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#### A. Links

#### 1. In the face of an accelerating ecological crisis, the aff has decided to advocate a strategy of expansionism – increasing infrastructure over the natural world for the sole purpose of human interest. This ignores the importance of environmental ethics and is violently anthropocentric.

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

 Three most significant and pressing factors contributing to the environmental crisis are the ever increasing human population, the energy crisis, and the abuse and pollution of the earth’s natural systems. These and other factors contributing to the environmental crisis can be directly linked to anthropocentric views of the world. The perception that value is located in, and emanates from, humanity has resulted in understanding human life as an ultimate value, superior to all other beings. This has driven innovators in medicine and technology to ever improve our medical and material conditions, in an attempt to preserve human life, resulting in more people being born and living longer. In achieving this aim, they have indirectly contributed to increasing the human population. Perceptions of superiority, coupled with developing technologies have resulted in a social outlook that generally does not rest content with the basic necessities of life. Demands for more medical and social aid, more entertainment and more comfort translate into demands for improved standards of living. Increasing population numbers, together with the material demands of modern society, place ever increasing demands on energy supplies. While wanting a better life is not a bad thing, given the population explosion the current energy crisis is inevitable, which brings a whole host of environmental implications in tow. This is not to say that every improvement in the standard of living is necessarily wasteful of energy or polluting to the planet, but rather it is the cumulative effect of these improvements that is damaging to the environment. The abuses facing the natural environment as a result of the energy crisis and the food demand are clearly manifestations of anthropocentric views that treat the environment as a resource and instrument for human ends. The pollution and destruction of the non-human natural world is deemed acceptable, provided that it does not interfere with other human beings. It could be argued that there is nothing essentially wrong with anthropocentric assumptions, since it is natural, even instinctual, to favour one’s self and species over and above all other forms of life. However, it is problematic in that such perceptions influence our actions and dealings with the world to the extent that the well-being of life on this planet is threatened, making the continuance of a huge proportion of existing life forms "tenuous if not improbable" (Elliot 1995: 1). Denying the non-human world ethical consideration, it is evident that anthropocentric assumptions provide a rationale for the exploitation of the natural world and, therefore, have been largely responsible for the present environmental crisis (Des Jardins 1997: 93). Fox identifies three broad approaches to the environment informed by anthropocentric assumptions, which in reality are not distinct and separate, but occur in a variety of combinations. The "expansionist" approach is characterised by the recognition that nature has a purely instrumental value to humans. This value is accessed through the physical transformation of the non-human natural world, by farming, mining, damming etc. Such practices create an economic value, which tends to "equate the physical transformation of ‘resources’ with economic growth" (Fox 1990: 152). Legitimising continuous expansion and exploitation, this approach relies on the idea that there is an unending supply of resources. The "conservationist" approach, like the first, recognises the economic value of natural resources through their physical transformation, while at the same time accepting the fact that there are limits to these resources. It therefore emphasises the importance of conserving natural resources, while prioritising the importance of developing the non-human natural world in the quest for financial gain. The "preservationist" approach differs from the first two in that it recognises the enjoyment and aesthetic enrichment human beings receive from an undisturbed natural world. Focusing on the psychical nourishment value of the non-human natural world for humans, this approach stresses the importance of preserving resources in their natural states. All three approaches are informed by anthropocentric assumptions. This results in a one-sided understanding of the human-nature relationship. Nature is understood to have a singular role of serving humanity, while humanity is understood to have no obligations toward nature. Such a perception represents "not only a deluded but also a very dangerous orientation to the world" (Fox 1990: 13), as only the lives of human beings are recognised to have direct moral worth, while the moral consideration of non-human entities is entirely contingent upon the interests of human beings (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 9). Humanity is favoured as inherently valuable, while the non-human natural world counts only in terms of its use value to human beings. The "expansionist" and "conservationist" approaches recognise an economic value, while the "preservationist" approach recognises a hedonistic, aesthetic or spiritual value. They accept, without challenge, the assumption that the value of the non-human natural world is entirely dependent on human needs and interests. None attempt to move beyond the assumption that nature has any worth other than the value humans can derive from it, let alone search for a deeper value in nature. This ensures that human duties retain a purely human focus, thereby avoiding the possibility that humans may have duties that extend to non-humans. This can lead to viewing the non-human world, devoid of direct moral consideration, as a mere resource with a purely instrumental value of servitude. This gives rise to a principle of ‘total use’, whereby every natural area is seen for its potential cultivation value, to be used for human ends (Zimmerman 1998: 19). This provides limited means to criticise the behaviour of those who use nature purely as a warehouse of resources (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 184). It is clear that humanity has the capacity to transform and degrade the environment. Given the consequences inherent in having such capacities, "the need for a coherent, comprehensive, rationally persuasive environmental ethic is imperative" (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 2). The purpose of an environmental ethic would be to account for the moral relations that exist between humans and the environment, and to provide a rational basis from which to decide how we ought and ought not to treat the environment. The environment was defined as the world in which we are enveloped and immersed, constituted by both animate and inanimate objects. This includes both individual living creatures, such as plants and animals, as well as non-living, non-individual entities, such as rivers and oceans, forests and velds, essentially, the whole planet Earth. This constitutes a vast and all-inclusive sphere, and, for purposes of clarity, shall be referred to as the "greater environment". In order to account for the moral relations that exist between humans and the greater environment, an environmental ethic should have a significantly wide range of focus. I argue that anthropocentric value systems are not suitable to the task of developing a comprehensive environmental ethic. Firstly, anthropocentric assumptions have been shown to be largely responsible for the current environmental crisis. While this in itself does not provide strong support for the claim, it does cast a dim light on any theory that is informed by such assumptions. Secondly, an environmental ethic requires a significantly wide range of focus. As such, it should consider the interests of a wide range of beings. It has been shown that anthropocentric approaches do not entertain the notion that non-human entities can have interests independent of human interests. "Expansionist", "conservationist" and "preservationist" approaches only acknowledge a value in nature that is determined by the needs and interests of humans. Thirdly, because anthropocentric approaches provide a moral account for the interests of humans alone, while excluding non-humans from direct moral consideration, they are not sufficiently encompassing. An environmental ethic needs to be suitably encompassing to ensure that a moral account is provided for all entities that constitute the environment. It could be argued that the indirect moral concern for the environment arising out of an anthropocentric approach is sufficient to ensure the protection of the greater environment. In response, only those entities that are in the interest of humans will be morally considered, albeit indirectly, while those entities which fall outside of this realm will be seen to be morally irrelevant. Assuming that there are more entities on this planet that are not in the interest of humans than entities that are, it is safe to say that anthropocentric approaches are not adequately encompassing. Fourthly, the goals of an environmental ethic should protect and maintain the greater environment. It is clear that the expansionist approach, which is primarily concerned with the transformation of nature for economic return, does not meet these goals. Similarly, neither does the conservationist approach, which is arguably the same as the expansionist approach. The preservationist approach does, in principle satisfy this requirement. However, this is problematic for such preservation is based upon the needs and interests of humans, and "as human interests and needs change, so too would human uses for the environment" (Des Jardins 1997: 129). Non-human entities, held captive by the needs and interests of humans, are open to whatever fancies the interests of humans. In light of the above, it is my contention that anthropocentric value systems fail to provide a stable ground for the development of an environmental ethic.

#### 2. The plan frames transportation infrastructure anthropocentrically – they only care about efficiency, growth for humans, and the direct effects on the region. They ignore the indirect effects on the entire ecosystem.

Bennett, ‘11 (Victoria J. Bennett is a postdoctoral research associate, Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society, Oregon State University, “Toward Understanding the Ecological Impact of Transportation Corridors,” [www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw\_gtr846.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw_gtr846.pdf))

Transportation corridors (notably roads) affect wildlife habitat, populations, and entire ecosystems. Considerable effort has been expended to quantify direct effects of roads on wildlife populations and ecological communities and processes. Much less effort has been expended toward quantifying indirect effects. In this report, we provide a comprehensive review of road/transportation corridor ecology; in par- ticular, how this new field of ecology has advanced worldwide. Further, we discuss how research thus far has shaped our understanding and views of the ecological implications of transportation infrastructures, and, in turn, how this has led to the current guidance, policies, and management options. We learned that the impacts of transportation infrastructures are a global issue, with the potential to affect a wide variety of taxonomically diverse species and ecosystems. Because the majority of research to date has focused on the direct and more aesthetic and anthropocentric implications of transportation corridors, mainly wildlife-vehicle collisions, it is a fairly standard practice to incorporate underpasses, green bridges (i.e., overpasses), fencing, and barriers into road corridors to alleviate such impacts. Few studies, however, have been able to demonstrate the efficiency of these structures. Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly evident that the indirect implications of transportation infrastructures (i.e., behavioral responses of wildlife individuals to roads) may be more pervasive, at least from the standpoint of biological diversity. Under- standing how road corridors influence the functional connectivity of landscapes is crucial if we are to effectively manage species of concern. With these issues in mind, we propose a program of study that addresses the indirect and cumulative implications of transportation infrastructure on species distributions, community structure and ecosystem function.

#### B. Impact: Anthropocentrism not only culminates in extinction, it alienates us from nature, destroying value to life.

Roger S. Gottlieb, professor of humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 1994, “ETHICS AND TRAUMA: LEVINAS, FEMINISM, AND DEEP ECOLOGY”, http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm

Perhaps there is in progress another, even more encompassing Death Event, which can be the historical condition for an ethic of compassion and care. I speak of the specter of ecocide, the continuing destruction of species and ecosystems, and the growing threat to the basic conditions essential to human life. What kind of ethic is adequate to this brutally new and potentially most unforgiving of crises? How can we respond to *this* trauma with an ethic which demands a response, and does not remain marginalized? Here I will at least begin in agreement with Levinas. As he rejects an ethics proceeding on the basis of self-interest, so I believe the anthropocentric perspectives of conservation or liberal environmentalism cannot take us far enough. Our relations with nonhuman nature are poisoned and not just because we have set up feedback loops that already lead to mass starvations, skyrocketing environmental disease rates, and devastation of natural resources. The problem with ecocide is not just that it hurts human beings. Our uncaring violence also violates the very ground of our being, our natural body, our home. Such violence is done not simply to the other -- as if the rainforest, the river, the atmosphere, the species made extinct are totally different from ourselves. Rather, we have crucified ourselves-in-relation-to-the-other, fracturing a mode of being in which self and other can no more be conceived as fully in isolation from each other than can a mother and a nursing child. We are that child, and nonhuman nature is that mother. If this image seems too maudlin, let us remember that other lactating women can feed an infant, but we have only one earth mother.

#### C. The alternative is to embrace a non-anthropocentric ethic.

#### This does not cede the political, but it does entail rejection of the affirmative’s human-centered justifications and framing.

Eric Katz and Lauren Oechsli, 1993 (Members of the Science, Technology, and Society Program,, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark. Katz is currently Vice President of the International Society for Environmental Ethics , “Moving beyond Anthropocentrism: Environmental Ethics, Development, and the Amazon”, <http://www.umweltethik.at/download.php?id=392>.)

Can an environmentalist defend a policy of preservation in the Amazon rain forest without violating a basic sense of justice? We believe that the mistake is not the policy of preservation itself, but the anthropocentric instrumental framework in which it is justified. Environmental policy decisions should not merely concern the trade-off and comparison of various human benefits. If environmentalists claim that the Third World must preserve its environment because of the overall benefits for humanity, then decision makers in the Third World can demand justice in the determination of preservation policy: preservationist policies unfairly damage the human interests of the local populations. If preservationist policies are to be justified without a loss of equity, there are only two possible alternatives: either we in the industrialized world must pay for the benefits we will gain from preservation or we must reject the anthropocentric and instrumental framework for policy decisions. The first alternative is an empirical political issue, and one about which we are not overly optimistic. The second alternative represents a shift in philosophical world view. We are not providing a direct argument for a nonanthropocentric value system as the basis of environmental policy. Rather, our strategy is indirect. Let us assume that a theory of normative ethics which includes nonhuman natural value has been justified. In such a situation, the human community, in addition to its traditional human-centered obligations, would also have moral obligations to nature or to the natural environment in itself. One of these obligations would involve the urgent necessity for environmental preservation. We would be obligated, for example, to the Amazon rain forest directly. We would preserve the rain forest, not for the human benefits resulting from this preservation, but because we have an obligation of preservation to nature and its ecosystems. Our duties would be directed to nature and its inhabitants and environments, not merely to humans and human institutions. From this perspective, questions of the trade-off and comparison of human benefits, and questions of justice for specific human populations, do not dominate the discussion. This change of emphasis can be illustrated by an exclusively human example. Consider two businessmen, Smith and Jones, who are arguing over the proper distribution of the benefits and costs resulting from a prior business agreement between them. If we just focus on Smith and Jones and the issues concerning them, we will want to look at the contract, the relevant legal precedents, and the actual results of the deal, before rendering a decision. But suppose we learn that the agreement involved the planned murder of a third party, Green, and the resulting distribution of his property. At that point the issues between Smith and Jones cease to be relevant; we no longer consider who has claims to Green’s wallet, overcoat, or BMW to be important. The competing claims become insignificant in light of the obligations owed to Green. This case is analogous to our view of the moral obligations owed to the rain forest. As soon as we realize that the rain forest itself is relevant to the conflict of competing goods, we see that there is not a simple dilemma between Third World develop- ment, on the one hand, and preservation of rain forests, on the other; there is now, in addition, the moral obligation to nature and its ecosystems. When the nonanthropocentric framework is introduced, it creates a more complex situation for deliberation and resolution. It complicates the already detailed discussions of human trade-offs, high-tech transfers, aid programs, debt- for-nature swaps, sustainable development, etc., with a consideration of the moral obligations to nonhuman nature. This complication may appear counterproduc- tive, but as in the case of Smith, Jones, and Green, it actually serves to simplify the decision. Just as a concern for Green made the contract dispute between Smith and Jones irrelevant, the obligation to the rain forest makes many of the issues about trade-offs of human goods irrelevant.12 It is, of course, unfortunate that this direct obligation to the rain forest can only be met with a cost in human satisfaction—some human interests will not be fulfilled. Nevertheless, the same can be said of all ethical decisions, or so Kant teaches us: we are only assuredly moral when we act against our inclinations. To summarize, the historical forces of economic imperialism have created a harsh dilemma for environmentalists who consider nature preservation in the Third World to be necessary. Nevertheless, environmentalists can escape the dilemma, as exemplified in the debate over the development of the Amazon rain forest, if they reject the axiological and normative framework of anthropocentric instrumental rationality. A set of obligations directed to nature in its own right makes many questions of human benefits and satisfactions irrelevant. The Amazon rain forest ought to be preserved regardless of the benefits or costs to human beings. Once we move beyond the confines of human-based instrumental goods, the environmentalist position is thereby justified, and no policy dilemma is created. This conclusion serves as an indirect justification of a nonanthropocen- tric system of normative ethics, avoiding problems in environmental policy that a human-based ethic cannot.13

## LINKS

### L – Transportation Infrastructure

#### Transportation investment is incompatible with ecology – New infrastructure dooms our climate, soil quality, biodiversity, land use and countless other indirect effects on the Earth’s ecological system.

