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# Disposable Planet Kritik Shell (1-2)

## A) Space exploration expands the resource exploitation mindset of Earth to space:

Margaret R. McLean 2006 (Assistant director of the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/ethicalperspectives/space-exploration.html>) JMA

With yesterday's budget proposal, President Bush put money behind his January 2004 promise: "We will build new ships to carry man forward into the universe, to gain a new foothold on the moon, and to prepare for new journeys to worlds beyond our own." In the budget unveiled on Monday, almost $17 billion will fly into NASA's coffers with around $5.3 billion dedicated to space exploration. The Crew Exploration Vehicle and Launch Vehicles will be built; new spacecraft on their way to the moon and Mars will be whizzing overhead by 2014. NASA chief Michael Griffin claimed that this new budget would set the stage for "the expansion of human presence into the solar system." But before we think about exploring-and potentially exploiting-"the final frontier," we would do well to remember that we do not have a very good track record in protecting our planet home. We have expanded human presence into pristine forests resulting in the disruption of migratory routes, soil erosion, and species extinction. What can be learned from our presence on Earth about the potential impact of our forays into the outer reaches of the solar system? We are the only earthly creatures with the capacity to extend our influence beyond the 4 corners of the globe. This puts on us the responsibility to acknowledge that, despite the depths of space, it is not so limitless as to be able to weather mistreatment or suffer every demand we may place on it. One way to think about expanding our presence in the solar system is through the lens of stewardship. Stewardship envisions humans not as owners of the solar system but as responsible managers of its wonder and beauty. Stewardship holds us accountable for a prudent use of space resources. Such responsibility may support exploration of the final frontier, but at the same time it warns against exploitation of its resources. We must account for our urges and actions in terms of their impact on others, the universe, and the future. As we boldly plan to extend ourselves to places where no one has gone before, we would do well to consider the following principles: 1. Space preservation requires that the solar system be values for its own sake, not on the basis of what it can do for us. 2. Space conservation insists that extraterrestrial resources ought not to be exploited to benefit the few at the expense of the many or of the solar system itself. 3. Space sustainability asks that our explorations "do no harm" and that we leave the moon, Mars, and space itself no worse-and perhaps better-than we found them. As we expand human presence into the solar system, we ought not to park ethical considerations next to the launching pad. We must take our best ethical thinking with us as we cross the frontier of space exploration.

## B) The mindset of exploiting nature leads to ontological damnation that outweighs a nuclear war:

Zimmerman, ’94 **(Tulane Philosophy Professor, Contesting Earth’s Future)**

Heidegger asserted that human self-assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. 3 Loss of this relation would be **even more dangerous than** a nuclear war that might "bring about **the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth**." This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one's soul by losing one's relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there **will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself**. Further, since modernity's one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any "being" at all, the loss of humanity's openness for being is already occurring.55 Modernity's background mood is **horror in the face of nihilism**, which is consistent with the aim of **providing material "happiness" for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy**.56 The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be **equivalent to modernity's slow-motion destruction of nature**: unbounded destruc­tion would equal **limitless consumption**. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contented clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a **state of ontological damnation**: **hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise**.

# Disposable Planet Kritik Shell (2-2)

## C) The alternative is to recognize that humans are part of nature—this liberates both the environment and ourselves:

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

However, the new ideology that social ecology proposes is not concerned with the ‘self-realization’ of deep ecology, but instead the *absence of domination*. Indeed, domination is the key theme in the writings of Murray Bookchin, the most prominent social ecologist. For Bookchin, environmental problems are directly related to social problems. In particular, Bookchin claims that the hierarchies of power prevalent within modern societies have fostered a hierarchical relationship between humans and the natural world (Bookchin, 1982). Indeed, it is the ideology of the free market that has facilitated such hierarchies, reducing both human beings and the natural world to mere commodities. Bookchin argues that the liberation of both humans and nature are actually dependent on one another. Thus his argument is quite different from Marxist thought, in which man’s freedom is dependent on the complete *domination* of the natural world through technology. For Bookchin and other social ecologists, this Marxist thinking involves the same fragmentation of humans from nature that is prevalent in capitalist ideology. Instead, it is argued that humans must recognize that they are part of nature, not distinct or separate from it. In turn then, human societies and human relations with nature can be informed by the non-hierarchical relations found within the natural world. For example, Bookchin points out that within an ecosystem, there is no species more important than another, instead relationships are mutualistic and interrelated. This interdependence and lack of hierarchy in nature, it is claimed, provides a blueprint for a non-hierarchical human society.

# \*\*\*\*\*Link Extensions\*\*\*\*\*

# Links: Generic Space

## Focusing on space undermines ability to preserve biodiversity on Earth:

Neil A. Manson, 2009 (Necessary Anthropocentrism - University of Lancaster Dept. of Philosophy <http://www.environmentalphilosophy.org/ISEEIAEPpapers/2009/Manson.pdf>) JMA

Recent findings regarding extrasolar planets indicate that the universe is teeming with possible abodes for life, while both theoretical and observational cosmology suggest that spacetime is infinite. Assuming spacetime is infinite, either life exists at only one location or it exists in an infinite number of locations. If the former, then it seems our top priority should be to spread life throughout the galaxy, both in order to increase the raw amount and diversity of life, and to decrease the chances of a catastrophic setback to the development of complex life. If the latter, then the raw amount of life in the universe is infinite, and the degree of biodiversity is maximal. Thus nothing we do will have any significant effect on the amount of life or degree of biodiversity in existence, and so there is no reason to protect non-human life or preserve biodiversity on Earth – if we take the cosmic perspective on what it is for our actions to be significant.

# Links: Space Colonization

## (--) Colonization separates humans from nature and leads to a disposable planet mentality

**Lotta Viikari, 2008**, (Ph.D. in International Law, researcher at the Northern Institute for Environmental and Minority Law, *The Environmental Element in Space Law: Assessing the Present and Charting the Future* p. 17, P.Sipe)

Considering how fundamentally reliant human life is on the terrestrial environment (the Earth being the only place where we can live without having to resort to advanced technology for life support), efforts to create self-sufficient space colonies can be seen as representing a striving for not only mastery but even independence from nature. They may also reflect an ideology which considers the entire Earth as but one resource available for human utilization; after its depletion, we can move on to exploiting other planets. Such an approach has been referred to as the “disposable planet mentality”.

## (--) Colonization and Attaining Resources in Space leads to a Disposable Planet Mentality

Greg Rehmke, 2008 (Great Mambo Chicken And Other Stories of Science Slightly Over the Edge A Mambo Chicken And Other Stories of Science Slightly Over the Edge, http://www.economicthinking.org/technology/greatmambo.html P. Sipe)

Some environmentalists who have turned their world-view skyward like the idea of a pristine, undeveloped solar system&emdash;sort of a cosmic nature park. Most of the scientists and engineers in Great Mambo Chicken, however, lack a highly developed sense of environmental consciousness. Most in fact look forward to disassembling the various planets to build broader living spaces. Freeman Dyson would smash and reshape Jupiter into a thin sphere that would circle the entire sun, capture all its currently wasted energy, and thus allow trillions more people to live comfortably in (what's left of) the solar system. Dave Criswell would smash up Mercury to form the powerful machinery needed to spin matter out of the sun. Not everyone in Great Mambo Chicken is so enthusiastic to smash up the planets for future real estate and sun-draining machinery. David Thompson, a zoology professor at the University of Wisconsin, worries that space colonies would be less livable than advertised, and would encourage a "disposable planet mentality." Thompson's "Astropopulation" article in Co-Evolutionary Quarterly (Summer 1978) criticized the growing garbage build-up in space, from orbiting space junk to leftover lunar trash heaps.

# Links: Space Mining

## (--) The Aff only views the environment in economic relation as a resource to be used

**Aldo Leopold, 1948** (internationally respected scientist, Author of A Sand County Almanac <http://home.btconnect.com/tipiglen/landethic.html>) JMA

An ethic to supplement and guide the economic relation to land presupposes the existence of some mental image of land as a biotic mechanism. We can be ethical only in relation to something we can see, feel, understand, love, or otherwise have faith in. The image commonly employed in conservation education is 'the balance of nature.' For reasons too lengthy to detail here, this figure of speech fails to describe accurately what little we know about the land mechanism. A much truer image is the one employed in ecology: the biotic pyramid. I shall first sketch the pyramid […] This thumbnail sketch of land as an energy circuit conveys three basic ideas: That land is not merely soil. That the native plants and animals kept the energy circuit open; others may or may not, That man-made changes are of a different order than evolutionary changes, and have effects more comprehensive than is intended or foreseen These ideas, collectively, raise two basic issues: Can the land adjust itself to the new order? Can the desired alterations be accomplished with less violence?

# Links: Valuing Nature for Humans

## Valuing Nature only for the benefits of humans entrenches anthropocentrism:

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

Although many environmental philosophers want to distance themselves from the label of anthropocentrism, it nevertheless remains the case that a number of coherent anthropocentric environmental ethics have been elaborated (Blackstone, 1972; Passmore, 1974; O’Neill, 1997; and Gewirth, 2001). This should really be of little surprise, since many of the concerns we have regarding the environment appear to be concerns precisely because of the way they affect human beings. For example, pollution diminishes our health, resource depletion threatens our standards of living, climate change puts our homes at risk, the reduction of biodiversity results in the loss of potential medicines, and the eradication of wilderness means we lose a source of awe and beauty. Quite simply then, an anthropocentric ethic claims that we possess obligations to respect the environment for the sake of human well-being and prosperity. Despite their human-centeredness, anthropocentric environmental ethics have nevertheless played a part in the extension of moral standing. This extension has not been to the non-human natural world though, but instead to human beings who do not yet exist. The granting of moral standing to future generations has been considered necessary because of the fact that many environmental problems, such as climate change and resource depletion, will affect future humans much more than they affect present ones. Moreover, it is evident that the actions and policies that *we* as contemporary humans undertake will have a great impact on the well-being of future individuals.

## (--) Emphasizing material benefits of the environment in policy debates skews policies away from environmental protection:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Combining esthetic and ethical arguments with the material discourse does not automatically solve this problem. Because material benefits are more readily quantified, they are likely to outweigh nonmaterial benefits in the cost-benefit comparisons encouraged by the material focus. The predictable result is that material benefits will be maximized at the cost of nonmaterial ones. The national parks provide a concrete example. Park proponents first argued that national parks were important for their esthetic qualities, which could express and strengthen the national character. But in order to build political support they added that parks would benefit local and national economies. As a result, park managers felt compelled to promote heavy visitation in order to realize the economic benefits they had promised, at the expense of maintaining the parks' distinctive esthetic and character-building values. n228 With this history as background, environmentalists should be wary of emphasizing the material discourse in political debates. They are likely to find that the political benefits of that strategy, although real, are outweighed by its tendency to skew policies in ways that systematically underestimate, or even deny, the nonmaterial values of nature.

