## 2AC

### Waste

#### They say no impact to meltdowns – reactors contain radioactivity 100x that of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That’s Lendman.

#### Capitalism is not the root cause.

Aberdeen, Author & Philanthropist, ‘3

[Richard, Uncommon Sense, Ch. 80, p. google]

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed.  This is a rather unfortunate and historically myopic view, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon **resorted to violence** as a means to achieve rather questionable ends.  And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem.  Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors.  These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed.  For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors.  Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation.  More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation.  The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹  does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see for more details).  So-called “classes” of people,unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation.  Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest.  War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this. Junior Bush and the neo-conservative genocidal maniacs of modern-day America could not have recently effectively gone to war against Iraq without the individual support of individual troops and a certain percentage of individual citizens within the U.S. population, each lending support for their own personal motives, whatever they individually may have been.  While it is true that corrupt leaders often provoke war, using all manner of religious, social and political means to justify, often as not, entirely ludicrous ends, very rare indeed is a battle only engaged in by these same unscrupulous miscreants of power.  And though a few iniquitous elitist powerbrokers may initiate nefarious policies of global genocidal oppression, it takes a very great many individuals operating from individual personal motivations of survival, desire and greed to develop these policies into a multi-national exploitive reality. No economic or political organization and no political or social cause exists unto itself but rather, individual members power a collective agenda.  A workers’ strike has no hope of succeeding if individual workers do not perceive a personal benefit.  And similarly, a corporation will not exploit workers if doing so is not believed to be in the economic best interest of those who run the corporation and who in turn, must answer (at least theoretically) to individuals who collectively through purchase or other allotment of shares, own the corporation.  Companies have often been known to appear benevolent, offering both higher wages and improved benefits, if doing so is perceived to be in the overall economic best interest of the immediate company and/or larger corporate entity. Non-unionized business enterprises frequently offer ‘carrots’ of appeasement to workers in order to discourage them from organizing and historically in the United States, concessions such as the forty-hour workweek, minimum wage, workers compensation and proscribed holidays have been grudgingly capitulated to by greedy capitalist masters as necessary concessions to avoid profit-crippling strikes and outright revolution. It is important to understand that so-called workers ‘rights’ and benefits were not volunteered by American capitalists or their political stooges (including several U.S. presidents) without extreme and often violent worker coercive persuasion over a great many years of prolonged strikes and similar worker revolts.  Modern supply-side Adam Smith inspired economic pipe dreams of unencumbered markets freely moving toward the common good are clearly and fundamentally, based on outright lies and not very well-masked, deliberate capitalist deception (again, see [Gallo Brothers](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/gallobrothers.html) for more information.  Those who proclaim the twisted gospel of modern supply-side economic theory are generally those who have a lot to gain from its acceptance, both economically and politically. Large political and other problems are historically created gradually stemming from negative individual leading to negative group motivation, in turn leading to negative individual and group action.  The correct root solution to humanity’s problems becomes, by historical default, changing individual negative motivation towards positive motivation.  This is not at all a new theory, as it was first stated over two thousand years ago by Jesus, historically the founder of Human and Civil Rights and not at all, the founder of Christianity or of any other religious movement; virtually everything Jesus said and did goes directly to human motivation, is community oriented, has little to do with modern conceptions of religion and is the antithesis of modern Christianity (see [Revolution](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/revolution.html) for more information).  Contrary to many current views painted of him, Jesus was extremely political, the correct political (and other) solution from true perspective being to center on and change individual motivation.  That is, if we wish to constructively change the extensive political and social problem plaguing our planet today, the root cause of negative individual human motivation leading to negative action must be addressed at the fundamental individual level. This correct political theory is seen as successfully initiated by early followers of Jesus, who practiced extreme communism, having no law “but to love one another”, sharing all things in common, allotting to each according to their need and giving the excess to the poor (which since they were mostly very poor, was a true sacrifice). ²   This was a way of life foreign to their culture, was viewed as a severe threat to the established religious and political order and thus, they were thrown to the lions accordingly.  The arising extended movement, called “The Way” by those who joined (it was not called “Christianity” by them, nor did these early followers view themselves as founders of a religion ), ³  represents extreme far-left radicalism even by modern liberal activist cooperative standards.  It has thus been historically demonstrated that if people practice the Human Rights foundation axiom set down by Jesus to treat other people as we ourselves wish to be treated, established ways of living will change, including non-violent elimination of the entire idea of capitalist oppression based on individual gain and private property ownership.  In practicing The Way, economic oppression is dealt with from the root cause up and thus, is overcome with love and peaceful unselfish collective co-existence. It is important to note that claiming to be a follower of Jesus and actually practicing “The Way” are today usually two entirely different realities; the modern 21st Century world has plenty of examples of the former and virtually no examples of the latter. Lenin and the Communist party overthrew a very oppressive capitalist Czarist system.  It did not take long for one corrupt system to be replaced by another, where even without capitalism and free enterprise to aggravate the Human Rights problem, people of power within the Communist political structure began, similar to their counterparts of capitalistic excess in Europe and America, exploiting the mass population for their own individual benefit, comfort and excess.  Thus the root problem is exposed as going deeper than simply changing an oppressive capitalist or other system.  Quite obviously, changing a corrupt system does not by itself, change the corrupt people who invented and supported it, neither does it change negative individual motivation leading to group oppression based on irrational disparagement of others regarding sex, color, intelligence or other perceived difference and neither does it prevent waste, laziness, murder, theft and rape by individuals within a perceived economic “class”.

#### They say Yucca won’t explode – it’s located right above multiple earthquake faults, has the risk of groundwater flooding the site and volcanic activity near it. That’s Warrick. Best studies go aff.

### Peak Oil

#### They say no impact to econ collapse – econ collapse triggers nationalist sentiments in countries and pronounces divisions within countries triggering nuclear confrontation. Best statistical studies prove that growth solves conflict. That’s Royal.

#### Collapse is not inevitable – the economy has been going strong, and it has the ability to continue – technology and dependence check collapse.

#### We’re on the verge of a global consciousness shift towards biospheric empathy -collapse now destroys the transition.

Rifkin **‘10**

[Jeremy, President of the Foundation on Economic Trends, January 11 2010, “'The Empathic Civilization': Rethinking Human Nature in the Biosphere Era,”

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeremy-rifkin/the-empathic-civilization\_b\_416589.html]