Dr. Rodrigue, ‘9 (J-P, “The Geography of Transport Systems,” Hofstra University, Department of Global Studies & Geography, <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans>.

The issue of transportation and the environment is paradoxical in nature. From one side, transportation activities support increasing mobility demands for passengers and freight, and this ranging from urban areas to international trade. On the other side, transport activities have resulted in growing levels of motorization and congestion. As a result, the transportation sector is becoming increasingly linked to environmental problems. With a technology relying heavily on the combustion of hydrocarbons, notably with the internal combustion engine, the impacts of transportation over environmental systems has increased with motorization. This has reached a point where transportation activities are a dominant factor behind the emission of most pollutants and thus their impacts on the environment. These impacts, like all environmental impacts, can fall within three categories: Direct impacts. The immediate consequence of transport activities on the environment where the cause and effect relationship is generally clear and well understood. Indirect impacts. The secondary (or tertiary) effects of transport activities on environmental systems. They are often of higher consequence than direct impacts, but the involved relationships are often misunderstood and difficult to establish. Cumulative impacts. The additive, multiplicative or synergetic consequences of transport activities. They take into account of the varied effects of direct and indirect impacts on an ecosystem, which are often unpredicted. The complexities of the problems have led to much controversy in environmental policy and in the role of transportation. The transportation sector is often subsidized by the public sector, especially through the construction and maintenance of road infrastructure which tend to be free of access. Sometimes, public stakes in transport modes, terminals and infrastructure can be at odd with environmental issues. If the owner and the regulator are the same (different branches of the government), then there is a risk that regulations will not be effectively complied to. It can also lead to another extreme where compliance would lead to inefficient transport systems, but which costs are subsidized. Total costs incurred by transportation activities, notably environmental damage, are generally not fully assumed by the users. The lack of consideration of the real costs of transportation could explain several environmental problems. Yet, a complex hierarchy of costs is involved, ranging from internal (mostly operations), compliance (abiding to regulations), contingent (risk of an event such as a spill) to external (assumed by the society). For instance, external costs account on average for more than 30% of the estimated automobile costs. If environmental costs are not included in this appraisal, the usage of the car is consequently subsidized by the society and costs accumulate as environmental pollution. This requires due consideration as the number of vehicles, especially automobiles, is steadily increasing.

#### Transportation Infrastructure fragments ecological spaces and destroys non-human animals.

Folkeson , ‘6 (Lennart, “Habitat fragmentation due to transportation infrastructure,” VTI Report 530A, www.vti.se/publications)

The physical presence of roads and railways in the landscape creates new habitat edges, alters hydrological dynamics, and disrupts natural processes and habitats. Maintenance and operational activities contaminate the surrounding environment with a variety of chemical pollutants and noise. In addition, infrastructure and traffic impose movement barriers to most terrestrial animals and cause the death of millions of individual animals per year. The various biotic and abiotic impacts operate in a synergetic way locally as well as at a broader scale. Transportation infrastructure causes not only the loss and isolation of wildlife habitat, but leads to a fragmentation of the landscape in a literal sense. An increasing body of evidence relating to the direct and indirect ecological effects of transportation infrastructure on nature includes the comprehensive reviews of Van der Zande et al. (1980); Ellenberg et al. (1981); Andrews (1990); Bennett (1991); Reck and Kaule (1993); Forman (1995); Spellerberg (1998); Forman and Alexander (1998); and Trombulak and Frissell (2000). Impressive, empirical data has also been presented in the proceedings of various symposia (e.g. Bernard et al. 1987; Canters et al. 1997; Pierre-LePense and Carsignol 1999; Evink et al. 1996, 1998 and 1999; and Huijser et al. 1999). Bibliographies on the topic have been compiled by Jalkotzky et al. (1997), Clevenger (1998), Glitzner et al. (1999), and Holzgang et al. (2000). Readers are encourages to consult these complementary sources for further information on the topics discussed in brief below. 3.1 Primary ecological effects Most empirical data on the effects of infrastructure on wildlife refers to primary effects measured at a local scale. Primary ecological effects are caused by the physical presence of the infrastructure link and its traffic. Five major categories of primary effects can be distinguished (Figure 3.1; see also: Van der Zande et al. (1980); Bennett (1991); Forman (1995)): ␣Habitat loss is an inevitable consequence of infrastructure construction. Besides the physical occupation of land, disturbance and barrier effects in the wider environment further decrease the amount of habitat that is suitable or available for wildlife. ␣Disturbance/Edge effects result from pollution of the physical, chemical and biological environment as a result of infrastructure construction and operation. Toxins and noise affect a much wider zone than that which is physically occupied. ␣Mortality levels associated with traffic are steadily rising (millions of individuals are killed on infrastructure each year in Europe) but for most common species, traffic mortality is not considered as a severe threat to population survival. Collisions between vehicles and wildlife are also an important traffic safety issue, and attract wider public interest for this reason. ␣Barrier effects are experienced by most terrestrial animals. Infrastructure restricts the animals’ range, makes habitats inaccessible and can lead to isolation of the population. ␣Corridor habitats along infrastructure can be seen as either positive (in already heavily transformed low diversity landscapes) or negative (in natural well conserved landscapes where the invasion of non native, sometimes pest species, can be facilitated).

#### “Green infrastructure” just moves the environmental impact somewhere else – turn the case.

Dr. Rodrigue, ‘9 (J-P, “The Geography of Transport Systems,” Hofstra University, Department of Global Studies & Geography, <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans>.

The main environmental dimensions of transportation are related to the causes, the activities, the outputs and the results of transport systems. Establishing linkages between these dimensions is a difficult undertaking. For instance, to what extent carbon monoxide emissions are linked to land use patterns? Furthermore, transportation is imbedded in environmental cycles, notably over the carbon cycle. The relationships between transport and the environment are also complicated by two observations: First, transport activities contribute among other anthropogenic and natural causes, directly, indirectly and cumulatively to environmental problems. In some cases, they may be a dominant factor, while in others their role is marginal and difficult to establish. Second, transport activities contribute at different geographical scales to environmental problems, ranging from local (noise and CO emissions) to global (climate change?), not forgetting continental / national / regional problems (smog and acid rain). Establishing environmental policies for transportation thus have to take account of the level of contribution and the geographical scale, otherwise some policies may just move the problems elsewhere and have unintended consequences. A noted example are local / regional policies that have forced the construction of higher chimneys for coal burning facilities (power plants) and induced the continental diffusion of acid rain. Thus, even if an administrative division (municipality, county, state/province) have adequate environmental enforcement policies, the geographical scale of pollutants diffusion (notably air pollutants) obviously goes beyond established jurisdictions. In addition to the environmental impacts of the network, traffic and modes, economic / industrial processes sustaining the transport system most be considered. These include the production of fuels, vehicles and construction materials, some of which are very energy intensive (e.g. aluminum), and the disposal of vehicles, parts and infrastructure. They all have a life cycle timing their production, utilization and disposal. Thus, the evaluation of the transport-environment link without the consideration of cycles in the environment and in the product life alike is likely to convey a limited overview of the situation and may even lead to incorrect appraisal and policies.

### L – Waterways Affs

#### Water transportation is the worst form of infrastructure – it manipulates the hydrological cycles and eradicates marine biodiversity.

Dr. Rodrigue, ‘9 (J-P, “The Geography of Transport Systems,” Hofstra University, Department of Global Studies & Geography, <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans>.

Water quality. Transport activities have an impact on hydrological conditions. Fuel, chemical and other hazardous particulates discarded from aircraft, cars, trucks and trains or from port and airport terminal operations, such as de-icing, can contaminate rivers, lakes, wetlands and oceans. Because demand for shipping services is increasing, marine transport emissions represent the most important segment of water quality inventory of the transportation sector. The main effects of marine transport operations on water quality predominantly arise from dredging, waste, ballast waters and oil spills. Dredging is the process of deepening harbor channels by removing sediments from the bed of a body of water. Dredging is essential to create and maintain sufficient water depth for shipping operations and port accessibility. Dredging activities have a two-fold negative impact on the marine environment. They modify the hydrology by creating turbidity that can affect the marine biological diversity. The contaminated sediments and water raised by dredging require spoil disposal sites and decontamination techniques. Waste generated by the operations of vessels at sea or at ports cause serious environmental problems, since they can contain a very high level of bacteria that can be hazardous for public health as well as marine ecosystems when discharged in waters. Besides, various types of garbage containing metals and plastic are not easily biodegradable. They can persist on the sea surface for long periods of time and can be a serious impediment for maritime navigation in inland waterways and at sea and affecting as well berthing operations. Ballast waters are required to control ship’s stability and draught and to modify their center of gravity in relation to cargo carried and the variance in weight distribution. Ballast waters acquired in a region may contain invasive aquatic species that, when discharged in another region may thrive in a new marine environment and disrupt the natural marine ecosystem. There are about 100 non-indigenous species recorded in the Baltic Sea. Invasive species have resulted in major changes in nearshore ecosystems, especially in coastal lagoons and inlets. Major oil spills from oil cargo vessel accidents are one of the most serious problems of pollution from maritime transport activities.

### L – Economics

#### Prioritizing economics is anthropocentric – stimulus and growth leave no room for intrinsically valuing the environment.

Doyle, ’12 (Jessica Jayne, “Key Concepts and Rationalities in Canada’s Environmental Enforcement Act: Tensions between Environmental Protection and Economic Development,” Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies University of Ottawa, www.ruor.uottawa.ca/fr/handle/10393/22813)

Existing research notes that philosophical anthropocentrism conceptually reinforces the movement towards rational choice methods of environmental governance (Halsey & White, 1998: 32). Both anthropocentrism and risk management only recognize the human- based value of objects because of their focus on the capitalist economic market (Hessing et al, 2005: 20; Snider, 1993: 74-75; White, 2008: 15). The “liberal-ecolog[ical]” and human- centric outlook associated with anthropocentrism and risk management essentially describes the problem of environmental degradation as fixable using market forces (Halsey, 2006: 43). This research project found that neoliberal and risk-based approaches to enforcement are similar because they both rely on environmental regulation to stabilize and control the market (Snider, 1993: 99-100). For instance, Chapter 3 discussed overdeterrence and “undue hardship” to characterize the dominance of rational choice approaches in the content of the EEA. Although the changes in the EEA appear to increase the level of punishment for environmental offences, the additional enforcement tools reflect cost-benefit, utilitarian approaches to environmental offences. The implication is that if risk-based, utilitarian approaches are dominant in the content of the EEA, anthropocentrism is likely to be dominant as well. This research project defined anthropocentrism as the philosophical belief that humans are biologically, mentally, and morally superior to all other living and non-living beings (Halsey & White, 1998: 31). Anthropocentrism was expected to be dominant in the content of the EEA because alternative philosophies involve structural reconsiderations of the capitalist, market-based economy. The central problem that non-anthropocentric philosophies focus on is the lack of emphasis in capitalist economics on the intrinsic value of the environment (O‟Connor, 1994: 125-127). Non-anthropocentric philosophies threaten economic growth because they propose a reconsideration of the unlimited consumption of environmental resources (Snider, 2000: 177-178). This need to reconsider structural concerns means that most alternatives to anthropocentrism must present counter ideologies to problems such as neoliberalism, globalization, risk management and the political economic status quo (Gillespie, 2006; Seis, 1999). The implication is that structural reconsiderations of the capitalist economic structure are unlikely to be reflected in Canadian environmental enforcement legislation, especially considering the historical context of staples-based economic growth (Wellstead, 2008: 20).

#### Aff’s economic rationality causes increased consumerism, which leads to accepting the Earth as disposable, and destruction of resources.

Monbiot, ’10 (George, English writer, known for his environmental and political activism “After this 60-year feeding frenzy, Earth itself has become disposable”, 4 January 2010, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jan/04/standard-of-living-spending-consumerism>)

Who said this? "All the evidence shows that beyond the sort of standard of living which Britain has now achieved, extra growth does not automatically translate into human welfare and happiness." Was it a) the boss of Greenpeace, b) the director of the New Economics Foundation, or c) an anarchist planning the next climate camp? None of the above: d) the former head of the Confederation of British Industry, who currently runs the Financial Services Authority. In an interview broadcast last Friday, Lord Turner brought the consumer society's most subversive observation into the mainstream. In our hearts most of us know it is true, but we live as if it were not**. Progress is measured by the speed at which we destroy the conditions that sustain life.** G**overnments are deemed to succeed or fail by how well they make money go round,** regardless of whether it serves any useful purpose. **They regard it as a sacred duty to encourage the country's most revolting spectacle**: the annual feeding frenzy in which shoppers queue all night, then stampede into the shops, elbow, trample and sometimes fight to be the first to carry off some designer junk which will go into landfill before the sales next year. The madder the orgy, the greater the triumph of economic management. As the Guardian revealed today, the British government is now split over product placement in television programmes: if it implements the policy proposed by Ben Bradshaw, the culture secretary, plots will revolve around chocolates and cheeseburgers, and advertisements will be impossible to filter, perhaps even to detect. Bradshaw must know that this indoctrination won't make us happier, wiser, greener or leaner; but it will make the television companies £140m a year. Though we know they aren't the same, we can't help conflating growth and wellbeing. Last week, for instance, the Guardian carried the headline "UK standard of living drops below 2005 level". But the story had nothing to do with our standard of living. Instead it reported that per capita gross domestic product is lower than it was in 2005. GDP is a measure of economic activity, not standard of living. But the terms are confused so often that journalists now treat them as synonyms. **The low retail sales of previous months were recently described by this paper as "bleak" and "gloomy".** **High sales are always "good news", low sales are always "bad news"**, even if the product on offer is farmyard porn. I believe it's time that the Guardian challenged this biased reporting. **Those who still wish to conflate welfare and GDP argue that high consumption by the wealthy improves the lot of the world's poor**. Perhaps, but it's a very clumsy and inefficient instrument. **After some 60 years of this feast, 800 million people remain permanently hungry.** Full employment is a less likely prospect than it was before the frenzy began. In a new paper published in Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Sir Partha Dasgupta makes the point that **the problem with gross domestic product is the gross bit. There are no deductions involved: all economic activity is accounted as if it were of positive value**. **Social harm is added to, not subtracted from, social good.** A train crash which generates £1bn worth of track repairs, medical bills and funeral costs is deemed by this measure to be as beneficial as an uninterrupted service which generates £1bn in ticket sales. Most important, **no deduction is made to account for the depreciation of natural capital: the overuse or degradation of soil, water, forests, fisheries and the atmosphere**. Dasgupta shows that **the total wealth of a nation can decline even as its GDP is growing**. In Pakistan, for instance, his rough figures suggest that while GDP per capita grew by an average of 2.2% a year between 1970 and 2000, total wealth declined by 1.4%. Amazingly, there are still no official figures that seek to show trends in the actual wealth of nations. You can say all this without fear of punishment or persecution. But in its practical effects, **consumerism is a totalitarian system: it permeates every aspect of our lives**. **Even our dissent from the system is packaged up and sold to us in the form of anti-consumption consumption, like the "I'm not a plastic bag", which was supposed to replace disposable carriers but was mostly used once or twice before it fell out of fashion,** or like the lucrative new books on how to live without money. George Orwell and Aldous Huxley proposed **different totalitarianisms: one sustained by fear, the other in part by greed**. **Huxley's nightmare has come closer to realisation. In the nurseries of the Brave New World**, "the voices were adapting future demand to future industrial supply. 'I do love flying,' they whispered, 'I do love flying**, I do love having new clothes … old clothes are beastly** … We always throw away old clothes. Ending is better than mending, ending is better than mending'". **Underconsumption was considered "positively a crime against society". But there was no need to punish it**. At first the authorities machine-gunned the Simple Lifers who tried to opt out, but that didn't work. Instead they used "**the slower but infinitely surer methods**" of conditioning**: immersing people in advertising slogans from childhood. A totalitarianism driven by greed eventually becomes self-enforced.** Let me give you an example of how far this self-enforcement has progressed. In a recent comment thread, **a poster expressed an idea that I have now heard a few times. "We need to get off this tiny little world and out into the wider universe … if it takes the resources of the planet to get us out there, so be it**. However we use them, however we utilise the energy of the sun and the mineral wealth of this world and the others of our planetary system, either we do use them to expand and explore other worlds, and become something greater than a mud-grubbing semi-sentient animal, or we die as a species." **This is the consumer society taken to its logical extreme: the Earth itself becomes disposable. This idea appears to be more acceptable in some circles than any restraint on pointless spending.** That we might hop, like the aliens in the film Independence Day, from one planet to another, consuming their resources then moving on, is considered by these people a more realistic and desirable prospect than changing the way in which we measure wealth. So how do we break this system? How do we pursue happiness and wellbeing rather than growth? I came back from the Copenhagen climate talks depressed for several reasons, but above all because, listening to the discussions at the citizens' summit, it struck me that we no longer have movements; we have thousands of people each clamouring to have their own visions adopted. **We might come together for occasional rallies and marches, but as soon as we start discussing alternatives, solidarity is shattered by possessive individualism. Consumerism has changed all of us. Our challenge is now to fight a system we have internalised.**