# Links: Environmental Crisis Rhetoric

## Ecological horror stories only encourage us to view nature as a standing reserve:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

While the discourses themselves are both valid and inevitable, the forms in which they have been brought to the political debate limit our ability to respond to, and even our ability to fully perceive, the problem of nature protection. The ecological horror story encourages us to view nature solely as a bundle of resources for human consumption or convenience, to rely on cost-benefit accounting in making decisions about what parts of nature we should protect, and to ignore the loss of nature short of catastrophic ecological collapse. The wilderness story teaches us that nature is defined by our absence, and encourages us to establish a limited number of highly protected reserves. The story of Noah's ark allows us to believe we are facing a short-term crisis, resolvable through straightforward temporary measures.

## Environmental disaster rhetoric only undermines efforts at real change:

Frank B. Cross, 2002 (Professor of Business Law, University of Texas at Austin, Case Western Reserve Law Review, Winter, 2002, 53 Case W. Res. 477; Lexis)

It is distinctly possible that at least some aspect of environmental threats, such as climate change, are real ones that should command policy attention. The response may have been delayed, if anything, by "this 'cry wolf' track record of prediction of atmospheric events," which meant that it was "not surprising that many meteorologists have deep reservations about taking costly actions on the basis of the predictions." n87 Not only does the exaggeration of the harm of warming make any effort appear futile, n88 the past litany of failed predictions hands a sword to critics of taking any action on climate. n89 Relying on predictions of doom potentially undermines environmental action in other ways as well. The focus on "disasters" may also distort environmental law, policy, and budgets and thereby hamper effective regulation. n90

# Links: Representations

## (--) Rhetoric matters in the context of environmental protection—the way problems are described affects their perception and ultimate solution:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Rhetoric matters. That is almost too basic to be worth saying, but it bears repeating because sometimes the rhetoric we use to describe problems becomes so ingrained as to be almost invisible. Even if we are unaware of it, though, rhetoric has the very real effect of severely constraining our perception of a problem and its potential solutions. Terminology is one aspect of rhetoric. The words we use to describe the world around us condition our response to that world. Whether we use the word "swamps" or "wetlands," for example, may determine whether we drain or protect those areas. n1 Not surprisingly, the battle to control terminology is an important one in the environmental context. n2 But there is far more to the rhetoric of law. The way words are put together to form stories and discourses shapes the law and society. Stories, which put a human face on [\*13] concerns that might otherwise go unnoticed, exert a powerful emotional tug. n3 "Discourses," loose collections of concepts and ideas, provide a shared language for envisioning problems and solutions. n4 This Article focuses on the use of rhetoric in political battles over the extent to which law should protect nature against human encroachment. At some level, all rhetoric in a democratic society can be tied to the political process; any statement that any member of the political community encounters may influence his or her views, votes, financial contributions, or other political activities. But some communications are more likely than others to affect political outcomes or to play a privileged role in the implementation and interpretation of law. The discussion that follows concentrates on such "political rhetoric," including communications directed to legislatures, agencies, or voters with the intention of influencing the outcome of political decisions; n5 statements made by legislators or agency personnel to explain or justify their decisions; and legislative, administrative, and judicial actions.

## (--) Stories about nature are crucial to understanding the policies that will eventually be formulated:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

The stories we tell to explain and justify our view of the relationship of humanity with nature are important determinants of the policies we adopt and the attitudes we develop. To date we have relied on three primary discourses to explain why and how the law should protect nature. These discourses are all valid. Nature is an important material resource for human use, a unique esthetic resource for human enjoyment, and most people agree that we have some kind of ethical obligation to protect nature.

# \*\*\*\*\*Impact Extensions\*\*\*\*\*

# Impacts: Environmental Destruction

## Their anthropocentric framing of the environment is the cause of species extinction, global warming, along with air and water pollution

Kortenkamp and Moore 2001 (University of Wisconsin – Madison – ECOCENTRISM AND ANTHROPOCENTRISM: MORAL REASONING ABOUT

ECOLOGICAL COMMONS DILEMMAS http://wikisdis.inrs.ca/images/e/ec/Zz%C2%ABc.pdf)

Ecocentrism and anthropocentrism: moral reasoning about Ecological commons dilemmas Aldo Leopold, sometimes called the father of environmental ethics, expressed these ideas over 50 years ago in his revolutionary essay ``The Land Ethic.'' Today we have clearly not accomplished the ``ecological necessity'' he called for. Environmental crises, such as species extinction, global warming, air and water pollution, and wild land destruction, are some of the most important problems currently facing our society. How we deal with these problems largely depends on how we perceive our relationship with the land. Do we view nature as property for us to use however we wish for our own benefit, or does nature have intrinsic value, value aside from its usefulness to humans? A half-century after Leopold gave us his land ethic, just how far and in what ways have our land ethics developed? The purpose of this project is to examine some issues in how people extend ethics to the natural environment. Environmental ethics was given a central place in debate among scientists by Hardin (1968) who argued that the human race is faced with the dilemma of how to prevent overuse and depletion of natural resources when individuals desire to maximize their gains. As noted by Dawes (1980), many environmental issues can be construed as social dilemmas.

## Warming causes human extinction

**Tickell, 8-11-2008**

(Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Gaurdian, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

## Must reverse species extinction or put human survival at risk:

California Academy of Sciences, last modified 8/21/2004 (HYPERLINK "http://www.calacademy.org/research/library/biodiv.htm" http://www.calacademy.org/research/library/biodiv.htm)

Currently, more than 10,000 species become extinct each year and while precise calculation is difficult, it is certain that this rate has increased alarmingly in recent years. The central cause of species extinction is destruction of natural habitats by human beings. **Human survival itself** may **depend upon reversing this accelerating threat to species diversity**. Among the millions of undescribed species are important new sources of food, medicine and other products. When a species vanishes, **we lose access to the survival strategies** encoded in its genes through millions of years of evolution. We lose the opportunity to understand those strategies which may hold absolutely essential options for **our own future survival as a species**. And we lose not only this unique evolutionary experience, but emotionally, we lose the unique beauty, and the unique spirit, which mankind has associated with that life form.

# Impact Extensions: Calculation

## (--) Technological thinking leads to calculation of nature:

Deluca, '5 **(Associate Professor of Speech Communication and adjunct in the Institute of Ecology at the University of Georgia, Ethics & the Environment 10.1)**

Machination is unconditional controllability, the domination of all beings, the world, and earth through calculation, acceleration, technicity, and giganticism. Calculation represents a reduction of knowing to mathematics and science and a reduction of the world and earth to what is calculable, a step taken decisively by Descartes (1999, 84–96). Machination is the "pattern of generally calculable explainability, by which everything draws nearer to everything else equally and becomes completely alien to itself" (1999, 92). The unrestrained **domination of machination produces a totalizing worldview** that enchants: **"When machination finally dominates and permeates everything, then there are no longer any conditions by which** still actually **to detect the enchantment and to protect oneself from it.** The bewitchment by technicity and **its constantly self-surpassing progress are only one sign of this enchantment**, by [End Page 75] virtue of which **everything presses forth into calculation, usage**, breeding, **manageability, and regulation**" (1999, 86–87). Heidegger prophetically predicts that machination will produce "a gigantic progress of sciences in the future. These advancements will bring exploitation and usage of the earth as well as rearing and training of humans into conditions that are still inconceivable today" (1999, 108). **Animals and plants are reduced to various forms of use value and**, more significantly, are **banished from Being-in-the-world with us**: "What is a plant and an animal to us anymore, when we take away use, embellishment, and entertainment" (1999, 194). "**Nature" suffers a similar fate**: "What happens to nature in technicity, when nature is separated out from beings by the natural sciences? The growing—or better, the simple rolling unto its end—destruction of **'nature'.... And finally what was left was only 'scenery'** and recreational opportunity and even this still calculated into the gigantic and arranged for the masses" (1999, 195). **Under the unrestrained domination of machination, humans suffer a "hollowing out**" (1999, 91, 348) and Being-in-the-world is replaced by "adventures." (I am here translating Erlebnis as adventure. Others translate it as lived-experience.)

## (--) Calculation allows individuals to be given relative worth or value, which necessarily requires that some lives are value-less. Such a possibility renders life meaningless and justifies extermination

Michael Dillon, professor of politics and international relations at the University of Lancaster, April 1999, Political Theory, Vol. 27, No. 2, “Another Justice,” p. 164-5

Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ultimately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economies of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism. They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability. Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. Once rendered calculable, however, units of account are necessarily submissible not only to valuation but also, of course, to devaluation. Devaluation, logically, can extend to the point of counting as nothing. Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of holocaust. However liberating and emancipating systems of value-rights-may claim to be, for example, they run the risk of counting out the invaluable. Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life. Herewith, then, the necessity of championing the invaluable itself. For we must never forget that, “we are dealing always with whatever exceeds measure.” But how does that necessity present itself? Another Justice answers: as the surplus of the duty to answer to the claim of Justice over rights. That duty, as with the advent of another Justice, is integral to the lack constitutive of the human way of being.

# Impact Extensions: Genocide

## (--) These patterns of exploitation justify extermination and genocide:

Michael Dillon, professor of politics and international relations at the University of Lancaster, April 1999, Political Theory, Vol. 27, No. 2, “Another Justice,” p. 164-5

Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ultimately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economies of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism. They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability. Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. Once rendered calculable, however, units of account are necessarily submissible not only to valuation but also, of course, to devaluation. Devaluation, logically, can extend to the point of counting as nothing. Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of holocaust. However liberating and emancipating systems of value-rights-may claim to be, for example, they run the risk of counting out the invaluable. Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life. Herewith, then, the necessity of championing the invaluable itself. For we must never forget that, “we are dealing always with whatever exceeds measure.” But how does that necessity present itself? Another Justice answers: as the surplus of the duty to answer to the claim of Justice over rights. That duty, as with the advent of another Justice, is integral to the lack constitutive of the human way of being.

# Impact Extensions: Standing Reserve

## (--) The logic of the standing reserve causes us to view humans as a standing reserve.

Beckman 2000

(Tad, of Harvey Mudd College. “Heidegger and Environmental Ethics.” 2000.) <http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML>

As human beings become progressively more involved as the orderers of a reality conceived as standing-reserve, they too become standing-reserve at a higher level of organization. In other words, as human beings come to see other beings in the world only for their potential applications to human dispositions, humans themselves come to mirror this shallowness of "being" and to see themselves merely in terms of potential resources to the dispositions of others. Enframing challenges us forth in the decisive role as organizer and challenger of all that is in such a way that human life withdraws from its essential nature. Within this role the essence of our humanity falls into concealment; we can no longer grasp the real nature of life. We withdraw into a conception of reality that is subjective and isolated; but Heidegger asserts that the human essence is not a being in isolation.

## (--) The will to technology unleashes a destructive process in which all organisms on Earth are ordered into standing in reserve.

