immune system, this animal "model" of AIDS is of dubious value.

Because chimpanzees are a threatened species, many researchers are studying simian (monkey) AIDS. However, Power et al. wrote, "... a molecular clone of the prototype SAIDS virus ... has no notable similarity in either genetic organization or sequence to the human AIDS retroviruses."¹⁰ Not surprisingly, the critical insights into the understanding, prevention, and treatment of human AIDS has come from research using human subjects and tissues. Although future advances against this disease are most likely to come from clinical investigation, a large fraction of the research on AIDS is being devoted to animal research.

71-72

Animal testing doesn't solve AIDS

Wenz, 2001 [Professor at the University of Illinois, "Environmental Ethics Today"] <murray>

Is such treatment of chimpanzees necessary and helpful in the fight against AIDS? Many human volunteers would willingly replace these animals, so it is not necessary. Is it helpful? Not likely, because people and chimpanzees are too different. Chimpanzees do not even get AIDS. When infected with the virus they contract a mild flu. Also, AIDS attacks the immune system, which we know is affected by stress. Because lab conditions are extremely stressful, immune responses from lab chimpanzees cannot be transferred to human beings leading normal lives.³⁷

J.118

69

A/T Animal research turn (cancer)

Alternatives to animal testing solves cancer better

Kaufman, 1989 [Stephen, Animal Rights activist, "Animal Rights: Opposing Viewpoints"]
<murray>

Several prevalent animal toxicity tests have been widely criticized by toxicologists and humanitarians. For example, the LD50 test, which determines how much of a drug, chemical, or cosmetic is needed to kill 50% of test animals, uses about 60-100 animals, most of whom suffer greatly. However, it has several scientific flaws.¹⁶ First, extrapolation of results from rodents to man is highly unreliable. Second, since the results can depend on such variables as strains within species, age, sex, and weight, different laboratories often obtain widely disparate results for the same substances. Third, LD50 data cannot be applied to most human poisoning victims, because the quantity and even the type of substance(s) ingested are often unknown. Finally, in an emergency, one needs to know how much of a substance is dangerous and

which organs are at risk, but the LD50 indicates only the meaningless statistic of how much is lethal to 50% of individuals. While the LD50 is nearly worthless, alternative protocols could yield more relevant information while using 80-90% fewer animals.¹⁷

Similarly, the Draize eye irritation test, in which unanesthetized rabbits have substances instilled in their eyes, is scientifically unsound. Fundamental anatomical differences between rabbits and people in the eyelids, tearing mechanisms, and corneas make the Draize results of dubious validity. In fact, when Draize data for 14 household and cosmetic products were compared to accident human eye exposures, they differed by a factor 18 to 250. On the other hand, modern *in vitro* assays have compared well with existing databases.¹⁸ A battery of *in vitro* tests would be less expensive, and probably more accurate, than the Draize test.

Animal tests for cancer causing substances are notoriously unreliable. Of the 19 known human oral carcinogens, only seven caused cancer in the NCI protocol. This standard screening test is so insensitive that a substance that did not appear to be carcinogenic in experimental animals could still cause cancer in up to one million Americans.¹⁹ On the other hand, an international study demonstrated that new *in vitro* tests were more sensitive and more accurate than the animal tests.²⁰

alt.
to A.I
(S)
cancer
better

A/T Bacteria Turn

Killing bacteria bad – they're key to decomposition of organic food that is key to all life

Jayapaul Azariah, Director, School of Life Sciences, University of Madras. 1999
[<http://www.intelliwareint.com/gls-cdrom/GLSPapers/Azariah.htm> BIOPIRACY, ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURE] <murray>

Aristotle (Politics 1256 b) wrote " Plants exist to give food to animals, and animals to give food to men - domestic animals for their use and food, wild ones, in most cases, if not all, furnish food and other conveniences, such as clothing and various tools. Since nature makes nothing purposeless or in vain, all animals must have been made by nature for the sake of men" (Rolston, 1988). Aristotelian approach of unilateral anthropocentrism is not a wise move. In a human centered approach only human beings are at the center and in the next circle we place plants, animals and microorganisms (bacteria and fungi). It should be remembered that bacteria will continue to live in this biosphere even if the species *Homo sapiens* is extinct. On the other hand if microorganisms like bacteria and fungi are to be extinct then there will be no means to decompose the organic food to release the raw metabolites back for the manufacture of organic food. Eventually all life will perish in the abundance of food and defecated food material. Even if we take deathlessness as the central criteria for the central circle then it is Protozoans, like Amoebae will take the center stage as it can't die when it is left to itself. It will grow fully, only to divide into two daughter cells. This process will go on and on. But Amoebae can be killed but it has no natural death. All organisms live in tune with nature except human beings. Ecologically speaking, human beings are intemperate species (Odum 1971). If natural selection is in operation then human beings will be the first species to be eliminated by natural selection.

A/T Bacteria turn

Antibiotics lead to global destruction – they cause mutations that take out their effectiveness and lead to more virulent diseases

Charni Sochet, writer for the COUNTRY YOSSI FAMILY MAGAZINE,
BACTERIOLOGICAL WARFARE <http://www.countryyossi.com/dec96/bacteria.html> [1996]

Morbidity from infectious diseases has risen voluminously on the global arena. Diseases that were once deemed eradicated are reemerging flagrantly to defy the global medical community. Pneumonia, tuberculosis, meningitis, typhoid fever, dysentery, invasive strep infections, malaria, shigella, E. Coli infections, etc. are frightening the medical community with their insidious destructive force that is a throwback to the plague-ridden millennia that preceded the discovery of penicillin. Penicillin initially was made widely available to troops during WWII and touted as the medical miracle of the Twentieth Century. Battle wounds are remarkably prone to post-operative infection; penicillin diminished this threat and vanquished the most pronounced wartime killer - infected wounds - by disabling the microbes and rendering them innocuous. In 1947, just four years after mass-production of penicillin began, the monsters reasserted themselves; microbes began appearing that were resistant to penicillin. The dragon had been tamed, but undeniably, had not surrendered.

Assaults and counterassaults launched and parried by the opposing forces marked the 50 year battle waged between pharmaceutical companies, doctors, biochemical engineers and the microbes that share our environment. And five decades later we're back to square one, with the roster of antibiotic-resistant infections looming threateningly. Infectious disease specialists caution that the profligate use of antibiotics have contributed to what may, potentially, catapult us into a public health emergency.

By our own neglect and lack of foresight we have conspired against ourselves and initiated an arms race in which, ironically, we have provided our enemies with the weapons of our own destruction. Bacteria are extraordinarily adaptable to any threat to their viability. Antibiotics have been engineered to assault specific components in the biological processes of bacteria, thereby effectively disarming them by hampering their reproductive capabilities. Unicellular organisms, bacteria, can readily alter and mutate their genetic dynamic, reinventing themselves and making themselves inviolate by offending chemically-engineered antibiotics. Easily reconfiguring their internal schematics, they can even reassigned biological proteins to produce an enzyme that will destroy the antibiotic. More frighteningly, they won't frugally hoard this new antibiotic-resistant DNA but affably donate this resistance to any available bacteria beyond their own strain. Which means that a strain of strep that may have developed resistance could transfer this resistance to malaria or some other vicious contagion and then render it resistant, which has been verified laboriously by the medical and research communities. But what if malaria meets up with another friendly bacteria, theoretically they could exchange resistances and go on to meet other bacteria, and so on....and so on....and so on.....

A/T Bacteria turn

Antibiotics actually increase the spread of disease for 2 reasons

Dr. David Williams, clinician and researcher, June 28 2003,
<http://www.drdavidwilliams.com/nc/meet.asp>

And with the overuse of antibiotics helping to create stronger mutant strains of viruses and bacteria, our immune systems are growing increasingly unable to combat these new microkillers.

There is hope, however. As we learn more about diseases and how to prevent them, one thing becomes obvious. Health can be maintained or restored without the side effects and growing ineffectiveness of antibiotics. To learn about natural ways to boost your immune system, click here. Or keep reading for my latest research findings.

Antibiotics: The Newest Threat to Immune Health

One of the most important health breakthroughs of the last century was the development and widespread use of antibiotics. Ironically, however, their overuse and misuse have also helped unleash one of the most dangerous health threats now facing us in the new century: deadly forms of mutant bacteria. You can defend yourself against the upsurge of these microkillers with effective and natural alternatives to antibiotics. Learn more.