The pivotal turning points in human consciousness occur when new energy regimes converge with new communications revolutions, creating new economic eras. The new communications revolutions become the command and control mechanisms for structuring, organizing and managing more complex civilizations that the new energy regimes make possible. For example, in the early modern age, print communication became the means to organize and manage the technologies, organizations, and infrastructure of the coal, steam, and rail revolution. It would have been impossible to administer the first industrial revolution using script and codex. Communication revolutions not only manage new, more complex energy regimes, but also change human consciousness in the process. Forager/hunter societies relied on oral communications and their consciousness was mythologically constructed. The great hydraulic agricultural civilizations were, for the most part, organized around script communication and steeped in theological consciousness. The first industrial revolution of the 19th century was managed by print communication and ushered in ideological consciousness. Electronic communication became the command and control mechanism for arranging the second industrial revolution in the 20th century and spawned psychological consciousness. Each more sophisticated communication revolution brings together more diverse people in increasingly more expansive and varied social networks. Oral communication has only limited temporal and spatial reach while script, print and electronic communications each extend the range and depth of human social interaction. By extending the central nervous system of each individual and the society as a whole, communication revolutions provide an evermore inclusive playing field for empathy to mature and consciousness to expand. For example, during the period of the great hydraulic agricultural civilizations characterized by script and theological consciousness, empathic sensitivity broadened from tribal blood ties to associational ties based on common religious affiliation. Jews came to empathize with Jews, Christians with Christians, Muslims with Muslims, etc. In the first industrial revolution characterized by print and ideological consciousness, empathic sensibility extended to national borders, with Americans empathizing with Americans, Germans with Germans, Japanese with Japanese and so on. In the second industrial revolution, characterized by electronic communication and psychological consciousness, individuals began to identify with like-minded others. Today, we are on the cusp of another historic convergence of energy and communication--a third industrial revolution--that could extend empathic sensibility to the biosphere itself and all of life on Earth. The distributed Internet revolution is coming together with distributed renewable energies, making possible a sustainable, post-carbon economy that is both globally connected and locally managed. In the 21st century, hundreds of millions--and eventually billions--of human beings will transform their buildings into power plants to harvest renewable energies on site, store those energies in the form of hydrogen and share electricity, peer-to-peer, across local, regional, national and continental inter-grids that act much like the Internet. The open source sharing of energy, like open source sharing of information, will give rise to collaborative energy spaces--not unlike the collaborative social spaces that currently exist on the Internet. When every family and business comes to take responsibility for its own small swath of the biosphere by harnessing renewable energy and sharing it with millions of others on smart power grids that stretch across continents, we become intimately interconnected at the most basic level of earthly existence by jointly stewarding the energy that bathes the planet and sustains all of life. The new distributed communication revolution not only organizes distributed renewable energies, but also changes human consciousness. The information communication technologies (ICT) revolution is quickly extending the central nervous system of billions of human beings and connecting the human race across time and space, allowing empathy to flourish on a global scale, for the first time in history. Whether in fact we will begin to empathize as a species will depend on how we use the new distributed communication medium. While distributed communications technologies-and, soon, distributed renewable energies - are connecting the human race, what is so shocking is that no one has offered much of a reason as to why we ought to be connected. We talk breathlessly about access and inclusion in a global communications network but speak little of exactly why we want to communicate with one another on such a planetary scale. What's sorely missing is an overarching reason that billions of human beings should be increasingly connected. Toward what end? The only feeble explanations thus far offered are to share information, be entertained, advance commercial exchange and speed the globalization of the economy. All the above, while relevant, nonetheless seem insufficient to justify why nearly seven billion human beings should be connected and mutually embedded in a globalized society. The idea of even billion individual connections, absent any overall unifying purpose, seems a colossal waste of human energy. More important, making global connections without any real transcendent purpose risks a narrowing rather than an expanding of human consciousness. But what if our distributed global communication networks were put to the task of helping us re-participate in deep communion with the common biosphere that sustains all of our lives? The biosphere is the narrow band that extends some forty miles from the ocean floor to outer space where living creatures and the Earth's geochemical processes interact to sustain each other. We are learning that the biosphere functions like an indivisible organism. It is the continuous symbiotic relationships between every living creature and between living creatures and the geochemical processes that ensure the survival of the planetary organism and the individual species that live within its biospheric envelope. If every human life, the species as a whole, and all other life-forms are entwined with one another and with the geochemistry of the planet in a rich and complex choreography that sustains life itself, then we are all dependent on and responsible for the health of the whole organism. Carrying out that responsibility means living out our individual lives in our neighborhoods and communities in ways that promote the general well-being of the larger biosphere within which we dwell. The Third Industrial Revolution offers just such an opportunity. If we can harness our empathic sensibility to establish a new global ethic that recognizes and acts to harmonize the many relationships that make up the life-sustaining forces of the planet, we will have moved beyond the detached, self-interested and utilitarian philosophical assumptions that accompanied national markets and nation state governance and into a new era of biosphere consciousness. We leave the old world of geopolitics behind and enter into a new world of biosphere politics, with new forms of governance emerging to accompany our new biosphere awareness. The Third Industrial Revolution and the new era of distributed capitalism allow us to sculpt a new approach to globalization, this time emphasizing continentalization from the bottom up. Because renewable energies are more or less equally distributed around the world, every region is potentially amply endowed with the power it needs to be relatively self-sufficient and sustainable in its lifestyle, while at the same time interconnected via smart grids to other regions across countries and continents.

#### Decreased growth leads to rapid and unrestrained rebounds supercharging their reasons why growth is bad.

Bronson 6 (Bob, Bronson Capital Markets Research, LLC, May 16, [http://www.financialsense.com/editorials/bronson/2006/0517.html] AD: 6-23-11, jm)

The reasons behind the investor psychology of an “echo-mania” are the stuff of the field of behavioral finance. Quite simply, investors haven’t had enough of the easy money made in the original mania, even though much, if not all, of that money was lost in the first downleg (A) of the Supercycle Bear Market. The eagerness for quick riches is hard to squelch, and so they rush in to buy all over again, creating a second, or “echo” bubble. They tell themselves they’ve “learned a lesson” and “won’t make the same mistake twice” by holding on to their hot stocks too long. They think they’ll sell in time to avoid the next market collapse, but empirical evidence shows they don’t. In fact, their eventual “herding,” when the decline is well underway and they finally “get it” and decide to sell en masse, usually causes a more severe second downleg than the first. Experiments conducted by George Mason University professor Vernon Smith, who shared in the 2002 Nobel Prize for economics, confirmed this behavior. Participants traded a dividend-paying “stock” with a very clear fundamental value. A bubble invariably forms, then bursts. If the experiment is repeated with the same people, a bubble forms again. The second time, though, participants think they will be able to sell their stock before trouble strikes. They then express surprise that, in fact, they weren’t able to get out before the second collapse, which leads to their total disdain for investing in stocks. This collective investor disillusionment is both a necessary and sufficient condition for bringing about the selling that results in the extreme fundamental undervaluation that finally ends the Supercycle Bear Market Period. We have seen exactly this behavior at work since the stock market began its rebound from the October 2002 and March 2003 lows. We expect that the recent “echo-mania” will end like the original mania and like the good professor’s experiment: badly for the investors speculating once again on highly overvalued stock and believing they’re now a better-than-average investor.

