### 2AC – K

#### Case outweighs – global warming will wipe out the planet before we can re-configure our relationship to others - rising sea levels, disease and extreme weather will consume the planet and are comparatively worse than nuclear war –that’s Diebel. Only we control 100% probability since we are seeing signs of it right now

#### The framework for the debate is whether or not the plan is better than the status quo or a competitive policy option - this is critical to predictability, education and teaching opportunity cost

#### Method focus causes scholarly paralysis

Jackson 11, associate professor of IR – School of International Service @ American University, ‘11 (Patrick Thadeus, The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations, p. 57-59)

Perhaps the greatest irony of this instrumental, decontextualized importation of “falsification” and its critics into IR is the way that an entire line of thought that privileged disconfirmation and refutation—no matter how complicated that disconfirmation and refutation was in practice—has been transformed into a license to **worry endlessly about foundational assumptions.** At the very beginning of the effort to bring terms such as “paradigm” to bear on the study of politics, Albert O. **Hirschman** (1970b, 338) **noted this very danger**, suggesting that without “a little more ‘reverence for life’ and a little less straightjacketing of the future,” the **focus on** producing internally **consistent** packages of **assumptions instead of** actually examining **complex empirical situations would result in scholarly paralysis.** Here as elsewhere, Hirschman appears to have been quite prescient, inasmuch as the major effect of paradigm and research programme language in IR seems to have been a series of debates and discussions about whether the fundamentals of a given school of thought were sufficiently “scientific” in their construction. Thus **we have debates about how to evaluate scientific progress**, and attempts to propose one or another set of research design principles **as uniquely scientific**, and inventive, “reconstructions” of IR schools, such as Patrick James’ “elaborated structural realism,” supposedly for the purpose of placing them on a firmer scientific footing by making sure that they have all of the required elements of a basically Lakatosian19 model of science (James 2002, 67, 98–103). The bet with all of this scholarly activity seems to be that if we can just get the fundamentals right, then scientific progress will inevitably ensue . . . even though this is the precise opposite of what Popper and Kuhn and Lakatos argued! In fact, all of this obsessive interest in foundations and starting-points is, in form if not in content, a lot closer to logical positivism than it is to the concerns of the falsificationist philosophers, despite the prominence of language about “hypothesis testing” and the concern to formulate testable hypotheses among IR scholars engaged in these endeavors. That, above all, is why I have labeled this methodology of scholarship neopositivist. While it takes much of its self justification as a science from criticisms of logical positivism, in overall sensibility it still operates in a visibly positivist way, attempting to construct knowledge from the ground up by getting its foundations in logical order before concentrating on how claims encounter the world in terms of their theoretical implications. This is by no means to say that neopositivism is not interested in hypothesis testing; on the contrary, neopositivists are extremely concerned with testing hypotheses, but **only after the fundamentals have been** soundly **established.** Certainty, not conjectural provisionality, seems to be the goal—a goal that, ironically, Popper and Kuhn and Lakatos would all reject.

#### Extinction outweighs

Bok 88 (Sissela, Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Rosenthal and Shehadi, Ed.)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical Imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences. Acknowledging such a rift would post a strong challenge to the unity and simplicity of Kant’s moral theory.

#### Epistemology must be secondary to the prior question of political practice

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128-9)

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, **smacks of intellectual elitism** and **displays** a certain **contempt** for those who search for guidance in their daily struggle as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the émigrés of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer **no**. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a **contemptuous position** that abrogates any hope of solving some of the **nightmarish realities that millions confront daily**. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, **“So what?”** To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics” be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate. Contrary to Ashley’s assertions, then, a poststructural approach fails to empower the marginalized and, in fact, abandons them. Rather than analyze the political economy of power, wealth, oppression, production, or international relations and render and intelligible understanding of these processes, Ashley succeeds in ostracizing those he portends to represent by delivering an obscure and highly convoluted discourse. If Ashley wishes to chastise structural realism for its abstractness and detachment, he must be prepared also to face similar criticism, especially when he so adamantly intends his work to address the real life plight of those who struggle at marginal places.

#### Implementation before ontology

**Jarvis 2k** – IR lecturer, Sydney (Darryl, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p 128-9, AG)

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflects our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. **Certainly it is** right and **proper that we** ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, **engage in epistemological and ontological debate**, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. **But to suppose that this is the only task** of international theory, let alone the most important one, **smacks of intellectual elitism** and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggles as actors in international politics. What does Ashley's project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the emigres of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But **to suppose that problem-solving** technical theory **is** not necessary—or is in some way **bad**—is a contemptuous position that **abrogates any hope of solving some of the** nightmarish **realities that millions confront** daily. As Holsti argues, **we need ask** of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, "**So what?" To what purpose do they** deconstruct, **problematize**, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle **modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition**? In what sense can this "debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics" be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate.