#### Policies focusing on human growth and development detract from environmental progress

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

Fortunately paradigm shifts are occurring within the field. **Classical understandings of the world consisting of "independent particles" are being reassessed and replaced by a more holistic and ecologically informed understanding that all things are inseparable from the greater whole** that is the universe (Pepper 1996:247). In this sense current science can be useful in developing a more encompassing understanding of the environment. **We should**, however, **be wary of placing scientists in an authoritative position in the decision making process.** Another commonly accepted option for dealing with the crisis at hand is that of **environmental policy, legislation, and regulation**, **which can curb the effects of environmental pollution** and improve the quality of the environment (Merchant 1992:26). Headway is being made with policies addressing environmental issues at both local and global levels.1 **The close association that exists between population growth and the other environmental issues makes it apparent that one of the most important policies would be to curb population growth**.2 This would entail a stabilisation of human numbers with a gradual levelling out at a lower figure at some point in the future (Marshall 1974: 137). Unfortunately individual governments largely have been reluctant to formulate such policies. **Due to the delicate nature of the topic, it would be politically suicidal to include such policy recommendations in a party manifesto.** **Policies on resource conservation and pollution are equally as important as population policies**. Unfortunately **government cannot be isolated from the economy of the country. It therefore becomes very difficult to achieve concerted action towards resource management and protection** when **most political programs** seem **dedicated** **to increasing** the **prosperity of the individual voter and of the G**ross **N**ational **P**roduct (Marshall 1974:152). Furthermore, the effective implementation of such acts and policies often lies in the hands of local authorities and councils who have the immediate needs of the community on their agenda. **Generally community "growth and development" holds greater importance than environmental concerns**.

### L – Development

#### Infrastructure investment continues the historical narrative of “Development” – attempting to solve the limits to growth by maximizing resources is inherently anthropocentric because it preserves the justification for human use of nature.

Sachs 93 (Wolfgang, “The Global Ecology and the Shadow of Development” in *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century*, ed. George Sessions, p. 433-434)

"Development" is, above all, a way of thinking. It cannot, therefore, be easily identified with a particular strategy or program, but ties many different practices and aspirations to a common set of assumptions. . . . Despite alarming signs of failure throughout its history, the development syndrome has survived until today, but at the price of increasing senility. When it became clear in the 1950s that investments were not enough, "man-power development" was added to the aid package; as it became obvious in the 1960s that hardship continued, "social development" was discovered; and in the 1990s, as the impoverishment of peasants could no longer be overlooked, "rural development" was included in the arsenal of development strategies. And so it went on, with further creations like "equitable development" and the "basic needs approach." Again and again, the same conceptual operation was repeated: degradation in the wake of development was redefined as a lack which called for yet another strategy of development. All along, the efficacy of "development" remained impervious to any counterevidence, but showed remarkable staying power; the concept was repeatedly stretched until it included both the strategy which inflicted the injury and the strategy designed for therapy. This strength of the concept, however, is also the reason for its galloping exhaustion; it no longer manifests any reactions to changing historical conditions. The tragic greatness of "development" consists in its monumental emptiness. "Sustainable development," which UNCED enthroned as the reigning slogan of the 1990s, has inherited the fragility of "development." The concept emasculates the environmental challenge by absorbing it into the empty shell of "development" and insinuates the continuing validity of developmentalist assumptions even when confronted with a drastically different historical situation. In Rachel Carson's Silent Spring, the book which gave rise to the environmental movement in 1962, development was understood to inflict injuries on people and nature. Since the "World Conservation Strategy" in r98o and later the Brundtland Report, development has come to be seen as the therapy for the injuries caused by development. What accounts for this shift? Firstly, in the 1970s, under the impact of the oil crisis, governments began to realize that continued growth depended not only on capital formation or skilled manpower, but also on the long-term availability of natural resources. Foods for the insatiable growth machine, such as oil, timber, minerals, soils, genetic material, seemed on the decline; concern grew about the prospects of long-term growth. This was a decisive change in perspective: not the health of nature but the continuous health of development became the center of concern. In 1992, the World Bank summed up the new consensus in a laconic phrase: "What is sustainable? Sustainable development is development that lasts.” Of course, the task of development experts does not remain the same under this imperative, because the horizon of their decisions is now supposed to extend in time, taking into account also the welfare of future generations. But the frame stays the same: "sustainable development" calls for the conservation of development, not for the conservation of nature. Even bearing in mind a very loose definition of development, the anthropocentric bias of the statement springs to mind; it is not the preservation of nature's dignity which is on the international agenda, but to extend human centered utilitarianism to posterity. Needless to say, the naturalist and biocentric current of present-day environmentalism has been cut out by this conceptual operation. With "development" back in the saddle, the view on nature changes. The question now becomes: which of nature's "services" are to what extent indispensable for further development, Or the other way around: which "services" of nature are dispensable or can be substituted by, for example, new materials or genetic engineering In other words, nature turns into a variable, albeit a critical one, in sustaining development. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that "nature capital" has already become a fashionable notion among ecological economists.

### L – Sustainability

#### Sustainability has been co-opted and manipulated by dominant groups; this destroys its meaning and causes anthropogenic priorities.

Devall, ‘2 (Bill Devall compiled and edited Clearcut: The Tragedy of Industrial Forestry and co-authored Deep Ecology, “The Unsustainability of Sustainability”, 2002, <http://www.culturechange.org/issue19/unsustainability.htm>)

Sustainability is currently one of the most fashionable terms used by post-Marxist Progressives. **The word sustainable has been slapped onto everything from sustainable forestry to sustainable agriculture, sustainable economic growth, sustainable development, sustainable communities and sustainable energy production.** The **widespread use of the term indicates that many people conclude that the dominant, industrial models of production are unsustainable**. However, **sustainability has taken on numerous ideological hues and coloring and has been tacked onto the political agendas of diverse social movements** including the feminist movement, Progressive movement, and social justice movement. **There are very few thoughtful discussions in these movements about the theory of sustainability.** Indeed some proponents of sustainability argue that we donít need a theory of sustainability. We already know what it is and even if we donít know, **it is a motivating slogan for social change**. For example, Alan AtKisson, an articulate **proponent of sustainability, says "the definition of sustainability is neither vague nor abstract; it is very specific and is tied to measurable criteria describing how resources are used and distributed**. Some of what currently gets called ësustainable developmentí is no such thing, but that does not mean the concept should be dismissed, any more than the concept of democracy should be dismissed when it is misappropriated by a dictatorship. **Sustainability, like democracy, is an ideal toward which we strive, a journey more than a destination**" (1999:200). However, many critics argue that the **political agendas and manipulations of Progressives, feminists, and social justice movements have so polluted and conflicted the** **idea of sustainability that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to rescue it for meaningful discussion.** At the very least, three difficult questions must be asked before any discussion of sustainability is undertaken in any group. What is being sustained? How long is it being sustained? In whoís interest is what being sustained? We also must ask at what scale of action are we sustaining what? Are we talking about a global system or more regional or bioregional systems? Are we talking about natural systems or human institutions? At Kisson, and other proponents of sustainability, argue that the **sustainability movement is different from the environmental movement** or the conservation movement. **In the sustainability movement, progress comes from unleashing human creativity, redesigning everything, and using technology to serve the needs of the people. Many** Progressives and post-modern feminists **assert** that nature is a social creation**. Nature is whatever humans want to make i**t. Therefore, human creativity can remake nature to more effectively serve human needs. Conservation biologists, however, as well as most proponents of the conservation movement, assert that nature is real.

#### Sustainability is impossible-empirically proven; we must drop our obsession with human progress in order to restore the vitality of nature.

Devall, ‘2 (Bill Devall compiled and edited Clearcut: The Tragedy of Industrial Forestry and co-authored Deep Ecology, “The Unsustainability of Sustainability”, 2002, <http://www.culturechange.org/issue19/unsustainability.htm>)

When conservation biologists use the term sustainability, they refer to "ecological sustainability" meaning sustaining the self-organizing processes of natural systems. That means that humans live within the moods and rhythm of natural systems as part of the system, not masters of it. In a sense, arguments over the meaning of sustainability reflect the battles that have been repeated over and over again between Progressives and Realists during the past two centuries. Ever since William Goodwin asserted the doctrine of Progress, Progressives have believe that the future will be better than the past because humans invent new technology and advance human rights. For many Progressives, nature must be molded to serve human needs. Realists point to the fact that no human civilization has sustained itself for more than a few centuries. Civilizations overshoot the carrying capacity of their resource base, and due to changes in weather patterns, overcutting of forests, etc., go into decline. Sing Chew, professor of Sociology at Humboldt State University, documents this process from 3000 B.C. to 2000 A.D. in his book World Ecological Degradation: Accumulation, Urbanization, and Deforestation (Chew, 2001). In his article, "The Shaky Ground of Sustainability," historian Donald Worster concludes that "like most popular slogans, sustainable development begins to wear thin after a while. Although it seems to have gained a wide acceptance, it has done so by sacrificing real substance. Worse yet, the slogan my turn out to be irredeemable for environmentalist use because it may inescapably compel us to adopt a narrow economic language, standard of judgment, and world view in approaching and utilizing the earth" (in Sessions, 1995:418). Even more damning is Wolfgang Sachs conclusion that sustainability is the shadow of development. "Even bearing in mind a very loose definition of development, the anthropocentric bias of the statement springs to mind; it is not the preservation of nature’s dignity which is on the international agenda, but to extend human-centered utilitarianism to posterity" (in Sessions, 1995:434). Neil Harrison, in his book Constructing Sustainable Development, concludes that sustainable development proposals are at least incomplete or impractical and at worst dangerously misleading (Harrison, 2001). The use of contested meanings of sustainability among Progressives shows that they have remained dangerously anthropocentric, impractical, and that they have failed to address the moral ambiguities of both technology and their own ideological agendas. Arne Naess, the famous philosopher who used the phrase deep, long-range ecology movement, concludes that the concept of sustainability can only be salvaged if "...(our discourse) rejects the monopoly of narrowly human and short-term argumentation patterns in favor of life-centered long-term arguments. It also rejects the human-in-environment metaphor in favor of a more realistic human-in-ecosystems and politics-in-ecosystems one. It generalizes more eco-political issues: from ëresourcesí to ëresources for...í: from ëlife qualityí to ëlife quality for...í: from ëconsumptioní to ëconsumption for...í" where ëfor...í is, we insert ënot only humans, but other living beingsí " (in Sessions, 1995:452). Currently, cultural and social change is occurring very rapidly, and if Professor Sing Chew is correct, these changes may mean we are headed towards a new dark ages during which human population decreases rapidly and accumulation of capital radically decreases. In the past, during so-called dark ages of human civilizations, nature was able to renew its vitality after centuries of abuse by human civilizations. However, past civilizations were regional in location. Humans have never before experienced a globalized civilization which is causing massive human-caused extinctions of other species and human-caused massive changes in global climate patterns. What can we expect in political discourse? Progressives continue to attack the Realists as they have for two hundred years. However, perhaps Progressives will give up their anthropocentric bias and their belief in human Progress and embrace a systems approach. At the very least, Progressives could stop slapping the word sustainable onto every harebrained scheme and political agenda that is currently fashionable or politically correct. Most likely Progressives will continue to assert that if the people can control corporations or control the WTO or the World Bank, then we can have "sustainable development." And they will continue to miss the whole point about the unsustainability of sustainability.

### L – Science

#### Attempting to solve environmental crisis through science is a limited and short-sited solution and harms the environment.

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

**Understanding the magnitude of** the **environmental crisis and the potential threat it poses to life on this planet, it is clearly not an option to adopt a "wait and see" attitude.** A **popular option is to turn to science**, which helps provide adequate material needs for everyone and also extends the richness of our non-material lives. Playing such a socially prominent and important role, **science constitutes a major element of the "cultural filter**" **through which Western society views the environment** (Pepper 1996: 240**). Classical science**, which is still very dominant, **has developed into a dualist paradigm in which the scientific observer is separate and distinct from his or her observations**. This has **contributed to a conception of the world consisting of independent material objects**, each having independent properties, with the behaviour of the whole explainable by the behaviour of its constituent parts. **Nature is viewed as separate from humanity, machine-like and reducible to basic components, which can be known objectively and predicted. This science** represents the source of absolute truths on which to base decisions and is **often regarded as the most respectable way to know nature.** The **dimensions of environmental issues are seldom, if ever**, **restricted to the specific parameters of any one scientific discipline** (Des Jardins 1997:5). Moreover, **most major issues facing humanity stretch beyond being mere scientific problems**, involving as they do, society, politics, law, economics, etc. Covering such a broad spectrum, it is evident that science, widely distinguished by the compartmentalisation of knowledge, cannot deliver comprehensive solutions to global issues (McMichael 1993: 326). The **task of assessing the impacts of ecological imbalances** and disruptions **on** **human and other** **life forms entails significantly more than the classical scientific paradigm** of hypothesis formation, data collection and data analysis. **Leaving environmental problems in** the **hands** **of science would**, therefore**, effectively result in a narrow understanding of the problem at hand**, and by correlation a **limited** and **short-sighted solution**. Furthermore, classical science asserts that "**scientific knowledge equals power over nature**" (Pepper 1996: 240), and that the **manipulation of nature can be used for social progress**. This has **resulted in science being used in many modern developments, of which some exert a negative impact on the environment** (e.g. inorganic fertilisers, pesticides, industrial processes, nuclear energy, and nuclear threat, to name but a few). In this light, **science should not be viewed as the ultimate source of hope for the future, and clearly should not be given full responsibility for addressing the environmental crisis.**

### L – Policy

#### Policy discussions are dominated by anthropocentric values- even discussions of endangered species and sustainability.