**Kroker, 2003** (Arthur, Canada Research Chair in Technology, Culture and Theory at the University of Victoria, “The Will To Technology And the Culture of Nihilism”, www.ctheory.net)

Heidegger presents us with a metaphysics of political economy. Beginning with the assumption that political economy is not understandable solely in its own language, Heidegger describes a relentless politics of economic and psychological appropriation by which the world-picture is reduced to a machinery of harvesting. Everything is there: the reduction of human experience to a "standing-reserve;" the mobilization of human consciousness into an support-system for technicity; the mutation of human flesh into the skin of the technodrome; the coming alive of technicity as a disembodied cybernetic organism, part-flesh/part-machine; the 'harvesting' of human vision as a cybernetic steering-system for the new economy. Here, the global political economy is rapidly transformed into an "energy source" for the coming to be of the fully realized technological future, with everything in a permanent "waiting" mode, on stand-by ready to be parasited by the demands of technicity. The French theorist, Paul Virilio, might have described the politics of "electrooptics" as a form of dromology, but Heidegger went further. For him, contemporary political economy is the exterminatory metaphysics of harvesting the "standing-reserve"(humans, animals, nature) of its living energy, and then abandoning it as yet another empty node in a random cycle of economic circulation. In Heidegger's sense, contemporary political economy is understandable only in the language of vampire metaphysics.

# Impact Extensions

## (--) Technological thinking and the will to action is the root cause of environmental catastrophe. The need for ceaseless interventions is motivated by guilt for the status quo, replicates and furthers environmental destruction.

LaDelle **McWhorter**, Professor of Philosophy at Northeast Missouri State, 19**92**, *Heidegger and the Earth*, ed: McWhorter.

Thinking today must concern itself with the earth. **Wherever we turn** on newsstands, on the airwaves, and in even the most casual of conversations everywhere - we **are inundated by predictions of ecological catastrophe and omnicidal doom.** And many of these predictions bear themselves out in our own experience. We now live with the ugly, painful, and impoverishing consequences of decades of technological innovation and expansion without restraint of at least a century of disastrous "natural resource management” policies, and of more than two centuries of virtually unchecked industrial pollution - consequences that include the fact that millions of us on any given day are suffering, many of us dying of diseases and malnutrition that are the results of humanly produced ecological devastation; the fact that thousands of species now in existence will no longer exist on this planet by the turn of the century; the fact that our planet's climate has been altered, probably irreversibly, by the carbon dioxide and chlorofluorocarbons we have heedlessly poured into our atmosphere; and the mind-boggling fact that it may now be within humanity's Power to destroy all life on this globe. **Our usual response to such prophecies of doom is to** ignore them or, when we cannot do that, to scramble **to find some way to manage our problems, some quick solution, some technological fix**. But **over and over** again new resource management techniques, **new solutions, new technologies disrupt delicate systems even further, doing still more damage to a planet already dangerously out of ecological balance**. **Our ceaseless interventions** seem only to **make things worse**, to perpetuate a cycle of human activity followed by ecological disaster followed by human intervention followed by a new disaster of another kind. In fact, it would appear that **our trying to** do things, change things, **fix things cannot be the solution, because it is part of the problem itself.** But, if we cannot act to solve our problems, what should we do?

## (--) The other team views the world as a standing reserve that can be controlled and tapped to fulfill human desires. The endpoint of this logic is biopolitical genocide as humans become part of this standing reserve as well in support of the greater good.

LaDelle McWhorter, Professor of Philosophy at Northeast Missouri State, 1992, *Heidegger and the Earth*, ed: **McWhorter.**

What is now especially dangerous about this sense of our own managerial power, born of forgetfulness, is that it results in our viewing the world as mere resources to be stored or consumed. Managerial or technological thinkers, Heidegger says, view the earth, the world, all things as mere Bestand, standing-reserve. All is here simply for human use. No plant, no animal, no ecosystem has a life of its own, has any significance apart from human desire and need. Nothing, we say, other than human beings, has any intrinsic value. All things are instruments for the working out of human will. Whether we believe that God gave Man dominion or simply that human might (sometimes called inteligence or ratlonality) in the face of ecological fragility makes right, we managerial, technological thinkers tend to believe that the earth is only a stockpile or a set of commodities to be managed, bought, and sold. The forest is timber; the river, a power source. Even people have become resources, human resources, personnel to be managed, or populations to be controlled. This managerial, technological mode of revealing Heidegger says is embedded in and constitutive of Western culture and has been gathering strength for centuries. Now it is well on its way to extinguishing all other modes of revealing, all other ways of being human and being earth. It will take tremendous effort to think through danger, to think past it and beyond, tremendous courage and resolve to allow thought of the mystery to come forth; thought of the inevitability along with revealing, of concealment, of loss, of ignorance; thought of the occurring of things and their passage as events not ultimately under human control. And of course even the call to allow this thinking - couched as it so often must be in a grammatical imperative appealing to an agent - is itself a paradox, the first that must be faced and allowed to speak to us and to shatter us as it scatters thinking in new directions, directions of which we have not yet dreamed, directions of which we may never dream.

# Impacts

## (--) Disposable Planet Mentality Leads to Ecological Destruction on Earth

J. Baird Callicott, 1989. (Ph.D. in Environmental Philosophy and Environmental Ethics, *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*” p. 308 P. Sipe)

Hartmann denies that extraterrestrial resource development and colonization, which he enthusiastically recommends, would lead to a “’disposable planet mentality’” (p. 229). Yet he apparently forgets this disclaimer and later writes, “the possibilities of self-sustaining colonies of humans…on other planetary surfaces are really increasing the chances for survival of the human race against [political and environmental] disasters.” If we think we can escape these disasters by emigrating off the Earth, we shall have less incentive to try to avert them.

# Impacts

## (--) Introducing environmental technologies without challenging ethics is the same system that justified using the atomic bomb

**Cornelia Dean, 2008** (The New York Times Media Group <http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.samford.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>?) JMA

Last year, a private company proposed ''fertilizing'' parts of the ocean with iron, in hopes of encouraging carbon-absorbing blooms of plankton. Meanwhile, researchers elsewhere are talking about injecting chemicals into the atmosphere, launching sun-reflecting mirrors into stationary orbit above the earth or taking other steps to reset the thermostat of a warming planet. This technology might be useful, even life-saving. But it would inevitably produce environmental effects impossible to predict and impossible to undo. So a growing number of experts say it is time for broad discussion of how and by whom it should be used, or if it should be tried at all. Similar questions are being raised about nanotechnology, robotics and other powerful emerging technologies. There are even those who suggest humanity should collectively decide to turn away from some new technologies as inherently dangerous. ''The complexity of newly engineered systems coupled with their potential impact on lives, the environment, etc., raise a set of ethical issues that engineers had not been thinking about,'' said William Wulf, a computer scientist who until last year headed the National Academy of Engineering. As one of his official last acts, he established the Center for Engineering, Ethics and Society there. Rachelle Hollander, a philosopher who directs the center, said the new technologies were so powerful that ''our saving grace, our inability to affect things at a planetary level, is being lost to us,'' as human-induced climate change is demonstrating. Engineers, scientists, philosophers, ethicists and lawyers are taking up the issue in scholarly journals, online discussions and conferences around the world. ''It's a hot topic,'' said Ronald Arkin, a computer scientist at Georgia Tech who advises the U.S. Army on robot weapons. ''We need at least to think about what we are doing while we are doing it, to be aware of the consequences of our research.'' So far, though, most scholarly conversation about these issues has been ''piecemeal,'' said Andrew Maynard, chief science adviser for the Project on Emerging Nanotechnologies at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington. ''It leaves the door open for people to do something that is going to cause long-term problems.'' That's what some environmentalists said they feared when Planktos, a California company, announced it would embark on a private effort to fertilize part of the South Atlantic with iron in hopes of producing carbon-absorbing plankton blooms that the company could market as carbon offsets. Countries bound by the London Convention, an international treaty governing dumping at sea, issued a ''statement of concern'' about the work, and a UN group called for a moratorium, but it is not clear what would have happened had Planktos not abandoned the effort for lack of money. ''There is no one to say 'thou shalt not,''' said Jane Lubchenco, an environmental scientist at Oregon State University and a former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. When scientists and engineers discuss geoengineering, it is obvious they are talking about technologies with the potential to change the planet. But the issue of engineering ethics applies as well to technologies whose planet-altering potential may not emerge until it is too late. Arkin said robotics researchers should consider not just how to make robots more capable, but also who must bear responsibility for their actions and how much human operators should remain ''in the loop,'' particularly with machines to aid soldiers on the battlefield or the disabled in their homes. But he added that progress in robotics was so ''insidious'' that people might not realize they had ventured into ethically challenging territory until too late. Ethical and philosophical issues have long occupied biotechnology, where institutional review boards commonly rule on proposed experiments and advisory committees must approve the use of gene-splicing and related techniques. When the U.S. government initiated its effort to decipher the human genome, a percentage of the budget went to consideration of ethics issues like genetic discrimination. But such questions are relatively new for scientists and engineers in other fields. Some are calling for the same kind of discussion that microbiologists organized in 1975 when the immense power of their emerging knowledge of gene-splicing or recombinant DNA began to dawn on them. The meeting, at the Asilomar conference center in California, gave rise to an ethical framework that still prevails in biotechnology. ''Something like Asilomar might be very important,'' said Andrew Light, director of the Center for Global Ethics at George Mason University, one of the organizers of a conference in Charlotte, North Carolina, in April on the ethics of emerging technologies. ''The question now is how best to begin that discussion among the scientists, to encourage them to do something like this, then figure out what would be the right mechanism, who would fund it, what form would recommendations take, all those details.'' But an engineering Asilomar might be hard to bring off. ''So many people have their nose to the bench,'' Arkin said, ''historically a pitfall of many scientists.'' Paul Thompson, a philosopher at Michigan State and former secretary of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, said many scientists were trained to limit themselves to questions answerable in the real world, in the belief that ''scientists and engineers should not be involved in these kinds of ethical questions.'' Researchers working in geoengineering say they worry that if people realize there are possible technical fixes for global warming, they will feel less urgency about reducing greenhouse gas emissions. ''Even beginning the discussion, putting geoengineering on the table and beginning the scientific work, could in itself make us less concerned about all the things that we need to start doing now,'' Light said. On the other hand, some climate scientists argue that if people realized such drastic measures were on the horizon, they would be frightened enough to reduce their collective carbon footprint. Still others say that, given the threat global warming poses to the planet, it would be unethical not to embark on the work needed to engineer possible remedies - and to let policy makers know of its potential. But when to begin this kind of discussion? ''It's a really hard question,'' Thompson said. ''I don't think anyone has an answer to it.'' Many scientists do not like talking about their research before it has taken shape, for fear of losing control over it, according to David Goldston, former chief of staff at the House Science Committee and a columnist for the journal Nature. This mind-set is ''generally healthy,'' he wrote in a recent column, but it is ''maladapted for situations that call for focused research to resolve societal issues that need to be faced with some urgency.'' And then there is the longstanding fear held by scientists that if they engage with the public for any reason, their work will be misunderstood or portrayed in inaccurate or sensationalized terms. Francis Collins, who is stepping down as head of the government human genome project, said he had often heard researchers say ''it's better if people don't know about it.'' But he said he was proud that the National Human Genome Research Institute had from the beginning devoted substantial financing to research on privacy, discrimination and other ethical issues raised by progress in genetics. If scientific research has serious potential implications in the real world, ''the sooner there is an opportunity for public discussion the better,'' he said in a recent interview. In part, that is because some emerging technologies will require political adjustments. For example, if the planet came to depend on chemicals in space or orbiting mirrors or regular oceanic infusions of iron, system failure could mean catastrophic - and immediate - climate change. But maintaining the systems requires a political establishment with guaranteed indefinite stability. As Collins put it, the political process these days is ''not well designed to handle issues that are not already in a crisis.'' Or as Goldston put it, ''with no grand debate over first principles and no accusations of acting in bad faith, nanotechnology has received only fitful attention.'' Meanwhile, there is growing recognition that climate engineering, nanotechnology and other emerging technologies are full of ''unknown unknowns,'' factors that will not become obvious until they are put into widespread use at a scale impossible to turn back, as happened, in a sense, with the atomic bomb. Before its first test, some of its developers worried that the blast might set the atmosphere on fire. They did not anticipate that the bombs would generate electromagnetic pulses intense enough to paralyze electrical systems across a continent.