#### Policy focus before reps

Adler and Haas 92 [Emanuel ADLER IR @ Hebrew Univ (Jerusalem) AND Peter HAAS Poli Sci @ UMass ’92 “Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program” International Organization 46 (1) p. 370-37]

Our critique of the approaches mentioned above should not be interpreted as reflecting a preference for poststructuralist, postpositivist, and radical interpretive analyses, although we do hope to build a bridge between structural and interpretive approaches. Rejecting the view of international relations as the mere reflections of discourses and habits-wherein the word is power and the **only power is the word**-we nevertheless have incorporated into our reflective approach the notion that the manner in which people and institutions interpret and represent phenomena and structures makes a difference for the outcomes we can expect in international relations." Thus, we adopt an ontology that embraces historical, interpretive factors, as well as structural forces, explaining change in a dynamic way. This ontology reflects an epistemology that is based on a strong element of intersubjectivity. So long as even a tenuous link is maintained between objects and their representation, we can reject an exclusive focus on words and discourse. By defending an epistemological and ontological link between words and the objects with which they are commonly associated, we believe that learning may occur through **reflection on** empirical events **rather than through** their representation. Finally, epistemic communities should not be mistaken for a new hegemonic actor that is the source of political and moral direction in society." Epistemic communities are not in the business of controlling societies; what they control is international problems. Their approach is instrumental, and their life is limited to the time and space defined by the problem and its solutions. Epistemic communities are neither philosophers, nor kings, nor philosopher- kings.

#### No link – there’s no profit motive for the aff so there’s no reason to trust our scholarship, the problem with their Glass evidence, which is the first card they read is that, it’s about how a researcher realized that his company would polluting a river but everyone told him to shut up, and they made up results. Not only is none of that talking about SMRs or nuclear power but we link turn that because we realize the flaws of squo reactors

#### Our aff is not nuclear optimism- it’s carefully reasoned tech based on science and checked by pessimistic engineers

Adams ‘10 (Technological Realism Should Replace Optimism, Pro-nuclear advocate with small nuclear plant operating and design experience Former submarine Engineer Officer, <http://atomicinsights.com/2010/05/technological-realism-should-replace-optimism.html>)

As a “served engineer” on a nuclear powered submarine, I learned a long time ago that things go wrong, even with the very best technology. The recognition of inevitable “problems” should not deter technical **development and should not make people afraid to develop new products** and services, but it should add a healthy dose of humility backed up by continuous efforts to prepare for the worst. My experiences have taught me to be uncomfortable with any proclamation of inevitable progress. I have worked on IT projects, been a full participant in the digital revolution, operated a custom plastics manufacturing company, and watched the nuclear industry work to regain respectability after some serious missteps in its early development history. Progress is hard work and there are often failures that reset the development cycle just as it seems ready to take off. Too many technology observers and pundits point to Moore’s Law as some kind of a general rule for technical developments. Moore’s Law is a very particular pronouncement – in 1965, Gordon Moore recognized that there was a recognizable path forward that would allow manufacturers to double the number of transistors that could be inexpensively placed on a chip every year for the next ten years and he recognized that he could apply that law to the 15-20 years of chip development that had already happened. He modified his prediction in 1975 to increase the doubling time to two years instead of one. He predicted that the implementation of that path would allow an increasing quantity of processing power, assuming that it would be possible to keep all of the transistors firing at the same rate as before. Moore’s Law does not apply to software development, to steel making, to underwater sensors, to remote manipulators, to wind energy collection systems, or to the rate of IP data transmission using satellite networks. It is not even infinitely applicable to semiconductor based processors – there are physical limits to the size of transistors and connecting wires that will eventually provide an asymptote that levels out the growth of processing power. I have never had much [“faith” in technology](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/30/weekinreview/30rosenthal.html). I like technology. I use lots of technology; my children have occasionally called me “Inspector Gadget” because of all of the tools (my wife and children sometimes call them “toys”) I have accumulated over the years. However, I understand the limits of the technology that I use. I read the manuals, heed the warnings, plan for failure, and worry about the potential consequences of inappropriately using technical devices. I know that no technology can overcome physical barriers; nothing I or anyone else can do will provide power from the wind when it is not blowing and nothing that I or anyone else can invent will enable chemical combustion to provide reliable heat energy without both a source of oxygen and a place to dump the waste products. Nothing that I or anyone else can invent will enable oil extraction from a dry well. I also know that not everything that breaks can be fixed, even if there is an unlimited amount of time and money. Some breaks and fissures can never be welded shut or forced to heal. This is where I believe that humble engineers and technicians who are not driven by sales numbers have a huge role to play. Their (our) **natural pessimism can help to reduce the consequences of always listening to the optimists**, the people who say “damn the torpedoes”, “failure is not an option”, or “whatever it takes”. Failure is always possible. Before stretching limits it is important to recognize the consequences of the failure to determine if they are acceptable. If the reasonably predictable “worst possible event” results in consequences that cannot be accepted, the prudent course of action is to avoid the action in the first place. I place deepwater drilling for oil and gas into that category. It is pretty obvious that the possible consequences are unacceptable and that technological development has not yet found a way to mitigate those consequences. I am not sure what the limits of “deepwater” should be, but it is apparent that 5,000 feet is beyond the limit. **I do not place operating nuclear energy production facilities in that categor**y. However, there are very definitely some kinds of nuclear plants – like very large graphite-moderated, water-cooled reactors operated by people who override safety systems and ignore warning indications – that have proven that they can cause consequences that are not acceptable. The real value comes in determining what the reasonably predictable consequences might be and what failure modes are reasonable to assume. For people who have no firm foundation in real world mechanics, chemistry and physics**, it is possible to spin all kinds of scary scenarios that depend on a series of impossible events**. (Note: Just because I believe that there is always something that can go wrong, I do not believe that all things are possible.) My prescription for progress is not “faith” in engineers or technologists. **It is for people to approach challenges with knowledge, a questioning attitude,**humility**and a willingness to expend the resources necessary** to operate safely. A thirst for maximizing short term profits or an attitude of blind optimism are both incompatible with performing difficult tasks in potentially dangerous environments.