Eric Katz and Lauren Oechsli, 1993 (Members of the Science, Technology, and Society Program,, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark. Katz is currently Vice President of the International Society for Environmental Ethics , “Moving beyond Anthropocentrism: Environmental Ethics, Development, and the Amazon”, <http://www.umweltethik.at/download.php?id=392>.)

It is not surprising that anthropocentric arguments dominate discussions of policy: arguments for environmental preservation based directly on human interests are often compelling. Dumping toxic wastes into a community’s reservoir of drinking water is clearly an irrational act; in such a case, a discussion of ethics or value theory is not necessary. The direct harm to humans engendered by this action is enough to disqualify it from serious ethical consideration. Nevertheless, other actions in the field of environmental policy are not so clear: there may be, for example, cases in which there are competing harms and goods to various segments of the human population that have to be balanced. The method for balancing these competing interests gives rise to issues of equity and justice. In addition, and more pertinent to our argument, are cases in which human actions threaten the existence of natural entities not usable as resources for human life. What reason do we humans have for expending vast sums of money (in positive expenditures and lost opportunities) to preserve endangered species of plants and animals that are literally nonresources?2 In these cases, policies of environmental preservation seem to work against human interests and human good. Anthropocentric and instrumental arguments in favor of preservationist policies can be developed in a series and arranged in order of increasing plausibility. First, it is argued that any particular species of plant or animal might prove useful in the future. Alastair Gunn calls this position the “rare herb” theory. According to this theory, the elimination of any natural entity is morally wrong because it closes down the options for any possible positive use.3 A point frequently raised in discussions of this problem is that the endangered species we are about to eliminate might be the cure for cancer. Of course, it is also possible that it will cause cancer; the specific effects of any plant or animal species might be harmful as well as beneficial. Because we are arguing from a position of ignorance, it is ludicrous to assert either possibility as certain, or to use either alternative as a basis for policy.

#### Environmental policy is decided through anthropocentric justifications.

Eric Katz and Lauren Oechsli, 1993 (Members of the Science, Technology, and Society Program,, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark. Katz is currently Vice President of the International Society for Environmental Ethics , “Moving beyond Anthropocentrism: Environmental Ethics, Development, and the Amazon”, <http://www.umweltethik.at/download.php?id=392>.)

In sum, these preservationist arguments based on “human interests” move from a narrow concern for the specific direct use of a natural entity or species, to the indirect importance of species as stabilizers of ecosystems, and finally to a general concern for the maintenance of ecosystems as the basis of human existence. These anthropocentric instrumental arguments for environmental preservation are easily transferred to issues of environmental policy. Recent concern about the destruction of the ozone layer and the increased probability of the “greenhouse effect” reflect the fear that current environmental and economic polices are damaging the environment and threatening human life. Indeed, it is a mark of the success of the environmental movement that the public is now aware of the connections between environmental health and human survival. A clear example of the connection between instrumental human interest arguments and concern for the preservation of an ecosystem is the current awareness of the plight of the Amazon rain forests. Although continued development of the forests and the conversion of rain forests to farmland and pasture contribute to a rapid loss of species,7 the major problem is a threat to the overall ecosystems of the rain forests themselves. Deforestation has a significant impact on climate because of the increase of atmospheric carbon.8 The recent increase in atmospheric carbon is a primary cause of the “greenhouse effect,” which leads to global warming. Thus, the preservation of the rain forests is an important element in the maintenance of a biosphere habitable for humanity. This line of reasoning has been a clear argument and powerful motivation for environmental policies designed to preserve the Amazon rain forests. Environmentalists and ordinary citizens alike now seek a halt to the destruction of the Amazon; they now recognize that the welfare of all human life depends on the maintenance of this unique ecological region.

#### Policy is created to improve human conditions, effects on other organisms are not considered-non anthropocentric thinking is key to solving this.

Eric Katz and Lauren Oechsli, 1993 (Members of the Science, Technology, and Society Program,, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark. Katz is currently Vice President of the International Society for Environmental Ethics , “Moving beyond Anthropocentrism: Environmental Ethics, Development, and the Amazon”, <http://www.umweltethik.at/download.php?id=392>.)

If a policy of preservation is adopted, the benefits to be derived are those associated with the continued maintenance of the biosphere as the basis of human life: production of oxygen, consumption of atmospheric carbon, preservation of potentially useful species, etc. If a policy of development is adopted, the benefits to be derived are primarily local and economic: increased agricultural and livestock production, industry, and exports. The costs and harms within each policy are determined by the failure to achieve the alternative benefits. A policy of preservation limits economic gain; a policy of development limits the goods of a functioning natural ecosystem. Although the choices appear clear, we lack the kind of data that would make the utility calculations possible. Is there a quantifiable good in the preservation of x amount of rain forest acreage that can be expressed in terms of biospherical maintenance and then compared to the loss of economic gains by indigenous local populations? Can we determine a quantifiable good in various methods of rain forest development, which then can be compared to losses in ecological function? It seems unlikely that these kinds of comparisons could ever be made; they are not being made now. In a recent survey of land use and management by indigenous peoples, Jason W. Clay warns: “Until now, few researchers have examined the ways indigenous inhabitants of tropical rain forests use and sustain their region’s resources.”9 Clay is saying that we do not know what the economic benefits and costs are in alternative policies of preservation and development. If viewed in this way, utility calculations become impossible as a basis of policy. Our complaint is not merely with the traditional difficulties of performing real- life utility calculations. The deeper issue is the anthropocentric framework that limits ethical and policy discussions. The primary concern for human interests or benefits—anthropocentrism—creates an irreconcilable conflict between two goods that are supposedly advocated by anthropocentric policies, i.e., the ecosystem which preserves the atmosphere, thus, preserving human life, and the economic use of the land by the indigenous population. We are faced with a classic case of a conflict between a long-term support system and short-term usable goods. This conflict cannot be resolved unless we expand the framework of discussion beyond the limits of anthropocentric instrumental reasoning.

## IMPACTS

### # - Outweighs The Case

#### Anthropocentrism is an unsustainable system—it poisons every environment it enters destroying all life.

Berry 95 (Thomas, Ph.D. from the Catholic University of America in European intellectual history  “The viable human” in *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century*, ed. George Sessions)

A deep cultural pathology has developed in Western society and has now spread throughout the planet. A savage plundering of the entire earth is taking place through industrial exploitation. Thousands of poisons unknown in former times are saturating the air, the water, and the soil. The habitat of a vast number of living species is being irreversibly damaged. In this universal disturbance of the biosphere by human agents, the human being now finds that the harm done to the natural world is returning to threaten the human species itself. The question of the viability of the human species is intimately connected with the question of the viability of the earth. These questions ultimately arise because at the present time the human community has such an exaggerated, even pathological, fixation on its own comfort and convenience that it is willing to exhaust any and all of the earth's resources to satisfy its own cravings. The sense of reality and of value is strictly directed toward the indulgences of a consumer economy. This nonsustainable situation can be clearly seen in the damage done to major elements necessary for the continued well-being of the planet. When the soil, the air, and the water have been extensively poisoned, human needs cannot be fulfilled. Strangely, this situation is the consequence of a human centered norm of reality and value. Once we grant that a change from an anthropocentric to a biocentric sense of reality and value is needed, we must ask how this can be achieved and how it would work it. we must begin by accepting the fact that the life community, the community of all living species, is the greater reality and the greater value , and that the primary concern of the human must be the preservation and enhancement of this larger community. The human does have its own distinctive reality and its own distinctive value, but this distinctiveness must be articulated within the more comprehensive context. The human ultimately must discover the larger dimensions of its own being within this community context. That the value of the human being is enhanced by diminishing the value of the larger community is an illusion, the great illusion of the present industrial age, seeks to advance the human by plundering the planet's geological structure and all its biological species' This plundering is being perpetrated mainly by the great industrial establishments that have dominated the entire planetary process for the past one hundred years, during the period when modern science and technology took control not only of natural resources but also of human affairs. If the viability of the human species is now in question, it is a direct consequence of these massive ventures, which have gained extensive control not only of our economies but also of our whole cultural development, whether it be economics, politics, law, education, medicine' or moral values' Even our language is heavily nuanced in favor of the consumer values fostered by our commercial industrial establishment'.

#### Extinction is irrelevant in impact comparison because the universe will still have value without humanity.

Lee 99 (Keekok, Visiting Chair in Philosophy at Lancaster University, The Natural and the Artefactual, 1999)

We should not delude ourselves that the humanization of nature will stop at biotic nature or indeed be confined only to planet Earth. Other planets in our solar system, too, may eventually be humanized; given the technological possibility of doing so, the temptation to do so appears difficult to resist on the part of those always on the lookout for new challenges and new excitement. To resist the ontological elimination of nature as 'the Other,' environmental philosophy must not merely be earthbound but, also, astronomically bounded (at least to the extent of our own solar system). We should bear in mind that while there may be little pristine nature left on Earth, this does not mean that nature is not pristine elsewhere in other planets. We should also be mindful that while other planets may not have life on them, this does not necessarily render them only of instrumental value to us. Above all, we should, therefore, bear in mind that nature, whether pristine or less than fully pristine, biotic or abiotic, is ontologically independent and autonomous of humankind--natural forms and natural processes are capable of undertaking their own .trajectories of existence. We should also remind ourselves that we are the controllers of our science and our technology, and not allow the products of our intellectual labor to dictate to us what we do to nature itself without pause or reflection. However, it is not the plea of this book that humankind should never transform the natural to become the artefactual, or to deny that artefacticity is not a matter of differing degrees or levels, as such claims would be silly and indefensible. Rather its remit is to argue that in systematically transforming the natural to become the artefactual through our science and our technology, we are at the same time systematically engaged in ontological simplification. Ontological impoverishment in this context is wrong primarily because we have so far failed to recognize that nature embodies its own funda­mental ontological value. In other words, it is not true, as modernity alleges, that nature is devoid of all value and that values are simply humanly conferred or are the projections of human emotions or attitudes upon nature. Admittedly, it takes our unique type of human consciousness to recognize that nature possesses ontological value; however, from this it would be fallacious to conclude that human consciousness is at once the source of all values, or even the sole locus of axiologically-grounded intrinsic values. But most important of all, human con­sciousness does not generate the primary ontological value of independence in nature; nature's forms and processes embodying this value exist whether human­kind is around or not.

### # - Turns Case (Econ)

#### Anthropocentrism is the root cause of warming and economic collapse.

Ingwe, ’10 (Richard, Centre for Research and Action on Developing Locales “Ecocentric and anthropocentric policies and crises in climate/environment, finance and economy: Implications of the emerging green policy of the Obama administration for Africa’s sustainable development,” African Journal of Political Science and International Relations Vol. 4(1), pp. 001-012, January 2010, http://www.academicjournals.org/ajpsir ISSN 1996-0832 )

The crisis in climate, finance, and economy, among other sectors at the global and national levels reflect the way policy has ignored ecocentric principles and limitation in the concept and operation of anthropocentrism. Specifically, pursuing the objectives, goals and interests of human beings without considering ecological principles or the inter-relatedness of human and non-human natural systems is responsible for the climate-environmental crisis. While the corruption of anthropocentric institutions, processes, structures and attitudes by top functionaries of global and national financial and economic systems has led to the crisis in these sub-sectors. The climate crisis is also the consequence of the way policy has ignored research-derived scientifically based information and knowledge provided by think-tanks, NGOs/CSOs and universities. This point is also applicable to the causes of the crises in finance and economy at global and national levels. The mitigation and adaptation to climate change and resuscitation of financial and economic systems will be successful if policy hearkens promptly to the research- derived information produced by think-tanks, universities and civil society in directing development plans and programmes. Unfortunately, despite the energy crisis in Africa in the form of gross inadequacy of electricity and the attendant disability of social and economic systems in Africa, the adoption of sustainable (renewable and efficient) energy has been rather negligible, slow, and by far below the level in nations that are in the front line of green power implementation.

### # - Environmental Crisis

#### Anthropocentrism causes every major environmental crisis.

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

I argue that **anthropocentric value systems are not suitable to the task of developing a comprehensive environmental ethic**. Firstly, **anthropocentric assumptions have been shown to be largely responsible for the current environmental crisis**. While this in itself does not provide strong support for the claim, it does **cast a dim light on any theory that is informed by such assumptions**. Secondly, **an environmental ethic requires a significantly wide range of focus**. As such**, it should consider the interests of a wide range of beings**. It **has been shown that anthropocentric approaches do not entertain the notion that non-human entities can have interests independent of human interests.** "Expansionist", "conservationist" and "preservationist" approaches only acknowledge a value in nature that is determined by the needs and interests of humans. Thirdly, because **anthropocentric approaches provide a moral account for the interests of humans alone**, while excluding non-humans from direct moral consideration, **they are not sufficiently encompassing**. An environmental ethic needs to be suitably encompassing to ensure that a moral account is provided for all entities that constitute the environment. It could be argued that the indirect moral concern for the environment arising out of an anthropocentric approach is sufficient to ensure the protection of the greater environment. In response, only those entities that are in the interest of humans will be morally considered, albeit indirectly, while those entities which fall outside of this realm will be seen to be morally irrelevant. Assuming that there are more entities on this planet that are not in the interest of humans than entities that are, it is safe to say that **anthropocentric approaches are not adequately encompassing**. Fourthly, the **goals of an environmental ethic should protect and maintain the greater environment**. It is clear that the **expansionist approach, which is primarily concerned with the transformation of nature for economic return, does not meet these goals.** Similarly, **neither does the conservationist approach, which is arguably the same as the expansionist approach.** Thepreservationist approach does, in principle satisfy this requirement. However, this is problematic for such preservation is based upon the needs and interests of humans, and "**as human interests and needs change, so too would human uses for the environment**" (Des Jardins 1997: 129). **Non-human entities, held captive by the needs and interests of humans, are open to whatever fancies the interests of humans**. In light of the above, it is my contention that **anthropocentric value systems fail to provide a stable ground for the development of an environmental ethic**. It is fair to say that the **success of the environmental movement is largely "a result of the power of anthropocentric arguments,** for the **general population began to realise that the degradation of the natural environment would have serious consequences for human health, safety, and survival"** (Katz 1999: 378). This is of little relevance when regarding the development of an environmental ethic, for the awareness raised by anthropocentric arguments is restricted to the consequences affecting humans alone. Above I argued that anthropocentric value systems are unsuitable to the development of an environmental ethic. Traditional ethical theories (teleological, utilitarian, and deontological) were shown to be anthropocentric. This makes such theories unsuitable to the development of an environmental ethic. Clearly a wider and more encompassing ethic is required, one which extends moral concern beyond human boundaries. What is required is a "change in the ethics, in attitudes, values and evaluations" (Zimmerman 1998: 17), with the assumptions of an environmental ethic being "broader and more inclusive than the mere consideration of human interests" (Katz 1999: 378). Whether and how such an ethic is possible is the task of another paper.