<continued...>

The impact of antibiotics on natural immunities

Despite what we've been conditioned to believe, the human body was designed to deal with foreign bacteria.

Every time your immune system overcomes an infection it emerges stronger. Through the body's production of natural antibodies, it becomes better able to deal with future assaults on your health.

If, however, antibiotics are given at the first sign of infection, several serious events can occur:

- The body's own immune system becomes suppressed and produces fewer natural antibodies.
- As bacteria are repeatedly exposed to antibiotics they begin to mutate. Through a series of mutations, they can quickly become immune to a drug's effect. Our inability to stop the spreading infection of these mutant bacteria costs thousands of people their lives each year.
- Antibiotics destroy the beneficial bacteria that reside in the intestinal tract. In a healthy intestinal tract trillions of beneficial organisms help:

A/T Military dolphin turn

Dolphins kill heg by trading off with better minesweeping capabilities
United Press International, April 4, 2003

[<http://www.applesforhealth.com/PetHealth/doldutwart4.html>]

Boyles does not question the dolphins and sea lions' treatment by the U.S. Navy, but she fears the dolphins' mine detection work could give the military a false sense of security.

"They don't need to rely on the dolphins. They have other methods to detect mines," Boyles said. "There is also no guarantee or even much likelihood that these animals will save humans and, certainly, our troops deserve the very best in surveillance."

The U.S. Navy has ships that can sweep for mines and helicopters that can detect mines from the air deployed in the Persian Gulf, but it does not reveal the success rate for the mechanical or dolphin mine detection systems

New remote control machines will replace dolphins

Erwin, Writer for the National Defense Magazine, May 2001 [Underwater Mine-hunting robots to replace humans, dolphins]

Remote-controlled underwater vehicles equipped with advanced sensors could help Navy submarines explore waterways that would be too shallow for most boats to operate in, officials said.

Two-thirds of the Yellow Sea in Southeast Asia and three-fourths of the Persian Gulf are shallower than 180 feet. To operate in these waters, the Navy needs small surveillance platforms, such as unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs), that could perform clandestine mine reconnaissance and collect tactical intelligence, noted Scott Farnsworth, the Navy's deputy program manager for UUVs.

For underwater mine detection, meanwhile, the Navy's largest development is the so-called remote mine-hunting system (RMS). Some of the technology in SAHRV "can be leveraged with RMS," said Capt. Terry Briggs, the RMS program manager.

<continued...>

In a separate program, the Navy plans to deploy a new UUV for explosive ordnance detection by 2006, which would replace human divers and dolphins, said Capt. Rick Kiser. The vehicle would be equipped with low-light cameras and would cost \$150,000, not including sensors, he said.

The goal is to develop a small UUV to cover 10-by-10-nautical mile areas at depths of 10 to 300 feet. This technology, said Kiser, could be used to locate aircraft crash sites.

74

A/T Military dolphins turn

Dolphins are unreliable at sweeping mines

Herald and Weekly Times March 31 2003, Flipper goes AWOL

Some of the Australian and British divers working with the US team in Umm Qasr say they appreciate any help they receive, be it human, mechanical or dolphin but the sceptics say the dolphins are too unreliable.

"If you put one to work in Sydney Harbour it would mark a million things because it can't tell the difference between a washing machine and a mine," the Australian diver said.

"The bottom line, mate, is it's a fish. It's also a very smart fish so how do you know it hasn't just gone off for a feed instead of working and then thought, 'hang on, I'd better mark a few things or they won't give me any fish when I get back'. We're talking about mines, so that's a pretty big risk to take based on Flipper's say-so."

A/T Military dolphins turn

The use of dolphins in military training is cruel torture that should be rejected
Ea Wong, animal rights activist, 2003

[http://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/948454023?ts=1056849778&sign\[partnerID\]=1&sign\[memberID\]=960048858&sign\[partner\(userID\)\]=960048858](http://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/948454023?ts=1056849778&sign[partnerID]=1&sign[memberID]=960048858&sign[partner(userID)]=960048858)

Stop Use of Dolphins in Mine-Hunting Operations

That US Air Force Major General Victor E. Renuart Jr. can with such sangfroid announce the US Navy's deployment of trained dolphins in mine-hunting operations in the Persian Gulf must surely be a cause of outrage and shame for animal-lovers everywhere, not least in the United States, a country that is home to so many animal rights organizations and conservation groups.

Despite Navy officials' claims that the dolphins are well taken care of and are not put in harm's way, the public has reason to believe that the full story has not been told about the exploitation of marine mammals by the military.

Whatever one's belief on the US-Iraq conflict, no member of a civilized society should condone the abuse and exploitation of dolphins for military purposes. Dolphins do not have unions, cannot speak up against abuse and unjust treatment and cannot demand better protection from their captors and trainers. They do not have informed consent or a choice as to whether to participate in naval exercises. Conscientious objectors are not recognized; neither are the dolphins' rights to freedom and privacy.

Most dolphins are kidnapped for aquariums, academic centers and research and training facilities from their pods and families at sea by 'aqua cowboys' who use speedboats to corner a group of dolphins and net the young. Much of what we know about the training of dolphins of war is based on the testimonies of ex-Navy trainers. It has been reported that dolphins were beaten, kicked and starved as aids in training. There are also allegations that dolphins that have become old and of no use to the Navy any more were dumped at sea without proper rehabilitation. Those that escape often have muzzles on their snouts or rostrums that prevent them from eating. It would be naïve to assume that positive reinforcement is all it takes to train dolphins. Being wild animals, once they have had their fill of fish, dolphins are known to wander off-duty. Training dolphins would therefore be likely to involve a degree of punishment. In 1990, the use of dolphins to guard Trident submarine bases were challenged by animal rights groups. Official documents released at that time revealed that 13 had died in Navy hands, reinforcing the belief that gross mistreatment had taken place in the training of dolphins.

<continued...>

<continued...>

The use of dolphins of war by both the US and Russia has prompted Navy Lt. Commander Douglas Burnett to comment in 1981 that "In a hostile confrontation, both sides will have to consider dolphins as potential enemy biosensors or weapons. In some situations, there may be no choice but to destroy dolphins or any marine mammal presenting a similar threat... it may be a sound decision to protect shipping... by poisoning the surrounding waters to remove the threat of dolphin attacks, which would, coincidentally, remove a sizeable proportion of the area's ecology." That dolphins had been destroyed in the past is an indication of the possibility that more dolphins could be harmed while in action today. Since the Iraqi forces regard the Navy dolphins as enemy dolphins, there might be attempts on the dolphins' lives. There is also the risk of indiscriminate killing of wild dolphin populations because any dolphin can potentially be an enemy dolphin. Also, the inherent danger that a dolphin may be injured or killed in mine-hunting operations remains a very real threat. If the Navy is willing to admit that dolphins are used to circumvent the risk posed to expensive equipment and human divers, isn't it an admission also that there are risks to dolphin lives? The US National Marine Fisheries Service has reported that Navy dolphin survival rates are 95-97%. However, the US Navy's refusal to disclose the number of dolphins deployed in the Persian Gulf indicates a lack of transparency that is worrying to animal lovers and the public. The claim by Thomas LaPuzza, a spokesman at the Point Loma Submarine Base in San Diego that 'the mines are a danger to ships, not to dolphins', sounds implausible and raises even more fear that the dolphins are being sent on a suicide mission without their knowledge or consent.

Just as it is very objectionable to use domesticated companion animals such as police dogs in dangerous operations without affording them sufficient protection, it is also repulsive to civilized minds that dolphins are trained to risk their lives this way. Dolphins are not American citizens or employees and gain no benefit from participating in war. To pressgang them into participating in military operations is a patronizing move on the part of the US Navy. Such disregard for the lives and freedom of marine mammals whose populations are already threatened by pollution and poaching is tantamount to cruelty to animals by the US Navy.

A/T Dolphin saboteurs turn

The US doesn't use dolphins as saboteurs – their evidence assumes India

Telegraph Group Limited, By Rahul Bedi in New Delhi
(Filed: 26/12/) **2002**

Other non-governmental organisations working to preserve marine life said countries such as Russia and the United States had more or less abandoned the use of dolphins as underwater saboteurs as they were unable to distinguish between friend and foe.