# \*\*\*\*\*Alternative Solvency Extensions\*\*\*\*\*

# Alternative Solvency

## (--) The alternative moves past the anthropocentric ethic of the affirmative and extend ethics beyond humanity

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

As noted above, perhaps the most fundamental question that an environmental ethic faces is simply, *why* do we have any obligations concerning the natural environment? If the answer is simply that we, as human beings, will perish if we do not constrain our actions towards nature, then that ethic is considered to be ‘anthropocentric’. Anthropocentrism literally means ‘human-centeredness’, and in one sense *all* ethics must be considered anthropocentric. After all, as far as we know, only human beings can reason about and reflect upon ethical matters, thus giving all moral debate a definite ‘human-centeredness’. However, within environmental ethics anthropocentrism usually means something more than this; it usually refers to an ethical framework that grants ‘moral standing’ solely to human beings. Thus, an anthropocentric ethic claims that only human beings are morally considerable in their own right, meaning that all the direct moral obligations we possess, including those we have with regard to the environment, are owed to our fellow human beings. While the history of western philosophy is dominated by this kind anthropocentrism, it has come under considerable attack from many environmental ethicists. Such thinkers have claimed that ethics must be extended beyond humanity, and that moral standing should be accorded to the non-human natural world. Some have claimed that this extension should run to sentient animals, others to individual living organisms, and still others 3 to holistic entities such as rivers, species and ecosystems. Under these ethics, we have obligations in respect of the environment because we actually owe things *to* the creatures or entities within the environment themselves. Determining whether our environmental obligations are founded on anthropocentric or non-anthropocentric reasoning will lead to different accounts of what those obligations are. This section examines the prominent accounts of moral standing within environmental ethics, together with the implications of each.

## (--) Must challenge anthropocentrism to treat the environment with respect:

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

Clearly then, the problems posed by just a minimal extension of moral standing are real and difficult. Despite this, however, most environmental philosophers feel that such anthropocentric ethics do not go far enough, and want to extend moral standing beyond humanity. Only by doing this, such thinkers argue, can we get the beyond narrow and selfish interests of humans, and treat the environment and its inhabitants with the respect they deserve.

## (--) The alternative is to reject the Aff and expand our environmental ethics allowing space into the Community

**Aldo** Leopold, 1948 (internationally respected scientist, Author of A Sand County Almanac <http://home.btconnect.com/tipiglen/landethic.html>) JMA

All Ethics So Far Evolved Rest Upon a Single Premise: That the Individual is a Member of a Community of Interdependent Parts. His Instincts Prompt Him to Compete for His Place in That Community, but His Ethics Prompt Him Also to Co-Operate (Perhaps in Order That There May Be a Place to Compete for). the Land Ethic Simply Enlarges the Boundaries of the Community to Include Soils, Waters, Plants, and Animals, or Collectively: the Land. this Sounds Simple: Do We Not Already Sing Our Love for and Obligation to the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave? Yes, but Just What and Whom Do We Love? Certainly Not the Soil, Which We are Sending Helter-Skelter Downriver. Certainly Not the Waters, Which We Assume Have No Function Except to Turn Turbines, Float Barges, and Carry off Sewage. Certainly Not the Plants, of Which We Exterminate Whole Communities Without Batting an Eye. Certainly Not the Animals, of Which We Have Already Extirpated Many of the Largest and Most Beautiful Species. a Land Ethic of Course Cannot Prevent the Alteration, Management, and Use of These 'Resources,' but It Does Affirm Their Right to Continued Existence, and, at Least in Spots, Their Continued Existence in a Natural State. in Short, a Land Ethic Changes the Role of Homo Sapiens from Conqueror of the Land-Community to Plain Member and Citizen of It. It Implies Respect for His Fellow-Members, and Also Respect for the Community as Such.

# Alternative Solvency

## (--) Raising questions about our obligations in respect to the environment and why we have them is needed to challenge public policy

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

Of course, pollution and the depletion of natural resources have not been the only environmental concerns since that time: dwindling plant and animal biodiversity, the loss of wilderness, the degradation of ecosystems, and climate change are all part of a raft of ‘green’ issues that have implanted themselves into both public consciousness and public policy over subsequent years. The job of environmental ethics is to outline our moral obligations in the face of such concerns. In a nutshell, the two fundamental questions that environmental ethics must address are: what duties do humans have with respect to the environment, and why? The latter question usually needs to be considered prior to the former; in order to tackle just *what* our obligations are, it is usually thought necessary to consider first *why* we have them. For example, do we have environmental obligations for the sake of human beings living in the world today, for humans living in the future, or for the sake of entities within the environment itself, irrespective of any human benefits?

## (--) Anthropocentrism is inevitable

Beth Mendenhall 2009 (Philosophy and Political Science at Kansas State University, Stance Volume 2 <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/virtualpress/stance/2009_spring/5Menderhall.pdf>) JMA

As humans, it is probably impossible to escape a human-centered ethic to guide our decisionmaking. Our subjectivity means we can only experience the world from one perspective, and this perspective colors everything we do. Our selfpreservation instincts lead us to value ourselves above the rest of the world. What person would reasonably kill themselves, or their children, friends, and neighbors, to save an ecosystem? Or two ecosystems? Though some radical environmentalists have chained themselves to trees and bulldozers, this is generally a statement to express the direness of the environmental situation, instead of an actual bodily sacrifice. Would the same environmentalist give their life to save two gorillas, or two earthworms? We are all responsible for the world, but we are first and foremost responsible for ourselves. More than that, our subjectivity means that one deep ecologist will observe value in the world differently than the next. Even those who subscribe to the idea that objective deliberations are possible, admit that we can rarely access them.

## (--) Political policies need to be changed to shift the focus from living standards to the appreciation life quality

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

While the various eco-philosophies that have developed within deep ecology are diverse, Naess and George Sessions have compiled a list of eight principles or statements that are basic to deep ecology: 1. The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent worth). These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes. 2. Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves. 3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs. 4. The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantially smaller population. The flourishing of non-human life *requires* a smaller human population. 5. Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening. 6. Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present. 7. The ideological change will be mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between bigness and greatness. 8. Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to try to implement the necessary changes.

# \*\*\*Disposable Planet: Affirmative 2ac Answers\*\*\*

## (--) Framework: the judge should only evaluate a policy alternative that is better than the plan…

## A) Infinite number of non-policy alternatives: making it impossible to be AFF.

## B) The resolution is a question of policy: not one of representations or discourse.

## C) Moots entirety of the 1ac: 8 minutes of arguments are irrelevant in their framework—creating a time and strategy skew.

## D) Reject the alternative.

## (--) Space exploration is crucial to solve multiple environmental threats which risk human extinction.

Joseph Pelton, 2010 (Dir., Emeritus, The Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington U.), THE FARTHEST SHORE: A 21ST CENTURY GUIDE TO SPACE, 2010, 123.

Over 12,000 television channels are provided worldwide by communications satellites, along with extensive Internet connections to much of the world. Our knowledge about the critical functions of the ozone layer and the Van Allen belts in protecting humans from extinction only comes from space programs. Knowledge about the climatic conditions on Venus and Mars may help to save us from the worst ravages of global warming or from the next ice age. Today space programs divide their investments between broad categories of space exploration, space transportation systems, space applications, new technology developments, new products and services, "spin-offs," educational development and research, and space sciences.

## (--) The permutation is the best option—individual efforts at radical environmentalism will fail unless matched at the governmental level.

Cesar Cuauhtemoc Garcia Hernandez, 2007 (JD, Boston College Law School, Seattle Journal for Social Justice, Fall/Winter, 2007, Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Unfortunately, localized efforts, though well intentioned, have not managed to curb climate change. In part, the efforts of individuals to alter their own practices or those of local communities have had limited effect because such efforts have not been met by similar action at the federal level. n24 Most notably, Congress has not ratified the Kyoto Treaty. n25 In addition, skeptics of global warming remain in highly influential governmental positions; significantly, one of these positions is the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. n26 Moreover, consumption of fossil fuels and emission of carbon into the atmosphere remain disproportionately high in the USA compared to the nation's percentage of the world's human population. n27

(--) Alt fails--Completely abandoning anthropocentrism makes decision-calculus impossible – That causes policy paralysis

Beth Mendenhall 2009 (Philosophy and Political Science at Kansas State University, Stance Volume 2 <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/virtualpress/stance/2009_spring/5Menderhall.pdf>) JMA

Another advantage of weak anthropocentricism is its ease as a decision-making calculus. Weighing the intrinsic value of non-human organisms, objects, or systems is significantly more difficult than weighing human values, possibly because of our proximity to and experience with them. If a gorilla has the same intrinsic value as an earthworm, would that justify our killing the gorilla to save two earthworms? If the gorilla does have more intrinsic value, how much more? Why is one ecosystem more valuable than another? If it is not, then why are human-created ecosystems less valuable? All these questions must be answered to act on a nonanthropocentric ethic. Critics may claim that even weak anthropocentrism falls prey to the same problem, but at least the problem is easier to resolve. A gorilla is probably more valuable to human interests than an earthworm, especially since there are fewer gorillas than earthworms. A natural ecosystem is more beneficial to our harmony with nature than a human-made ecosystem. If human consensus about benefit is unclear, we have the guidance of our own conscious. Whether or not I think a gorilla or an earthworm is more valuable is always a relevant question when following a weakly anthropocentric ethic. Admittedly, our ethic may fall prey to the same issue in determinations of the value of one human vs. another, but at least the problem is not as widespread, and we have more experience with human value so that controversy will be easier to answer. Because this is a problem for all ethical systems, and is not unique to an anthropocentric environmental ethic, we will not address it here. This observation about practicality helps explain why more than just being a benefit, a human-centered view is the only type of environmental ethic we can practically utilize

# Disposable Planet: Affirmative 2ac Answers

## (--) Turn: Space exploration causes consciousness shifting that leads to harmonious living with the earth’s environment.