## ALTERNATIVES

#### The Alt. is to embrace a deep ecological framework

Roger S. Gottlieb, professor of humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 1994, “ETHICS AND TRAUMA: LEVINAS, FEMINISM, AND DEEP ECOLOGY”, http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm

What moral stance will be shaped by our personal sense that we are poisoning ourselves, our environment, and so many kindred spirits of the air, water, and forests? To begin, we may see this tragic situation as setting the limits to Levinas's perspective. The other which is nonhuman nature is not simply known by a "trace," nor is it something of which all knowledge is necessarily instrumental. This other is inside us as well as outside us. We prove it with every breath we take, every bit of food we eat, every glass of water we drink. We do not have to find shadowy traces on or in the faces of trees or lakes, topsoil or air: we are made from them. Levinas denies this sense of connection with nature. Our "natural" side represents for him a threat of simple consumption or use of the other, a spontaneous response which must be obliterated by the power of ethics in general (and, for him in particular, Jewish religious law[(23)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN23) ). A "natural" response lacks discipline; without the capacity to heed the call of the other, unable to sublate the self's egoism. Worship of nature would ultimately result in an "everything-is-permitted" mentality, a close relative of Nazism itself. For Levinas, to think of people as "natural" beings is to assimilate them to a totality, a category or species which makes no room for the kind of individuality required by ethics.[(24)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN24) He refers to the "elemental" or the "there is" as unmanaged, unaltered, "natural" conditions or forces that are essentially alien to the categories and conditions of moral life.[(25)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN25) One can only lament that Levinas has read nature -- as to some extent (despite his intentions) he has read selfhood -- through the lens of masculine culture. It is precisely our sense of belonging to nature as system, as interaction, as interdependence, which can provide the basis for an ethics appropriate to the trauma of ecocide. As cultural feminism sought to expand our sense of personal identity to a sense of inter-identification with the human other, so this ecological ethics would expand our personal and species sense of identity into an inter-identification with the natural world. Such a realization can lead us to an ethics appropriate to our time, a dimension of which has come to be known as "deep ecology."[(26)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN26) For this ethics, we do not begin from the uniqueness of our human selfhood, existing against a taken-for-granted background of earth and sky. Nor is our body somehow irrelevant to ethical relations, with knowledge of it reduced always to tactics of domination. Our knowledge does not assimilate the other to the same, but reveals and furthers the continuing dance of interdependence. And our ethical motivation is neither rationalist system nor individualistic self-interest, but a sense of connection to all of life. The deep ecology sense of self-realization goes beyond the modern Western sense of "self" as an isolated ego striving for hedonistic gratification. . . . . Self, in this sense, is experienced as integrated with the whole of nature.[(27)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN27) Having gained distance and sophistication of perception [from the development of science and political freedoms] we can turn and recognize who we have been all along. . . . we are our world knowing itself. We can relinquish our separateness. We can come home again -- and participate in our world in a richer, more responsible and poignantly beautiful way.[(28)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN28) Ecological ways of knowing nature are necessarily participatory. [This] knowledge is ecological and plural, reflecting both the diversity of natural ecosystems and the diversity in cultures that nature-based living gives rise to. The recovery of the feminine principle is based on inclusiveness. It is a recovery in nature, woman and man of creative forms of being and perceiving. In nature it implies seeing nature as a live organism. In woman it implies seeing women as productive and active. Finally, in men the recovery of the feminine principle implies a relocation of action and activity to create life-enhancing, not life-reducing and life-threatening societies.[(29)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN29) In this context, the knowing ego is not set against a world it seeks to control, but one of which it is a part. To continue the feminist perspective, the mother knows or seeks to know the child's needs. Does it make sense to think of her answering the call of the child in abstraction from such knowledge? Is such knowledge necessarily domination? Or is it essential to a project of care, respect and love, precisely because the knower has an intimate, emotional connection with the known?[(30)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN30) Our ecological vision locates us in such close relation with our natural home that knowledge of it is knowledge of ourselves. And this is not, contrary to Levinas's fear, reducing the other to the same, but a celebration of a larger, more inclusive, and still complex and articulated self.[(31)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN31) The noble and terrible burden of Levinas's individuated responsibility for sheer existence gives way to a different dream, a different prayer: Being rock, being gas, being mist, being Mind, Being the mesons traveling among the galaxies with the speed of light, You have come here, my beloved one. . . . You have manifested yourself as trees, as grass, as butterflies, as single-celled beings, and as chrysanthemums; but the eyes with which you looked at me this morning tell me you have never died.[(32)](http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22FN32) In this prayer, we are, quite simply, all in it together. And, although this new ecological Holocaust -- this creation of planet Auschwitz -- is under way, it is not yet final. We have time to step back from the brink, to repair our world. But only if we see that world not as an other across an irreducible gap of loneliness and unchosen obligation, but as a part of ourselves as we are part of it, to be redeemed not out of duty, but out of love; neither for our selves nor for the other, but for us all.

### Ethics First

#### Environmental ethics must come first.

Wesley Shumar, ’99 (Review of: Beyond Anthropocentrism in Ethics, BEING AND WORTH, by Andrew Collier. Routledge, Critical Realism Intervention Series, 1999. ix

Being and Worth is a small book with a big argument, and in it Andrew Collier has made a significant contribution to contemporary thinking on ethics. Western philosophical tradition tends to concentrate on the subtleties of epistemology and ontology, considering ethics to be on different, less rigorous ground – when not ignoring it entirely. This separation of head from heart is common to classical, mod- ern and postmodern thought, and it is what tribal elders in many different cultures mean when they say Westerners are people who miss the forest for the trees; that is, miss the very important things in life while amassing techno- logical and scientific know-how. Collier’s thesis is that there is an equivalence between being and goodness. The good is not something subjective and completely relative to cultural ideas and personal valu- ing but is in fact an objective part of the world. This is because there is a correct relationship between the objects of the world, natural and human, and ourselves. Culture will, of course, affect how we articulate and understand objects and our relationship to them, but this doesn’t pre- clude the objective underlying structure. On the face of it, one wants to reject this thesis, so at odds with the relativism that dominates contemporary thinking. However, when one considers the examples of nature and environmental issues, as Collier does, it’s clear he has a point. We in the West have been slow to see that there is indeed a correct relationship to objects in nature and that if we don’t learn about this relationship, both we and the nat- ural environment suffer. The undeniable global implica- tions of deforestation, ozone and greenhouse gas emissions, pollution, and so forth, are not relative to cultural assump- tions but have an objectivity that transcends culture.

**We are reaching a brink; human destruction of the environment will lead to “environmental crisis” unless we reevaluate our values.**

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

**We are enveloped** and immersed **in a world comprised of air, earth, waters, plants, animals and constructed artefacts**. It is both animate and inanimate. The environment, then, may be loosely defined as that which constitutes and makes up our surroundings. **As we occur in the world together with our surrounding**s, acting upon it and being acted upon, **we form part of the environment**. **Located within this environment, humankind has grown and developed socially and economically to a point that if present trends continue the earth’s natural systems will be impoverished within less than a century** (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 37). This situation can be referred to as an **environmental crisis**. To talk of an environmental crisis signifies that **we are at a turning point, a period requiring insightful thinking, creative solutions, and a transformation not only of actions, but also of spiritual, perceptual, and moral outlook**. South Africa, in a bid to participate in the global arena, needs to respond to these challenges. **Science and environmental policy are the most commonly accepted options for dealing with this crisis. While each has a significant contribution to make, overemphasis on either option could easily compound the environmental crisis**. The environmental crisis is **primarily a consequence of human action**. **Value systems inform actions**. Therefore, **we need to question our most fundamental values**. This highlights the importance of ethical thinking in relation to the environmental crisis. The three main classes of ethical theory are teleological, utilitarian and deontological. It will be shown that they are, for the most part, applied in anthropocentric ways. I will argue that an anthropocentric value system is inadequate for the development of an environmental ethic.

## ANSWERS TO: Aff Responses

### They Say: “Permutation”

#### The perm still links – it locks in utilitarian and economic risk calculus which is incompatible with radical alternatives to anthropocentrism.

Doyle, ’12 (Jessica Jayne, “Key Concepts and Rationalities in Canada’s Environmental Enforcement Act: Tensions between Environmental Protection and Economic Development,” Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies University of Ottawa, www.ruor.uottawa.ca/fr/handle/10393/22813)

This section discusses the viewpoint of philosophical anthropocentrism to explain why risk- based and utilitarian approaches to environmental harm tend to be the most common methods of environmental governance. Anthropocentrism is a philosophical approach to the environment that “giv[es] exclusive or arbitrarily preferential consideration to human interests as opposed to the interests of other beings” (Hayward in Dobson, 2000: 51). Philosophically, anthropocentrism is a belief that humans are biologically, mentally, and morally superior to all other living and non-living beings (Halsey & White, 1998: 31). According to existing research, philosophical anthropocentrism conceptually reinforces the movement towards neoliberal, risk-based methods of governance (Halsey & White, 1998: 32). These “utilitarian” and risk-based solutions to environmental harm are problematic because they involve a decision-making process that does not consider the intrinsic value of things such as biodiversity or clean water (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982: 70; Halsey & White, 1998: 31-33; Hessing et al, 2005: 7-21). Although this research project cannot examine whether the actors in the policy-making process accept this viewpoint, existing research problematizes the dominance of this viewpoint in the environmental policy-making process (Halsey, 2006: 43; Halsey & White, 1998: 33). Existing research sees non-anthropocentric philosophies towards environmental harm as more effective than anthropocentric philosophies. Non-anthropocentric philosophies of environmental harm involve a reconsideration of the current structural economic context. Several dichotomies attempt to separate anthropocentric thought from non-human centered thought. These include the differences between anthropocentrism, ecocentrism, and biocentrism (Halsey & White, 1998), environmental and ecological justice (White, 2007), and reformist and radical assumptions towards the causes of environmental harm (Levy, 1997: 126). Alternative approaches question the lack of emphasis in capitalist economics on the intrinsic value of the environment (O‟Connor, 1994: 125-127). Non-anthropocentric approaches threaten economic growth because they propose limits on the consumption of environmental resources (Snider, 2000: 177-178). Existing research tends to see environmental governance strategies that are based on the principles of anthropocentrism are ineffective in protecting the environment (Halsey & White, 1998; Hessing et al, 2005). Environmental criminologists who question the effectiveness of anthropocentrism must propose structural changes to the political, economic, and social contexts of the policy-making process (Lynch & Stretesky, 2003: 87). This is because shifts away from human- centered solutions to environmental harm must also involve a counter-discourse to neoliberalism, globalization, risk management and the current political economic context (Benton, 2008; Gillespie, 2006; Seis, 1999).

#### The permutation devolves into self-serving rationalizations—ethical compromises are unacceptable.

Lupisella & Logsdon 97 (Mark, masters degree in philosophy of science at university of Maryland and researcher working at the Goddard Space Flight Center, and John, Director, Space Policy Institute The George Washington University, Washington, “DO WE NEED A COSMOCENTRIC ETHIC?” <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.25.7502>)

Steve Gillett has suggested **a hybrid view combining homocentrism as applied to terrestrial activity combined with biocentrism towards worlds with indigenous life**.32 Invoking such a patchwork of theories to help deal with different domains and circumstances could be considered acceptable and perhaps even desirable especially when dealing with something as varied and complex as ethics. Indeed, it has a certain common sense appeal. However, **instead of digging deeply into what is certainly a legitimate epistemological issue,** let us consider the words of J. Baird Callicott: “**But there is both a rational philosophical demand and a human psychological need for a self-consistent and all-embracing moral theory. We are neither good philosophers nor whole persons if for one purpose we adopt utilitarianism, another deontology, a third animal liberation, a fourth the land ethic, and so on. Such ethical eclecticism is not only rationally intolerable, it is morally suspect as it invites the suspicion of ad hoc rationalizations for merely expedient or self-serving actions.**”33

### They Say: “Cede the Political”

#### Ethics first framework makes this irrelevant.

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

It is fair to say that the success of the environmental movement is largely "a result of the power of anthropocentric arguments, for the general population began to realise that the degradation of the natural environment would have serious consequences for human health, safety, and survival" (Katz 1999: 378). This is of little relevance when regarding the development of an environmental ethic, for the awareness raised by anthropocentric arguments is restricted to the consequences affecting humans alone. Above I argued that anthropocentric value systems are unsuitable to the development of an environmental ethic. Traditional ethical theories (teleological, utilitarian, and deontological) were shown to be anthropocentric. This makes such theories unsuitable to the development of an environmental ethic. Clearly a wider and more encompassing ethic is required, one which extends moral concern beyond human boundaries. What is required is a "change in the ethics, in attitudes, values and evaluations" (Zimmerman 1998: 17), with the assumptions of an environmental ethic being "broader and more inclusive than the mere consideration of human interests" (Katz 1999: 378). Whether and how such an ethic is possible is the task of another paper.

#### The political is already ceded—only a radical form of politics can regain it from transnational companies and political technophiles.