"Western navies found that despite their stupendous intelligence, dolphins were unable to tell the difference between ships and could easily end up planting mines on those from their own side," Mitali Kakkar of Reef Watch Marine Conservation in Bombay said.

She also appealed to the navy to abandon training dolphins for war. India is possibly the only country that is persisting in pursuing this potentially dangerous programme involving dolphins, Ms Kakkar said.

A/T Alt → anarchy

Ecocentrism doesn't cause anarchy

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000
[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

But it would be wrong to say the future society
will definitely be ecoanarchist in organization, and that an ecocentric consciousness requires
this. It should remain as an open question. In this way, anarchists and non-anarchists can join
socialists, non-socialists and others, in helping define what a deep and pluralistic left
biocentrism
should be for our times, and creatively respond to the unfolding future.

Even if they win the link, collapse of civilization solves all of the world's problems

Moonwatcher, philosophy and anthropology student, 2002
[<http://www.nyctophilia.net/anth.html>, "Anthropocentrism"] <murray>
As for the civilization argument, first of all, I've studied anthropology and the conclusion
I've drawn is that we were better off before civilization. People in non-civilized society
have no social inequality, no gender inequality, excellent nutrition (better than people in
first world countries), very little disease (except when they get diseases from
civilization), less famine (because total dependence on agriculture is what leads to
famine), less social instability (because their system of law works to eliminate the harm
caused by crime instead of just punishing it), less environmental damage (because they've
learned to live with their environments), and less work to get their food. Civilized people,
depending on their social class, work 8 to 14 hours a day, while a Bushman gatherer-
hunter works about 2 or 3 and a person of a semi-agricultural society works a few more.
And civilization is very quickly leading to the destruction of the ecosystems it depends
on. Second of all, not all humans have civilization, such as the Bushman that I cited
above. Are civilized people above non-civilized people? Of course not. So humans with
their civilization aren't better than other living things (or non-living things) just because
of that.

A/T Benign anthropocentrism

Anthro might justify short-term ecological preservation, but such a mentality will inevitably leads to the destruction of species not deemed “useful” to humans

Ernest Partridge, University of California, Riverside, *Environmental Ethics*, 6, Su. 1984⁽¹⁾ [NATURE AS A MORAL RESOURCE, www.igc.org/gadfly] <murray>

Does the anthropocentric position offer no safety or security for sub-human species and their habitats? Perhaps it does -- at least for the short term. As suggested earlier, we often enjoy the company of such creatures. So long as we feel that way about them -- so long as they entertain and delight us -- we may take some trouble to keep them around. We will, however, do so on account of what they do for us. But if that is the reason, then their safety is hostage to our tastes, and our tastes change, as do our attitudes and moral fashions. This is not a comforting thought for the eco-moralist, since extinction, like the death penalty, can not be rescinded.

What attitude toward nature renders the world safe for California condors, snail darters, and sea otters? Such an attitude seems to have some hold on us since we do, in fact, have laws protecting even *ugly* endangered species. Is there an attitude toward nature more substantial than the "aw gawsh" response which might prompt us to care enough to take some trouble and expense to protect a "useless" species. The uncompromising human chauvinist cannot offer us much warrant for protecting those species which cannot readily be shown to be useful, entertaining, or of some other direct human value. Before the more forceful pressures of profit and "practicality," the "aw gawsh" factor can be readily overridden, and the survival of such species placed in great peril.⁽²⁾

The idea of benign anthropocentrism is wrong – it is impossible to truly protect the environment within an anthropocentric framework

Mark Hathaway, 1998 [Theme 5, Paper 2: Pushing the Boundaries - Christian Action [www.faith-and-the-economy.org/Documents/Thm5Pap2-Oikonomia2.rtf, Ecological Perspectives on Economics]<Murray>

Some claim, of course, that we can be anthropocentric and still protect other life forms. Indeed, it is obvious that, to preserve the human species, we will have to protect at least some part of nature. But the question immediately arises: How much of nature needs to be preserved, and which species we can afford to lose? Ultimately this leads to a slippery slope that threatens to destroy humanity along with many other members of the Earth community.

A/T Anthro inevitable

It is possible to transition away from anthropocentrism

Frechette, 1998 [Professor of Philosophy, "Environmental Ethics"] <Murray>

✓ To persuade enough people who cannot share a vision that an urgent need exists for a new approach to environmental problems, to persuade them that whatever we do that affects the ecology is morally either right or wrong, to educate them to the point where they are willing to make personal sacrifices (as envisaged by McMahon) is, to say the least, a formidable task. Educators at every teaching level, journalists of every order, the powers of radio and television, in fact all the powers of communication, would have to participate. To see it as an impossible task, however, is surely to lack another kind of vision. /

A/T "No alternative"

Their argument that there is no alternative is a new link – their failure to conceive of any alternate system outside anthropocentrism is one reason why human chauvinism is so entrenched

Robin Attfield, professor of philosophy at University of Wales, 1999 ["The Ethics of the Global Environment"]

*A/T
no alt
their arg
=
parachute:
where are
abs
Instrumentalists*

The argument that there is no coherent alternative to instrumentalism does not, however, rely just on misrepresenting alternative intrinsic accounts as logically incoherent by assimilating them to detached accounts. It also trades on a contemporary insensitivity to the serious logical and epistemological problems of instrumental accounts of value, problems which were well known to classical philosophers (see e.g., Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 994b9–16). It does not appear to be widely realized that the classical arguments apply not just to a few especially shaky instrumentalist theories which adopt questionable goals but to instrumentalism in general, since they assume only quite general features of the instrumentalist position.

*2 works
and Engls.*

Instrumentalist positions take as valuable (or in the moral case, as creating moral constraints) just what contributes to a stated end. An obvious example which comes to mind is utilitarianism. However, in the more general case we are concerned with, of instrumentalist forms of human chauvinism, there may be a set of goals, not just a single goal such as that of maximizing net happiness of humans; the human-chauvinist assumption is that the values (indeed constraints) are goal reducible, and that all goals reduce in some way to human goals, or at least can be assessed in terms of human concerns and interests. Human chauvinist positions are not necessarily instrumental, but those that are not (e.g., the position that just humans and nothing else are intrinsically valuable) tend to make the arbitrary chauvinistic nature of their assumptions unwisely explicit—most successful contemporary chauvinisms being covert ones.

Problems for instrumentalism arise (as Aristotle observed) when questions are asked about the status of the goal itself. Instrumentalism relies entirely for its plausibility upon selecting a set of goals which are widely accepted and are, in the theory, implicitly treated as valuable. It relies at bottom on an implicit valuation which cannot itself be explained in purely instrumental terms. Of course, a value assumption is not eliminated in this fashion; it is merely hidden under the general consensus that such a goal is appropriate, that such an end is valuable. But the strategy of successful instrumentalism is to avoid recognition of the fact that the goal is, and indeed must be, implicitly treated as valuable, by selecting a set of goals so much part of the framework of contemporary thought, so entrenched and habitual as a valued item by humans, that the value attached to the goal becomes virtually invisible, at least to those within the framework. Thus it is with the assumption of human chauvinist instrumentalism that goals are exclusively determinable in terms of human interest. The basic, convincing and self-evident character of this assumption rests on nothing more than the shared beliefs of the privileged class of humans concerning the paramount and exclusive importance of regarding their own interests and concerns, on a valuational assumption or goal which is "self-evident" because it is advantageous and is habitual. The consensus features, of which instrumentalists make so much, are nothing more than the consensus of the privileged class about the goal of maintaining their own privilege, that is, a consensus of interests. This sort of agreement of course shows very little about the well groundedness of the position.

A/T "No alternative"

There is no alternative but to endorse a radical rethinking of humanity's place within nature

Christopher Manes, philosopher and deep ecologist, 1990 (GREEN RAGE, p. 240)

Learning to reinhabit the world, to restore a culture in balance with nature, will not be easy. It may in fact already be impossible because of the overpopulation industrial society has created. Yet there is no alternative but to pursue it. Calls for a more rational regime of technology have a superficial appeal, since they require only a slight readjustment rather than a rethinking of our place in the natural world. But such a rethinking is not only required by the environmental crisis, it is something worth pursuing for its own sake.