#### Hegemony is a DA to the alternative, changing the way we look at nature doesn’t change a cyberattack coming

#### Cyberterror coming against the grid now – we already know that they’ve been able to infiltrate the system

CNN 10-13 [Pam Benson – “Panetta: Cyber threat is pre 9/11 moment”, October 13th, 2012, http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2012/10/12/panetta-cyber-threat-is-pre-911-moment/?hpt=hp\_t3, Chetan]

The United States must beef up its cyber defenses or suffer as it did on September 11, 2001 for failing to see the warning signs ahead of that devastating terrorist attack, the Secretary of Defense told a group of business leaders in New York Thursday night. Calling it a “pre-9/11 moment,” Leon Panetta said he is particularly worried about a significant escalation of attacks. In a speech aboard a decommissioned aircraft carrier, Panetta reminded the Business Executives for National Security about recent distributed denial of service attacks that hit a number of large U.S. financial institutions with unprecedented speed, disrupting services to customers. And he pointed to a cyber virus known as Shamoon which infected the computers of major energy firms in Saudi Arabia and Qatar this past summer. More than 30-thousand computers were rendered useless by the attack on the Saudi state oil company ARAMCO. A similar incident occurred with Ras Gas of Qatar. Panetta said the attacks were probably the most devastating to ever hit the private sector. The secretary did not say who is believed responsible for those attacks, but senior defense officials who briefed reporters on the speech, said the United States knows, however they would not divulge the suspect. And he warned America's critical infrastructure - its electrical power grid, water plants and transportation systems - are threatened by foreign actors. "We know of specific instances where intruders have successfully gained access to these control systems," Panetta said. "We also know they are seeking to create advanced tools to attack those systems and cause panic, destruction and even loss of life."

#### Lash out

#### Valuing nature as standing reserve of natural resources for human benefit is essential to the survival of all species

**Younkins 4** (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified, AG)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. **Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer**. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. **People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently** of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. **All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans]** men **affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress**. Mankind’s **survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things**, even man himself. **Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe**. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. **Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value**. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. **The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature**. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. **Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans]** men **sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them**. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, **only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation**. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This **antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.**

#### Perm do the plan and re-orient our relationship to nature

#### Consumption focus fails---political action key

Bryant 12—prof of philosophy at Collin College (Levi, Black Ecology: A Pessimistic Moment, [larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/03/19/black-ecology-a-pessimistic-moment/](http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/03/19/black-ecology-a-pessimistic-moment/))

So why is this an issue? It’s an issue because while environmentalists prescribe all sorts of action we need to take to avert the climate catastrophe, it seems to me that in failing to engage in an ecology of social and political institutions they are whistling past the graveyard by failing to address the question of the conditions under which action is possible. Here’s the part where everyone gets angry with me. Given the way in which government and corporations are today intertwined*, I don’t think there’s much we can do to avert the coming catastrophe*. As Morton says, referring to logical time, “the catastrophe has already happened”. So what would it mean, I wonder, to take Morton’s thesis seriously? Here I know Tim will disagree with me. When I look at environmental discussions in popular media and from many around me, I see the discussion revolving almost entirely around consumers. We’re told that we have to consume differently to solve this problem. I agree that we need to consume differently, but **I don’t see any feasible way in which**driving fuel efficient cars, **using less** heat and AC, eating less meat, etc **will solve these problems**. This is because the lion’s share of our climate change problems arise from the production and distribution end of the equation, rather than the consumption end. They are problems arising from agricultural practices, factories, and how we ship goods throughout countries and the world. The problem is that given the way in which governments and corporations are intertwined with one another, and given the way in which third world countries are dependent on fossil fuels for their development, andgiven the fact that only governmental solutions can address problems of production and distribution, **we’re left with no recourse for action**. We can only watch helplessly while our bought and sold politicians continue to fiddle as the world burns.