Philip Harris, 2009 (Fellow, American Institute of Aeoronautics & Astronautics), SPACE ENTERPRISE: LIVING AND WORKING OFFWORLD IN THE 21ST CENTURY, 2009, 98.

David Cummings, executive director for the Universities Space Research Association, wrote: "Human exploration of space, for example, is an extension of the great exploration mythologies of the past, giving cultural guidance about the importance of courage and the spirit of adventure in our lives. The famous view of Earth from lunar orbit gave us another lesson about the importance of living harmoniously with the Earth's environment, as did the exploration of Mars and Venus."

## (--) Lack of coalitions will doom holistic environmental solutions.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

Clearly, this is an oversimplified example, but the point should [\*136] be clear: holism is not always effective. Treating the Earth system's problem of climate change, while separately addressing deforestation, fossil fuel consumption, habitat loss, population growth, and so on, may well be the overall best strategy. Different coalitions may be assembled to reach a consensus on each individual issue where no one coalition could be assembled to tackle it all together. n238

## The role of the ballot is to maximize the lives saved.

David Cummisky 1996 (professor of philosophy at Bates College, Kantian Consequentialism, pg. 145)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract “social entity.” It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive “overall social good.” Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Robert Nozick, for example, argues that to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has.” But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that “rational nature exists as an end in itself” (GMM 429). Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct. If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many rational beings as possible (chapter 5). In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? If I sacrifice some for the sake for others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. Persons may have “dignity, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value ( GMM 436)., but persons also have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others (chapter 5 and 7). The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, the equal consideration suggests that one may have to sacrifice some to save many.

## (--) Turn: Embracing science and objective reason is critical to a progressive social politics—we can’t combat AIDS or warming without it.

Alan Sokal, 1996 (Professor of Physics at New York University), “A PHYSICIST EXPERIMENTS WITH CULTURAL STUDIES” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://linguafranca.mirror.theinfo.org/9605/sokal.html>

POLITICALLY, I'm angered because most (though not all) of this silliness is emanating from the self-proclaimed Left. We're witnessing here a profound historical volte-face. For most of the past two centuries, the Left has been identified with science and against obscurantism; we have believed that rational thought and the fearless analysis of objective reality (both natural and social) are incisive tools for combating the mystifications promoted by the powerful--not to mention being desirable human ends in their own right. The recent turn of many "progressive" or "leftist" academic humanists and social scientists toward one or another form of epistemic relativism betrays this worthy heritage and undermines the already fragile prospects for progressive social critique. Theorizing about "the social construction of reality" won't help us find an effective treatment for AIDS or devise strategies for preventing global warming. Nor can we combat false ideas in history, sociology, economics, and politics if we reject the notions of truth and falsity.

# Disposable Planet: Affirmative 2ac Answers

## (--) Turn/Alt fails: The alternative of ethical extension is anthropocentric in itself – only by reexamining who we are and our place as a society and as individuals can we change our ethical approach to the environment

Alisdair Cochrane, 2006 (London School of Economics and Political Science <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21190/1/Environmental_ethics_%28LSERO%29.pdf>) JMA

They argue that a broader philosophical perspective is needed, requiring fundamental changes in both our attitude to and understanding of reality. This involves reexamining who we are as human beings and our place within the natural world. For radical ecologists, ethical extensionism is inadequate because it is stuck in the traditional ways of thinking that led to these environmental problems in the first place. In short, it is argued that ethical extensionism remains too human-centered, because it takes human beings as the paradigm examples of entities with moral standing and then extends outwards to those things considered sufficiently similar. Secondly, none of these radical ecologies confine themselves solely to the arena of ethics. Instead, radical ecologies also demand fundamental changes in society and its institutions. In other words, these ideologies have a distinctively political element, requiring us to confront the environmental crisis by changing the very way we live and function, both as a society and as individuals.

# Affirmative Impact Answers

## Species extinction doesn’t trigger human extinction:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, n213 the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. n214 Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215

## Species extinction doesn’t cause economic collapse:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse. n217

# Space Solves Warming

## A) Space Exploration Solves Global Warming.

Peter Marshall, 2009 (Former President, Society of Satellite Professionals, International), LICENSE TO ORBIT: THE FUTURE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRAVEL, 2009, 148.

Space planes and space tourism may eventually lead us to a wealth of new technologies. The future of commercial space is about far more than better rockets. New materials, space elevators, new cheap and clean energy sources, environmental solutions to global warming and much more could come from innovative new space systems. Commercial innovations in space may ultimately allow us to establish permanent colonies on the Moon and Mars. In time we might even seek to "terraform" Mars or perhaps even Venus or the Moon to create a new extraterrestrial biosphere where humans can live and breed a new generation of Martians,Venusians or Selenians.

## B) Warming risks human extinction.

Oliver Tickell, 2008 (Climate Researcher, The Guardian, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, August 11, 2008 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way.

## (--) Space key to checking excess greenhouse gas emissions:

Joseph Pelton, 2010 (Dir., Emeritus, The Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington U.), THE FARTHEST SHORE: A 21ST CENTURY GUIDE TO SPACE, 2010, 127.

Space systems not only alert us to dangers and tell us the speed with which global warming is occurring; atmospheric models based on observations of other planets and the Sun's interactions tell us of longer-term consequences. Finally, if it becomes necessary to create some sort of heat irradiator that allows the effects of excess greenhouse gases to escape into the void of space, it will be space systems that have truly become our saviors.

## (--) Space is critical to save Earth from greenhouse gas emissions:

Joseph Pelton, 2010 (Dir., Emeritus, The Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington U.), THE FARTHEST SHORE: A 21ST CENTURY GUIDE TO SPACE, 2010, 20.

Economic studies have shown that, in several areas, money invested in space applications has yielded a twenty-fold return on investment in terms of new goods, products, services and improved economic output. Today as we face significant peril from coming climate change, space technology in its many dimensions will be critical in saving our planet from the destructive path followed by Venus when greenhouse gases trapped in its atmosphere destroyed all possibility of life on our sister planet.

# Space Solves Ozone Depletion

## Space Exploration solves Ozone Depletion—this risks extinction.

Joseph Pelton, 2010 (Dir., Emeritus, The Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington U.), THE FARTHEST SHORE: A 21ST CENTURY GUIDE TO SPACE, 2010, 14.

Space applications can provide vital knowledge to deal with life and death issues such as global warming, worldwide drought, and holes in the ozone layer that could lead to genetic mutations that may ultimately endanger life on Earth. A well-conceived international program of human space exploration, space science and space applications can advance discovery, understanding, and cooperation. It can lift our sights, and fuel our dreams.

## A healthy ozone layer is critical to avoid human extinction.

Peter Marshall, 2009 (Former President, Society of Satellite Professionals, International), LICENSE TO ORBIT: THE FUTURE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRAVEL, 2009, 123.

The flights of the supersonic Concorde into the high stratosphere were a serious concern in terms of its potential damage to the ozone layer. Many breathed easier when the SST was grounded. The prospect of potentially thousands of flights by space planes into stratosphere raises anew these environmental concerns. Likewise the near-term development of supersonic commercial executive jets as a parallel industry raises similar questions with even greater concern. The truth is that damage to the ozone layer may be a more urgent concern than global warming. Genetic damage could kill off the human race much faster than rising temperatures. This may seem like a quibble to some, but survival of the species seems deserving of some serious thought.

# 1ar: Space Exploration Key to Solve Environmental Problems

## (--) Space exploration is key to environmental and human survival.

Joseph Pelton, 2010 (Dir., Emeritus, The Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington U.), THE FARTHEST SHORE: A 21ST CENTURY GUIDE TO SPACE, 2010, 20.

When someone asks: “Why do we need to spend money on space?” There is a really good and short answer. We need space systems, space science and space applications if we humans -- and indeed all flora and fauna on the planet -- are going to survive another century or two.

## (--) Space exploration is key to human survival.

Michael Griffin, 2008 (Former NASA Administrator), LEADERSHIP IN SPACE, 2008, 56.

In the end, space exploration is fundamentally about the survival of the species, about ensuring better odds for our survival through the promulgation of the human species. But as we do it, we will also ensure the prosperity of our species in the economic sense, in a thousand ways. Some of these we can foresee, and some we cannot. Who could claim that he or she would have envisioned the Boeing 777 after seeing the first Wright Flyer? And yet one followed the other in the blink of an historical eye.

## (--) Space exploration is key to solving Earth’s environmental problems.

Kim Robinson, 2009 (Science Writer), WASHINGTON POST, July 19, 2009, B1.

It has been said that space science is an Earth science, and that is no paradox. Our climate crisis is very much a matter of interactions between our planet and our sun. That being the case, our understanding is vastly enhanced by going into space and looking down at the Earth, learning things we cannot learn when we stay on the ground. Studying other planets helps as well. The two closest planets have very different histories, with a runaway greenhouse effect on Venus and the freezing of an atmosphere on Mars. Beyond them spin planets and moons of various kinds, including several that might harbor life. Comparative planetology is useful in our role as Earth's stewards; we discovered the holes in our ozone layer by studying similar chemical interactions in the atmosphere of Venus. This kind of unexpected insight could easily happen again.

## (--) Space exploration protects Earth’s environment.

Charles Kennel, 2009 (Chair, Space Studies Board of the National Research Council), AMERICA’S FUTURE IN SPACE: ALIGNING THE CIVIL SPACE PROGRAM, 2009, 3.

The key global perspective enabled by space observations is critical to monitoring climate change and testing climate models, managing Earth resources, and mitigating risks associated with natural phenomena such as severe weather and asteroids.

## (--) Observation from space is essential to protect the Earth’s environment.

Rustam Rustamov, 2009 (Analyst, United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs), SPACE TECHNOLOGIES FOR THE BENEFIT OF HUMAN SOCIETY AND EARTH, 2009, 101-102.

Remote sensing is a useful method in several modes of oil spill control, including a large scale area of surveillance ability, specific site monitoring and advantages of technical and technological assistance in emergency cases. There is a significant capacity of providing essential information to enhance strategic and tactical decision-making, decreasing response costs by facilitating rapid oil recovery and ultimately minimizing impacts. Observation can be undertaken visually or by using remote sensing systems. In remote sensing, a sensor other than human vision or conventional photography is used to detect or map oil spills.