63

A/T Vague alternative = no solvency

Vague alternatives are good – leaving room for interpretation is necessary to allow others to expand on the idea and is key to societal acceptance of the philosophy

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, March 6 2003
[http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Key_Deep_Ecology_Ideas.html, Key Deep Ecology Ideas]
<murray>

8) Deep Ecology is by its Nature Difficult to Pin down and Conceptualize. This seems to be deliberately built into the philosophy. Naess maintains that precision and ambiguity are needed by the philosopher. This seems to be in part so that the follower of deep ecology has herself or himself an interpretative role to play:

"To be a great philosopher seems to imply that you think precisely, but do not explain all the consequences of your ideas. That's what others will do if they have been inspired." Arne Naess, Is It Painful To Think?, p. 98

It is painful to think, compared to gliding through life adapting to society's demands on you.
Being a dissenter does not make for social popularity.

A/T Animals don't feel pain

All vertebrates feel pain

Peter Singer, 1985 [Prof. At university of Melbourne, "In Defense of Animals"] <Murray>

In 1979 the RSPCA's report on shooting and angling, chaired by Lord Medway, had found that certain body chemicals associated with the experience of pain in man were also present in fish and other vertebrate classes. The 1983 report therefore concluded that this new evidence, added to the older neurological and behavioural findings, strongly indicated that all vertebrates share a common capacity to experience pain.

A/T Anthro justified - Darwinism

"Survival of the fittest" justifies enslavement

Weebler, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism",
<http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>] <murray>

Question: "Nature is cruel--cats will play with their food--so we should be cruel too. It's survival of the fittest. Compassion is not natural, and other species are motivated by self interest."

- a) "survival of the fittest" would allow one to exploit and enslave other humans . You acknowledge that one animal will prey on another, but you ignore that they can also prey on members of their own species--in which case, by using this moral standard and policy, humans preying on other humans would be justified too.

A/T Anthro justified: "Most successful"

Humans are not the most successful creature

Moonwatcher, philosophy and anthropology student, 2002

[<http://www.nyctophilia.net/anth.html>, "Anthropocentrism"] <murray>

I've heard a lot of pathetic attempts to explain why humans are above other living and non-living things, like "because we have opposable thumbs", "because we have language", "because we're the most successful creature", "because we have civilization", and of course the most common, "because we're smarter than everything else."

Well, we're not the only animals with opposable thumbs (all other primates and also koala bears have them), so that obviously can't be it. And while no other creature has language exactly like ours, many animals communicate and dolphins actually use an extremely complex system of squeaks to communicate which is not completely understood by scientists. Language is not unique to humans, although our particular type of language is. That can't be it either.

I'm not sure what makes people think we're the most successful creature -- considering that some humans are threatening their very existence and the safety of the rest of the ecosystem. And really, in a way we're one of the least successful. Our numbers are nothing compared to, say, bacteria, and there's absolutely no diversity among humans, it's just one species and virtually no difference between different groups within the species. From an evolutionary perspective, diversity is the sign of success, and in that area we're on the other end of the spectrum.

A/T Tenacious Moral Instinct = anthro justified

The ideal of human unity does not justify anthropocentrism

Weebler, Accessed in 2003 [Animal Rights Activist, "Animal Rights and Vegetarianism",
<http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Animal%20Rights%20FAQ.htm>] <murray>

Some will try to shrug off the issue of human supremacy by claiming that human discrimination against other species is not motivated by a belief in human moral superiority but a practical reality of "humans sticking together." Some call this **tenacious moral instinct**. The notion that humans by their nature, like all species, will gravitate towards their own kind--and thus have a right to discriminate against other species accordingly.

The first problem is that humans have enslaved and discriminated against each other based on race, religion, gender, age, intelligence, and appearance for 1000s of years. The ideal of universal human rights is itself a new concept. Despite our laws we still have discrimination and exploitation of humans for a myriad of reasons. Therefore the idea that humans as a species have a natural tendency to "stick together" and that this acts as some overriding "moral instinct" is easily disproved by the fact that one does not lock their doors at night to keep out bears and wolves. Furthermore, other species have been known to fight and kill members of their own species, and conversely, "adopt" members of other species. Thus, one cannot define the act of moral regard according to some rigid hierarchy.

A/T Anthro justified: opposable thumbs

Opposable thumbs does not justify anthropocentrism

Moonwatcher, philosophy and anthropology student, 2002

[<http://www.nyctophilia.net/anth.html>, "Anthropocentrism"] <murray>

I've heard a lot of pathetic attempts to explain why humans are above other living and non-living things, like "because we have opposable thumbs", "because we have language", "because we're the most successful creature", "because we have civilization", and of course the most common, "because we're smarter than everything else."

Well, we're not the only animals with opposable thumbs (all other primates and also koala bears have them), so that obviously can't be it. And while no other creature has language exactly like ours, many animals communicate and dolphins actually use an extremely complex system of squeaks to communicate which is not completely understood by scientists. Language is not unique to humans, although our particular type of language is. That can't be it either.

A/T anthro justified: language

Other species have language too – that's not a justification for anthropocentrism

Moonwatcher, philosophy and anthropology student, 2002
[<http://www.nyctophilia.net/anth.html>, "Anthropocentrism"] <murray>

I've heard a lot of pathetic attempts to explain why humans are above other living and non-living things, like "because we have opposable thumbs", "because we have language", "because we're the most successful creature", "because we have civilization", and of course the most common, "because we're smarter than everything else."

Well, we're not the only animals with opposable thumbs (all other primates and also koala bears have them), so that obviously can't be it. And while no other creature has language exactly like ours, many animals communicate and dolphins actually use an extremely complex system of squeaks to communicate which is not completely understood by scientists. Language is not unique to humans, although our particular type of language is. That can't be it either.

A/T Anthro justified: Intelligence

Intelligence doesn't justify anthropocentrism – that's like saying retarded people are worth nothing

Moonwatcher, philosophy and anthropology student, 2002

[<http://www.nyctophilia.net/anth.html>, "Anthropocentrism"] <murray>

Now, the most often cited, and seemingly obvious argument: humans are smarter. Now why would this make us superior? Is being smart an advantage? Well, certainly in some situations, it is, but it can also be a disadvantage, as smarter animals tend to overanalyze and seek out patterns even when there aren't any, which makes us less efficient. And there are many situations where a human just couldn't survive and something less intelligent like a bacterium could. As explained above, our smarts have not made us the most successful in evolutionary terms. And of course, we don't judge a person's worth by their comparative intelligence. Retarded people are worth just as much as average or intelligent people, so why judge an animal or plant or bacterium or rock by its comparative intelligence?

A/T Anthro justified: human ethics

Even if humans are the only species who ponder ethical questions, that doesn't mean that we should not assign moral value to other organisms

Patrick Curry, BA in psychology, -September 3, 2001

(University of California at Santa Cruz, The Campaign for Political Ecology) <Murray>

Anthropocentrism - human-centredness - is sometimes taken to mean that all value and/or ethics should or even must have human beings as its principal or even sole focus. This is an egregious error. In the first place, human beings are certainly not the only locii of value, need and agency; it takes a particular arrogance and dogmatism to deny that to other animals, at the very least.

Secondly, even if it were true that values and/or ethics are generated only by human beings, ie. are anthropogenic, it does not follow that humans must be the main repository or central concern of value. (Of course, that could be argued on other grounds.) Analogously, recognition of the intrinsic value of the natural world - an important theme in ecological ethics - may require a human valuer; but that does not mean it has no such value.

Discourse shapes reality

Our discourses surrounding ecological issues determines our reality – a change in worldview can change our practices

Eric Reitan, Seattle University, Electronic Green Journal, December 1998 [Pragmatism, Environmental World Views, and Sustainability, <http://egj.lib.uidaho.edu/egj09/reitan1.html>] <murray>

The Pragmatic Basis of Environmentalism

The fundamental assumption here is that there exists an essential link between our outlook on the world and our behavior, one so strong that how we look at the world--our worldview--will largely determine what we do. The fundamental justification for changing our worldview, then, is that making such a change is the only realistic way to sufficiently change our harmful behavior.