#### **Environmental benefits from economic decline are short-term and a small downturn massively increases overall environmental damage—this card is comparative.**

Anbumozhi & Bauer 10

[Venkatachalam Anbumozhi is a capacity building specialist at the Asian Development Bank Institute in Tokyo and Armin Bauer is a senior economist in the Regional and Sustainable Development Department at the Asian Development Bank in Manila, “Impact of Global Recession on Sustainable Development and Poverty Linkages” ADBI Working Paper Series, No. 227, July 2010 http://www.adbi.org/files/2010.07.08.wp227.impact.global.recession.dev.poverty.linkages.pdf]

The global financial crisis and the resulting economic slowdown may be assumed to have at least the benefit of also reducing environmental degradation in the individual countries. This paper discusses the consequences of the crisis for energy use, pollution prevention, and land use in Asia and the associated emissions of greenhouse gases—the principal global warming pollutants—as well as their linkage with poverty. There are some short-term benefits to the global environment from the economic slowdown. Such benefits include reduction in the rate of air and water pollution from reduced energy use—which has direct implications for the urban poor’s health. However, modest benefits to global and local environments arising from the economic slowdown are likely to be much smaller than the costs associated with many environmental conservation measures, related to energy savings, natural resources protection, and water environment. Both supply and demand side investments in energy and environment are being affected. Many ongoing projects are being slowed and a number of downward revisions are being made in expected profitability. Meanwhile, businesses and households are spending less on energy efficiency measures. Tighter credit and lower prices make investment in energy savings and environmental conservation less attractive financially, while the economic crisis is encouraging end users to rein in spending across the board. This is delaying the deployment of more efficient technology and equipment. Furthermore, solution providers are expected to reduce investment in research, development, and commercialization of more energy-efficient models, unless they are able to secure financial support from governments. The economic slowdown is likely to alter land use patterns by increasing the pressure to clear forests for firewood, timber, or agricultural purposes—the livelihood opportunities available with the rural poor. Further, the likely additional delay in many countries in the construction of effluent treatment plans for limiting the discharge of pollutants into the rivers is expected to harm the water environment. Thus on balance, the modest benefits to global and local environments arising from the economic slowdown are likely to be much smaller than the costs of many environmental conservation measures for improving the livelihood conditions of the poor.

### Heidegger

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus a competitive policy option or the status quo.

#### This is key to ground and predictablity – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Their infatuation with ontology is politically debilitating – focusing on ontology divests politics of its emancipatory potential and devolves into a self-justifying cycle of never-ending critique.

Yar, Ph.D in the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University, 2k

[Majid, “Arendt's Heideggerianism: Contours of a `Postmetaphysical' Political Theory?,” Cultural Values, Volume 4, Issue 1, January, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Complete]

Similarly, we must consider the consequences that this 'ontological substitution' for the essence of the political has for politics, in terms of what is practically excluded by this rethinking. If the presently available menu of political engagements and projects (be they market or social liberalism, social democracy, communitarianism, Marxism, etc.) are only so many moments of the techno-social completion of an underlying metaphysics, then the fear of 'metaphysical contamination' inhibits any return to recognisable political practices and sincere engagement with the political exigencies of the day. This is what Nancy Fraser has called the problem of 'dirty hands', the suspension of engagement with the existing content of political agendas because of their identification as being in thrall to the violence of metaphysics. Unable to engage in politics as it is, one either [a] sublimates the desire for politics by retreating to an interrogation of the political with respect to its essence (Fraser, 1984, p. 144), or [b] on this basis, seeks 'to breach the inscription of a wholly other politics'. The former suspends politics indefinitely, while the latter implies a new politics, which, on the basis of its reconceived understanding of the political, apparently excludes much of what recognizably belongs to politics today. This latter difficulty is well known from Arendt's case, whose barring of issues of social and economic justice and welfare from the political domain are well known. To offer two examples: [1] in her commentary on the U.S. civil rights movement in the 1950s, she argued that the politically salient factor which needed challenging was only racial legislation and the formal exclusion of African-Americans from the political sphere, not discrimination, social deprivation and disadvantage, etc.(Arendt, 1959, pp. 45-56); [2] Arendt's pronounceraent at a conference in 1972 (put under question by Albrecht Wellmer regarding her distinction of the 'political' and the 'social'), that housing and homelessness were not political issues, that they were external to the political as the sphere of the actualisation of freedom as disclosure; the political is about human self-disclosure in speech and deed, not about the distribution of goods, which belongs to the social realm as an extension of the oikos.[20] The point here is not that Arendt and others are in any sense unconcerned or indifferent about such sufferings, deprivations and inequalities. Rather, it is that such disputes and agendas are identified as belonging to the socio-technical sphere of administration, calculation, instrumentality, the logic of means and ends, subject-object manipulation by a will which turns the world to its purposes, the conceptual rendering of beings in terms of abstract and levelling categories and classes, and so on; they are thereby part and parcel of the metaphysical-technological understanding of Being, which effaces the unique and singular appearance and disclosure of beings, and thereby illegitimate candidates for consideration under the renewed, ontological-existential formulation of the political. To reconceive the political in terms of a departure from its former incarnation as metaphysical politics, means that the revised terms of a properly political discourse cannot accommodate the prosaic yet urgent questions we might typically identify under the rubric of 'policy'. Questions of social and economic justice are made homeless, exiled from the political sphere of disputation and demand in which they were formerly voiced. Indeed, it might be observed that the postmetaphysical formulation of the political is devoid of any content other than the freedom which defines it; it is freedom to appear, to disclose, but not the freedom to do something in particular, in that utilising freedom for achieving some end or other implies a collapse back into will, instrumentality, teleocracy, poeisis, etc. By defining freedom qua disclosedness as the essence of freedom and the sole end of the political, this position skirts dangerously close to advocating politique pour la politique, divesting politics of any other practical and normative ends in the process.[21]

#### Case outweighs: Let beings be allows waste currently stored on-site that culminates in extinction. Ontological concerns of Being are irrelevant in a world without Beings. Our impacts come first because thoughts about thinking are impossible without people to think them.

#### Permutation do both: Heideggerian releasement is an affirmative argument: we can establish a free relation to technology through thinking, so the action of the plan is not implicated by their link.

Godzinski 5(Ronald Jr., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, “(En)Framing Heidegger’s Philosophy of Technology,” Essays in Philosophy, Vol. 6, No. 1, humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html)

In a related vein, the previous claim that everything within the natural world gives itself over to us, as standing-reserve is, for Heidegger, a phenomenological claim. As a purely phenomenological claim, Heidegger is not making an evaluative assertion about the status of modern technology and our comportment toward things that are treated as standing-reserve. Perhaps following the regressive method that Husserl used in *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, Heidegger presents us with a purely descriptive account of modern technology that seems to be value neutral. In truth, he acknowledges that technology is not intrinsically dangerous or evil.[17](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#17) Even Heidegger’s infamous “Memorial Address”[18](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#18) supports this idea:¶ For all of us, the arrangements, devices, and machinery of technology are to a greater or lesser extent indispensable. It would be foolish to attack technology blindly. It would be shortsighted to condemn it as the work of the devil.[19](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#19) ¶ When understood within this particular context, Heidegger is neither praising nor demonizing modern technology. Of course the same would have to be said about technological objects that were purported to be intrinsically good, as well. Hence, the potential value that any technical device might have would be contingent upon its context of use. From a Heideggerian standpoint, it would be inappropriate to claim that any technical device is intrinsically good or evil.[20](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#20) ¶ In “The Question Concerning Technology,” Heidegger makes the phenomenological observation that we master nature because we respond to nature’s call to requisition it. We do this primarily because this is how we have been *called* by Being. We use things as standing-reserve since they give themselves as standing-reserve—everything gives itself to be used. Even when we are not openly trying to master nature, Heidegger would nonetheless contend that we are still responding to its call. The revealing is not something that we do strictly on our own accord, without first hearing nature’s call. In this sense, we cannot be held accountable for modern technology, since this is something that just happens in the context of western culture: ¶ When man…reveals that which presences, he merely responds to the call of unconcealment even when he contradicts it. Thus when man, investigating, observing, ensnares nature as an area of his own conceiving, he has already been claimed by a way of revealing that challenges him to approach nature as an object of research, until even the object disappears into the objectlessness of standing-reserve. Modern technology as an ordering revealing is, then, no merely human doing.[21](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#21) ¶ The challenge which directs us to order the self-revealing as standing-reserve, is nothing other than what Heidegger calls “enframing” [*Gestell*].[22](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#22) Enframing, or *Gestell*, is the essence of modern technology. From Heidegger’s perspective, enframing is the way in which truth reveals itself as standing-reserve. We simply cannot avoid its influence or sway. One is already in a relationship with it, so it is not a matter of whether or not I will respond to it. Rather, it is a matter of how I will respond to it. More importantly, our response to the challenge that enframing emits, is neither completely predetermined nor free.¶ Heidegger recognizes that an authentic notion of freedom will be open to the essencing of technology. Thus, a genuine and free relationship to technology will be one that is open to the essencing of technology. This type of openness to the presencing of technology is called Gelassenheit, or releasement:¶ We can use technical devices, and yet with the proper use also keep ourselves so free of them, that we may let go of them at any time…. We can affirm the unavoidable use of technical devices, and also deny them the right to dominate us, and so to warp, confuse, and lay waste our nature…. I would call this comportment toward technology which expresses “yes” and at the same time “no,” by an old word, *releasement toward things*.[23](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#23) ¶ In the movement of Gelassenheit, one enters into a free relationship with technology which is not founded upon domination and mastery.[24](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#24) On the contrary, an authentic relationship to technology is one that is simply beyond our control.[25](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#25) Paradoxically, a relationship which is exemplified by releasement continually uses things as standing-reserve, while avoiding the danger of being taken as standing-reserve, although Heidegger certainly keeps a watchful eye out for the ultimate danger that rests within the ordering of standing-reserve. That is, if we, ourselves, get ordered or dominated by the things that we in turn are trying to order and dominate, then we will encounter the danger, to the extent that the sending or presencing of Being gets closed off and concealed from us.[26](http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html#26)