#### The alt has NO way of addressing consumotion all you do is change scholarship, to do WHAT

#### Management solves extinction—letting nature “be” cements existing destruction – only nuke power can solve warming

**Soulé 95** – Natural Resources Professor, California (Michael and Gary Lease, Reinventing Nature?, p 159-60, AG)

The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, **the idea that nature is** self-regulating and **capable of caring for itself**. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect—nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, **a century ago**, a hands-off policy **was the best policy. Now it is not. Given nature's** **current** fragmented and **stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating** spiral of **deterioration**. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change.' For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even **fifty years ago**, neglect might have been the best medicine, but **that was a world** with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world **largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species**. The alternative to neglect is active caring—in today's parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. **Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, management is the** only viable alternative **to massive attrition of living nature**.

Vague alt

#### CO2 will overall lead to decrease in crop production and cause global starvation – disproves the thesis of your warming discourse evidence

Strom 7 [Robert Strom, Professor Emeritus of planetary sciences in the Department of Planetary Sciences at the University of Arizona, 2007 (studied climate change for 15 years, the former Director of the Space Imagery Center, a NASA Regional Planetary Image Facility, “Hot House”, SpringerLink, p. 211-216]

Agriculture is critical to **the survival of civilization**. Crops feed not only us but also the domestic animals we use for food. Any disruption in food production means a disruption of the economy, government, and health. The increase in CO2 will result in some growth of crops, and rising temperatures will open new areas to crop production at higher latitudes and over longer growing seasons; however, the overall result will be decreased crop production in most parts of the world. A 1993 study of the effects of a doubling of CO2 (550 ppm) above pre-industrial levels shows that there will be substantial decreases in the world food supply (Rosenzweig et al., 1993). In their research they studied the effects of global warming on four crops (wheat, rice, protein feed, and coarse grain) using four scenarios involving various adaptations of crops to temperature change and CO2 abundance. They found that the amount of world food reduction ranged from 1 to 27%. However, the optimistic value of 1% is almost certainly much too low, because it assumed that the amount of degradation would be offset by more growth from "CO2 fertilization." We now know that this is not the case, as explained below and in Chapter 7. The most probable value is a worldwide food reduction between 16 and 27%. These scenarios are based on temperature and CO2 rises that may be too low, as discussed in Chapter 7. However, even a decrease in world food production of 16% would lead to large-scale starvation in many regions of the world. Large-scale experiments called Free-Air Concentration Enrichment have shown that the effects of higher CO2 levels on crop growth is about 50% less than experiments in enclosure studies (Long et al., 2006). This shows that the projections that conclude that rising CO2 will fully offset the losses due to higher temperatures are wrong. The downside of climate change will far outweigh the benefits of increased CO2 and longer growing seasons. One researcher (Prof. Long) from the University of Illinois put it this way: Growing crops much closer to real conditions has shown that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will have roughly half the beneficial effects previously hoped for in the event of climate change. In addition, ground-level ozone, which is also predicted to rise but has not been extensively studied before, has been shown to result in a loss of photosynthesis and 20 per cent reduction in crop yield. Both these results show that we need to seriously re-examine our predictions for future global food production, as they are likely to be far lower than previously estimated. Also, studies in Britain and Denmark show that only a few days of hot temperatures can severely reduce the yield of major food crops such as wheat, soy beans, rice, and groundnuts if they coincide with the flowering of these crops. This suggests that there are certain thresholds above which crops become very vulnerable to climate change. The European heat wave in the summer of 2003 provided a large-scale experiment on the behavior of crops to increased temperatures. Scientists from several European research institutes and universities found that the growth of plants during the heat wave was reduced by nearly a third (Ciais et al., 2005). In Italy, the growth of corn dropped by about 36% while oak and pine had a growth reduction of 30%. In the affected areas of the mid- west and California the summer heat wave of 2006 resulted in a 35% loss of crops, and in California a 15% decline in dairy production due to the heat-caused death of dairy cattle. It has been projected that a 2 °C rise in local temperature will result in a $92 million loss to agriculture in the Yakima Valley of Washington due to the reduction of the snow pack. A 4'C increase will result in a loss of about $163 million. For the first time, the world's grain harvests have fallen below the consumption level for the past four years according to the Earth Policy Institute (Brown, 2003). Furthermore, the shortfall in grain production increased each year, from 16 million tons in 2000 to 93 million tons in 2003. These studies were done in industrialized nations where agricultural practices are the best in the world. In developing nations the impact will be much more severe. It is here that the impact of global warming on crops and domestic animals will be most felt. In general, the world's most crucial staple food crops could fall by as much as one-third because of resistance to flowering and setting of seeds due to rising temperatures. Crop ecologists believe that many crops grown in the tropics are near, or at, their thermal limits. Already research in the Philippines has linked higher night-time temperatures to a reduction in rice yield. It is estimated that for rice, wheat, and corn, the grain yields are likely to decline by 10% for every local 1 °C increase in temperature. With a decreasing availability of food, malnutrition will become more frequent accompanied by damage to the immune system. This will result in a greater susceptibility to spreading diseases. For an extreme rise in global temperature (> 6 'C), it is likely that worldwide crop failures will lead to mass starvation, and political and economic chaos with all their ramifications for civilization.