Best 6 (Steven, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas El Paso, “Revolutionary Environmentalism: An Emerging New Struggle for Total Liberation” 2006)

George W. Bush’s feel-good talk of progress and democracy, **given an endless and uncritical airing by mainstream corporate media**, masks the fact that **we live in an unprecedented era of social and ecological crisis**. Predatory **transnational corporations** such as ExxonMobil and Maxxam **are pillaging the planet**, destroying ecosystems, pushing species into extinction, and annihilating indigenous peoples and traditional ways of life. War, globalization, and destruction of peoples, species, and ecosystems march in lockstep: **militarization supports the worldwide imposition of the "free market" system**, and its growth and **profit imperatives thrive though the exploitation** of humans, animals, and the earth (see Kovel 2002; Tokar 1997; Bannon and Collier 2003). **Against the mindless optimism of technophiles, the denials of skeptics, and complacency of the general public, we depart from the premise that there is a global environmental crisis which is the most urgent issue facing us today. If humanity does not address ecological problems immediately and with radical measures** that target causes not symptoms, severe, **world-altering consequences will play out over a long-term period and will plague future generations**. Signs of major stress of the world’s eco-systems are everywhere, from shrinking forests and depleted fisheries to vanishing wilderness and global climate change. Ours is an era of global warming, rainforest destruction, species extinction, and chronic resource shortages that provoke wars and conflicts such as in Iraq. While five great extinction crises have already transpired on this planet, the last one occurring 65 million years ago in the age of the dinosaurs, we are now living amidst the sixth extinction crisis, this time caused by human not natural causes. Human populations have always devastated their environment and thereby their societies, but they have never intervened in the planet’s ecosystem to the extent they have altered climate. We now confront the “end of nature” where no natural force, no breeze or ripple of water, has not been affected by the human presence (McKribben 2006). This is especially true with nanotechnology and biotechnology. Rather than confronting this crisis and scaling back human presence and aggravating actions, humans are making it worse. Human population rates continue to swell, as awakening giants such as India and China move toward western consumer lifestyles, exchanging rice bowls for burgers and bicycles for SUVs. The human presence on this planet is like a meteor plummeting to the earth, but it has already struck and the reverberations are rippling everywhere. Despite the proliferating amount of solid, internationally assembled scientific data supporting the reality of global climate change and ecological crisis, there are still so-called environmental “skeptics,” “realists,” and “optimists” who deny the problems, often compiling or citing data paid for by ExxonMobil. Senator James **Inhofe has declared global warming to be a “myth”** that is damaging to the US economy. **He and others revile environmentalists as “alarmists,” “extremists,” and “eco-terrorists” who threaten the American way of life**. There is a direct and profound relationship between global capitalism and ecological destruction. The capitalist economy lives or dies on constant growth, accumulation, and consumption of resources. **The environmental crisis is inseparable from the social crisis, whereby centuries ago a market economy disengaged from society and ruled over it with its alien and destructive imperatives.** The crisis in ecology is ultimately a crisis in democracy, as transnational corporations arise and thrive through the destruction of popular sovereignty. The western environment movement has advanced its cause for over three decades **now**, but **we are nonetheless losing ground in the battle to preserve species, ecosystems, and wilderness** (Dowie 1995; Speth 2004). Increasingly, **calls for moderation, compromise, and the slow march through institutions can be seen as treacherous and grotesquely inadequate. In the midst of predatory global capitalism and biological meltdown, “reasonableness” and “moderation” seem to be entirely unreasonable and immoderate, as “extreme” and “radical” actions appear simply as necessary and appropriate.** As eco-primitivist Derrick Jensen observes, “**We must eliminate false hopes, which blind us to real possibilities**.” **The current** world **system is inherently destructive** and unsustainable; **if it cannot be reformed, it must be transcended through revolution at all levels**—economic, political, legal, cultural, technological, and, most fundamentally, conceptual. **The struggles and changes must be as deep, varied, and far-reaching as the root of the problems.**

#### Radical environmental movements are more effective at creating change – our evidence is comparative.

Best 6 (Steven, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas El Paso, “Revolutionary Environmentalism: An Emerging New Struggle for Total Liberation” 2006)

Revolutionary environmentalism is based on the realization that **politics as usual just won’t cut it anymore. We will always lose if we play by their rules rather than invent new forms of struggle**, new social movements, and new sensibilities. **The defense of the earth requires immediate and decisive**: logging roads need to be blocked, driftnets need to be cut, and cages need to be emptied. But these are defensive actions, and in addition to these tactics, **radical movements** and alliances **must be built** from the perspective total liberation. **A new revolutionary politics will build on the achievements of democratic**, libertarian socialist, and anarchist **traditions**. It will incorporate radical green, feminist, and indigenous struggles. It will merge animal, earth, and human standpoints in a total liberation struggle against global capitalism and its omnicidal grow-or-die logic. **Radical politics must reverse the growing power of the state, mass media, and corporations to promote egalitarianism and participatory democratization at all levels of society** – political, cultural, and economic. **It must dismantle all asymmetrical power relations and structures of hierarchy, including that of humans over animals and the earth. Radical politics is impossible without the revitalization of citizenship and the re-politicization of life, which begins with forms of education, communication, culture, and art that anger, awaken, inspire, and empower people toward action and change**.

#### The alt solves best for political change.

Best 4 (Steven, professor of philosophy at Texas El Paso, “From Earth Day to Ecological Society” <http://www.drstevebest.org/Essays/FromEarthDay.htm>, date accessed: 7/27/11

**If humanity is to survive and flourish in its precarious journey into the future, it needs a new moral compass because anthropocentrism has failed us dramatically.** Albert Schweitzer observed that “**the problem with ethics so far is that they have been limited to a human-to-human consideration**.” In place of the alienated and predatory sensibility of Western life, **Schweitzer proposed a new code – an “ethic of reverence for life.”** **This entails a universal ethic of compassion and respect that includes all humanity, embraces non-human species, and extends to the entire earth.** We need a “Declaration of Interdependence” to replace our outmoded “Declaration of Independence.” **The demand to cease exploiting animals and the earth is one and the same; we cannot change in one area without changing in the othe**r. Animal rights and **environmental ethics are the logical next stages in human moral evolution and the next necessary steps in the human journey to enlightenment and wholeness.** Sadly, on Earth Day, as on every other day, the human species continues to invade and damage the planet. As I write, I receive a report from Traffic, a British-based wildlife monitoring group, saying that because of deforestation and trading in its body parts, the Sumatran tiger, Indonesia's last tiger sub-species, is on the brink of extinction. In addition, I read that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service removed two tropical birds, the Mariana mallard and the Guam broadbill, from its endangered species list – not because they are safe but because they became extinct. In some way we cannot possibly grasp, the entire earth is trying to adjust to their inalterable absence. According to the cliché, “Every day is Earth Day.” Truth be told, every day is Human Growth Day. On April 22, the media might turn away from Michael Jackson or Bush’s terror war for a thirty second fluff piece on the state of the planet, and some individuals might pause for a moment to think about their environment. **Like the evil-doer who sins all week and then atones on Sunday, human beings plunder the planet all year long and stop for a moment of guilt and expiation.** We congratulate ourselves for honoring Earth Day, when in fact the very concept would be incoherent in an ecological society. In honor of Earth Day it is appropriate to ask: what does it mean to be an environmentalist? **Where industries, the state, and toxic nihilists of ever stripe want those who care about the environment to bear stigmas such as “kook,” wacko,” “un-American,” and even “terrorist,” being an environmentalist must become a badge of honor.** To be an environmentalist is to realize that one is not only a citizen of human society, one also is a citizen of the earth, an eco-citizen. **Our community includes not only our society with other human beings on a national and international scale, but also our relations to the entire living earth, to the biocommunity**. **We need to act like we are citizens and not conquering invaders. We have not only a negative duty to avoid doing harm to the earth as much as possible, but also a positive duty to help nature regenerate.**

### They Say: “Extinction Outweighs”

#### Cold utilitarian calculus directly excludes the natural world and cannot accurately make decisions—you should always prioritize an ethic that recognizes the value of the natural world.

Katz 97 (Eric, Director of Science, Technology, and Society Program at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, “Nature as Subject” 1997)

**One approach** within this conception of environmental philosophy **would be to seek** these "**'environmentally appropriate" ethical princi­ples in the direct application of traditional ethical theories--such as utilitarianism**, Kantianism, rights theory, or contractarianism--to the newly emerging problems of the environmental crisis. From this perspective, environmental philosophy would be a version of a basic ap­plied ethics. Its subject matter--the justification of environmental policies--would be new, but the philosophical principles and ethical ideals used to analyze and solve these new problems would be the familiar positions and ideas of Western philosophy. **A rather different ap­proach to environmental philosophy would eschew the traditional ver­sions of ethical theory and offer a radical reinterpretation or critique of the dominant philosophical ideas** of the modern age. From this critical perspective, **traditional ethical systems must be modified**, expanded, or **transcended** in order to deal with the fundamental philosophical issues raised by the existence of the contemporary environmental cri­sis. **The crucial change would be an expansion of ethical thought be­yond the limits of the human community to include the direct moral consideration of the natural world**. 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. Mass extinction is key to evolution.

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

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

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

### They Say: “Nature Doesn’t Matter”

#### Humanity is not better than anything else—we are part of a larger biotic community.

Harding 05 (Stephan, doctorate in ecology from the University of Oxford, a degree in Zoology from the University of Durham, and has many years experience of ecological field research and of teaching at University level. “What is deep ecology”, http://biomimicry.typepad.com/bioinspire/files/BioInspire.23-01.31.05.pdf, date accessed: 7/22/11)

Notice that the experience was not looked for, expected or contrived. It happened spontaneously. Something in the dying eyes of the wolf reached beyond Leopold’s training and triggered a recognition of where he was. After this experience he saw the world differently, and went on to develop a land ethic, in which he stated that **humans are not a superior species with the right to manage and control the rest of nature, but rather that humans are ‘plain members of the biotic community’**. He also penned his famous dictum: “**a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise**.” Arne **Naess emphasises the importance of such spontaneous experience**. **A key aspect of these experiences is the perception of gestalts, or networks of relationships. We see that there are no isolated objects, but that objects are nodes in a vast web of relationships**. When such deep experience occurs, we feel a strong sense of wide identification with what we are sensing. **This identification involves a heightened sense of empathy and an expansion of our concern with non-human life. We realise how dependent we are on the well-being of nature for our own physical and psychological well-being. As a consequence there arises a natural inclination to protect non-human life.** O**bligation and coercion to do so become unnecessary.** We understand that **other beings, ranging from microbes to multicellular life-forms to ecosystems and watersheds,** to Gaia as a whole, **are engaged in the process of unfolding their innate potentials.** Naess calls this process self-realisation. For us humans, **self-realisation involves the development of wide identification in which the sense of self is no longer limited by the personal ego,** but instead encompasses greater and greater wholes. Naess has called this expanded sense of self the ecological self. Since all beings strive in their own ways for self-realisation, **we recognise that all are endowed with intrinsic value, irrespective of any economic or other utilitarian value they might have for human ends. Our own human striving for self-realisation is on an equal footing to the strivings of other beings.** There is a fundamental equality between human and non-human life in principle. This **ecocentric perspective contrasts with the anthropocentric view which ascribes intrinsic value only to humans, valuing nature only if it is useful to our own species.** The new sense of belonging to an intelligent universe revealed by deep experience often leads to deep questioning, which helps to elaborate a coherent framework for elucidating fundamental beliefs, and for translating these beliefs into decisions, lifestyle and action. **The emphasis on action is important. It is action that distinguishes deep ecology from other ecophilosophies**. **This is what makes deep ecology a movement as much as a philosophy. By deep questioning, an individual is articulating a total view of life which can guide his or her lifestyle choices. In questioning society, one understands its underlying assumptions from an ecological point of view.** One looks at the collective psychological origins of the ecological crisis, and the related crises of peace and social justice. One also looks deeply into the history of the West to find the roots of our pernicious anthropocentrism as it has manifested in our science, philosophy and economics. One tries to understand how the current drive for globalisation of Western culture and of free trade leads to the devastation of both human culture and nature. **This deep questioning of the fundamental assumptions of our culture contrasts markedly with the mainstream shallow or reform approach**. This tries to ensure the continuance of business as usual by advocating the ‘greening’ of business and industry by incorporating a range of measures such as pollution prevention and the protection of biodiversity due to its monetary value as medicine or its ability to regulate climate. **Although deep ecology supporters often have no option but strategically to adopt a reform approach when working with the mainstream, their own deep questioning of society goes on in the background.** This may subtly influence the people with whom they interact professionally.

#### D-Rule to preserve nature.

Marina 9 (Daniel, Södertörns högskola | Institutionen för Kultur och Kommunikation, “Anthropocentrism and Androcentrism – An Ecofeminist Connection” http://www.projectsparadise.com/anthropocentrism-androcentrism/)

**Environmentalism is the movement that works to end naturism.** Environmentalists assert that **the domination of nature by humans exists and that this domination is wrong.** Some environmentalists carry out the work to **end naturism from the discipline of philosophy. Environmental philosophy is work carried out within some philosophical field – mainly ethics – that is motivated by the general goal of the environmental movement**. Despite the differences between the various positions, there is one assumption shared by most environmental philosophers, namely nature deserves moral consideration in its own right. As Warren explains, mainstream Western ethics has traditionally neglected nature. **The standard notion has been that humans only have moral obligations towards humans. Nature has merely had instrumental value.** **Environmental philosophers endeavour to elucidate the connections between environmental problems and traditional philosophical conceptions**. They set themselves the task of identifying how naturism manifest itself in philosophy, that is, of **countering when philosophers deliberately or accidentally articulate the already privileged world of humans maintaining its status over nature.** Some of the environmental ethical positions are: (1) the individualistic approaches of Peter Singer and Tom Regan: **moral consideration is due to all those individuals who possess the morally relevant capacities, namely sentiency** (Singer) and to be the subject of a life (Regan); (2) the holistic approach of Aldo Leopold whose focus is on populations, **species, ecosystems, and the biosphere: it is not only individual animals that enjoy moral value, but also plants and the non-living elements of the natural world;** (3) **deep ecology that expects humans to develop an ecological sensitivity: a respect that reflects the fact that each organism is essentially related to the other elements of the “biospherical net” and the fact that every life form possesses an intrinsic value independently of the instrumental values that it may possess in the eyes of a human beholder**; (4) **social ecology that identifies a structural and institutional root of the environmental crisis, specifically a society that has been permeated by authoritarian hierarchies and a capitalist market economy, and a natural world that has been arranged in accordance with a hierarchal order of beings:** it underlines then the vital connection between social problems and environmental problems, that is, between the way humans relate to humans and the way humans relate to nature. Ecofeminism is the approach that merges the goal of the environmental movement with the goal of the feminist movement. Warren explains that it does this because ecofeminists believe that both environmentalism and feminism have their shortcomings, and that they should complement each other. According to her environmentalists will not be able to fully and correctly understand, and consequently successfully abolish, naturism unless they cease to disregard the connections existing between the domination of nature and the domination of women. **They will not be able to elaborate theories that do not contribute to oppression unless they recognize the role and configuration of** **oppressive conceptual frameworks and the conceptual connections** between naturism and sexism they give rise to. They will not be sensitive to the specific realities and perspectives of women unless they admit gender as a fundamental category of analysis. Feminism needs, in a similar way, to understand the connections between sexism and naturism.

### They Say: “Alternative Hurts Humans”

#### Humans are only excluded from nature by choice—the ethic of the alternative recognizes the multiplicity of centers of value in nature.