#### **Their Kinsella alt just says we need to recognize the assumptions and consequences. The perm does that.**

#### **Plan is a net benefit to the permutation.**

#### **a.) The very idea of housing in Yucca Mountain is the standing reserve mentality.**

Bloomfield and Vurdubakis, ‘5

[Brian and Theo (Centre for the Study of Technology and Organisation, Lancaster University Management School), “The secret of Yucca Mountain: reflections on an object in extremis”, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 2005, volume 23, page 741]

The Yucca Mountain project has been officially trumpeted as the long sought after solution to nuclear waste, but for many others in US society (and beyond) the repository has a very different meaning. If Heidegger (1977) bemoaned what the siting of a hydroelectric plant had done to the Rhine, the technological revealing of nature as standing reserve, the outcry over Yucca Mountain by various US native peoples is no less notable. Indeed, for them the repository implies an act not of purification but, rather, one of defilement. Yucca Mountain has ``long been a place of powerful spiritual energy for the Shoshone and the Paiute. The water in the area is sacred, too, as it is with many desert peoples'' (http://www.sacredland.org/endangered sites pages/ yucca mountain.html). Further, Erikson observes: ``Shoshone and Paiute natives \_ see that whole tract as part of an ancient claim and view its use by federal agencies as `willful trespass'. They have been using Yucca Mountain for at least twelve thousand years ... . The very idea of injecting the most virulent poisons ever known into the body of a mountain seems to them an insult to the earth, an affront to ancestors, and a violation of natural good sense'' (1994, pages 208 ^ 209). Clearly, then, the object Yucca Mountain as well as the idea of turning it into a repository for nuclear waste are perceived within a variety of interpretative horizons. Their meaning and value are formed in relation to a number of different historical, cultural, economic, and political contexts.

#### **b.) SQUO treats atomic energy as an standing reserve, concealing the problems with waste.**

Rawles, Lecturer at the University of Edinburgh, 2k

[Richard, “Coyote Learns to Glow”, Part of “Learning to Glow: A Nuclear Reader”, RSR]

Humans, having gathered uranium from the New Mexican desert not all that far from Yucca Mountain, have harnessed the energy within the atom, for commercial and security purposes, in effect by “tricking" nature out of its secret power. We are aided in our industry by this supposedly "free” energy source. As Martin Heidegger observed, we regard the natural world as a “standing reserve:’ there for the plundering-the military metaphor is more than apt in this case. Having stolen from nature its hidden fire, we delude ourselves into believing that there’s no reckoning, no balancing of accounts, despite even the scientific evidence, which tells us there are no free meals in nature’s unforgiving cycles. We are burdened by the waste from this virtual cornucopia, much as the Greeks of the early classical period projected into Pandora's box of woes the burdens of civilizing fire—its destructive aspects, along with the rituals needed to maintain the fire.

#### c.) Their Kinsella link evidence talks about environmental concerns being subordinated and the enframed process of uranium mining which we solve via dealing with the waste and reusing the fuel. That’s 1AC waste

#### Heidegger’s privileging of ontology is complicit in atrocities.

Committee on Public Safety 96 (The writers subsume their individual names within the denomination of "Committee" in deference to the indivisibility of the work presented Levinasian Scholars "My Place in the Sun" Reflections On The Thought Of Emmanuel Levinas Diacritics 26.1 (1996) 3-10 Project Muse) TBC 7/7/10

At the heart of Levinas's critique of Heidegger is the reproof that the question of man has become submerged in the question of being, and thus that the recovery of the meaning of being entails the forgetting of the meaning of the human. Heidegger's Letter on Humanism (Brief über den Humanismus), published in 1947, in which he claims that "what is essential is not humanity, but being" [Brief 24] is offset by the title of Levinas's work, published in the same year, in which he shows how the anonymity of existence, or being, is redeemed only by the existent, or be-ing; hence, De l'existence à l'existant, from existence to the existent--denoting a sense of direction, lost needlessly in Lingis's translation of the title as Existence and Existents. Levinas depicts the anonymity of being through the il y a, in which the impersonality of the verb mirrors the subjectless horror of existence. The anonymity of the il y a is "saved" ultimately only through the face of the other for whom one is always inescapably responsible. It is not that Levinas retreats from the ontological (the domain of Sein or being) to the ontic (the domain of the Seienden or be-ings), or that he rejects being in favor of some pre-Heideggerian idealist notion of the subject. Rather, his emphasis on the passage from the bare meaning of être or existence to l'étant or existent gropes toward what finally comes to signify the ethical, whereby the anonymity of the infinitive is overcome by the priority of the participial being-for-another-existent and the subject deposed rather than posed [EI 50]. "I am wary of that debased word 'love,'" he remarks again to Nemo, "but the responsibility for the other, being-for-the-other, seemed to me, even at that time [1947], to put an end to the anonymous and senseless rumbling of being" [EI 51]. Only in the most practical and mundane of obligations to the other is ontology rendered ethical and humane. This horror invoked by the anonymous il y a is not to be confused with Heideggerian anguish before death, or care for being. Levinas describes how the original De l'existence appeared in a cover on which were inscribed the words "where it is not a question of anxiety" [EI 47]. One could scarcely ask for a more explicit derangement of fundamental ontology, in the light of a horror of the il y a which had become historically incarnated for him: "None of the generosity which the German counterpart of the 'there is,' the 'es gibt,' is said to contain was displayed between 1933 and 1945," he writes later [DL 375]. There is no mistaking his imputation of ideological implications of complicity between Heideggerian Sein and modern genocide. They are related, not by happenstance but as the fundamental possibility of each other. Invoking the Platonic concept of the good beyond being (epekeina ts ousias), Levinas contests the notion that nothingness is a privation of being and that evil is a privation of the good, insisting that evil itself is a positive mode of being. Being can be more primally terrible than simply not-being. In brief, the distance between Heideggerian ontology and Levinasian ethics can be measured by the difference between an inquiry into being qua being (ti to on) and an inquiry into humanity itself (ti bioteon)--a distance which, as Heidegger himself observes in his Letter [Brief 22], is paradoxically both farther away than any individual be-ing and yet nearer than any be-ing could ever be.