#### Expansion of nuclear power internationally coming now – so the impact is inevitable

Bernstein and Gerami 12

(Paul Bernstein, Senior Research Fellow in the Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction (CSWMD) at the National Defense University, and Nina Gerami, Research Fellow in CSWMD, \*\*\*ENR = uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing\*\*\* June 2012, “Proliferation Risks of Civilian Nuclear Power Programs” http://wmdcenter.dodlive.mil/files/2012/06/CSWMD-Proceedings-3-FINAL.pdf)

Nuclear Renaissance? Lending added urgency to nonproliferation efforts is the possibility that nuclear power will expand sig- nificantly across the world as more governments seek to address increasing energy demands, rising oil and natu- ral gas prices, and growing pressure to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Some observers have called for a civilian nuclear “renaissance” to create new or wider markets, particularly in Asia and the Middle East. According to the World Nuclear Association, nuclear power is under serious consideration in more than 45 countries that do not currently possess it.3 If these states follow through with their plans, nuclear energy capacity could double or triple by 2030.4 Experts debate two issues: whether this renais- sance will actually occur on a significant scale, and the degree of proliferation risk it would pose. Although the use of the term renaissance almost certainly overstates what is likely to occur in the next couple of decades, there is no doubt that nuclear power will expand worldwide. Nuclear power is expected to expand significantly in some states, such as China and India, more modestly in other countries with estab- lished nuclear power programs, and it is likely that at least a few additional states will embark on new pro- grams. Despite the significant interest expressed by many governments in expanding or adopting nuclear power, it is difficult to predict how many will actually proceed down this path. Civilian nuclear power infra- structures entail complex, large-scale projects shaped by political and other factors.5 Economic and financial constraints, as well as new concerns about safety and public confidence following the Fukushima crisis in Japan, could limit the extent of a nuclear energy reviv- al. In the aftermath of Fukushima, some governments, particularly in regions that are seismically active and prone to tsunamis, have cancelled their plans to pur- sue nuclear power. Some countries are deferring their plans, while others have vowed to stay on track.6

#### But we solve that, Lovering

#### Plan solve meltdowns

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less. So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

#### Meltdowns cause extinction

Lendman 11 – Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (Stephe, 3/13. “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan” The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>)

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It could be, literally, an apocalyptic event.

#### The alt is violent, causes passivity, and makes exploitation worse

#### Graham ‘99

(Phil, Graduate School of Management, University of Queensland, Heidegger’s Hippies: A dissenting voice on the “problem of the subject” in cyberspace, Identities in Action! 1999, <http://www.philgraham.net/HH_conf.pdf>)

Societies should get worried when Wagner’s music becomes popular because it usually means that distorted interpretations of Nietzsche’s philosophy are not far away. Existentialists create problems about what is, especially identity (Heidegger 1947). Existentialism inevitably leads to an authoritarian worldview: this, my Dionysian world of the eternally self-creating, the eternally self-destroying, this mystery world of twofold voluptuous delight, my “beyond good and evil,” without a goal, unless the joy of the circle itself is a goal; without will, unless a ring feels good will towards itself – do you want a name for this world? A solution to all its riddles? A light for you, too, you best-concealed, strongest, most intrepid, most midnightly men? – This world is the will to power – and nothing besides! And you yourselves are also this will to power – and nothing besides! (Nietzsche 1967/1997). Armed with a volume of Nietzsche**,** some considerable oratory skills, several Wagner records, and an existentialist University Rector in the form of Martin Heidegger, Hitler managed some truly astoundingfeats of strategic identity engineering (cf. Bullock, 1991). Upon being appointed to the Freiberg University, Heidegger pronounced the end of thought, history, ideology, and civilisation: ‘No dogmas and ideas will any longer be the laws of your being**.** The Fuhrer himself, and he alone, is the present and future reality for Germany’ (in Bullock 1991: 345). Heidegger signed up to an ideology-free politics: Hitler’s ‘Third Way’ (Eatwell 1997). The idealised identity, the new symbol of mythological worship, Nietzsche’s European Superman, was to rule from that day hence. Hitler took control of the means of propaganda: the media; the means of mental production: the education system; the means of violence: the police, army, and prison system; and pandered to the means of material production: industry and agriculture; and proclaimed a New beginning and a New world order. He ordered Germany to look forward into the next thousand years and forget the past. Heidegger and existentialism remain influential to this day, and history remains bunk (e.g. Giddens4, 1991, Chapt. 2). Giddens’s claims that ‘humans live in circumstances of … existential contradiction’, and that ‘subjective death’ and ‘biological death’ are somehow unrelated, is a an ultimately repressive abstraction: from that perspective, life is merely a series of subjective deaths, as if death were the ultimate motor of life itself (cf. Adorno 1964/1973). History is, in fact, the simple and straightforward answer to the “problem of the subject”. “The problem” is also a handy device for confusing, entertaining, and selling trash to the masses. By emphasising the problem of the ‘ontological self’ (Giddens 1991: 49), informationalism and ‘consumerism’ confines the navel-gazing, ‘narcissistic’ masses to a permanent present which they self-consciously sacrifice for a Utopian future (cf. Adorno 1973: 303; Hitchens 1999; Lasch 1984: 25-59). Meanwhile transnational businesses go about their work, ~~raping~~ [ruining] the environment**;** swindling each other and whole nations**;** and inflicting populations with declining wages, declining working conditions, and declining social security**.** Slavery is once again on the increase (Castells, 1998; Graham, 1999; ILO, 1998). There is no “problem of the subject”, just as there is no “global society”; there is only the mass amnesia of utopian propaganda, the strains of which have historically accompanied revolutions in communication technologies. Each person’s identity is, quite simply, their subjective account of a unique and objective history of interactions within the objective social and material environments they inhabit, create, and inherit. The identity of each person is their most intimate historical information, and they are its material expression: each person is a record of their own history at any given time. Thus, each person is a recognisably material, identifiable entity: an identity**.** This is their condition. People are not theoretical entities; they are people. As such, they have an intrinsic identity with an intrinsic value. No amount of theory or propaganda will make it go away. The widespread multilateral attempts to prop up consumer society and **hypercapitalism** as a valid and useful means of sustainable growth, indeed, as the path to an inevitable, international democratic Utopia, are already showing their disatrous cracks. The “problem” of subjective death threatens to give way, once again, to unprecedented mass slaughter. The numbed condition of a narcissistic society, rooted in a permanent “now”, a blissful state of Heideggerian Dasein, threatens to wake up to a world in which “subjective death” and ontology are the least of all worries.