Marina 9 (Daniel, Södertörns högskola | Institutionen för Kultur och Kommunikation, “Anthropocentrism and Androcentrism – An Ecofeminist Connection” <http://www.projectsparadise.com/anthropocentrism-androcentrism/>)

Finally, I would like to summarize some of the reasons why **anthropocentrism is open to criticism**. I shall focus on those that Val Plumwood adduces. **According to her anthropocentrism is basically a framework of beliefs** and perceptions that generates a myriad of illusions. Nature is perceived as discontinuous from the human realm, as subordinate, as inessential, as a denied and disorderly Other, as passive, and so on. **Anthropocentrism disregards nature’s complexity, her uniqueness as a life-sustaining whole, and the plurality of legitimate centres with genuine interests and needs that it comprises.** **Humans are perceived as discontinuous from the natural realm, as essentially rational, and are reduced to being masters and conquerors**. **Humans, as physical and biological beings, can, of course, be allowed to remain within nature**. What anthropocentrism especially consigns to an area outside and above nature is that part of the human self that is considered authentically human, i.e. rationality and freedom. **Human identity is in such a way construed in opposition to the natural, the physical, the biological, and the animal, including those human traits associated with animality, that the authentically human includes also the “desire to exclude and distance” from the nonhuman**. **This conception of the human self as separate from, or if anything “accidentally related” to, nature together with the conception of the nonhuman as inferior and antagonistic renders humanity a legitimate oppressor and nature a means to human ends.** **Anthropocentrism disregards humanity’s vital dependence on nature, the essential character of genuine human traits such as the emotions and the body, as well as other attitudes towards nature than that to master and conquer it.**

#### They have it backwards—human centered politics destroys the natural other—the alt solves.

Marina 9 (Daniel, Södertörns högskola | Institutionen för Kultur och Kommunikation, “Anthropocentrism and Androcentrism – An Ecofeminist Connection” <http://www.projectsparadise.com/anthropocentrism-androcentrism/>)

These three terms suggest a spatial image. Something, **in this case humanity, is situated at the centre of something.** There are numerous settings in which humans can be claimed to occupy the centre. For example, **an anthropocentric cosmology would claim that humanity occupies the physical centre of the universe**.31 **In environmental philosophy the terms are mainly applied to morality.** Here I shall analyze the ways in which humans are said to occupy the privileged spot of that specific universe. The starting point shall be Val Plumwood’s liberation model of anthropocentrism. I am beginning with Plumwood because she offers a detailed account of what centrism and anthropocentrism is. Plumwood defines centrism as a structure that is common to and underlies different forms of oppression, like colonialism, racism, and sexism. **The role of this structure is to generate a Centre and the Periphery, an oppressor and the oppressed, a Centre and the Other.** The shared features are: 1. **Radical exclusion: Those in the centre are represented as radically separated from and superior to the Other**. **The Centre is represented as free from the features of an inferiorized Other, and the Other as lacking the defining features of the Centre.** Differences are exaggerated to the point of preventing or hindering any sense of connection or continuity, to the point that “identification and sympathy are cancelled.”32 2. **Homogenization: Those on the periphery are represented as alike and replaceable. Similarities are exaggerated and differences are disregarded within that group.** “**The Other is not an individual but is related to as a member of a class of interchangeable items.”**33 Differences are only acknowledged when they affect or are deemed relevant to the desires and well-being of those in the centre. 3. *Denial*: **The Other is represented as inessential. Those in the centre deny their own dependency on those on the periphery.** 4. *Incorporation*: Those in the centre do not admit the autonomy of the Other. **The Other is represented as a function of the qualities of the Centre**. The Other either lacks or is the negation of those qualities that characterize those in the centre, being these qualities at the same time the most cherished and esteemed socially and culturally. 5. *Instrumentalism*: **Those in the centre deny the Other its independent agency. Those on the periphery are represented as lacking, for instance, ends of its own.** The Centre can consequently impose its own ends upon them without any conflict. **The Other becomes a means or a resource the Centre can make use of to satisfy its own needs, and is accordingly valued for the usefulness the Centre can find in it.** A second reason for beginning with Plumwood is that all the iniquitous senses of anthropocentrism that I have come across in the literature can, I think, be identified as either instrumentalism or denial. Warwick Fox’s *passive sense* of anthropocentrism would be an example of denial. **In this sense he speaks of anthropocentric ecophilosophy as one that focuses on social issues only, on interhuman affairs and problems**. For these environmentalists “**the nonhuman world retains its traditional status as the background against which the significant action – human action – takes place.”**34 **According to them the environmental crisis would then be solved within that human sphere by ensuring the well-being of humanity.** There would be no need to deal with the way humanity relates to nature. The other senses would be examples of either instrumentalism or of outcomes of instrumentalism: Andrew Dobson’s *strong* anthropocentrism (“The injustice and unfairness involved in the instrumental use of the non-human world”35); the account Robert Sessions gives of how deep ecology describes the anthropocentric attitude (“(1) Nonhuman nature has no value in itself, (2) humans (and/or God, if theistic) create what value there is, and (3) humans have the right (some would say the *obligation*) to do as they please with and in the nonhuman world as long as they do not harm other human’s interests”36); Tim Hayward’s account of the ethical criticism of anthropocentrism (“The mistake of giving exclusive or arbitrarily preferential consideration to human interests as opposed to the interests of other beings”37); Andrew Dobson’s description of what environmentalists consider a basic cause of ecological degradation and a potential cause of disaster (“Concern for ourselves at the expense of concern for the non-human world”38); and Warwick Fox’s **aggressive sense of anthropocentrism, according to which anthropocentrism is the overt discrimination against the nonhuman world.**

# AFF

## Aff Answers

### Cede the Political

#### Rejecting anthropocentrism cedes the political – it’s more productive to use human-centered logic to convince institutions to stop destroying the environment.

Sapontzis, ’95 (S. F., California State University, Hayward, “The Nature of the Value of Nature”, spring 1995, <http://ejap.louisiana.edu/EJAP/1995.spring/sapontzis.1995.spring.html>)

[5] Finally, if the motivating concern about the value of nature really is practical, it must be political. **In order to overcome the environmental crisis,** we must convince peoples and governments **to change their behaviors and institutions in the ways necessary to achieve that end**. **If** the peoples and **governments which are devastating nature are anthropocentric**, **then environmentally enlightened anthropocentric arguments have** an immediate **relevance to political debates concerning environmentally significant practice**s. In contrast**,** arguments employing ideas **of the overriding, objective** value of nature are politically irrelevant **until these anthropocentric**, **nature-devastating** peoples and **governments come to believe that nature has such value**. While neither task is easy, convincing peoples and governments to change their fundamental value systems seems a far more problematic and time-consuming task than convincing them that continuing their nature-devastating practices is contrary to their anthropocentric values. Especially in a time of crisis, pursuing the less problematic and time-consuming course of argument is the course to take to make a real, political difference. Consequently, the practical motivation of overcoming the environmental crisis does not direct us to establish the overriding, objective value of nature; rather, it directs us to develop politically compelling, anthropocentric arguments for environmentalism.

#### Pragmatically using anthropocentric thought can protect nature – the radical alternative collapses on itself because it anthropomorphizes nature.

Grundmann, ’91 (Reiner, “The Ecological Challenge to Marxism,” New Left Review I/187, May-June, <http://newleftreview.org/I/187/reiner-grundmann-the-ecological-challenge-to-marxism>)

As far as the use of the phrase ‘domination of nature’ is concerned, there seems to be nothing wrong with it if it denotes ‘conscious con- trol’. In this sense we speak of ‘taming’ a river, or of taming wild animals. To take another example: imagine a musician who plays her instrument with virtuosity. We call her play ‘masterly’; in German one would say ‘sie beherrscht ihr Instrument’. It is in this sense that we have to understand the domination of nature. It does not mean that one behaves in a reckless fashion towards it, any more than we suggest that a masterly player dominates her instrument (say a violin) when she hits it with a hammer. Anthropocentrism versus Ecocentrism I take it that the anthropocentric view lends itself naturally to such a reading. Non-anthropocentric views often (and typically) refuse all talk about ‘mastery of nature’. But such reasoning gets the matter wrong. As a defender of anthropocentrism, the American philosopher Bryan Norton correctly observed that environmentalists often fall prey to two typical confusions. The first is the belief that one must choose between attributing intrinsic or instrumental value to an object—that no object can be valued for its intrinsic value and simul- taneously for its usefulness. The second is the belief that one must either attribute intrinsic value to an object, or else leave it without any protection from the vagaries of human consumptive demands. Such beliefs sometimes lead to the confusion that the protection of nature on anthropocentric grounds is a contradiction in terms. As regards the first belief, Norton rightly contends that ‘one can assign instrumental value to an object without automatically denying that it has value beyond that usefulness . . . Attributing intrinsic value to an object limits the ways in which that object can be used, but need not prohibit all use of it.’47 As regards the second belief, Norton shows this to be wrong as well. A simple analogy makes this clear: ‘One need not attribute intrinsic value to a neighbour’s property in order to have a good reason not to destroy it. Nor need one attribute intrinsic value to nature in order to have good reason not to use it destructively.’48 Interestingly, from an instrumental view of nature thus understood, one can derive a rationale for the protection of species which is again anthropocentric. One might believe that humans who protect rather than destroy other living things are less likely to be violent in their dealings with other humans. To quote another example from Norton, one should, therefore, value wild birds, for example, ‘as providing occasions for the uplifting of human attitudes and values’.49 The anthropocentric approach has the main virtue of offering a reference point from which to evaluate ecological problems. This, as we shall see, can be defined in different ways (currently living human individuals, society, mankind, future generations); but no matter how we define it, it firmly establishes a clear criterion of how to judge existing ecological phenomena. Any ‘ecocentric’ approach, on the other hand, is bound to be inconsistent, unless it adopts a mystical standpoint. It is inconsistent because it pretends to define ecological problems purely from the standpoint of nature. It starts with assump- tions about nature and natural laws to which all human action should adapt. Note that the refusal of anthropocentrism is followed by a conspicuous position which anthropomorphizes nature; that is, it pro- jects human standards and inventions into the working of nature. But why should nature work in a ‘balanced’ manner? Or why should nature always be beautiful? Is it not humankind that introduces laws of beauty into nature? Marx, in the Paris Manuscripts, put it thus: ‘Man forms objects in accordance with the laws of beauty.’50

### Perm

#### Perm do both – We need to change our values and use science and policies.

Sivil, 2000 (Richard Sivil studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>)

Science and environmental policy options each have distinctive roles to play in addressing the environmental crisis. **Science is a useful tool for developing technology and increasing our understanding of the complexity of life**, while **governmental policies regulate human social behaviour.** We must, however, remember that each also has its respective problems. It would be unwise to assume that on their own they could effectively solve the current environmental crisis. Furthermore, **handing over the task to science or government entails a relinquishing of personal responsibility that will not make the environmental crisis go away**. The point is that we all act in ways that contribute to the crisis, and we are thus all responsible for what happens to the world around us. Accepting responsibility entails not only an acknowledgement that our individual actions contribute to the environmental crisis, but also that we are accountable for our actions. We should be willing to amend or change our actions in an attempt to remedy the current situation. Our actions, both individually and collectively, depend largely upon what we believe to be good, what is right, and what is permissible (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 1). Therefore we need to ask fundamental questions about what we as human beings value, why we value the things we do, the way we should live our lives, our place in nature, and the kind of world we want to leave behind for others (Des Jardins 1997:5). This places our value system at the heart of the environmental crisis. Clearly then**, placing the burden of responsibility on either science or government policy will do little to correct the situation as long as the values informing our actions remain unchanged**. **We will alter our attitudes and actions through questioning and changing our values, and in such a way we can begin to address the problems of the environment**. **In no way should this suggest that ethical theories can solve the environmental crisis on their own, for "ethical and philosophical analysis done in the abstract, ignorant of science, technology, and other relevant disciplines, will not have much to contribute to the resolution of environmental problems"** (Des Jardins 1997: 9). **Science, legislation, and ethics need to combine forces in order to address the crisis at hand.**

#### Domination and protection are compatible – perm solves.

Grundmann, ’91 (Reiner, “The Ecological Challenge to Marxism,” New Left Review I/187, May-June, <http://newleftreview.org/I/187/reiner-grundmann-the-ecological-challenge-to-marxism>)

It seems evident, therefore, that the definition of ‘nature’s nature’ and of eco- logical balance is a human (and, therefore, a social) act, a human definition which sets an ecological balance in relation to social needs, pleasures and desires. If we characterize human beings as living in, and dominating, nature, this does not produce two incompatible statements. When we term ecological a problem that arises as a con- sequence of society’s dealings with nature, many might agree. But I think it is useful to push the point further. It does not mean that the very fact of dealing with nature (manipulation, domination, harness- ing or inducing) is the crucial point, the ‘cause’, so to speak, of ecolog- ical problems. Ecological problems arise only from specific ways of dealing with nature. To repeat my earlier claim: both society’s existence in nature and its attempt to dominate nature are compatible; human beings do indeed live in, and dominate, nature.51 By their misunderstanding of this relation, both ecologists and their declared enemies maintain the mutually exclusive character of the two predicates. Consider the following argument which takes the ecocen- tric approach to extremes, thereby revealing its absurdity. It is difficult to know what is ‘normal’ for nature. Ecologists will probably argue that the ‘normal’ state of nature is one of balance. Since I can- not see how this definition makes sense without reference to human interests and definitions, I maintain that nature is always in ‘balance with itself’. Take the example of a river in which, due to pollution (detergents), no fish can survive. But instead of fish, other animals and plants (for example, algae) are flourishing. The ecologist, con- fronted with such an argument, would probably say that if the river cannot return to the former (‘normal’) state under its own powers, its ecosystem would have to be called ‘unbalanced’. But in so arguing, she would only reveal her preference for higher living organisms. Lower animals such as insects and bacteria are usually outside the concern of ecological reasoning. (Albert Schweitzer tried to be consist- ent and defended the right of living for the tsetse fly and the tubercle. This position, radical in ethical and religious respects, makes a consistent course of human action impossible. Consider the case of the AIDS virus!) Let us again take the argument a step further and consider the example of a river that is drying out. In this case we once more have ‘nature’, in the form of sand, rocks, plants, insects, amphibians, rep- tiles, mammals. The ecologist would probably maintain that nature’s diversity and complexity were being destroyed. And here, ironically, we have the re-emergence (if only implicit) of the anthropocentric view: namely, that it is man who has an interest in conserving natural complexity.

### Link Turns

#### Affirming infrastructure responds to “Urbicide” (destruction of built environments) which is the pinnacle of anthropocentrism.