<it continues...>

The principle here, embraced by James as a starting point for his discussion of philosophical pragmatism, is that our worldview (or overall philosophy) has more direct impact on how we live our lives than any other single thing. And it is this principle which undergirds the current trend in environmental philosophy: according to a plethora of environmentalists, the only realistic way to move from the current unsustainable practices in human society to genuinely sustainable ones is to abandon the worldview that drives our unsustainable consumerist lifestyle and replace it with a worldview that inspires a caring and nurturing relationship with nature. To this extent at least, the majority of environmental theorists writing today are pragmatic in the philosophical sense.

A/T Permutation

1. The permutation is irrelevant – we don't advocate any specific alternative, our advocacy is just a rejection of the 1AC's anthropocentric framework, it's impossible to simultaneously endorse and reject the 1AC
2. No net benefit - permutation still links to the critique if it advocates all of the 1AC
3. Severance – if they say that the permutation means plan plus alternative, it severs out of the entire rest of the 1AC – that's a voter because it means they can spike out of all negative positions in the 2AC
4. The permutation is the kiss of death for the ecosystem – attempting to develop our ethical concern for nature with anthropocentrism as a starting point ensures that nature will always take a back seat to human concerns

Stan Rowe, Professor of Ecology, University of Saskatchewan 1994 [The Trumpeter, Spring, Ecocentrism: the Chord that Harmonizes Humans and Earth] <murray>
Wherever our sense of greatest importance lies, there also will our ethics be. The attempt to build ethical concern for the Ecosphere from the inside out, by add-ons starting with our selves and the human race, may soothe consciences for a little while, but it will be the kiss of death for wild nature. Aldo Leopold has been the influential exponent of ethics-by-extension, rationalized as an expedient for human survival. Unfortunately this approach only strengthens anthropocentrism, making it certain that land, air, water and other organisms will always in the crunch take second place to the welfare of self, family and friends. More sensible, but more difficult, is the ecocentric ethic that confers highest valuation on the Ecosphere which, by proxy, bestows ethical merit and concern on its subsidiary contents according to *their compliance and cooperation*. The self finds its ecological values in the welfare of the non-self.

A/T Permutation

An attempt to combine deep ecology and anthropocentric perspectives fails – these differing justifications for policymaking are incompatible
Rowman and Littlefield, 1983 [“Ecological Ethics and Politics”]

James Sterba's recent essay in this journal, 'Reconciling Anthropocentric and Nonanthropocentric Environmental Ethics', represents the latest attempt to circumvent the decades old debate in environmental philosophy between the anthropocentrists and nonanthropocentrists, and to show that the axiological disagreement which has characterised the debate becomes moot as one proceeds to construct general normative principles and then to translate those principles into specific policy.¹ Sterba works to show that as regards principles of environmental justice, in their most morally defensible forms, both the anthropocentrist and nonanthropocentrist positions would ultimately concur on which such principles are acceptable. I have elsewhere argued that at least one such attempt to establish a convergence of anthropocentric and nonanthropocentric perspectives at the level of policy formation fails, and will here argue that Sterba's attempt at reconciling the two camps fails as well.² Though my critique of Sterba's argument is, of course, insufficient to show that no such reconciliation is possible, I think that it will provide grounds for recognising that such a unification project faces great difficulties, and that despite the growing weariness with the anthropocentric-nonanthropocentric debate, the foundational axiological division represented by the debate will remain a crucial point of contention for some time to come.

A/T Permutation

The permutation pursues shallow reform at the exclusion of our criticism – the two are mutually exclusive
Manes, 1990 [Environmental philosopher, "Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization"] <Murray>

In Scott's revolutionary, quasi-Jeffersonian vision, Earth Day represented an opportunity to make the environmental movement a force for social change that could help avert an ecological disaster, the biological meltdown we are now facing. But the opportunity, if it existed, was squandered. Every April Gaylord Nelson, now chairman of the Wilderness Society, is asked whatever happened to Earth Day. He has replied sedately that Earth Day only "gave an opportunity for [environmentalism] to express itself."²⁵ Sadly, the environmental movement's national leadership, increasingly entrenched in Washington and aloof from grass-roots activists, refused to listen to an important part of that expression, choosing instead to champion liberal reform to the exclusion of fundamental changes in our society's relationship to the natural world. We will never know if the American public was ready for this radical reappraisal, but at the very least it would be more receptive to changes now that they are absolutely essential had the environmentalist leadership discussed the possibility twenty years ago. As if to

symbolize the direction the mainstream environmental movement would choose, the militant Scott eventually took a job as the Sierra Club's conservation director in Washington and would play a major role in the movement's withdrawal into middle-class respectability.

152 - 52

A/T Permutation

The permutation is doomed to fail – accepting a compromise position ensures that deeper ecological alternatives cannot emerge

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000
[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

Those who run the industrial system like things the way they are. Opposition is usually ignored until it becomes perceived as some kind of threat. Then overtures to the opposition are made to enter the process, with the promise of “reform” or “change” - but not abolition, of that which is being criticized. However, to accept and enter the process, means also to accept certain basic assumptions: regarding the World Trade Organization, for example, the CONTINUATION of this organization and its global economic priorities; or the acceptance of a growth economy, increasing consumption and the market; or for instance, the “co-existence” of the oil and fishing industries and the “right” of fossil fuel companies in principle to commercially exploit oil and gas deposits, without regard for the impending global warming horrors. I believe that deeper alternatives do not and cannot emerge from these kinds of multi-stakeholder participation. Environmentalists participate from a position of weakness: philosophically disarmed; without a large, mobilized social base behind them; and with the present reality that the only economic model is that of the grow-or-die transnational corporation.

Ecological problems cannot be resolved by working within existing structures

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, April 1998 [My Path to Left Biocentrism, <http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/GW63-Path.html>]

Deep ecology (DE) says major ecological problems cannot be resolved within the existing capitalist or socialist industrial economic system. Shallow ecology says that these problems can be resolved within, and with the continuation of industrial society. Yet it is this industrial society that has caused the Earth-threatening ecological crisis.

A/T Pragmatism

Pragmatism endorses shortsighted reforms that is ecologically disastrous
Frechette, 1998 [Professor of Philosophy, "Environmental Ethics"] <Murray>

The Pragmatic-Utilitarian Ethic

The second ethical system believed to have contributed to our environmental problems is the Pragmatic-Utilitarian ethic espoused by most Americans today. As popularly interpreted, this approach has become an ethic of expediency. Whatever is of the greatest immediate benefit to the greatest number of people at the lowest cost is judged desirable or "good," and therefore moral.

The primary problem is not with the theory that the greatest benefit at the lowest cost is good, but with the failure to take into account future good as well as present good. The shortsighted policies stemming from this philosophy have been ecologically disastrous. One outstanding example is the dust-bowl of the American midwestern plains, which resulted from over-grazing and over-ploughing the land. The indigenous buffalo-grass had held the soil against the periodic droughts and merciless winds. When it was ploughed under the preparation for crop-planting, the operation could have been said to be benefitting the greatest number at the lowest cost. The long-term effect was anything but beneficial, however, and everyone suffered. Over-grazing, strip-mining, dumping factory wastes into lakes and rivers, the indiscriminate use of pesticides—all of these practices have been justified as "practical" and therefore right.

A/T
Prag.
→
shortsighted
↓
DAV

A/T Pragmatism

Pragmatism is just a tool to maintain our system of anthropocentrism

Eric Reitan, Seattle University, Electronic Green Journal, December 1998 [Pragmatism, Environmental World Views, and Sustainability, <http://egj.lib.uidaho.edu/egj09/reitan1.html>] <murray>

Introduction: Environmental Pragmatism

Over the last several years, there has been an emerging discussion among environmental philosophers over the question of whether philosophical pragmatism can have a place of value in the environmental movement. Pragmatism is the distinctively American philosophical school which, roughly, holds that our ideas, theories, and worldviews should be examined and evaluated in the light of their impact on lived experience, according to how well they enable us to maneuver through experience successfully. Some worry that pragmatism's tendency to root all values in subjective human experience undercuts the environmentalist's claim that all of us ought to care about nature, because nature has an intrinsic value independent of the human activity of valuing. (Katz 1987)

A/T Specific policies good

Simply passing a policy will not solve the ecological crisis – a new worldview is needed

Eric Reitan, Seattle University, Electronic Green Journal, December 1998 [Pragmatism, Environmental World Views, and Sustainability, <http://egj.lib.uidaho.edu/egj09/reitan1.html>] <murray>

The Environmentalist Push for a New Worldview

One of the most recurring themes in contemporary environmental theory is the idea that, in order to create a sustainable human society embedded in a flourishing natural environment, we need to change how we think about our relationship with nature. **A simple change in public policy is not enough.** Modest social changes--such as increased use of public transportation or a growing commitment to recycling--are not enough. Nor is environmental education that stresses the dangers of current practices and the prudence of caring for the earth. Even appeals to moral duty--obligations to future generations and to the fellow creatures with whom we share the planet--are insufficient.