## (--) The global perspective of space is necessary to protect the Earth’s environment.

Pat Norris, 2008 (Former Scientist, NASA’s Goddard Space Flight Center), SPIES IN THE SKY: SURVEILLANCE SATELLITES IN WAR AND PEACE, 2008, 21.

Satellites are also telling us new things about the earth itself. From space a satellite can monitor global change, well, globally. Deforestation in the Amazon, shrinkage of the polar ice caps, spreading deserts, and other large-scale phenomena are hard to measure on the ground it's a case of not seeing the forest for the trees. But space makes these changes clear.

## (--) Orbital imaging is key to protect the planet’s environment.

Philip Harris, 2009 (Fellow, American Institute of Aeoronautics & Astronautics), SPACE ENTERPRISE: LIVING AND WORKING OFFWORLD IN THE 21ST CENTURY, 2009, 526.

The satellite industry not only turned our world into a global village by its communication capabilities, but demonstrated that it could be a profitable enterprise. Furthermore, orbital imaging and sensing has shown myriad practical applications on Earth, even in protecting our planet's environment.

## (--) Space exploration protects the biosphere.

David Schrunk, 2009 (Aerospace Engineer & Medical Doctor), SPACE ENTERPRISE: LIVING AND WORKING OFFWORLD IN THE 21ST CENTURY, 2009, xiv.

Permanent stations, outposts, bases and eventually cities in that orbital environment provide an unparalleled vantage point for scanning the cosmos and understanding the universe. Already both manned and unmanned spacecraft transmit to earthlings, information and images about other planets and galaxies within our Solar System. Space satellites have proven most persuasively their value for improving our global communication and agriculture, for predicting the weather and tracking human activities, for studying the Earth's topography and oceans, for understanding our own fragile biosphere, in terms of both problems and resources.

# 1ar: Perm Extensions

## (--) Only the perm solves: we need to take pragmatic actions while challenging values:

Beth Mendenhall 2009 (Philosophy and Political Science at Kansas State University, Stance Volume 2 <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/virtualpress/stance/2009_spring/5Menderhall.pdf>) JMA

With a working explanation of our weakly anthropocentric, non-individualistic, environmental ethic we can now outline how it speaks to issues in a way most environmentalists would appreciate. In other words, this ethic tells us to do things that environmentalists already think we should do- **reduce, reuse, recycle, develop alternative energy, protect species, eliminate pollution, and reduce greenhouse emissions**, etc. As such, it could satisfy many environmentalists as a way to justify their goals to themselves and a wider audience. Considered preferences of a weakly anthropocentric ethic can include all of these objectives, based on a rational worldview that values ecological diversity, harmony with nature, and human existence. The first two are easily justified, and the third is a firm conviction widely held, as discussed above. Ecological diversity is valuable to humans for myriad reasons, such as medicine, scenic views, education and tasty foods. Many believe that harmony with nature is important to our spiritual development, or the formation of human values. **It is not difficult to imagine a rational worldview that respects these values, and many already exist** and are followed today (e.g., Hinduism, Jainism). Even the major religions of the Judeo-Christian tradition can inform considered preferences such as these, which will be a major advantage to our view. The weakly anthropocentric view avoids the difficulties of justifying an environmental ethic from either end of the spectrum. On one hand, it avoids controversy over the existence of intrinsic value in non-human organisms, objects, and ecological systems. This is one important characteristic of a nonanthropocentric ethic like Deep Ecology– finding intrinsic value in all living things. 3 By intrinsic value, I mean value that exists independent of any observer to give it value. For example, a nonanthropocentric ethicist would see value in an animal that no human could ever benefit from or even know about, simply because of what it is. While possibly justifiable, an ethic that treats all living things and possibly even ecological systems as intrinsically valuable may seem very radical to a large portion of the public. It seems that **even the philosophical community remains divided on the issue**. On the other hand, our ethic avoids making felt human desire the loci of all value by showing how considered human values can explain the value in our environment. In other words, **what humans value, either directly or indirectly, generates value in the environment.** In this way, we avoid unchecked felt preferences that would not be able to explain why excessive human consumption is wrong. Avoiding these controversial stances will contribute substantially to the first advantage of a weakly anthropocentric environmental ethic: public appeal. The importance of public appeal to an environmental ethic cannot be overstated. **We are running out of time to slow or reverse the effects of past environmental degradation, and we will need the support of society to combat them effectively.** Hence, the most important advantage of a weakly anthropocentric ethic over a nonanthropocentric one is public appeal because many people feel that nonanthropocentrism is just too radical and contrary to common sense.

## (--) Perm do both – Only a weak anthropocentric environmental ethic can solve

Beth Mendenhall 2009 (Philosophy and Political Science at Kansas State University, Stance Volume 2 <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/virtualpress/stance/2009_spring/5Menderhall.pdf>) JMA

For a system of ethics to be successful, it must be both internally consistent and widely acceptable. There is danger in getting so caught up in the first requirement that we find ourselves defending views that most human beings would be unwilling to accept – such positions are doomed to be ignored by most outside the philosophical community. Environmental ethics, which seek to explain the ethical relationship between humans and the environment, are no exception. The main point of contention among environmental ethicists revolves around the question of anthropocentrism. Anthropocentrism is the evaluation of reality exclusively in terms of human interests and values. As a way of viewing the world, anthropocentrism has a profound impact on our decision-making calculus. I believe that an anthropocentric environmental ethic can be both internally consistent, and widely accepted, by confirming the intuitions of environmentalists who seek to challenge human destruction of the natural world. In that way, our environmental ethic can effect more change in the way humans treat the environment, and be defensible to a critical audience. The decision to adopt an anthropocentric environmental ethic is one that is both pragmatic and ethical. Its practical appeal stems from its attraction to a wide audience, while its ethical appeal is generated by its concern for those animals, humans, and ecosystems suffering from the environmental crises.

# 1ar: Perm Extensions

## The permutation is the best option—combining technological solutions with deep ecology buys time for the mindset shift to occur.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

I have analogized geoengineering to trying to treat lung cancer instead of trying to quit smoking. A deep environmentalist, one who cares about root causes and philosophical underpinnings rather than just the effects thereof, would want to find and eliminate the factors behind the desire to smoke. But is it trivial in forming policy to take into account that the world really likes to smoke? I think not: politics and policymaking are largely a world of competing preferences, not an academic forum where the ideal theoretical answer is the right answer. Of course, it is sad that the world's smoker would rather suffer serious illness than kick the habit. Thus, it is right for leaders to preach sensibility from their bully pulpits. We should teach "living lightly," simple frugality, and critical thinking to our children. We should try to soften the blow of consumerism and advocate sustainable development in place of rapacious deforestation and biodiversity loss. But while we do all of that, what do we do about climate change? While the preacher is at the bully pulpit, the deacons should be working to solve the problem. Were the planet a teenager trying her first cigarette, it surely would be smarter to address 'root causes' to prevent her from smoking at all. But in the case of climate change, the smoker has been at it for many years, and the addiction is firmly in place. In such a situation, focusing on the "real problem" simply may not work. Strong interests anchor the status quo, and they are not easily condemned "black hats," but a wide range of actors with motives that are not necessarily selfish or shortsighted.

## The permutation solves best for human being’s dilemma regarding nature.

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

IV. The Gap Between Rhetoric and Reality The crux of the modern nature problem is the need to find an appropriate human role in nature. Human beings are both of nature, having evolved through the same processes that govern other creatures, and outside nature, having developed the ability to modify and control the environment on a scale far beyond any other creature. The nature problem, therefore, is as much about people as it is about nature. Instead of focusing on how to divide the world between humanity and nature, as we have done so far, we must consider how best to combine the two.

## Environmental management is justified to compensate for the effects of past environmental mismanagement.

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Besides potentially inhibiting the creation of large reserves, a strict hands- off strategy is inconsistent with the protection of species, ecosystems, or natural processes. No place in the United States remains entirely unaffected by human actions. Ongoing management efforts are often necessary to compensate for the effect of past actions, or current actions outside the designated reserves. Competition with or predation by alien species, for example, is one of the leading threats to domestic biodiversity. n259 Once introduced, alien species often spread rapidly and are difficult, if not impossible to remove. Protecting native species from the threat of such exotics requires ongoing management. n260 Intensive management may also be required to substitute for [\*57] changes in historic fire regimes, n261 predation levels, n262 and other elements of the biophysical environment. Given the extensive changes in background conditions, ecologists tell us that most areas dedicated to the preservation of nature cannot simply be left to their own devices, but will require active human management. n263

## Technological solutions aren’t inconsistent with deep ecology.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

Part V insists that it is time for environmentalists to reclaim the Big Fix, that holists and deep ecologists must, in a Rawlsian vein, learn to speak the pragmatic language of political discourse. If for no other reason, they must do this because geoengineering offers hope for solving climate change beyond the too-little, too-lates of Kyoto - essentially if you are one of the people who care about climate change, you should support geoengineering, because most people still do not care enough. But on a deeper level, geoengineering asks environmentalists how much they value their private philosophies, and how much they value the estuaries, islands, and trees that are threatened by climate change.

# 1ar: Perm Extensions

## (--) The permutation gives breathing room for the mindset shift to occur.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

On the practical side, this debate echoes in many quarters of the environmental movement. Should we try to force reduced levels of consumption, or settle for "green fees?" Should we attempt to revalue "living lightly" or try to develop "no-regrets" environmentally-friendly technologies? Should an environmentalist tell McDonald's to "shut its doors" or work to package its unsustainable product in more sustainable containers? n233 Ultimately, it may be that the only way to a sustainable future is for McDonald's to shut its doors, but this will not happen today, or next year. Likewise, other engines of industry will continue to run for a long time. In the meantime, ought we not do what we can to address the climate change problem itself?

## (--) Holistic approaches should be kept in mind while creating incremental solutions.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

Finally, holism is flawed because it tries to take the "big picture" into account without necessarily knowing how to frame the picture. Holism multiplies uncertainty. It requires large-scale guessing regarding both present conditions, causes for present conditions, and likely future conditions, with each guess clouded in uncertainties and information costs. Acting holistically makes sense if we know exactly where we are, why we are here, and where we are headed, but in an uncertainty-riddled context such as global climate change, n239 wholesale, holistic alterations radically amplify the risks of making mistakes. Of course, holism remains important; only a fool would not look at causes, contexts, and consequences for points of leverage in battling climate change. In some cases, however, holistic policy prescriptions actually lessen the opportunity for consensus-building and may magnify the uncertainties and information costs associated with environmental policy.

