### Ice age

**SD\* 07** – (August 29, Science Daily, “Next Ice Age Delayed By Rising Carbon Dioxide Levels” <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/08/070829193436.htm>) Jacome

\*Citing Dr Tyrrellm University of Southampton's School of Ocean and Earth Science.

ScienceDaily (Aug. 29, 2007) — Future ice ages may be delayed by up to half a million years by our burning of fossil fuels. That is the implication of recent work by Dr Toby Tyrrell of the University of Southampton's School of Ocean and Earth Science at the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton.

Arguably, this work demonstrates the most far-reaching disruption of long-term planetary processes yet suggested for human activity.

Dr Tyrrell's team used a mathematical model to study what would happen to marine chemistry in a world with ever-increasing supplies of the greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide.

The world's oceans are absorbing CO2 from the atmosphere but in doing so they are becoming more acidic. This in turn is dissolving the calcium carbonate in the shells produced by surface-dwelling marine organisms, adding even more carbon to the oceans. The outcome is elevated carbon dioxide for far longer than previously assumed.

Computer modelling in 2004 by a then oceanography undergraduate student at the University, Stephanie Castle, first interested Dr Tyrrell and colleague Professor John Shepherd in the problem. They subsequently developed a theoretical analysis to validate the plausibility of the phenomenon.

The work, which is part-funded by the Natural Environment Research Council, confirms earlier ideas of David Archer of the University of Chicago, who first estimated the impact rising CO2 levels would have on the timing of the next ice age.

Dr Tyrrell said: 'Our research shows why atmospheric CO2 will not return to pre-industrial levels after we stop burning fossil fuels. It shows that it if we use up all known fossil fuels it doesn't matter at what rate we burn them. The result would be the same if we burned them at present rates or at more moderate rates; we would still get the same eventual ice-age-prevention result.'

Squo solves – other countries doing fusion

30 years sufficient – that’s CX

### Ov

### Perm

**Managerialism obliterates other types of knowledge; it is impossible to do both.**

**McWhorter, Professor of Philosophy at Northeast Missouri State, 92** (LaDelle, Heidegger and the Earth, ed: McWhorter, p. vii-viii)

In order to approach the world in a manner exclusively technological, calculative, mathematical, scientific, we must already have given up (or lost, or been expelled by, or perhaps ways of being such as *we* are even impossible within) other approaches or modes of revealing that would unfold into knowledges of other sorts. **Those other approaches or paths of thinking must already have been obliterated**; those other knowledges must already have concealed themselves in order for technologjcal or scientific revelation to occur. **The danger a managerial approach to the world lies not, then, in what it knows** - not in its penetration into the secrets of galactic emergence or nuclear fission - **but in what it forgets**, what it itself conceals. **It forgets that any other truths are possible**, and it forgets that the belonging together of revealing with concealing is forever beyond the power of human manage­ment. We can never have, or know, it all; we can never manage everything. **What is now especially dangerous about this sense of our own managerial power, born of forgetfulness, is that it results in our viewing the world as mere resources to be stored or consumed.** Managerial or technological thinkers, Heidegger says, view the earth, the world, all things as mere *Bestand,* **standing-reserve**. All is here simply for human use. No plant, no animal, no ecosystem has alife of its own, has any significance, apart from human desire and need. Nothing, we say, other than human beings, has any intrinsic value. All things are instruments for the working out of human will. Whether we believe that God gave Man dominion or simply that human might (sometimes called intelligence or rationality) in the face of ecological fragility makes us always right, we managerial, technological thinkers tend to believe that the earth is only a stockpile or a set of commodities to be managed bought, and sold. The forest is timber; the river, a power source. Even people have become resources, human resources, personnel to be managed, or populations to be controlled. This managerial, technological mode of revealing, Heidegger says, is embedded in and constitutive of Western culture and has been gathering strength for centuries. Now it is well on its way to extinguishing all other modes of revealing all other ways of being human and being earth. It will take tremendous effort to think through this danger, to think past it and beyond, tremendous courage and resolve to allow thought of the mystery to come forth; thought of the inevitability, along with revealing, of conceal­ment, of loss, of ignorance; thought of the occurring of things and their passage as events not ultimately under human control.

### Links

Assumes the world is a collection of objects out in the world to be ordered and re-ordered to best suit human purposes

Joronen in 10(Mikko, Doctoral candidate in Human Geography @ The University of Turku, The Age of Planetary Space *Planetary System of Ordering,* 2010 <http://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/66733/AnnalesAII257Joronen.pdf?sequence=1>) JM

Under such colonization of calculable price mechanism, the whole globe eventually becomes an area of domination: the metaphysical essence of markets is to bring all beings into a quasi-Darwinian struggle for survival between the powers of business calculation. It is precisely because this survival is based on successful accumulation and efficient commodification of beings, that under the contemporary global capitalism the whole globe becomes conquered for its market. Under such economic malleability everything is established as producible products and hence delivered to the markets in terms of growing efficiency and competitiveness. Out of the colossal competition between the figures of calculation and machination, globalization turns into a struggle between different technological worldviews (Heidegger 1977d:134–135; See also Joronen 2008; Moisio 2008:89–90). Globalization – growing giganticism fuelled by the competition between powers of efficient manipulation – and survival – a struggle to maximize the utility and control of beings under the pre-delineating framework of gigantic calculation – are both manifestations of the operational logic of technological Gestell. Consequently, economic survival struggle and the glorification of competitiveness hide the fact that they aim at massive ordering, thus admiring the megalomania of endless growth and expansion. By penetrating and spreading, and hence, by turning all beings under the logic of technological manipulation, the techno-capitalist logic of optimization of productivity and competitiveness that constantly seeks to open new markets by turning things into products of profit making eventually present one of the ontic realities that have accelerated the globalization of Gestell.