#### Perm: do the plan and reject technological thought in all other instances

#### No alt solvency - only they have forgotten Being by forgetting its existence in science and technology

Latour 91 [Bruno Latour teaches sociology at the E´ cole des Mines in Paris **We have never been modern,** p. 65-67 GAL] x

But immediately the philosopher loses this well-intentioned simplicity. Why? Ironically, he himself indicates the reason for this, in an apologue on Heraclitus who used to take shelter in a baker's oven. *'Emm gar kai entautha theous\* —* 'here, too, the gods are present,\* said Heraclitus to visitors who were astonished to see him warming his poor carcass like an ordinary mortal (Heidegger, 1977b, p. 233). *'Auch bier namlich wesen Gotter an.'* But **Heidegger** is taken in as much as those naive visitors, since he **and his epigones do not expect to find Being except along the Black Forest** Holzwege. **Being cannot reside in ordinary beings**. Every­where, there is desert. **The gods cannot reside in technology** — **that pure Enframing** (Zimmerman, 1990) **of being** *[Ge-Stelf],* that ineluctable fate [Geschick], that supreme danger [Gefahr]. **They are not to be sought in science, either, since science has no other essence but that of technology** (Heidegger, 1977b). **They are absent from politics, sociology, psychol­ogy, anthropology, history** - which is the history of Being, and counts its epochs in millennia. **The gods cannot reside in economics — that pure calculation forever mired in beings and worry**. **They are not to be found in philosophy, either, or in ontology, both of which lost sight of their destiny** 2,500 years ago. **Thus Heidegger treats the modern world** as the visitors treat Heraclitus: **with contempt**. **And yet — 'here too the gods are present**\*: **in a hydroelectric plant** on the banks of the Rhine, **in subatomic particles, in Adidas shoes** as well as in the old wooden clogs hollowed out by hand, in **agribusiness** as well as in timeworn landscapes, in shopkeepers\* **calculations** as well as in Holderlin's heartrending verse. **But why do those philosophers no longer recognize them?** Because they believe what the modern Constitution says about itself! This paradox should no longer astonish us. **The moderns indeed declare that technology is nothing but pure instrumental mastery**, science pure Enframing and pure Stamping [Das Ge-Stell], **that econo­mics is pure calculation, capitalism pure reproduction,** the subject pure consciousness. **Purity everywhere**! They claim this, but **we must be careful not to take them at their word, since what they are asserting is only half of the modern world, the work of purification that distils what** the work of **hybridization supplies**. **Who has forgotten Being?** No one**, no one ever has**, **otherwise Nature would be truly available as a pure 'stock**\*. Look around you: **scientific objects are circulating simultaneously as subjects objects and discourse. Networks are full of Being**. As for **machines**, they **are laden with subjects and collectives. How could a being** **lose** its difference, its incompleteness, its mark, **its trace of Being**? **This is never in anyone's power**; otherwise we should have to imagine that we have truly been modern, we should be taken in by the upper half of the modern Constitution. **Has someone**, however, **actually forgotten Being**? **Yes: anyone who really thinks that Being has really been forgotten.** As Levi-Strauss says, 'the barbarian is first and foremost the man who believes in barbarism.' (Levi-Strauss, [1952] 1987, p. 12). **Those who have failed to undertake empirical studies of sciences, technologies, law, politics, economics, religion or fiction have lost the traces of Being that are distributed everywhere among beings. If, scorning empiricism**, you opt out of the exact sciences, then the human sciences, then traditional philosophy, then the sciences of language, and **you hunker down in your forest - then you will indeed feel a tragic loss. But what is missing is you yourself, not the world!** **Heidegger's epigones have converted that glaring weakness into a strength. 'We don't know anything empirical, but that doesn't matter, since your world is empty of Being. We are keeping the little flame of Being safe from everything, and you, who have all the rest, have nothing**.' **On the contrary: we have everything, since we have Being, and beings, and we have never lost track of the difference between Being and beings**. **We are carrying out the impossible project undertaken by Heidegger**, who believed what the modern Constitution said about itself without understanding that what is at issue there is only half of a larger mechanism which has never abandoned the old anthropological matrix. **No one can forget Being, since there has never been a modern world, or,** by the same token, **metaphysics**. **We have always remained pre-Socratic, pre-Cartesian, pre-Kantian, pre-Nietzschean**. No radical revolution can separate us from these pasts, so there is no need for reactionary counter­revolutions to lead us back to what has never been abandoned. Yes, Heraclitus is a surer guide than Heidegger: *'Einai gar kai entautha theous?*