#### Vague alts bad and that’s a voting issue - the neg can shift the alt in the block and moot the 2AC, killing fairness.

#### Phenomenology fails – we can’t transcend purely empirical ideas

Bartok 84 (Philip J. Dept of Phil U of Notre Dame FOUCAULT’S ANALYTIC OF FINITUDE AND THE “DEATH” OF PHENOMENOLOGY) TBC 7/8/10

Foucault’s line of argument here is most plausibly understood as an internal objection to Husserl’s approach: Transcendental phenomenology fails to achieve the (transcendental) aims set out for it by Husserl himself. The transcendental reduction fails insofar as it merely effects something like a shift of vision, attempting to assign transcendental significance to what are, by Husserl’s own admission, merely empirical contents. If Foucault’s archaeological analysis of the character of the modern episteme is adequate, this failure was inevitable given the fact that Husserl’s project was configured by an episteme characterized by the analytic of finitude. Given the problematic dual status of “man” under this episteme, Husserlian phenomenology cannot help but devolve into an anthropology.

#### The problem is not with calculative thought is not too much rationality, but too little.

Marsh 95 (James L., Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, Critique, Action, and Liberation p. 227-228 GAL)

In contrast to Heidegger's basically negative account of modern rationality as a calculation rooted in *Gestell.* or "enframing." we note in Husserl a fundamental endorsement of the project of science. Enframing is the technological context in modern society in which all qualitative difference is minimized or suppressed or used for the sake of profit. Basically accepting the premise that it is good to be scientific, in the sense of being ordered to judgments in evidence, he finally urges the person so committed to be fully consistent with that premise. Full commitment to judgments grounded in evidence leads one. as we have already seen, to phenomenological reflection on the life-world as the *fons et origo* of objects, language, and presuppositions essential to the scientific enterprise. Scientism. and in a similar way logicism as he criticizes it in the *Formal and Transcendental Logic,* is insufficiently scientific because it refuses to move beyond positive science. Scientism is unscientific; logicism is illogical. Husserl enters into the pathology of western *Ratio* by criticizing it from within dialectically rather than rejecting it from without in a totalizing Heideggerian objectification. Dialectic rather than "rejectionism" is the strategy. The result of Husserl's dialectical criticism of modem philosophy and science is a more reflective, more critical, more comprehensive account of rationality that preserves the legitimate projects of science and transcendental philosophy, negates one-sided objectivism and subjectivism, and develops a new, higher viewpoint, that of transcendental phenomenology. This account contrasts with Heidegger's *Denken.* a questioning, receptive openness to being which moves beyond evidential, conceptual rationality altogether. For Husserl. the alternative to a less adequate scientistic. subjectivistic rationality can only be a more comprehensive, more critical, more reflective account of rationality.Finally, in contrast to Heidegger's account of the darkness of the modern rooted in *Gestell,* Husserl tries to show that scientism is rooted in a forgetfulness of the life-world that reifies scientific concepts and mistakes them for the things themselves. Such an account forgets the historical and logical genesis of scientific concepts from perceived things to imagining and drawing of shapes to geometry to abstract formal logic to various calculative techniques. In contrast to Heidegger, however. Husserl does not equate such abstract calculation with rationality as such or with scientific rationality. Rather in its forgetfulness of origins, in its reification. and in its oversimplification such calculation reveals itself as insufficiently rational. The problem with calculation as one degenerate form of modernist reason is not too much but too little rationality. Calculation as forgetfulness of the life-world is not the essence of rationality but the essence of irrationality which as such can be criticized with reason's resources and can be transcended rationally. Heidegger s recourse to *Denken* is. therefore, not only arbitrary, but redundant and unnecessary. *21*

### Apocalypse K

#### CA framework from the other page.

#### Focusing on statism and security is key to real world change.

Buzan 4 (Barry , December, Montague Burton Prof. of International Relations @ the London School of Economics and honorary prof. @ the University of Copenhagen, "Realism vs. Cosmopolitanism" <http://www.polity.co.uk/global/realism-vs-cosmopolitanism.asp>

**A.Mc.:** But would not a realist response be that the very issues David seeks to highlight are largely marginal to the central dilemmas of world politics: the critical issues of war and peace, life and death. **B.B.:** Again, that is a difficult question for realism because in traditional realism there was a rather clear distinction between 'high' and 'low' politics, high politics being about diplomacy and war, and low politics being about economics and society and many issues like the weather and disease. And because of the change in the importance of the different sectors that I mentioned earlier, this becomes problematic for realism. But the realists have been fairly agile. The realist line of defence would be that in most areas of world politics - again the emphasis on politics - states are still the principle authorities. And there is nothing that stops them from co-operating with each other. Thus, realists, or at least a good proportion of realists, can live quite comfortably with the idea of international regimes in which states, as the basic holders of political authority in the system, get together sometimes with other actors, sometimes just with other states, to discuss issues of joint concern, and sometimes they can hammer out of a set of policies, a set of rules of the game, which enable them to co-ordinate their behaviour. Now, this certainly does not feel like traditional power politics realism. You can think of it to some extent in terms of power politics by looking at issue power; who are the big players in relation to any big issue? Who are the people who have any kind of control? Who loses out?, etc.. There is, therefore, an element of power politics in this whole notion of regimes, and it does retain a strong element of state centrism. I think the realist would say: if you discount the state, where is politics? Where is it located? You cannot eliminate politics, as some liberals sometimes seem to do. To wish the state away, to wish politics away, is not going to generate results. The good dyed-in-the-wool realist would argue that power politics is a permanent condition of human existence. It will come in one form or another, in one domain or another, in relation to one issue or another, but it will always be there. It will be politics and it will be about relative power. And at the moment the state is still an important player in the game.

#### Perm do both:

#### Case outweighs: by failing to solve the impending waste crisis, they allow waste on-site and Yucca Mountain to eventually blow up, leading to extinction. Rejecting securitization on the issue won’t resolve problems on-site or at Yucca.

#### Permutation do both.

#### Single-issue piecemeal reforms are key to challenge the root causes of environmental destruction

Stewart 03[Keith: wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on environmental politics in Ontario and currently works for the Toronto Environmental Alliance, Canadian Dimension, 9-1].

