### K

**Ehrenfeld says the purely ends-based goals of technology in humanism divorce it from any morality or final purpose allowing destruction to be legitimized at the press of a button because all that is important is technology itself, we will destroy ourselves, and the planet, in the process**

**This outweighs – 3 reasons**

**Ehrenfeld, 81** – (David, professor of biology at Rutgers University, studied at Harvard, Ph.D in Zoology from University of Florida, known author, The Arrogance of Humanism, Ch. 3 Pg. 113-115) Idriss

Beyond the quasi-solutions and residue problems, beyond the problems of narrowed contexts and too many variables, there are certain ecological realities that impose additional, albeit sometimes overlapping, constraints on our exercise of power. The most direct of these is that few biological systems in the world, either individual organisms or groups of organisms, have evolved any mechanisms for coping with large, surplus inputs of concentrated energy in their immediate environments, energies of the sort that man now has readily at his disposal. We ourselves provide a good example of this: although we have numerous biochemical and physiological ways of detoxifying and excreting a host of different poisons, we have no mechanism for expelling excess energy. If we eat too many calories we get fat, to our own detriment. Poisons have been with us, especially in plant materials, for as long as we have existed, but surplus energy is a new phenomenon.

Many ecological systems are fragile and are especially vulnerable to our energetic interference. They are fragile either because they have evolved in extremely stable environments (rain forests, coral reefs, and old, deep lakes), or because they are "preoccupied" with some overwhelming environmental force (tundra, deserts, steep mountain slopes). As an example, a single cross-desert motorcycle race may alter and largely destroy five hundred square miles of desert plant community. We think that the damage will last for a century or more.

A second ecological constraint is time. Natural plant and animal communities change their structures and species compositions over time--the process is known as succession. We can modify the process, derail it, but we can hardly ever accelerate it in a predictable way. Most of our energetic environmental activities bring succession back to earlier stages, and it is the earlier stages that are **dominated by organisms in conflict with people**--the weeds, the pests, and the vermin. Thus we can destroy the labyrinthine structure of a forest soil in milliseconds with a bomb or in hours with a bulldozer, yet it will not be coaxed back again before decades of slow successional change have prepared the way for its return. In the meantime we must live with the bamboo, the imperata grass, the bramble thickets, or whatever. In another example, in North America, ragweed is a member of the earliest of successional plant communities; it flourishes in recently disturbed soil, but if left alone will disappear after one or two summers, to be replaced by goldenrod, aster, and blackberry. If it is pulled up forcibly, however--preferably by a power tiller-- conditions will be ideal for the return of more ragweed at the next opportunity. Nature provides the best of paradoxes.

Irreversibility is the third ecological constraint. It seems difficult for the humanist mind to grasp the significance of the many irreversible processes that we have stirred up in living systems; the tendency is to deny that anything so final, so thoroughly beyond our control, can occur. But we are causing irreversible changes all the time. Species are extinguished wholesale, and no genetic prowess will ever bring them back. Deserts are substituted for garden spots and rich grasslands-a few thousand years ago the Sahara was a fertile place, and more recently the parched, cracked earth of parts of modern Iraq was the cradle of our agricultural civilization. Perhaps the deserts are not permanent, but compared with the time scale of human civilizations, they can be regarded as such. "Desert-makers" is truly as appropriate a title for humans as "tool-users."

**The aff’s inclusion of humanism turns solvency – it creates dichotomies between humanity and nature that prevent repair, create more problems, and make current ones worse – only through recognizing humanity’s place in the larger system of nature can solve – it’s try or die for a neg ballot**

**Ehrenfeld, 81** – (David, professor of biology at Rutgers University, studied at Harvard, Ph.D in Zoology from University of Florida, known author, The Arrogance of Humanism, Ch. 1 Pg. 10-11) Idriss