What is needed is a change in our worldview. More specifically, we need to change our view of nature and of our relationship with nature. Again and again, environmental thinkers press home this point. Aldo Leopold, one of the seminal figures of the environmental movement, advocates the adoption of a "land ethic" which "changes the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land-community to just plain member of it." (Leopold 1949) Deep ecologists such as Arne Naess advocate a process of deep questioning of our basic assumptions about nature and our relationship to nature, and they argue that unless we move away from "anthropocentric" conceptions of nature, and towards a more ecocentric view which accords value to all parts of the ecosphere, we will not *want* to do the things which need to be done to live sustainably in the natural world. (Naess 1988) Fritjof Capra, a research physicist and environmentalist, holds that the hope of the earth lies in a "new vision of reality," a "new ecological paradigm" currently emerging among scientists, philosophers, and other thinkers--one which views humans as part of a larger, interrelated whole. (Capra 1987) Thomas Berry insists that "to be viable, the human community must move from its present anthropocentric norm to a geocentric norm of reality and value." (Berry 1987) Psychologist Chellis Glendinning believes that Western culture imposes on us a mechanistic worldview that is fundamentally unsatisfying, leading to a "Techno-Addiction" that can be overcome only if we "integrate into our lives a new philosophy" that is "earth-based, ecological, and indigenous." (Glendinning 1992)

While not all environmentalists embrace this clamoring for a new worldview, the trend is clear and unmistakable. Driving this trend is a growing suspicion that the prevailing modern worldview--a consumerist vision of life which denigrates nature to the status of property--is largely responsible for inspiring the unsustainable social and individual practices which threaten the health of our planet and ourselves. Thus, the only viable path to sustainability is the adoption of a new, environmentally friendly worldview.

100

A/T "Fiat good"

1. We win even in a world of fiat – quick-fix solutions to environmental problems that seek primarily to benefit humans are bound to fail, and they perpetuate notions of human superiority that simply result in further ecological destruction, INC Katz evidence
2. We don't say that fiat shouldn't be evaluated at all, just that we need to evaluate the philosophical underpinnings of the plan before the actual effects of the case, which solves all their offense
3. Our criticism of anthropocentrism is a prerequisite to determining the implications of the affirmative's plan; Also, fiat without evaluating the ~~policy~~ implications means we can never solve environmental problems in the real world

Eric Katz, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1997 [Nature As Subject : Human Obligation and Natural Community] <murray>

This issue of justice arises because the policy discussion has been limited to a consideration of human interests. If the criterion for policy decisions is the maximization of human satisfactions or benefits, then it becomes appropriate—even mandatory—to ask questions about the distribution of these benefits. In this way, issues of justice, in general, serve to limit and complement teleological criteria for the determination of policy. In the context of Third World environmental development, however, considerations of justice override any plausible account of benefits resulting from the preservation of the natural environment. The need for economic development seems so great that the hypothetical long-term effects on global warming appear trivial. If we restrict our analysis of policy to the maximization of human welfare and to the creation of just social institutions, then we cannot escape the problem created by the Third World's need for economic development. Conceived as a problem in maximizing and balancing human goods, the scales incline toward policies of development. The demand for anthropocentric justice dooms the preservation of the natural environment

4. Education - we should be able to discuss the entirety of the 1AC, not restrict our analysis to the 10 seconds they devote to the plan text – key to in depth evaluation of critical issues

A/T Fiat good

It is essential to offer alternative paradigms as part of the public debate about ecological issues – solely evaluating fiat is bad for real world activism

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, April 1998 [My Path to Left Biocentrism, <http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/GW63-Path.html>]

Looking back at my twenty years of involvement in the environmental movement, it seems that a primary concern has been to raise "alternative visions" as a contribution to the public debate taking place around the particular environmental issues, such as biocides, forestry, 'sustainable development', protected areas, indigenous issues, natural gas. While such visions need a detailed knowledge of an issue, to develop an alternative vision means going beyond the practical knowledge, which often the Earth destroyers have had a monopoly of. It is these alternative visions, which reject the existing taken-for-granted industrial order, that are so threatening to corporations, governments and the "wise use" groups. We have seen this by corporate and "wise use" attacks on the work of the Green Web.

Once I became aware of the deep ecology philosophy, in the mid-80s, I saw that there was a real, hopeful, non-human centered alternative to the destructiveness of industrial capitalist society. One still required the detailed knowledge of the issues, but deep ecology helped to focus and raise the questions to ask. Many times I have been at meetings designed primarily to obtain the public's approval for an environmentally destructive project. Usually there is a "consensus" within which any controversy takes place. Someone informed by deep ecology, and with a detailed knowledge of the particular issue, can shatter the consensus and open up a real discussion. Others present can then participate in this discussion, which is subversive to the taken-for-granted industrial order.

Raising alternative ecological and social visions to those peddled by industrial society, is of fundamental importance. Circulating such visions within society, in any public way, is extremely difficult.

A/T Fiat good

Endorsing the plan with an ecocentric, rather than anthropocentric, justification is good for education because it is one of the most important real world questions facing the environmental movement

Jon C. Williams, philosopher, May 12, 2001 [Examining Anthropocentric Foundations for Strong Environmental Ethics: A Reply to Onora O'Neill, http://ambient.2y.net/jon/philo/third_draft_1.html]
<Murray>

Most of us believe that we ought to protect the environment. However, few of us agree on the extent of protection required or the justification for doing so. Those who favor a less demanding position might say something like the following: "We have no moral reasons to protect or preserve the environment, although we do have instrumental reasons for doing so." Whereas, those favoring a more demanding position might say, "We have distinctively moral reasons to protect and preserve the environment." The two positions may be characterized as weak and strong environmentalism respectively because it seems likely that instrumental reasons would require less in the way of environmental protection than moral reasons. Thus, those attempting to justify strong environmentalism typically seek to establish moral justifications for their claims.

A/T Social ecology / Ecofeminism

(Social ecology / ecofeminism) is not competitive with our rejection of anthropocentrism – both are similar frameworks that work towards the same end goal

John Clark is Professor of Philosophy at Loyola University, et all, Critical Essays in the philosophy of Deep Ecology, 2000 <murray>

In a discussion of the "rules of Gandhian nonviolence," Arne Naess proposes a number of hypotheses and norms that are highly relevant to recent debates in ecophilosophy. For example, he suggests that the "character of the means used in group struggle determines the character of the results," and that one should "choose that personal action or attitude which most probably reduces the tendency towards violence of all parties in a struggle." One should not, he says, "act as a mere functionary, a representative of an institution or an underling, but always as an autonomous, *fully responsible* person." Mistrust, he suggests, "stems from misjudgment, especially of the disposition of [one's] opponent to answer trust with trust, mistrust with mistrust." One should "fight antagonisms, not antagonists," and "formulate the essential interests which [one] and [one's] opponent share and try to cooperate upon this basis." Furthermore, one should not "humiliate or provoke [an] opponent," or "judge [an] opponent harder than [one]self."¹ These proposals are not intended to be taken as legalistic commandments, but rather as general guidelines for action. As such they are very much in accord with an ecological perspective that values richness and diversity wherever they occur, and that practices universal respect based on a recognition that the maximum self-realization of the whole comes through the greatest possible flourishing of all the parts. Furthermore, while the rules may have been formulated with "opponents" such as corporations, governmental bodies, and antiecological interest groups in mind, they may very usefully be applied to recent debates between proponents of such contending ecological viewpoints as deep ecology, social ecology, and ecofeminism.