Most Environmentalists Are against the System Precisely because capitalism keeps inventing new ways to muck up the planet, the environmental movement--or at least large chunks of it--is constantly engaged in challenging the right of corporations to make money by whatever eco-destructive means are most profitable. These fights take place on multiple fronts at various spatial scales, use a bewildering variety of strategies and tactics by constantly changing coalitions of groups and individuals motivated by an equally diverse set of ideas about protecting nature. But if you spend some time with environmentalists, rather than simply absorbing whatever makes it through the filter of the mainstream media, you'll find that issue-specific solutions (save this park, better public transit, phase out that toxin) are usually couched within a broader context. At the risk of over-generalizing (and how can I not if I'm to speak of the environmental movement as if it was a coherent entity) I would argue that there is a widespread recognition within the environmental movement, particularly among those who've been around for a while, that there is a system that is lighting all these fires (climate change, deforestation, toxic contamination, radioactive waste, species extinction, etc.) that we spend all of our time running around trying to put out. Most days I label this system capitalism, but others might call it patriarchy, spiritually empty consumerism, racism, or simply big, mean corporations. And none of us would be wrong. That the planet-sized pyromaniac in question isn't always labeled capitalism is perhaps because capitalism isn't the cause of all of the world's evil, the weakness of the socialist movement in Canada and the ecologically regrettable record of "actually existing socialism." You also have to remember that few activists come to movements fresh from graduate degrees where they studied Marx--the "big picture" stuff comes out of lived experience combined with a lot of reading. Environmental activists are typically born out of a sense that something precious is in peril. Our victories seem always temporary, while defeats risk becoming permanent. It is this sense of urgency and an attachment to very particular bits of "nature"--a forest, a river, your child's smog-scarred lungs, the planet's atmosphere--or outrage at some particular assault--the toxic dump next door, the contaminated workplace, the carcinogen being sprayed on your neighbourhood park to kill those vicious dandelions--which move individuals and communities to action. Typically this action initially takes the form of seeking out practical, achievable solutions like the Kyoto Protocol, a ban in your community on the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes, or saving the local wetland. These "reformist" solutions are not to be despised, for you can't build a movement without victories. Indeed, to dream of a movement that suddenly overthrows the existing order and replaces it with a socially and environmentally superior alternative without having won any victories along the way to inspire the collective imagination and from which to learn practical lessons is ludicrous.

#### Plan is a net benefit to the perm:

#### Fear of death contributes to progressive movements to eliminate risks – disarmament movement proves.

Dhanpala, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs at the United Nations, ‘1

[Jayantha, “Sustaining People-Centered Disarmament”, UN Chronicle, March-May 2001, Vol. 38, Iss. 1, p. ebsco]

The fact that today, over a half century after this goal was set, this aim has still not been fully achieved must not deflect attention from the progress that the world has made in this period in the disarmament field. Virtually the entire Southern Hemisphere is covered by nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is now forbidden to place nuclear weapons on the seabed, in Antarctica, and to deploy them in outer space. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty will, when it enters into force, outlaw all nuclear-test explosions. Stockpiles of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons have been declining worldwide over the last decade, as countries that once invested heavily in the production of such weapons have slowly turned their attention to cleaning up the enormous environmental problems created by the weapons-production and testing process. Chemical and biological weapons have been outlawed by multilateral conventions. Efforts are also under way to develop new multilateral controls against the illicit transfer of small arms and light weapons-the focus of a major UN conference in July 2001. **There have been numerous setbacks, especially in the area of global nuclear disarmament**. Over 30,000 nuclear weapons reportedly remain in the world. The conduct by India and Pakistan of several nuclear tests in 1998 aggravated regional tensions and further set back international efforts to de-legitimize possession of such weapons. There is also a glaring absence of multilateral norms governing the production, stockpiling, transfer or use of missiles-a problem that extends into the new field of missile defence. Each year, the world is greeted with huge new arms deals involving not only munitions and ammunition but also the technology to make them. Meanwhile, serious problems remain in enforcing arms embargoes that have been mandated by the UN Security Council. Another ominous development is the recent rise in global military expenditures. In 1990-the last year of the cold war-this figure stood at around $1 trillion a year. Defence spending fell over the last decade to just below $800 billion in 1998, effectively making over $200 billion available for more productive uses in society-a savings that no doubt contributed to the aggregate growth of the world economy in this period. The most recent estimates, however, show that global military expenditures have once again started to rise, fuelled by increased defence spending in several regions and by many of the great Powers. This trend is all the more troubling given that nearly half the world's population still has to make do on less than $2 per day. These are significant developments indeed. **They demand a very significant response, one deeply rooted in the ideals and interests of the people**. While there is no panacea that can possibly remedy all such concerns, disarmament has much more to contribute in achieving these goals than is commonly appreciated. In short, **the world community, encompassing grassroots citizens, nation states and international organizations, needs to revitalize disarmament as a tool to serve these collective ideals and interests**. Disarmament, first of all, is not an end in itself; nor is disarmament just about arms. It is about what people can do with fewer arms. It is an important, though often neglected, means by which Governments can advance the security interests of their citizens, improve their social and economic well-being and promote a cleaner environment. **The greater the public understands the real costs, risks and sacrifices associated with existing weapons of mass destruction-and the security, and economic and environmental benefits from their elimination-the greater will be the political will to eliminate such weapons. This political will must be nurtured by enlightened leaders throughout society, both inside and outside government. It must find its strength in civil society-the ultimate foundation of efforts worldwide to sustain disarmament as a high priority of Governments and international institutions**. Civil society has surely left its mark on international relations in recent years: it has spawned the highly-successful International Campaign to Ban Landmines; it has led the call for action to alleviate the carnage produced by the illicit trade in small arms; it has promoted the creation of an International Criminal Court; and it has served as a catalyst for international action on the environment, humanitarian affairs, the rights of women and children, and in numerous areas of economic development. Against this background, "**sustainable disarmament" emerges as a new focal point of efforts within civil society to pursue a better world. It is a political strategy to enhance security, promote human welfare and protect the environment through the process of destroying weapons that jeopardize human civilization. It does not take political will for granted and recognizes the need for both citizen education and action to create and reinforce that will among national leaders. It recognizes the need for institutional support, to give it a steady focus and permanence as a goal of policy and of law. In short, it means more than just the physical elimination of this or that weapon system; it seeks to develop an institutionalized support system, rooted in civil society, to advance collective ends with fewer arms. The ultimate disarmament dividend is human security-the security of all people. It is the ultimate basis for the sustainability of disarmament: the support it deserves, and is increasingly earning, among people everywhere.**

#### Excluding environmentally securitizing discourse cedes its rhetorical power to militant elites, framing the environment as a security issues allows effective response and a formation of a non-militaristic concept of “security”

Liftin, prof of political science at Univ. of Washington, 98

(Karen T., “Constructing Environmental Security and Ecological Interdependence”, Global Governance 5 (1998)) NG

It may be tempting to jettison environmental security, but there are strong practical and epistemological reasons for not doing so. First, the two principal trends that have thrown the field of security studies into tumult-the declining utility of force and the growing salience of nonstate actors-are likely to persist. Alternative formulations of security will therefore continue to demand a hearing. Second, climate change, land degradation and desertification, the largest wave of species extinctions since the dinosaurs, and multifarious pollutants are real and growing sources of insecurity. Third, limiting security language to military threats cedes too much ground to the security traditionalists. If security is a discursive practice, then it can be constructed by a mulitiplicity of social actors. Security discourse can be rehabilitated to encompass environmental dangers, however, only if certain caveats are prudently observed. These have mostly to do with the twin dangers of bolstering a traditional state-centric threat-defense conception of security, and falling into an objectivism that ignores the socially constructed element of all security concerns. To claim that environmental problems are social constructions is not to deny their physical character; to believe otherwise would be ecologically and politically irresponsible. One of the pitfalls of security language is the presumption that security signifies some reality with a concrete external referent. As Ole Wrever argues, rather than being a sign for an objective referent, security is most aptly understood as a speech act: "The utterance itself is the act."19 Although his critique could provide the basis for a more reflective conception of security as a socially constructed set of concerns, Waever opposes an expanded notion of security, including the "securitization of the environment," on the grounds that "security is articulated only from aspecific prace, in an institutional voice, by elites."20 In other words, only those concerned with classic state-centric threat-defense dynamics are entitled to perform security speech acts. This reading not only ignores the fact that security speech acts are performed on a daily basis by an increasingly diffuse group of scholars and practitioners, but it also abdicates too much terrain to the security traditionalists. The state is not the sole subject of security, nor is coercive power the sole means of seeking it. If Cold War hawks could seize on the ambiguous symbol of national security, then contemporary analysts may also deploy the ambiguous symbol of environmental security. But to do so reflectively, without falling prey to the sorts of ideological excess that characterized Cold War security discourse, they must be conscious of how they construct their speech acts.