#### Framework – evaluate the aff vs. status quo or a competitive policy option. That’s best for fairness and predictability – that’s best for fairness and education

#### Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being

Zimmerman 93 (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

#### Capitalism is inevitable – their alternative caricaturizes the left and cedes the political sphere to the right.

**Wilson 1** [John K. Wilson, best-selling progressive author and coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 200. How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives, Published by NYU Press, ISBN 0814793630, p. 15-16]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism—they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town—the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an [end page 15] ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the *Socialist Worker* to an uninterested public.

#### Transitioning away from capitalism would collapse civilization and kill billions.

 **Rockwell 8** [Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., President of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2008 [“Everything You Love You Owe to Capitalism,” Ludwig von Mises Institute, May 18th, Available Online at http://mises.org/story/2982, Accessed 10-04-2008 ]

Whatever the specifics of the case in question, socialism always means overriding the free decisions of individuals and replacing that capacity for decision making with an overarching plan by the state. Taken far enough, this mode of thought won't just spell an end to opulent lunches. It will mean the end of what we all know as civilization itself. It would plunge us back to a primitive state of existence, living off hunting and gathering in a world with little art, music, leisure, or charity. Nor is any form of socialism capable of providing for the needs of the world's six billion people, so the population would shrink dramatically and quickly and in a manner that would make every human horror ever known seem mild by comparison. Nor is it possible to divorce socialism from totalitarianism, because if you are serious about ending private ownership of the means of production, you have to be serious about ending freedom and creativity too. You will have to make the whole of society, or what is left of it, into a prison. In short, the wish for socialism is a wish for unparalleled human evil. If we really understood this, no one would express casual support for it in polite company. It would be like saying, you know, there is really something to be said for malaria and typhoid and dropping atom bombs on millions of innocents.

#### 8. Capitalism best ensures value to life

**Tracinski 8** Robert, editor of the Intellectual Activist, The Moral and the Practical,http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceable value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity

#### Plan solves colonization

O’Neil 11[Ian, PhD from University of Wales, founder and editor of Astroengine, space producer for Discovery News “'Suitcase' Nuclear Reactors to Power Mars Colonies,” August 30th, <http://news.discovery.com/space/mars-colonies-powered-by-mini-nuclear-reactors-110830.html>]