Coward, ‘6 (Martin, PhD in Politics, Newcastle University, MA in Ideology and Discourse Analysis, Essex University,07 August 2006“Against anthropocentrism: the destruction of the built environment as a distinct form of political violence” <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/> displayFulltext?type=1&fid=461164&jid=RIS&volumeId=32&issueId=03&aid=461163

On 9th November 1993 the Bosnian–Croat army (HVO) destroyed the Stari Most, or Old Bridge, in Mostar, Bosnia Herzegovina. The bridge had spanned the Neretva river for over 400 years and was regarded as being both integral to the city of Mostar as well as an outstanding example of both Ottoman and Bosnian cultural heritage. Video footage of this event featured in numerous television news bulletins, adding to the stream of horrifying representations of suﬀering emerging from the bloody disintegration of the former Yugoslavia. The destruction of the Stari Most was striking insofar as it dramatically illustrated the violence perpetrated against Bosnians and their heritage. However, although it became a singularly iconic event, the destruction of the Stari Most should not be seen as an isolated case of urban destruction. Indeed, this incident is representative of a widespread assault upon urban fabric that has been a deﬁning feature of post-Cold War conﬂicts such as the 1992–95 Bosnian war, the Russian invasion of Chechnya, and the intensiﬁcation of the Israel–Palestine conﬂict in the wake of the second intifada. These conﬂicts have witnessed the deliberate destruction not only of symbolic cultural heritage, but also of the more mundane components of the built environment: shops, ﬂats, houses, car parks, cafés, public squares and so on. Croatian writer Slaveneka Drakulic’s Mostar Bridge Elegy, written shortly after the demolition of the Stari Most, represents an attempt to understand the signiﬁcance of such urban destruction. 3 Writing about the relation between a photograph of the space left between the two banks of the Neretva by the collapse of the Stari Most and a photograph of a Bosnian Muslim woman with her throat cut (after the massacre at Stupni Dol), Drakulic asks, ‘Why do I feel more pain looking at the image of the destroyed bridge than the image of the woman?’ She goes on to reply: Perhaps it is because I see my own mortality in the collapse of the bridge, not in the death of the woman. We expect people to die. We count on our own lives to end . . . The bridge [however] was built to outlive us . . . it transcended our individual destiny. A dead woman is one of us – but the bridge is all of us.

#### Urbacide is anthropocentric

Coward, ‘6 (Martin, PhD in Politics, Newcastle University, MA in Ideology and Discourse Analysis, Essex University,07 August 2006“Against anthropocentrism: the destruction of the built environment as a distinct form of political violence” <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/> displayFulltext?type=1&fid=461164&jid=RIS&volumeId=32&issueId=03&aid=461163

Whilst it is common to embark upon investigation of the nature of political violence out of due concern for individuals facing death or persecution, an exclusively anthropocentric focus fails to get to grips with the issues raised by destruction of objects it regards as secondary equipmental supplements to the lives of individual subjects. Moreover, in failing to get to grips with the issue of the disavowal of heterogeneity revealed by consideration of urbicide, anthropocentric understandings can lead to the enactment of political solutions that eﬀectively perpetuate the politics of exclusion. Anthropocentrism, thus, is not simply concern for humanity. Indeed, the examination of urbicide presented above can be said to have the coexistential condition of humanity as its principal concern. Rather anthropocentrism comprises a conceptual horizon which takes the pre-social individual as its principle subject. For the anthropocentric imaginary sociality and materiality are, therefore, secondary aspects of being. The principal crimes against humanity for the anthropocentric imaginary are, thus, the persecution of an individual, alone or as part of a group who share the same characteristics, on the grounds of their identity. Given the urbanisation of warfare, and the prevalence of urbicide, it seems a failure of imagination to continue our investigations into political violence from within an anthropocentric imaginary. Indeed, if the contemporary era is one of rapid urbanisation and the increasing interconnection that is sometimes referred to as globalisation, the question of coexistence is of particular salience for our era. Given the problems that the anthropocentric imaginary has in addressing the politics of exclusion that attacks the conditions of possibility of such coexistence, it would seem to be a poor tool for examination of the violences that confront us in the contemporary era.

### No Root Cause

#### Anthropocentrism is not the root cause of environmental harm.

Sapontzis, ’95 (S. F., California State University, Hayward, “The Nature of the Value of Nature”, spring 1995, <http://ejap.louisiana.edu/EJAP/1995.spring/sapontzis.1995.spring.html>)

While I support a great many environmental causes, **I doubt that the continuing devastation of nature is a logical consequence of anthropocentric value systems and that we need to develop value systems imputing overriding, objective value to nature in order to overcome the environmental crisis**. As long as people believed that nature was an inexhaustible storehouse of riches for fulfilling human interests, **anthropocentrism could lead to indifference to the effects of human actions on nature**. However, **now that we recognize the fragility of nature**, the devastating effects on nature of our indifference to the effects of our actions on nature, and the dependence of the quality of human life on preserving nature, **anthropocentric values should (logically) lead us to cease doing things which are destructive of the natural order**, insofar as the quality of human life depends on that order, and to start doing things which can undo the devastation already wrought, where doing so would maintain or enhance the quality of human life. **Understanding what changes in our behavior an environmentally enlightened anthropocentrism would require of us** is doubtless not a simple matter and likely **would not require that every endangered species be preserved or that we all return to the sort of simple homesteader life some environmentalists seem to favor**. However, that it would require us to do those things which must be done to overcome the environmental crisis is a logical truism, since that crisis is defined as a crisis for the biotic community on which the quality, and even the fact, of human life depend.

### Anthro Good

#### Anthropocentric ethics are inevitable and philosophically valid – humans are distinct and naturally dominate the environment as a means of survival.

Grundmann, ’91 (Reiner, “The Ecological Challenge to Marxism,” New Left Review I/187, May-June, <http://newleftreview.org/I/187/reiner-grundmann-the-ecological-challenge-to-marxism>)

It is thus clear that any discourse on nature and ecological problems is not without presuppositions; and these presuppositions lie within the cultural background of the participants of the discourse—they are a product of history. A definition of ‘nature’ or of ecological problems, therefore, always relates to an anthropocentric element. Oechsle, for example, rightly defends humanity’s special position within nature; and she rightly refuses to accept ecological naturalism. However, her ambivalence towards anthropocentrism leads to an ambiguous defence of it. To repeat: in my view, humanity’s special position within nature is characterized by its domination of nature. In order to separate the question of whether humanity has a special status within nature from the question of whether it should dominate nature, Oechsle (approv- ingly) cites Mumford, who claimed that within occidental civilization there have been examples of a ‘democratic’ technology. This argument allows her to defend a sort of anthropocentrism without having to embrace the notion of domination of nature. However, a distinction between a democratic and an authoritarian technology makes sense only with respect to humanity, not with respect to nature. Every technology, even the softest, forms a part of humanity’s domination of nature.58 Oechsle agrees with authors like Amery, Bahro and Meyer- Abich that we have to research the origins of the destruction of nature. These are seen in the specific occidental human self- understanding and worldview. As Amery puts it: ‘We have to lay bare the roots of these historical and ideal attitudes in order to initiate the painful process of a planetary revolution . . . If one forgets these roots, all necessary proposals will meet political and social resistance; and only if we become aware how deep these roots reach into our col- lective unconscious, will the attempt succeed.’59 But this ‘planetary revolution’ seems to be something of a utopian project; some might consider it even quite dangerous. Therefore, I think it is worthwhile to investigate the possibilities that a modern approach to the problem- atic offers us. Human beings have no fixed place where they must live; virtually every place on this planet can be inhabited by them. By this they distinguish themselves from most other animals (and, of course, plants) which survive only within a limited geographical, biological, climatic zone. How are human beings able to survive in an ‘insecure environment’? The answer is: by constructing a second ‘nature’ around themselves.60 This artificial, human-made nature is the embodiment of their necessity to fight against nature; it is the solution of the appar- ent contradiction that they are in and against nature. But something further follows from this. Because human beings organize their lives in the described way, they have no ‘natural enemies’, in contradistinc- tion to all other species. However, there are times when they are opposed by specific elements of nature; nature exerts its resistance upon them. As John Stuart Mill observed, the powers of nature ‘are often towards man in the position of enemies, from which he must wrest, by force and ingenuity, what little he can for his own use.’61 Nature, as such, is not always beneficial to human beings. It is com- pletely mistaken to identify nature with ‘good’, and technology or human culture with ‘bad’.62 Moralizing rarely helps. As Passmore has rightly observed, ‘these natural processes may in fact be quite harm- ful; so that, let us say, oysters from granite regions ought to be con- demned for human consumption. The “natural” is not necessarily harmless, let alone beneficial to man.’63 In exactly the same vein, Adorno, reflecting on the landscape of the Swiss Alps, remarked: ‘Both the scars of civilization and the untouched zone beyond the timber line are contrary to the idea that nature is cheering and warm- ing, dedicated only to man; they reveal what the cosmos looks like. The usual image of nature is limited, narrowly bourgeois, sensitive only to the tiny space in which historically familiar life flourishes; the bridle path is philosophy of culture.’64 And again Passmore, in reply to Barry Commoner’s ‘Third law of ecology—nature knows best’, pointed out: It is true enough . . . that every human intervention in an ecosystem is likely to disturb the workings of that system in a way that is detrimental to some member of it. So much is true of every change, man-induced or nature-induced. But it by no means follows, as his ‘law’ might seem to sug- gest, that every such change, or even most of such changes, will be detri- mental to human beings. Unlike the watches to which he compares them, ecological systems were not designed for man’s use. When men picked seeds off plants and sowed them on cleared ground they acted in a way that was detrimental to the organic life which was accustomed to feed on the fallen seeds. But only the most unreconstructed primitivist would suggest that the actions of our agricultural forefathers were destructive of human interests. A nature left entirely alone as ‘knowing best’ would support only the dreariest and most monotonous of lives.65

#### Anthropocentrism is key to the existence of life – space colonization.

Pinson ’02[Robert, B.A. in biology from Oberlin College and third-year law student at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, “Ethical Considerations For Terraforming Mars,” Environmental Law Institute News & Analysis, Nov. 2002, http://pajamasmedia.com/instapundit/lawrev/pinson.pdf.] JL

**Does Mars have rights? Not really. It is beautiful and has its use in its present form, but it also has no life, at least that we know of.** We will certainly research to see if life does in fact exist on Mars. But to a certain extent, **even if it does, the good of all life should outweigh the good of a naturally soon-to-be extinct form of life. On earth, many would allow the killing of one animal for the good of the whole population or species. In nature, the good of the many indeed outweighs the good of the few** (or the one). Planets must be vehicles for life in this universe; they are perfectly designed for it. Mars will not lose its uniqueness; earth certainly has not. In fact, it may be the life that grows on a planet that makes it truly unique. Life on Mars will evolve and adapt differently than life on earth. This difference will simultaneously make Mars unique, ensure the survival of life through diversification, and provide a wonderful opportunity to watch and learn. **If there is life on Mars, does it have rights?** The answer to that is yes and no. Many believe that we should nurture indigenous life on Mars. **I believe we should let natural selection decide. Let us expose terrestrial life to the Martian environment and watch what develops. Perhaps there will be genetic blending among the groups and life will become enhanced in beauty and diversification. Just because some bacteria may exist on Mars should not mean that all life on earth must stop expanding. Perhaps the bacteria are there by accident; perhaps they are the ancestors to life on earth. Certainly we should study any indigenous life on Mars, but we should not put its interests ahead of our own.**194A possibility exists that we will create new life that could destroy life as we know it. However, the possibility of this occurrence is so much smaller than the possibility of success that we must try. **The most applicable environmental ethic to terraforming Mars is anthropocentrism. It puts our interests at the forefront while still ensuring the existence of all life. It seems obvious that we should give ourselves the highest level of intrinsic worth since we are the ones placing the value.195 Life, of course, has the ultimate intrinsic worth, but we are a part of that life. It is in our best interest to preserve and expand life. What better way than by changing a planet that is currently unable to sustain life into one that can. Not only will we enrich our lives but also the life around us.** We cannot, of course, begin terraforming today, but we can research and plan for the future.

#### Focusing on ecological concerns necessitates sacrifice of human welfare for the sake of environmental ideology.

Smith, ‘9 (Wesley J., Senior Fellow in Human Rights and Bioethics at the Discovery Institute and a special consultant for the Center for Bioethics and Culture, “Poverty is the Answer: Radical Environmentalism Leading Us to a New Form of Human Sacrifice”, <http://stanford.wellsphere.com/bioethics-article/poverty-is-the-answer-radical-environmentalism-leading-us-to-a-new-form-of-human-sacrifice/632295>)

I have written how radical environmentalism is becoming distinctly anti-human. With the fervent ideology of Deep Ecology, it is explicitly stated. But some of what we are witnessing among the neo Greens is a drive to sacrifice human flourishing and prosperity--without the explicitly stated misanthropic dogmas. This willingness to sacrifice human welfare is reaching a fever pitch among those who believe that global warming is a crisis of unimagined proportions-- a belief that can border on quasi-religion or pure ideology. An article by David Owen--pushing the importance of economic decline to saving the planet--in the New Yorker illustrates the point. From his column: [T]he world's principal source of man-made greenhouse gases has always been prosperity. The recession makes that relationship easy to see: shuttered factories don’t spew carbon dioxide; the unemployed drive fewer miles and turn down their furnaces, air-conditioners, and swimming-pool heaters; struggling corporations and families cut back on air travel; even affluent people buy less throwaway junk. Most of us view our current economic crisis with alarm. Apparently, Owen sees it is a positive: The environmental benefits of economic decline, though real, are fragile, because they are vulnerable to intervention by governments, which, understandably, want to put people back to work and get them buying non-necessities again--through programs intended to revive ordinary consumer spending (which has a big carbon footprint), and through public-investment projects to build new roads and airports (ditto). And the answer, apparently, is more of the same decline we are now experiencing: The ultimate success or failure of Obama's [anti-global warming] program, and of the measures that will be introduced in Copenhagen this year, will depend on our willingness, once the global economy is no longer teetering, to accept policies that will seem to be nudging us back toward the abyss.

#### And sacrificing humanity in the name of the environment logically leads to genocide.

Smith, ‘9**.** (Wesley J., Senior Fellow in Human Rights and Bioethics at the Discovery Institute and a special consultant for the Center for Bioethics and Culture, “Poverty is the Answer: Radical Environmentalism Leading Us to a New Form of Human Sacrifice”, <http://stanford.wellsphere.com/bioethics-article/poverty-is-the-answer-radical-environmentalism-leading-us-to-a-new-form-of-human-sacrifice/632295>)

So, people need to be poorer, with all the concomitant increase in human suffering and shorter lives that would result from lower levels of prosperity. And remember, he only writes here about the well off areas of the world. But you can bet that he and his co-believers would strive mightily to stifle development in now destitute areas of the world--dooming perhaps billions of people to lives of continued squalor, disease, and lower life expectancies. More to the point of what we discuss here at SHS, human beings are a logical species: We take our ideas where they lead! (Thus, once Americans accepted the verity of Jefferson's "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal..."it doomed slavery, because servitude and equality are incompatible.) For the same reason, once we accept the fundamental premise of the piece--that we must sacrifice human prosperity to "save the planet"--the misanthropic ideology of Deep Ecology--humans as a viral infection afflicting Gaia--with radical depopulation as the cure--consider the genocidal implications--become a logical next step And thus we see how the healthy environmentalism that cleaned up filthy rivers and reduced Los Angeles air pollution is quickly mutating into an implicit and explicit anti-humanism that is in danger of leading to becoming so degraded in our self perception, that we could reach the point of being urged (forced?) to become human sacrifices on Gaia's altar.