#### Environmental security is necessary to ensure fast responses in times of crisis relative to climate change

Barnett et al 2010 (Jon Barnett, Richard A. Matthew, and Karen L. O’Brien, Reader and Australian Research Council Fellow in the Department of Resource Management and Geography at the University of Melbourne, Director of the Center for Unconventional Security Affairs and Associate Professor of International and Environmental Politics in the Schools of Social Ecology and Social Science at the University of California at Irvine, Professor in the Department of Sociology and Human Geography at the University of Oslo Norway, Global and environmental change and human security,p.4-32, 2010) AM

¶The second explanation is that there has been a tendency to downplay¶ issues of development, equity, ethics, power relations, and social justice¶ in global change research, prioritizing instead a general, aggregated notion¶ of welfare. Although social drivers of change are well recognized¶ in global environmental change research, analyses have historically¶ tended to focus on the absolute numbers of people and on talks of amorphous¶ and aggregated social categories such as ‘‘humanity,’’ ‘‘society,’’¶ ‘‘Africa,’’ ‘‘small islands,’’ and so on. Consequently, the potential contributions¶ of social sciences to global change research have been undervalued,¶ despite the fact that global environmental change is a social¶ problem as much as it is a natural system phenomenon. Almost all environmental¶ change problems are the by-products of modern development¶ practices and the social disparities they produce. For example, climate¶ change is caused by the emissions of gases from fossil fuel use and land¶ use changes; forests are cleared to meet the demand for paper, timber,¶ and new land for agriculture and grazing; biodiversity is lost through¶ land clearing for agriculture and infrastructure; rivers are dammed and¶ diverted to control flooding, for hydropower and to secure the supply of water to irrigators; coasts and reefs are modified to support human settlements¶ and are then polluted or destroyed by those settlements; fisheries¶ are depleted by more intense applications of more efficient fishing¶ techniques; and land is degraded by unsustainable farming practices.¶ Global environmental change is thus an inherently social problem, and¶ one that has the potential to undermine human security—namely, the¶ needs, rights, and values of people and communities. Human insecurity¶ from environmental change is a function of many social processes that¶ cause some people to be more sensitive and less able to prepare for and¶ respond to sudden and incremental environmental changes. People who¶ are most dependent on natural resources and ecosystem services for their¶ livelihoods are often the most sensitive to environmental change (Adger¶ 1999, 2003; Blaikie et al. 1994; Bohle, Downing, and Watts 1994). For¶ example, in terms of needs, a change in soil moisture can undermine¶ nutrition in subsistence farming households, a decline in fish abundance¶ can undermine nutrition and income for fishers, and a decline in surface¶ or groundwater quality can undermine maternal and child health in¶ communities without reticulated water supply. Just as important as¶ sensitivity is people’s capacity to anticipate, plan for, and adapt to¶ environmental changes. These response strategies are functions of various¶ social factors, including institutions, information, health, education,¶ and access to food and nutrition, money and resources, and social¶ support networks. Underlying many of these determinants of adaptive¶ capacity is the effectiveness of the state. States that consciously or unconsciously,¶ actively (through violence) or passively (through denial of entitlements),¶ discriminate against social groups on the basis of political¶ opposition, class, ethnicity, and/or location create vulnerable groups.

#### Addressing security issues solves health problems

McDonald 2010 (Bryan, assistant director for global health centers, *Global and Environmental Change and Human Security,* p. 53-76, 2010) AM

Adopting a human security perspective on global health challenges¶ also recognizes the broad significance of good health and that localized¶ health emergencies can become global situations very rapidly. The Commission¶ on Human Security found that good health is essential to human¶ security ‘‘because the very heart of human security is protecting lives’’¶ (2003, 96). Interconnections between health and human security have¶ also led to a commonalty of purpose between efforts to improve health¶ and well-being and national security efforts to ensure stable public health¶ in a shared focus on ensuring national security by dramatically improving¶ global public health (National Intelligence Council 2000; Brower and¶ Chalk 2003). An important characteristic of human security is its emphasis on the¶ importance of preventive measures as opposed to reactive efforts. Many¶ threats to global health can be most effectively addressed through pre- distribution¶ of cheap, reliable bed nets demonstrate that, despite advances in¶ the treatment of malaria, the most effective interventions are simple ones¶ that reduce the spread of disease among human populations. In developed¶ countries, recognition of the health costs of growing epidemics of¶ obesity and of diseases such as diabetes has prompted a renewed interest¶ in promoting good health during a person’s lifespan rather than waiting¶ for the development of a costly and difficult-to-treat health condition.¶Persistent health threats, such as malnutrition, contribute to multiple¶ sources of human insecurity; improving the health and well-being of¶ individuals is one strategy to address these enduring failures of development.¶ While the increasing speed and scale of transnational interactions¶ has created or amplified many security challenges, in terms of the magnitude¶ of impact of the daily lives of people and communities around the¶ world, threats to global health remain one of the most significant and unrelenting¶ challenges facing humanity in the twenty-first century. Improving global health is a significant and¶ necessary component of efforts to ensure human security.

#### Securitization is necessary to solve conflict. Brklacich, et al., 10

(Mike Brklacich, May Chazan, and Hans-Georg Bohle, Professor and Chair of the Department of Geography and¶ Environmental Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa Canada, Ph.D. candidate at Carleton University, chair of development geography at the Geography Department¶ of Bonn University, Global and Environmental Change and Human Security, p.35-51, 2010) AM