Setting aside for the moment the question of the side effects and durability of the release, what are the implications of this way of thinking about humanity and Nature? At the outset it is clear that a dichotomy has been created: people vs. Nature. Of course, there is nothing wrong with a dichotomy if a dichotomy is warranted. Situations in which two well-defined alternatives are set in opposition to one another occur all the time in ordinary existence. Digital computers operate in a binary language that glorifies the concept of dichotomy. Yet there is something about the extreme commonness of dichotomies that must make one suspicious: are clearcut alternatives with two possible, mutually exclusive choices really so frequent in life? Good-bad; socialist-capitalist; RepublicanDemocrat; beautiful-ugly; cowardly-brave; even pleasure-pain --who has not been hurt or fooled by dichotomies that at least part of the time are false and misleading? Evidently we set up dichotomies because our logical thoughts are more comfortable in that mode. This does not mean that the dichotomies necessarily exist, or are even useful. Dichotomies are most mischievous when they arbitrarily separate parts of a highly interrelated and complex system. In working with the broken mechanism of a watch, for example, no watchmaker is likely to separate "top half" from "bottom half," or "springs and gear wheels" from "jeweled bearings." **This might prevent the repair altogether.** Nature can be portrayed as being in opposition to us, but it also includes us; we comprise one system. Perhaps the most vivid illustration of this has been provided by Gregory Bateson, in his discussions of alcoholism and schizophrenia. Traditionally, both have been treated by forming a dichotomy--the patient on the one hand and the disease (the darker side of Nature) on the other. The two are separated conceptually, and the "disease" is treated with drugs or other therapy. Not surprisingly, **the results are usually terrible; either there is no progress, or the symptoms are masked or exchanged for others.** Bateson is a realist; he avoids the dichotomy. He sees, in many cases, the symptoms of alcoholism and schizophrenia as understandable responses to long-standing, aberrant social environments, which are so constructed as to leave the sufferer with no options for behaving in a "normal" fashion. The alcoholic or schizophrenic symptoms offer a form of escape, albeit a self-destructive one; or to put it another way, they are appropriate behaviors towards parents or others who have built a personal world in which there is punishment for either behaving or not behaving in ways that have been forbidden. (An example is a parent who cannot accept love but also blames a child for not being loving.) The singular success of Alcoholics Anonymous is, according to Bateson, the result of its recognition of alcoholic behavior as a permanent part of a person who is, in turn, part of a larger system.

**Total environmental management is impossible**

**Ehrenfeld, 81** – (David, professor of biology at Rutgers University, studied at Harvard, Ph.D in Zoology from University of Florida, known author, The Arrogance of Humanism, Ch. 3 Pg. 104-105) Idriss

The most spectacular failures of human control and negations of human omniscience have been manifested in our dealings with the many human environments. In no important instance have we been able to demonstrate comprehensive, successful management of our world, nor do we understand it well enough to be able to manage it in theory. Only in those few cases in which small, remote systems could, in effect, be treated as if they were isolated, have management and control worked at all; but **one cannot run an entire world this way.**

**Technology itself is not bad, but the underlying assumptions humanity has about technology ultimately turn the aff**

**Ehrenfeld, 81** – (David, professor of biology at Rutgers University, studied at Harvard, Ph.D in Zoology from University of Florida, known author, The Arrogance of Humanism, Ch. 3 Pg. 111) Idriss

Although machines are the usual instruments of our restrictive narrow-mindedness, it is the narrow-mindedness, not the machines, that is the ultimate source of the trouble. I previously described how the Chinese, using nothing more complex than fly swatters, have controlled housefly populations. I did not mention, however, that they used similarly non-technical methods to rid themselves of most of their birds, reasoning that birds eat fruits and grain and are therefore bad. Now there are reports that part of the wider context is revealing itself, the insect pests are becoming hard to control, and the Chinese would like their birds back again. With what insouciance we now manipulate whole provinces of the plant and animal kingdoms--redistributing or eliminating their inhabitants at the chance of a whim--as happened to the poor Montagnards of Vietnam. Like Humpty Dumpty, **they are not so easily reassembled**. Much better to look at the context first, rather than suffer from it later.

### Case

#### Continued dependence on REE causes war with China

Sebastian Anthony – 12/30/11, Rare earth crisis: Innovate, or be crushed by China, http://www.extremetech.com/extreme/111029-rare-earth-crisis-innovate-or-be-crushed-by-china/2,