It may seem strange to conceive of those who espouse various ecological perspectives and who seek to overcome ecological crisis as "opponents" of one another. Indeed, many ecophilosophers were in fact surprised when they first

Furthermore, deep ecologists can consistently support a social ecological perspective, and I would argue that the most basic principles of the movement point toward the need for developing such an approach (as is already being done in some cases). In fact, according to Alan Drengson, "Arne Naess says that he is a supporter of the ecofeminist, social ecology, social justice, bioregional, and peace movements."²⁴ While Naess does not always make such support explicit in his discussion of such movements, there is nothing in his thought that contradicts such a position. In addition, he makes certain statements which imply that social institutional principles can be rooted in the deep ecology platform itself.

A/T Social ecology

Social ecology is anthropocentric and does not solve exploitation of nature

Green Web, March 15, 1998 [“Left Biocentrism Primer,
<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/lbprimer.htm>”]

8. Social ecology, eco-feminism and eco-marxism, while raising important questions, are all human-centered and consider human-to-human relations within society to be more important and, in the final analysis, determine society's relationship to the natural world. Left biocentrism believes that an egalitarian, non-sexist, non-discriminating society, a highly desirable goal, can still be exploitative towards the Earth.

Social ecology is wrong – empirically, hierachal societies can live in harmony with nature

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000
[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

Bookchin, who is the dominant social ecology theorist, believes that an anarchist society is a “precondition” for a society based on ecological principles. This view is itself derived from a more fundamental position of Bookchin that: “...the very concept of dominating nature stems from the domination of human by human...” (22) For deep ecology supporters however, humans do not have an ontological privileged status as evolutionary stewards. They are not, as Bookchin claims, “nature rendered self-conscious.” (23) The social ecology bottom line implies that ultimately social issues come first. As Robyn Eckersley points out, some hierarchical societies, such as feudalism, some monastic communities, and some preliterate societies, lived in relative harmony with the natural world. Also, as the *Left Biocentrism Primer* notes, the ecological crisis cannot claim social hierarchy as its ultimate cause: “Left biocentrism believes that an egalitarian, non-sexist, non-discriminating society, a highly desirable goal, can still be exploitative towards the Earth.” (24)

A/T Social ecology

Social ecology is wrong – eliminating hierarchy does not solve environmental problems

Michael E. Zimmerman is Professor of Philosophy at Tulane University, Summer 1989 [Global Climate Change (IC#22), ‘An Interview with Michael Zimmerman’] <murray>

Deep ecologists concede that patriarchy has been responsible for a lot of violence against women and nature. But while they oppose the oppression of women and promote egalitarian social relations, deep ecologists also warn that getting rid of patriarchy would not necessarily cure the problem, because you can imagine a society with fairly egalitarian social relationships where nature is still used instrumentally.

Alan: *And then there's a third big player on the scene, "social ecology," with its own critique of deep ecology.*

Michael: Right. According to social ecologist Murray Bookchin, deep ecology fails to see that the problem of the environmental crisis is directly linked to authoritarianism and hierarchy. Bookchin says *those* are the real problems, and they're expressed both socially and environmentally.

Alan: *So social ecologists see things like homelessness as being caused by the same mechanisms that cause rainforest devastation?*

Michael: Also racism, sexism, third world exploitation, mistreatment of other marginalized groups - they're all phenomena on the same spectrum. By supposedly not recognizing the social roots of the environmental crisis, deep ecologists invite themselves to be accused of nature mysticism. Social ecologists say we need to change our social structure, and that the elimination of authoritarianism and hierarchy in human society will end the environmental crisis.

Deep ecologists say there's no certainty that would happen. Again, you can imagine a case where social hierarchy is eliminated and yet the new egalitarian society dominates nature just as badly. The problem is that anthropocentrism can take on different forms.

A/T Ecofeminism

Ecofeminism is counterproductive since it essentializes gender roles, thereby perpetuating patriarchy

Patrick Curry, BA in psychology, -September 3, 2001

(University of California at Santa Cruz, The Campaign for Political Ecology) <Murray>

Ecofeminism is difficult to characterise, as it includes some major disagreements, or at least different emphases (which is not necessarily a weakness). They share a perception of the fundamental - if not, I think, necessarily always dominant - role of patriarchy in the exploitation of both women and nature; but positing an essential or necessary connection between the latter two (as is held by some ecofeminists, on either mystical or biological grounds) is problematic, for two reasons. First, that is the very argument long used by male chauvinists to justify dominating women; and second, by merely inverting the dominant values attached to male/female essentialism, it preserves the same destructive logic, when the point is to subvert it. The trick is to maintain that women are closer to nature - and therefore best-placed to lead its "liberation" - without subscribing to an essentialist determinism which would, for example, deny men the ability to change their ways or share in such a process. Analogous to human beings as a whole in relation to nature, women's experience and insights are best understood as special or even unique without being therefore superior. That experience/insight includes reasserting, against modernist abstract universalism, the profound value of life as embodied, situated and engaged, local and particular; and, against a hypertrophic rationalism, the value of intuition and what cannot be calculated, economically or otherwise.³⁸

Anthropocentrism is benign

It's impossible to reject all anthropocentrism – we can reject human destruction of the biosphere while still endorsing benign anthropocentrism

William Grey, prof at univ of queensland, *Ethics and the Environment*, Vol. 3, No. 1 Spring 1998, pp. 97-103 [Environmental Value and Anthropocentrism] <murray>

It is common among those urging a healthy respect for nature to react against every sign of anthropocentrism. I hope, however, that the foregoing suggests why we cannot reject all anthropocentrism as unhealthy. Yes, we should recognize how human ways of thinking can destroy the biosphere. But this is already to grant the decisive importance of our ways of thinking. Our task is to gain, among other things, a sounder thinking, a truer thinking, and to bring this responsibly to bear upon the earth.

Every species has its distinctive place within the natural order, and we have ours. Why should we not speak of it? How can we urge earth-responsibility upon our fellows without granting them the full gravity of their responsibility? If the raccoon must be true to its own nature -- if it must be raccoon-centric -- then surely we must be properly anthropocentric and true to our nature (Talbott 2002).

A/T anthro → social exploitation

The idea that combating anthropocentrism breaks down forms of social domination in human society is wrong and breeds complicity that makes solving oppression harder

Patrick Curry, BA in psychology, -September 3, 2001
(University of California at Santa Cruz, The Campaign for Political Ecology) <Murray>

There is an important political and strategic dimension to this issue, because there is a dangerously naïve version of ecocentric inclusiveness which is actually quite common. It consists of maintaining that the "liberation" of nature (a highly patronising idea, by the way) not only can and must proceed together with that of other oppressed classes, such as women and the poor, but that it necessarily does. Obscuring in this way the real conflicts and hard choices that do sometimes occur between what are at least perceived as humans' and nature's interests only makes it harder to evaluate and act on them. (One example, as I write: the question of banning DDT on environmental grounds, jeopardizing the eradication of malaria in the Third World.) This is true even within the broad movement to protect the non-human world: clashes between proponents of animal liberation/ rights (about individual animals) and ecologists/environmentalists (about species and/or ecosystems) are all too common.¹⁸ Alliances between different progressive and emancipatory movements do not come ready-made; the hard work of forging them is unavoidable. And it should be added that in some, perhaps many situations, an appeal to anthropocentric self-interest may be an unavoidable part of the argument for an ecocentric outcome.

Alt doesn't solve

Abandoning anthropocentrism forecloses the possibility of an environmental ethic emerging

Jon C. Williams, philosopher, May 12, 2001 [Examining Anthropocentric Foundations for Strong Environmental Ethics: A Reply to Onora O'Neill, http://ambient.2y.net/jon/philo/third_draft_1.html] <Murray>

However, abandoning the anthropocentric viewpoint over its perceived weaknesses leaves strong environmental ethics in a rather difficult spot. On the one hand, anthropocentrists have a wealth of philosophical support from which to draw. Most moral philosophy holds that humans are members of the moral community and the source of values which ought to be respected. Human persons are moral agents who possess rights and are owed obligations by other moral agents.

Philosophy is useless because it's inaccessible to anyone outside academic circles

Michael E. Zimmerman is Professor of Philosophy at Tulane University, Summer 1989 [Global Climate Change (IC#22), ‘An Interview with Michael Zimmerman] <murray>

Alan: *How do these kinds of developments in philosophy and other academic disciplines filter their way out into actual social change?*

Michael: That's a very good question, and it's an unfortunate response I have to give. I think that philosophy has made itself socially useless. No one cares what philosophers say. Now, that wasn't true before World War II. Dewey and other American pragmatists had an enormous impact on American education and social reflection. But after the war philosophers, with their interest in analytic philosophy and epistemology, made their questions and their research not relevant to the larger public. They engaged in much less reflection upon the categories and presuppositions of culture, and their reflection became so rarefied that they just took themselves out of the ball game.