Nuclear power is an emotive subject -- particularly in the wake of the Fukushima power plant disaster after Japan's March earthquake and tsunami -- but in space, it may be an essential component of spreading mankind beyond terrestrial shores. On Monday, at the 242nd National Meeting and Exposition of the American Chemical Society (ACS) in Denver, Colo., the future face of space nuclear power was described. You can forget the huge reactor buildings, cooling towers and hundreds of workers; the first nuclear reactors to be landed on alien worlds to support human settlement will be tiny. Think less "building sized" and more "suitcase sized." "People would never recognize the fission power system as a nuclear power reactor," said James E. Werner, lead of the Department of Energy's (DOE) Idaho National Laboratory. "The reactor itself may be about 1 feet wide by 2 feet high, about the size of a carry-on suitcase. There are no cooling towers. A fission power system is a compact, reliable, safe system that may be critical to the establishment of outposts or habitats on other planets. Fission power technology can be applied on Earth's Moon, on Mars, or wherever NASA sees the need for continuous power." The joint NASA/DOE project is aiming to build a demonstration unit next year. Obviously, this will be welcome news to Mars colonization advocates; to have a dependable power source on the Martian surface will be of paramount importance. The habitats will need to have a constant power supply simply to keep the occupants alive. This will be "climate control" on an unprecedented level. Water extraction, reclamation and recycling; food cultivation and storage; oxygen production and carbon dioxide scrubbing; lighting; hardware, tools and electronics; waste management -- these are a few of the basic systems that will need to be powered from the moment humans set foot on the Red Planet, 24 hours 39 minutes a day (or "sol" -- a Martian day), 669 sols a year. Fission reactors can provide that. However, nuclear fission reactors have had a very limited part to play in space exploration up until now. Russia has launched over 30 fission reactors, whereas the US has launched only one. All have been used to power satellites. Radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs), on the other hand, have played a very important role in the exploration of the solar system since 1961. These are not fission reactors, which split uranium atoms to produce heat that can then be converted into electricity. RTGs depend on small pellets of the radioisotope plutonium-238 to produce a steady heat as they decay. NASA's Pluto New Horizons and Cassini Solstice missions are equipped with RTGs (not solar arrays) for all their power needs. The Mars Science Laboratory (MSL), to be launched in November 2011, is powered by RTGs for Mars roving day or night. RTGs are great, but to power a Mars base, fission reactors would be desirable because they deliver more energy. And although solar arrays will undoubtedly have a role to play, fission reactors will be the premier energy source for the immediate future. "The biggest difference between solar and nuclear reactors is that nuclear reactors can produce power in any environment," said Werner. "Fission power technology doesn't rely on sunlight, making it able to produce large, steady amounts of power at night or in harsh environments like those found on the Moon or Mars. A fission power system on the Moon could generate 40 kilowatts or more of electric power, approximately the same amount of energy needed to power eight houses on Earth." "The main point is that nuclear power has the ability to provide a power-rich environment to the astronauts or science packages anywhere in our solar system and that this technology is mature, affordable and safe to use." Of course, to make these "mini-nuclear reactors" a viable option for the first moon and Mars settlements, they'll need to be compact, lightweight and safe. Werner contends that once the technology is validated, we'll have one of the most versatile and affordable power resources to support manned exploration of the solar system.

#### Colonization solves extinction

Schulze-Makuch and Davies 10 (Dirk Schulze-Makuch, Ph.D., School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Washington State University and Paul Davies, Ph.D., Beyond Center, Arizona State University, “To Boldly Go: A One-Way Human Mission to Mars”, <http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars108.html>)

There are several reasons that motivate the establishment of a permanent Mars colony. We are a vulnerable species living in a part of the galaxy where cosmic events such as major asteroid and comet impacts and supernova explosions pose a significant threat to life on Earth, especially to human life. There are also more immediate threats to our culture, if not our survival as a species. These include global pandemics, nuclear or biological warfare, runaway global warming, sudden ecological collapse and supervolcanoes (Rees 2004). Thus, the colonization of other worlds is a must if the human species is to survive for the long term. The first potential colonization targets would be asteroids, the Moon and Mars. The Moon is the closest object and does provide some shelter (e.g., lava tube caves), but in all other respects falls short compared to the variety of resources available on Mars. The latter is true for asteroids as well. Mars is by far the most promising for sustained colonization and development, because it is similar in many respects to Earth and, crucially, possesses a moderate surface gravity, an atmosphere, abundant water and carbon dioxide, together with a range of essential minerals. Mars is our second closest planetary neighbor (after Venus) and a trip to Mars at the most favorable launch option takes about six months with current chemical rocket technology.

#### Perm do both - alt alone dooms us to extinction

**Santoni 85** (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and **Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in** our **thinking** about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But **it is not clear that** what either offers as **suggestions** for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race **are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. **Being aware** of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it **must only be a “first step”** (as Fox acknowledges), **during which we** simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” **should we be as cautious** as Zimmerman suggests **about our disposition “to want to do something”** or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, **does it follow that “we should be willing for** the worst (i.e. **an all-out nuclear war) to occur”?** **Zimmerman** **wrongly**, I contend, **equates “resistance” with “denial”** when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” **Resistance connotes** opposing, and **striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs** that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements **his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard**. In my judgment, **an individual’s decision not to act** against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust **is**, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

#### Heidegger’s Nazism flows directly from his obsession with ontology, not in spite of it

**Zizek 2k** p. 113-114 (The Ticklish Subject)

Here **one should avoid the trap that caught Heidegger’s defenders, who dismissed Heidegger’s Nazi engagement as a** **simple anomaly**, a fall into the ontic level, in blatant contradiction to his thought, which teaches us not to confuse ontological horizon with ontic choices (as we have already seen, Heidegger is at his strongest when he demonstrates how, on a deeper structural level, ecological, conservative, and so on, oppositions to the modern universe of technology are already embedded in the horizon of what they purport to reject: the ecological critique of the technological exploitation of nature ultimately leads to a more ‘environmentally sound’ technology, etc.). **Heidegger did not engage in the Nazi political project ‘in spite of’ his ontological philosophical approach, but *because of* it; this engagement was not ‘beneath’ his philosophical level- on the contrary, if one is to understand Heidegger, the key point is to grasp** the complicity (in Hegelese: ‘speculative identity’) between **the elevation above ontic concerns and the passionate ‘ontic’ Nazi political engagement**.