Human vulnerability to environmental stress is not a new concept. Some¶ of the earliest work dates back to the 1940s and Gilbert White’s pioneering¶ research into human activities in the floodplains of major river systems¶ throughout the United States. White’s work forged the foundation¶ for the next four decades of natural hazards research and several studies¶ that eventually resulted in a thorough characterization of hazards (e.g.,¶ magnitude of the event, return period frequencies), created a typology¶ of hazards (i.e., natural, quasi-natural, and anthropocentric hazards),¶ and classified responses (e.g., mitigation of the event, spread of risk) (for¶ reviews, see Burton, Kates, and White 1993; Mitchell 1989). Much of¶ this natural hazards research as well as famine research were placebased,¶ and therefore they effectively captured the net impacts of cumulative¶ or multiple stressors, including biophysical and socioeconomic¶ factors, on human well-being. A key consequence however of focusing¶ on outcomes (e.g., incidence of hunger, number of people displaced by¶ extreme weather, etc.) of multiple stressors was that this research provided¶ limited insight into the root causes of these human tragedies.¶ There have been several notable changes to this initial foundation for¶ vulnerability research over the past fifteen years. One has involved a¶ reorientation of hazards and famine research in order to better understand¶ how coping capacity and external stressors or shocks collectively¶ define a state of human vulnerability (Emel and Peet 1989; Watts and¶ Bohle 1993). This has contributed to a recasting of vulnerability concepts,¶ and there is now overwhelming evidence that vulnerability is a¶ fundamental characteristic of all human systems and that an external¶ stress such as an extreme weather event exposes rather than causes vulnerability¶ (Adger 1999; Mustafa 1998). In addition, the scope of vulnerability¶ research has broadened considerably and emerging stressors¶ such as economic globalization and HIV/AIDS are now considered to be¶ drivers of human vulnerability (Chen and Narasimhan 2003). And finally,¶ it is now recognized that it is no longer sufficient to simply focus on identifying vulnerabilities but it is also essential to extend the research¶ scope and consider opportunities and strategies to move from a state of¶ human vulnerability to one of human security (Bohle 2001; Twigg and¶ Bhatt 1998; O’Brien and Vogel 2004).¶ Human security is achieved when and where individuals and communities¶ live with three basic conditions: (1) the options necessary to end,¶ mitigate, or adapt to threats to their human, environmental, and social¶ rights; (2) the capacity and freedom to exercise these options; and (3)¶ the opportunity to actively participate in attaining these options (Lonergan¶ 1999). Human security and vulnerability are intimately linked: human¶ security is the capacity to overcome vulnerability and to respond¶ positively to environmental change. From this perspective, vulnerability¶ and human security occupy opposite ends of a common continuum (see¶ figure 2.1).¶Research on human vulnerability to environmental stress, much of¶ which has taken place in the context of hazards, disasters, famines, and,¶ more recently, climate change, can therefore inform efforts to conceptualize¶ and promote human security amid emerging social and environmental¶ threats.¶ This conceptualization affords two observations that are consistent¶ with recent theorizing on vulnerability. First, vulnerability is not a residual¶ to any particular environmental event or stressor, but rather it is a¶preexisting, underlying state. An individual’s, a community’s, or a nation’s¶underlying level of vulnerability may, however, be unveiled or revealed¶as a result of certain stressors (O’Brien and Vogel 2004). Second, vulnerability¶ is not the end product of singular events or strategies; people and¶ groups dynamically slide back and forth along the vulnerability-security¶ continuum. Overall, figure 2.1 suggests that vulnerability and security¶are not static states, but are the result of dynamic processes, and these¶processes are likely in motion prior to observable effects from any given¶environmental perturbation.

#### Alt fails: We must connect politics with the environment—nature is not grounded in social theory.

Kaplan, Professor of National Security, 1994

(Robert D., editor of The Atlantic Monthly, Februrary, “The Coming Anarchy: How Scarcity, Crime, Overpopulation, Tribalism, and Disease Are Rapidly Destroying the Social Fabric of Our Planet”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, volume: 273, questia, accessed: 7/15/08)

Tad Homer-Dixon is an unlikely Jeremiah. Today a boyish thirty-seven, he grew up amid the sylvan majesty of Vancouver Island, attending private day schools. His speech is calm, perfectly even, and crisply enunciated. There is nothing in his background or manner that would indicate a bent toward pessimism. A Canadian Anglican who spends his summers canoeing on the lakes of northern Ontario, and who talks about the benign mountains, black bears, and Douglas firs of his youth, he is the opposite of the intellectually severe neoconservative, the kind at home with conflict scenarios. Nor is he an environmentalist who opposes development. "My father was a logger who thought about ecologically safe forestry before others," he says. "He logged, planted, logged, and planted. He got out of the business just as the issue was being polarized by environmentalists. They hate changed ecosystems. But human beings, just by carrying seeds around, change the natural world." As an only child whose playground was a virtually untouched wilderness and seacoast, Homer-Dixon has a familiarity with the natural world that permits him to see a reality that most policy analysts--children of suburbia and city streets--are blind to. "We need to bring nature back in," he argues. "We have to stop separating politics from the physical world--the climate, public health, and the environment." Quoting Daniel Deudney, another pioneering expert on the security aspects of the environment, Homer-Dixon says that "for too long we've been prisoners of 'social-social' theory, which assumes there are only social causes for social and political changes, rather than natural causes, too. This social-social mentality emerged with the Industrial Revolution, which separated us from nature. But nature is coming back with a vengeance, tied to population growth. It will have incredible security implications.

#### Death reps cause an empathic shift.

Recuber, Doctoral Candidate in Sociology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, ‘11

[Timothy, He has taught at Hunter College in Manhattan, "CONSUMING CATASTROPHE: AUTHENTICITY AND EMOTION IN MASS-MEDIATED DISASTER", Dissertation Publication

gradworks.umi.com/3477831.pdf, RSR]

Perhaps, then, what distant consumers express when they sit glued to the television watching a disaster replayed over and over, when they buy t-shirts or snow globes, when they mail teddy bears to a memorial, or when they tour a disaster site, is a deep, maybe subconscious, longing for those age-old forms of community and real human compassion that emerge in a place when disaster has struck. It is a longing in some ways so alien to the world we currently live in that it requires catastrophe to call it forth, even in our imaginations. Nevertheless, the actions of unadulterated goodwill that become commonplace in harrowing conditions represent the truly authentic form of humanity that all of us, to one degree or another, chase after in contemporary consumer culture every day. And while it is certainly a bit foolhardy to seek authentic humanity through disaster-related media and culture, the sheer strength of that desire has been evident in the public’s response to all the disasters, crises and catastrophes to hit the United States in the past decade. The millions of television viewers who cried on September 11, or during Hurricane Katrina and the Virginia Tech shootings, and the thousands upon thousands who volunteered their time, labor, money, and even their blood, as well as the countless others who created art, contributed to memorials, or adorned their cars or bodies with disaster-related paraphernalia— despite the fact that many knew no one who had been personally affected by any of these disasters—all attest to a desire for real human community and compassion that is woefully unfulfilled by American life under normal conditions today. In the end, the consumption of disaster doesn’t make us unable or unwilling to engage with disasters on a communal level, or towards progressive political ends—it makes us feel as if we already have, simply by consuming. It is ultimately less a form of political anesthesia than a simulation of politics, a Potemkin village of communal sentiment, that fills our longing for a more just and humane world with disparate acts of cathartic consumption. Still, the positive political potential underlying such consumption—the desire for real forms of connection and community—remains the most redeeming feature of disaster consumerism. Though that desire is frequently warped when various media lenses refract it, diffuse it, or reframe it to fit a political agenda, its overwhelming strength should nonetheless serve notice that people want a different world than the one in which we currently live, with a different way of understanding and responding to disasters. They want a world where risk is not leveraged for profit or political gain, but sensibly planned for with the needs of all socio-economic groups in mind. They want a world where preemptive strategies are used to anticipate the real threats posed by global climate change and global inequality, rather than to invent fears of ethnic others and justify unnecessary wars. They want a world where people can come together not simply as a market, but as a public, to exert real agency over the policies made in the name of their safety and security. And, when disaster does strike, they want a world where the goodwill and compassion shown by their neighbors, by strangers in their communities, and even by distant spectators and consumers, will be matched by their own government. Though this vision of the world is utopian, it is not unreasonable, and if contemporary American culture is ever to give us more than just an illusion 216 of safety, or empathy, or authenticity, then it is this vision that we must advocate on a daily basis, not only when disaster strikes.