Alt
~~Deep ecology doesn't solve~~

Deep ecology cannot cause social change

Milbrath, 1984 [Professor at the Environmental Studies Center, "Environmentalists: Vanguard for a New Society"] <Murray>

The "deep ecologists" are immersed in nature emotionally and philosophically. While many "reform environmentalists" have these same deep feelings those singled out here as deep ecologists typically are not very involved in politics and political reform. Many of them live in counter-culture communities that are close to nature and minimally

disturb the biosphere as they interact with nature to provide their life needs; in this sense they are both radical and conservative. Although society may eventually learn important lessons from the experiences of these people in their new communities, they do not constitute a strong force for near-term social change.

/ 25 - 26

|||

Alternative = mysticism

Deep ecology is based on irrational mysticism

Robin Attfield, professor of philosophy at University of Whales, 1999 ["The Ethics of the Global Environment"]

rationality There is then, given this point and the annular model, no need to opt for the position of Leopold¹⁶ as the only alternative to human (or animal) chauvinism, that is, for a position which simply transfers to natural items the full set of rights and obligations applicable to humans, leading to such nonsignificance as that rocks have obligations to mountains. Distinctions between the moral constraints appropriate to different types of items can be recognized without leading back to human chauvinism. The point is an important one since many objections to allowing moral obligations to extend beyond the sphere of humans, or in some cases the sphere of sentient creatures, depend on ignoring such distinctions, on assuming that it is a question of transferring the full set of rights and obligations appropriate to intelligent social creatures to such items as trees and rivers—that the alternative to chauvinism is therefore an irrational and mystical animism concerning nature.¹⁷

c/b of deep eco

Perm solvency

Perm solves – we must be willing to put aside differences in philosophy to rally behind our common cause of preventing ecological collapse

Sandy Irvine, Published by the *Campaign for Political Ecology*, 1996
[<http://eco.gn.apc.org/resguide/index.html>] <murray>

The building of a more sustainable society will depend, in part, upon the creation of an independent, ecologically based political party, contesting positions of power and influence in society. At present, however, the most urgent task is to rally together people who share the same perspectives and lay the foundations for that longer term goal. The need now is for a tight organisation with a really coherent and forceful message.

Ecopolitics is not about sectarianism. People committed to the ecological vision must be willing to work with individuals from other parties as well as other organisations. It is foolish to be dogmatically committed to any specific organisational strategy since there are so many uncertainties in the present political situation. The key consideration is to keep options open and build upon the latent support in many sections of society for a more conserving and caring way of life.

Perm solvency

The permutation is key to build solidarity in the environmental movement solves ecological destruction

David Orton, Deep ecologist and philosopher, February 2000
[<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Ecofascism.html>, A Left Biocentric Analysis] <murray>

My own overall interest, as well as participating in ongoing theoretical and philosophical discussions with others and within the deep ecology movement for purposes of clarification, is to help outline an Earth-centered theory of social change within a contracting economy. Such a theory - various names have been floated but I am working with "left biocentrism", has to be based in deep ecology but this is only an important starting point. For building a mass revolutionary movement to replace the environmental and social destruction of industrial capitalist society, a comprehensive theoretical framework is needed. So building unity within the ranks of left biocentrists, the main concern of this bulletin, is also important because of this larger task. In a hostile corporate world, a theory has to present alternative ecological, social, political and economic views. There is much work for all to do.

Perm solvency (tech specific)

The permutation solves best – we should endorse beneficial uses of technology while rejecting harmful ones in order to increase public support for ecological protection and to prevent extinction

The Campaign for Political Ecology, Spring, 1997 [“An Ecologically Rational Approach to Technology”, <http://eco.gn.apc.org/eview/ev12supp.html>] <Murray>

Ecological sustainability is a prerequisite for human life to continue; since prehistory, technology of one kind or another has been an integral part of this existence. Any reasonable approach to politics and to ordering the affairs of human communities must recognise these realities, both the constraint imposed by the need for sustainability and the fact that wherever there is human life there will also be technology. We should all accept that some technologies bring considerable benefits without significant ecological harm. On the other hand, the ecological outcomes of many technologies are at best undesirable and potentially catastrophic. Many, if not the majority of cases, however, lie in the grey area of sometimes/maybe good, sometimes/maybe bad.

Unfortunately, the issues have become polarised and emotional. There is a perception of two groups, that of pro- consumption, pro-development, pro-technology on the one hand and the anti- technology ecological group on the other. We desperately need to dissolve this image if we are to be able to progress towards a sustainable future. Very few ecologically motivated people would really be prepared to do without any technology and return to pre-Palaeolithic lifestyles. In any case their survival rate would be minimal and their cause would not be advanced by their own extinction. On the other hand, very few ordinary people, including those working in technological areas, really want their work to lead to the destruction of life on Earth.

The public, even its most ecological members, are consumers. Ultimately it is our purchasing power that causes goods to be sold. Manufacture cannot continue indefinitely without it. We need to be more aware of the environmental impact of our purchases, not just of the final product but of all the steps in the manufacturing chain.

Equally, we need to be objective in our criticism of specific technologies. We should be wary of condemning whole groups of technologies out of hand just because some sub- sets of them are ecologically unsound. At the same time we should continue to review technology that is generally accepted in order to worry out any hidden dangers and to minimise the environmental impact caused.

A/T Tech bad link

A critique of technology inevitably leads to extinction of all life – we need to use technology to repair the damage we've already done

Michael E. Zimmerman is Professor of Philosophy at Tulane University, Summer 1989 [Global Climate Change (IC#22), ‘An Interview with Michael Zimmerman’ <murray>

Alan: A critique I hear often is that deep ecologists want to return to a way of life that's totally tied to the rhythms of the Earth, but at this point we have so disturbed those rhythms that we can't even consider going back. To retreat to a pre-technological state would in fact be dooming the Earth to destruction, whereas what we need now is to be more engaged in trying to repair the damage. How would a deep ecologist respond?

Michael: I think deep ecologists have mixed emotions about that, but I would agree with that critique. For example, if we stopped our development at the current level, it would be a catastrophe, because our production methods are so dirty and inefficient and destructive that if we keep this up, we're really in trouble.

Some deep ecologists say that it would be all for the best if the industrial world were just to collapse, despite all the human suffering that would entail. If such a thing ever occurs, some people have suggested, we could never revive industrialization again because the raw materials are no longer easily accessible. I hope that *doesn't* happen, and yet it *may* happen.

Now, social ecologists say that deep ecologists flirt with fascism when they talk about returning to an "organic" social system that is "attuned to nature." They note that reactionary thinkers often contrast the supposedly "natural" way of life - which to them means social Darwinism and authoritarian social systems - with "modernity," which in political terms means progressive social movements like liberalism and Marxism. But deep ecologists recognize this danger. They call not for a regression to collective authoritarianism, but for the *evolution* of a mode of awareness that doesn't lend itself to authoritarianism of any kind.

So I think the only thing we can do is to move forward. We need to develop our efficiency and production methods so that we'll be able to take some of the pressure off the environment. We also need to develop increasing wealth for the highly populated countries so their populations will go down. [Ed. Note: See Lappé and Schurman, "The Population Puzzle," in IC #21.]

There's a necessity for new technology. The question is, can it be made consistent with our growing awareness that the planet is really hurting?

Tech key to environment

Technology is necessary to combat problems caused by overpopulation

The Campaign for Political Ecology, Spring, 1997 [“An Ecologically Rational Approach to Technology”, <http://eco.gn.apc.org/eview/ev12supp.html>] <Murray>

ECO has been drawing attention to the critical issue of carrying capacity and environmental impact summarised by the equation: $I = P \times C \times T$ (environmental Impact = numbers in Population x per-capita Consumption x inefficiency of Technology). To achieve a sustainable balance Impact must be brought within the limits of local and global carrying capacity. We have already and repeatedly stressed the importance of restraint both of population numbers and per-capita consumption. As we approach the Millennium, it is appropriate and urgent to integrate Technology fully into the discussion in order to meet the unprecedented ecological challenges of the twenty-first century.