The doomsday event that everyone is praying will never come to pass, but which every Western nation is currently planning for, is the eventual cut-off of Chinese rare earth exports. Last year, 97% of the world’s rare earth metals were produced in China — but over the last few years, the Chinese government has been shutting down mines, ostensibly to save what resources it has, and also reducing the amount of rare earth that can be exported. Last year, China produced some 130,000 tons of rare earths, but export restrictions meant that only 35,000 tons were sent to other countries. As a result, demand outside China now outstrips supply by some 40,000 tons per year, and — as expected — many countries are now stockpiling the reserves that they have. Almost every Western country is now digging around in their backyard for rare earth-rich mud and sand, but it’ll probably be too little too late — and anyway, due to geochemistry, there’s no guarantee that explorers and assayers will find what they’re looking for. The price of rare earths are already going up, and so are the non-Chinese-made gadgets and gizmos that use them. Exacerbating the issue yet further, as technology grows more advanced, our reliance on the strange and magical properties of rare earths increases — and China, with the world’s largest workforce and a fire hose of rare earths, is perfectly poised to become the only real producer of solar power photovoltaic cells, computer chips, and more. In short, China has the world by the short hairs, and when combined with a hotting-up cyber front, it’s not hard to see how this situation might devolve into World War III. The alternate, ecological point of view, is that we’re simply living beyond the planet’s means. Either way, strategic and logistic planning to make the most of scarce metals and minerals is now one of the most important tasks that face governments and corporations. Even if large rare earth deposits are found soon, or we start recycling our gadgets in a big way, the only real solution is to somehow lessen our reliance on a finite resource. Just like oil and energy, this will probably require drastic technological leaps. Instead of reducing the amount of tantalum used in capacitors, or indium in LCD displays, we will probably have to discover completely different ways of storing energy or displaying images. My money’s on graphene.

### Guidance Documents CP

#### severs --- Guidance documents are distinct from rulemaking --- considered a separate option

Raso, 10 --- J.D., Yale Law (January 2010, Connor N., The Yale Law Journal, “Note: Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents,” Lexis)

I. LEGAL TREATMENT OF GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

A. Introduction

The term "guidance document" suggests a wide variety of regulatory materials. Examples of such materials include general agency interpretations of existing legislative rules, statements outlining how an agency intends to regulate an evolving policy area, training manuals written for internal agency staff, compliance guides directed to the general public, advisory opinions tailored to individual case facts, and memoranda from agency leaders providing direction to agency staff members. As these examples suggest, agencies use guidance documents both to manage internal operations and to communicate with outside parties.

"Legislative rules" n13 are the administrative equivalent of public laws passed by Congress. Like public laws, legislative rules are legally binding, generally applicable, and nonretroactive. n14 Before issuing a legislative rule under the Administrative Procedures Act's (APA) informal rulemaking process, agencies are required to provide notice of the proposed text and to accept public comments. n15 Agencies must also complete a number of lesser-known procedural requirements before issuing a legislative rule. n16 Guidance documents are not subject to any of these requirements, however. n17

In many situations, an agency holds clear authority to issue a guidance document. The line between guidance and legislative rules is unclear in other [\*789] cases, however. The following discussion outlines how the courts have distinguished between the two in these difficult cases.

#### The CP is distinct from the plan --- does not have the force of law but it still solves by altering conduct. The perm severs the certainty of administrative law.

Raso, 10 --- J.D., Yale Law (January 2010, Connor N., The Yale Law Journal, “Note: Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents,” Lexis)

B. Interpretive Rules

Courts are commonly asked to determine whether interpretive rules are legislative rules in disguise. Interpretive rules clarify an agency's interpretation of an existing legislative rule or statute without imposing substantive changes. n18 Unlike legislative rules, they do not have the force of law. They therefore do not bind external parties, n19 but they may, nonetheless, have the effect of altering their conduct. n20 Finally, the literature has noted that interpretive rules sometimes serve as instructions from agency leaders to subordinates. n21

In analyzing this question, courts ask whether a rule has a "legally binding" effect. n22 If so, agencies are required to issue a legislative rule. The D.C. Circuit has adopted a multifactor test to implement this standard. The test asks whether: (1) there would have been an adequate legislative basis for the agency to perform its mandate in the absence of the rule; (2) the rule was published in the Code of Federal Regulations; (3) the agency explicitly invoked its general legislative authority; and (4) the rule effectively amended a prior legislative rule. n23 Affirmative answers to the first question and negative answers to the final three increase the probability that a court will find that the rule is, indeed, interpretive rather than legislative.

#### CP avoids politics --- stays below the political radar

Raso, 10 --- J.D., Yale Law (January 2010, Connor N., The Yale Law Journal, “Note: Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents,” Lexis)

B. Alignment of Political Principals

Agency leaders facing a Congress and President in agreement on their issue area have a relatively simple means of minimizing political pressure: obey their political principals. This is not to suggest that agencies hold no discretion during unified government. n100 Nonetheless, agencies hold greater slack when Congress and the President are divided. This situation is more likely when different political parties control the two branches. n101 Such division increases the cost of issuing a legislative rule. By contrast, a guidance document is less likely to draw the attention of Congress and the President because it is exempt from the numerous procedural requirements that alert the political branches to agency rulemakings. n102 In short, this Note argues that the advantage of avoiding this attention increases when Congress and the President are divided because the agency cannot please both of its superiors.