## (--) Even if the permutation contradicts deep ecology—it is the best solution.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

On the political-philosophical side, the question becomes a Rawlsian one: how to maintain "private" philosophical beliefs and yet also engage in "public" political discourse. n234 I suggest that, in this vein, geoengineering may be a type of "principled self-contra- [\*134] diction" for a deep environmentalist. Even setting aside the practical arguments just advanced - that it is unwise to bet the planet on changing people's deeply held practices - a deep environmentalist ought in principle to advocate policies that are based not on private philosophical ideas, potentially incommensurate with public discourse, but on the limited shared values of a Rawlsian liberalism. n235 Repairing the climate does not reflect deep environmental ideology as does preventive regulation - hence the Rawlsian "contradiction" - but it may be more in accord with values a deep environmentalist shares, in a liberal state, with a non-environmentalist. As such, it is the Rawlsian choice.

## (--) Deep ecological approaches risk delaying measures to solve environmental problems.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

D. Summary What the deep environmentalist, holist, and political environmentalist all have in common is an agenda wider than climate change, and the Big Fix lets them down every time. Yet these factions cast a long shadow on the intellectual ambiance of contemporary environmentalism. n243 The desire to "take everything into account" is admirable. It is grounded in good science, respectable philosophy, and seasoned political savvy. Yet the practical, philosophical, and political motivations behind doing so often act at [\*139] cross-purposes with the need to protect the Earth's climate from potentially devastating change.

# 1ar: Space Exploration Causes Environmental Consciousness Shifting

## Space exploration encourages environmental stewardship.

Al Globus, 2009 (Board Member, National Space Society), AD ASTRA, Winter 2009/2010, 43.

Space development has been good for the environment. It was a satellite that detected the ozone hole in the atmosphere, and today that hole is shrinking. It was satellite photos of the massive destruction of the Brazilian rain forest that convinced their government to pass laws to protect the Amazon Basin. A fleet of dozens of Earth-observing satellites are filling data archives with the information needed to understand the land, sea, air, and ecosystems of the only place in the universe that we know life exists: a thin layer on the outside of the third planet circling the Sun, just one of hundreds of billions of stars in the Milky Way, which is just one of 80 billion galaxies in the observable universe.

## Exploring space leads to a greater environmental ethic.

Steven Dick, 2010 (Dir., NASA History Division), NASA’S FIRST 50 YEARS: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES, 2010, 649.

In Rocket Dreams: How the Space Age Shaped Our Vision of a World Beyond.

Marina Benjamin argues that "The impact of seeing the Earth from space focused our energies on the home planet in unprecedented ways, dramatically affecting our relationship to the natural world and our appreciation of the greater community of ~~man~~kind, and prompting a revolution in our understanding of the Earth as a living system." She finds it no coincidence that the first Earth Day on 20 April 1970 occurred in the midst of the Apollo program, or that one of the astronauts developed a new school of spiritualism.

## The ban on ozone depleting chemicals proves—space exploration leads to shifts in environmental consciousness.

Berndt Feuerbacher, 2009 (Scientist, German Aerospace Center), HANDBOOK OF SPACE TECHNOLOGY, 2009, 520.

Weather maps and forecasts based on satellite data have become a part of the modern news scene. Weather forecasts of up to two weeks are inconceivable without meteorological satellites. A look at the Earth's atmosphere from low Earth orbit also provides new insights, since it enables us to monitor our planet's gaseous envelope from its lowest to its highest density, which makes possible measurements with improved resolution. Along with such a global view, climate effects can also be detected and reasons for changes identified. One example is the discovery of the ozone hole, which initiated a reversal in anthropogenic influences through a worldwide ban on chlorofluorocarbons.

# 1ar: Life is Pre-Eminent Value

## (--) Life is the pre-eminent value--Existence precedes ontology: their metaphysical arguments are meaningless in the face of our arguments.

Paul Wapner, 2003 (associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University. Leftist Criticism of. Accessed at <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=539>)

THE THIRD response to eco-criticism would require critics to acknowledge the ways in which they themselves silence nature and then to respect the sheer otherness of the nonhuman world. Postmodernism prides itself on criticizing the urge toward mastery that characterizes modernity. But isn't mastery exactly what postmodernism is exerting as it captures the nonhuman world within its own conceptual domain? Doesn't postmodern cultural criticism deepen the modernist urge toward mastery by eliminating the ontological weight of the nonhuman world? What else could it mean to assert that there is no such thing as nature? I have already suggested the postmodernist response: yes, recognizing the social construction of "nature" does deny the self-expression of the nonhuman world, but how would we know what such self-expression means? Indeed, nature doesn't speak; rather, some person always speaks on nature's behalf, and whatever that person says is, as we all know, a social construction. All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation.

## (--) Consequences should precede method.

Jeffrey Issac, 2002 (professor of political science at Indiana University, Dissent, Spring 2002, accessed via ebsco)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

## (--) The judge should evaluate consequentialist impacts.

Sissela Bok 1988 (Sissela Bok, Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Ed. David Rosenthal and Fudlou Shehadi, 1988)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.

# 1ar: Science Bolsters Progressive Left Agenda

## (--) Scientific reasoning bolsters democracy while checking authoritarianism.

Edward Ross Dickinson, 2004 (University of Cincinnati, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About “Modernity,” Central European History, vol. 37, no. 1, March)

Second, I would argue that there is also a causal fit between cultures of expertise, or “scientism,” and democracy. Of course, “scientism” subverted the real, historical ideological underpinnings of authoritarian polities in Europe in the nineteenth century. It also in a sense replaced them. Democratic citizens have the freedom to ask “why”; and in a democratic system there is therefore a bias toward pragmatic, “objective” or naturalized answers— since values are often regarded as matters of opinion, with which any citizen has a right to differ. Scientific “fact” is democracy’s substitute for revealed truth, expertise its substitute for authority. The age of democracy is the age of professionalization, of technocracy; there is a deeper connection between the two, this is not merely a matter of historical coincidence.

## (--) Evidence, empiricism, and logic bolster a leftist political agenda—they cede these tools to the right wing.

Alan Sokal, 1996 (Professor of Physics at New York University), “A PHYSICIST EXPERIMENTS WITH CULTURAL STUDIES” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://linguafranca.mirror.theinfo.org/9605/sokal.html>

I say this not in glee but in sadness. After all, I'm a leftist too (under the Sandinista government I taught mathematics at the National University of Nicaragua). On nearly all practical political issues--including many concerning science and technology--I'm on the same side as the Social Text editors. But I'm a leftist (and a feminist) because of evidence and logic, not in spite of it. Why should the right wing be allowed to monopolize the intellectual high ground? And why should self-indulgent nonsense--whatever its professed political orientation--be lauded as the height of scholarly achievement?

# 1ar: Alternative Fails

## (--) Technological progress is necessary to save the environment—radical environmentalism will fail.

Frank B. Cross, 2002 (Professor of Business Law, University of Texas at Austin, Case Western Reserve Law Review, Winter, 2002, 53 Case W. Res. 477; Lexis)

An equally critical question is: When we discover a serious environmental problem, what should we do about it? The essence of Lomborg's book is the claim that radical action is not required to deal with environmental problems, that the growth of the economy and technology will itself help to address the problems, with some supplementary government regulation. In the past, the doomsayers have called for a variety of radical responses, such as zero or negative population growth, a halt to economic development or even de-development, and the prohibition of various technological advances, such as genetic modification. While such proposals may have declined in number, they are still heard today. n93 This is the more severe flaw in the environmental movement. They have identified real problems in the past, even as they exaggerated them. Pollution was a serious problem in the twentieth century. But the radical solutions were unnecessary to solve the pollution problem; in fact, they probably would have exacerbated pollution. The world does face a number of serious environmental problems in the developing world. The more developed nations, affluent, with well-developed technology, have gone far toward curing their internal environmental problems. This observation would suggest that the answer to our greatest problems lies not in stopping [\*492] growth or new technologies, but advancing them. A plenitude of evidence supports that suggestion.

## (--) The alternative is too radical: Radical environmentalism will not be embraced by the majority of the population.

Cesar Cuauhtemoc Garcia Hernandez, 2007 (JD, Boston College Law School, Seattle Journal for Social Justice, Fall/Winter, 2007, Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

The federal government's inaction regarding climate change, ostensibly based in a belief that more environmentally protective policies would adversely affect the nation's economy, is reflected at the individual level. n28 While many people are willing to engage in limited actions to reduce their environmental "footprint," few are willing or able to drastically restructure their daily affairs to protect the environment. n29 Recently, such strategies as carbon offsets--a market-based approach that allows individuals to "pay to have their greenhouse gas emissions . . . cancelled out by a corresponding emissions reduction elsewhere"--have enabled individuals to limit their own contribution to environmental devastation while only mildly altering their lifestyle. n30

## (--) The alternative is too time-consuming and likely to fail—interim steps like the plan are the best we can hope for.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

Perhaps, if regulation is unlikely to succeed in any serious way given the current institutional, economic, and social contexts, we might try to change the deep, underlying causes of climate change--a market economy driven by growth in goods and populations, and the productive capability to meet consumer demand. n119 Although most of the discussion of this point will be deferred to part V, it should be clear that such changes are very costly and contentious ones. To say there is a lack of agreement on whether (and how) to remake the world's economic and social structure is surely an understatement. Of course, progress can take place [\*103] through evolution rather than revolution, and the role of environmental education, in both shallow and deep modes, should not be minimized. n120 Indeed, it is probably the case that - given the variety of environmental and other issues facing the world - some form of "deep reorientation," however gradual, will eventually be necessary, absent radically new technologies to overcome our current concerns. Unfortunately, in the meantime, several billion people remain committed to consumption-based lifestyles and modes of self-definition. Changing deep structures is likely to be a difficult, time consuming, and potentially divisive process that, while it would alter the fundamental assumptions of present cost-benefit curves and consequently yield some kind of "efficient" result, hardly seems like the policy recommendation for a more urgent problem such as global climate change. Again, though a more thorough treatment of this issue must be postponed to the end of this Article, it is clear for present purposes that a "deep structural" approach would be at least as difficult to achieve and as "costly" as ordinary climate change regulation.

## (--) Consumption habits are deeply entrenched—the alternative will fail.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

Moreover, an environmentalist's distaste for the materialistic ideals that undergird the root causes of climate change does not make attempting to thwart those ideals either practical or morally [\*133] justified. Conspicuous consumption is deeply entrenched in American self-conceptions, and in conceptions of Americans by people in the developing world who want to be like them. n231

## (--) Deep environmentalism can’t overcome ideas deeply ingrained in Western culture.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

I suggest it is both unwise and counter-democratic to tell billions of consumers that "We Know Better," and set about changing deep structures without regard to the life-defining goals of the consumers themselves. Such action is unwise because it pins the biosphere's integrity on the hope of overcoming something deeply ingrained in Western culture. And it is counter-democratic because, until the members of that culture change its constitutive forces, overcoming them in the name of a paternalistic deep environmentalism thwarts their clearly expressed preferences. n232

# 1ar: Tech Needed to solve

## (--) Solutions to the energy crisis require advanced technologies:

Martin W. Lewis, 1995 (Green Delusions, assistant professor in the school of the environment @ Duke, pg. 139-140)

The solution to the energy bind lies, as most members of the environmental community realize, in a combination of solar power and conservation. What eco-radicals fail to recognize, however, is that both effective conservation and the commercialization of solar energy demand highly sophisticated technologies. The modern frontiers of energy conservation may be found in such areas as low emissivity windows, energy-sparing fluorescent light bulbs, and computer-integrated sensor systems (Fickett et al, 1990; Bevington and Rosenfeld 1990). Due to a wide variety of such advances, the energy intensity of American industry in fact declined at a rate of 1.5-2 percent per year between 1971 and 1986, allowing industrial production to increase substantially while energy consumption actually fell (Ross and Steinmeyer 1990).

## (--) Alternative energy sources can go a long way to controlling climate change.

Jay Michaelson, 1998 (J.D. Yale Law School, Stanford Environmental Law Journal, January 1998, “Geoengineering: A Climate Change Manhattan Project” Accessed May 23, 2011 on Academic Lexis/Nexis)

Of course, deep ecologists may not be completely right: some consumption-friendly steps, such as zero-emission vehicles or alternative energy sources, may go a long way toward controlling cli- [\*93] mate change without requiring intrusive regulation or geoengineering marvels. n82 Even these policies, however, necessitate substitutions for environmentally favored goods that have not been at all popular in recent years. n83 Any policy which requires us to change our attitudes must consider whether the cost of doing so is prohibitive.

## (--) Ecologically benign power sources require significant technological advances.

Martin W. Lewis, 1995 (Green Delusions, assistant professor in the school of the environment @ Duke, pg. 140)

When it comes to harnessing solar power, technological achievements are even more vital. Admittedly, several important solar applications demand little technical sophistication. Simply by placing windows properly a significant power savings can be realized. But in order to do something slightly more complicates—such as heat water—certain high-tech applications are essential. The simplest passive solar water heating systems usually rely on components made of plastic, a substance many eco-radicals would like to ban. But to address our needs for an ecologically benign power source, solar-generated electricity must be commercialized on a massive scale. No matter how this is done, significant technological advances will be necessary.

# 1ar: Status quo tech won’t cause extinction

## Resources aren’t finite—the concept of spaceship Earth is flawed.

Julian Simon, 1998 (professor of business administration at the University of Maryland, “POPULATION GROWTH, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://www.juliansimon.com/> writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR28.txt)

Of course, it is logically possible that the cost of the services we get now from copper and other minerals will be relatively higher in the future than now if there are more people in the future. But all past history suggests that the better guess is that cost and price will fall, just as scarcity historically has diminished along with the increase in population. Either way, however, the concept of mineral resources as "finite" is unnecessary, confusing, and misleading. And the notion of our planet as "spaceship earth," launched with a countable amount of each resource and hence having less minerals per passenger as the number of passengers is greater, is dramatic but irrelevant.

## Human history disproves their argument—substitution and innovation solves resource scarcity.

Julian Simon, 1998 (professor of business administration at the University of Maryland, “POPULATION GROWTH, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://www.juliansimon.com/> writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR28.txt)

Chapters 1-11 showed that all natural resources - minerals, food, and energy - have become less rather than more scarce throughout human history. But it is counter-intuitive, against all common sense, for more people to result in more rather than less natural resources. So here is the theory again: More people, and increased income, cause problems of increased scarcity of resources in the short run. Heightened scarcity causes prices to rise. The higher prices present opportunity, and prompt inventors and entrepreneurs to search for solutions. Many fail, at cost to themselves. But in a free society, solutions are eventually found. And in the long run the new developments leave us better off than if the problems had not arisen. That is, prices end up lower than before the increased scarcity occurred.

## Resource supply shortages will be solved by new technologies.

Julian Simon, 1998 (professor of business administration at the University of Maryland, “POPULATION GROWTH, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://www.juliansimon.com/> writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR28.txt)

But population growth does not constitute a Ponzi scheme: there is no reason to expect resources to run out. Instead, as Part I of this book demonstrates (on the basis of the history of long-run price declines in all natural resources, plus theory that fits the data), resources may be expected to become more available rather than more scarce. Hence there is no reason to think that consumption in the present is at the expense of future consumers, or that more consumers now imply less for consumers in the future. Rather, it is reasonable to expect that more consumption now implies more resources in the future because of induced discoveries of new ways to supply resources, which eventually leave resources cheaper and more available than if there were less pressure on resources in the present.

## Notions of finite resources are false.

Julian Simon, 1998 (professor of business administration at the University of Maryland, “POPULATION GROWTH, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://www.juliansimon.com/> writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR28.txt)

There is no persuasive reason to believe that the relatively larger use of natural resources that would occur with a larger population would have any special deleterious effects upon the economy in the future. For the foreseeable future, even if the extrapolation of past trends is badly in error, the cost of energy is not an important consideration in evaluating the impact of population growth. Other natural resources may be treated in a manner just like any other physical capital when considering the economic effect of different rates of population growth. Depletion of mineral resources is not a special danger for the long run or the short run. Rather, the availability of mineral resources, as measured by their prices, may be expected to increase - that is, costs may be expected to decrease - despite all notions about "finiteness."

## Technology will continue to create new resources.

Julian Simon, 1998 (professor of business administration at the University of Maryland, “POPULATION GROWTH, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.” Accessed May 23, 2011 at <http://www.juliansimon.com/> writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR28.txt)

This point of view is not limited to economists. A technologist writing on minerals put it this way: "In effect, technology keeps creating new resources." The major constraint upon the human capacity to enjoy unlimited minerals, energy, and other raw materials at acceptable prices is knowledge. And the source of knowledge is the human mind. Ultimately, then, the key constraint is human imagination acting together with educated skills. This is why an increase of human beings, along with causing an additional consumption of resources, constitutes a crucial addition to the stock of natural resources.

# 1ar: Ecological crisis rhetoric is good

## (--) Ecological crisis rhetoric mobilizes action—the history of endangered species legislation proves.

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

George Perkins Marsh suggested in his 1864 book that unbridled human exploitation of nature could threaten human survival. n45 After lying dormant for nearly a century, that suggestion surfaced at the dawn of the modern era in a powerful new form I call the ecological horror story. Rachel Carson's Silent Spring, a book credited with inspiring the modern environmental movement, contains the prototypical example of this story. Carson began her book with a chapter called "A Fable for Tomorrow." n46 In her fable, tragedy struck a bucolic village that was once alive with flowers, crops, wildlife, songbirds, and fish. People sickened, livestock died, flowers withered, and streams became lifeless. The disappearance of the songbirds gave spring a [\*20] strange stillness. By the end of the brief fable, overuse of chemical pesticides had transformed the village into a biotic wasteland. n47 Nearly twenty years later, Paul and Anne Ehrlich conveyed their version of this story through another brief tale. They put the reader in the position of a horrified airline passenger watching a worker pry rivets out of the plane's wings. n48 They characterized species as the rivets holding together the earth, a plane on which we are all passengers. Removing too many species, or perhaps just a single critical one, could disable the plane, precipitating an ecological catastrophe. n49 Environmentalists repeated the ecological horror story in various forms through the 1960s and 1970s. n50 Growing recognition of both the power of human technology, brought home by nuclear weapons programs, and the fragility of the earth, brought home by photographs of the earth from space, encouraged apocalyptic visions of the potential for human destruction of the biotic world. n51 This story contributed to the passage of early federal endangered species legislation. In 1966, when the Endangered Species Preservation Act n52 was under consideration, the New York Times editorialized that "[i]f man refuses to follow wise conservation practices in controlling his economic affairs, the ultimate victim may be not natural beauty or birds and fish but man himself." n53 In a 1968 report, Secretary of the Interior Udall characterized extinction as a sign of dangerously declining environmental health. Extinction, he wrote, was not important because of the anguish of the conservationists, but because bluebirds, Indian paintbrush, cardinals, and grizzly bears should be present - because there is something wrong with an environment in which bluebirds cannot live but where rat populations flourish. An environment [\*21] that threatens these wild creatures is symptomatic of an environment which is going downhill - and taking man with it. n54 Witnesses who testified in favor of the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969, n55 which extended the reach of the Endangered Species Preservation Act, emphasized the ecological horror story. n56 Some legislators explicitly indicated that they found this story a compelling justification for the legislation. n57 In its formal report on the bill, the Senate Committee on Commerce did not directly endorse this apocalyptic approach, but did focus on the importance of nature as material resource. Explaining why species should be protected, the Committee noted that even species without known commercial value might in the future "prove invaluable to mankind in improving domestic animals or increasing resistance to disease or environmental contaminants." n58 In 1973, the ecological horror story encouraged Congress to pass the Endangered Species Act. n59 Legislators and witnesses warned against disrupting the balance of nature; many speculated that human survival was at risk. n60 [\*22] They also emphasized the potential economic costs of extinctions, even short of ecological collapse. The House Report noted that as species disappeared, so did potential cures for cancer. n61 "Sheer self interest," it argued, compelled caution. n62 Several legislators sounded the same theme. n63 The ecological horror story remains a favorite theme of environmentalists today. n64 In particular, advocates of biodiversity protection commonly emphasize the possibility that Homo sapiens will fall victim to the current wave of extinctions, though few rely entirely on that argument. n65 The story also retains [\*23] political currency as a justification for endangered species protection. A few years ago, for example, Interior Secretary Babbitt told Congress, "[t]he Endangered Species is a warning light. When one species in an ecosystem's web of life starts to die out, all species may be in peril." n66

## (--) Aesthetic arguments in favor of nature carry less political weight than pragmatic ones:

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Nonetheless, many others during this era were less willing to rest their political arguments for preservation on esthetic grounds. According to historian Bob Pepperman Taylor, even Gifford Pinchot was sensitive to the esthetic pull of nature but thought material arguments would carry more political weight. n88 Bird lovers who believed sincerely that song and plumage birds should be protected for their beauty alone felt compelled to find economic arguments for regulation of market hunting. n89

## (--) Aesthetic arguments on behalf of nature are politically weak and won’t justify protection of nature.

Holly Doremus, 2000 (Professor of Law, University of California at Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 2000, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse.” Accessed via Academic Lexis/Nexis, May 23, 2011)

Because it limited potential parks to a small number of places, most not suitable for agricultural use, and allowed extensive economic development of those sites provided the scenery was preserved, n97 this esthetic made it relatively easy to gain political support. But the limitations of this esthetic argument quickly became apparent. In the debate over conversion of the Hetch Hetchy Valley, within the boundaries of Yosemite National Park, to a reservoir for San Francisco, John Muir described the valley's beauty as second only to that of Yosemite Valley itself. n98 Reservoir proponents answered that [\*28] Hetch Hetchy, although lovely, was not unique. They also asserted that the reservoir project would improve an ordinary meadow by turning it into a beautiful lake. n99 With those arguments buttressing the materialist claim that the valley should serve San Francisco's material needs, Hetch Hetchy disappeared under water.