**The science of economic management reduces everything to an object to be priced—results in environmental degradation, war, and violence**

**Nhanenge 7** [Jytte Masters @ U South Africa, paper submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts in the subject Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT]

Shiva also finds that scientific knowledge is directed towards violence and economic profits: 80% of scientific research is devoted to the war industry. War is aimed at violence against the perceived enemy and civilians, sometimes a country's own population. Also in peaceful domains does science relate to violence. It exploits nature for maximization of profit. Science can only include the quantifiable, profit generating properties of a resource system. Thus properties which are not profitable, but which are qualitative and stabilise ecological processes, are ignored and destroyed. The focus on power and control for profit means that science misses out on much of what is important for nature and people. Thus, science and technology choose nuclear energy, experimenting on animals and spreading deadly pesticide, while they are overlooking the lest profitable, but sustainable organic farming and solar energy. Consequently, science focuses on violence and profit, which destructs human and natural well-being. (Shiva 1989: 23; Des Jardins 2001: 255).

**The teleological narratives surrounding U.S. hegemony rely on images of anarchy and racial inferiority that colonize knowledge production and lead to perpetual intervention**

**Kaplan, humanities prof, 4**—President of the American Studies Association as well as a professor of English and the Edmund J. and Louise W. Kahn Endowed Term Professor in the Humanities at the University of Pennsylvania (Amy, *American Quarterly* 56.1 (2004) 1-18, “Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, October 17, 2003,” Project MUSE, RBatra)

This coming-out narrative, associated primarily with neoconservatives, aggressively celebrates the United States as finally revealing its true essence—its manifest destiny—on a global stage. We won the Cold War, so the story goes, and as the only superpower, we will maintain global supremacy primarily by military means, by preemptive strikes against any potential rivals, and by a perpetual war against terror, defined primarily as the Muslim world. We need to remain vigilant against those rogue states and terrorists who resist not our power but the universal human values that we embody. This narrative is about time as well as space. It imagines an empire in perpetuity, one that beats back the question haunting all empires in J. M. Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians: "One thought alone preoccupies the submerged mind of Empire: how not to end, how not to die, how to prolong its era." 9 **In this hypermasculine narrative there's a paradoxical sense of invincibility and unparalleled power and at the same time utter and incomprehensible vulnerability—a lethal combination**, which reminds us that the word vulnerable once also referred to the capacity to harm.

Another dominant narrative about empire today, told by liberal interventionists, is that of the "reluctant imperialist." 10 In this version, the United States never sought an empire and may even be constitutionally unsuited to rule one, but it had the burden thrust upon it by the fall of earlier empires and the failures of modern states, which abuse the human rights of their own people and spawn terrorism. The United States is the only power in the world with the capacity and the moral authority to act as military policeman and economic manager to bring order to the world. Benevolence and self-interest merge in this narrative; backed by unparalleled force, the United States can save the people of the world from their own anarchy, their descent into an [End Page 4] uncivilized state. As Robert Kaplan writes—not reluctantly at all—in "Supremacy by Stealth: Ten Rules for Managing the World": "The purpose of power is not power itself; it is a fundamentally liberal purpose of sustaining the key characteristics of an orderly world. Those characteristics include basic political stability, the idea of liberty, pragmatically conceived; respect for property; economic freedom; and representative government, culturally understood. At this moment in time it is American power, and American power only, that can serve as an organizing principle for the worldwide expansion of liberal civil society." 11 This narrative does imagine limits to empire, yet primarily in the selfish refusal of U.S. citizens to sacrifice and shoulder the burden for others, as though sacrifices have not already been imposed on them by the state. The temporal dimension of this narrative entails the aborted effort of other nations and peoples to enter modernity, and its view of the future projects the end of empire only when **the world is remade in our image.**

This is also a narrative about race. The **images of an unruly world, of anarchy and chaos, of failed modernity, recycle stereotypes of racial inferiority** from earlier colonial discourses about races who are **incapable of governing themselves**, Kipling's "lesser breeds without the law," or Roosevelt's "loosening ties of civilized society," in his corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. In his much-noted article in the New York Times Magazine entitled "The American Empire," Michael Ignatieff appended the subtitle "The Burden" but insisted that "America's empire is not like empires of times past, built on colonies, conquest and the white man's burden." 12 Denial and exceptionalism are apparently alive and well. In American studies we need to go beyond simply exposing the racism of empire and examine the dynamics by which Arabs and the religion of Islam are becoming racialized through the interplay of templates of U.S. racial codes and colonial Orientalism.

These narratives of the origins of the current empire—that is, the neoconservative and the liberal interventionist—have much in common. They take American exceptionalism to new heights: its paradoxical claim to uniqueness and universality at the same time. **They share a teleological narrative of inevitability, that America is the apotheosis of history, the embodiment of universal values of human rights, liberalism, and democracy, the "indispensable nation,"** in Madeleine Albright's words. In this logic, the United States claims the authority to "make sovereign judgments on what is right and what is wrong" for everyone [End Page 5] else and "to exempt itself with an absolutely clear conscience from all the rules that it proclaims and applies to others." 13 Absolutely protective of its own sovereignty, it upholds a doctrine of limited sovereignty for others and thus **deems the entire world a potential site of intervention**

. Universalism thus can be made manifest only through the threat and use of violence. If in these narratives imperial power is deemed the solution to a broken world, then they preempt any counternarratives that claim U.S. imperial actions, past and present, may have something to do with the world's problems. According to this logic, **resistance to empire can never be opposition to the imposition of foreign rule; rather, resistance means irrational opposition to modernity and universal human values.**

### Anti-politics

**No uniqueness – left has already ceded the political**

**Castenada 9** [Concha, “Letter to Joe Bagent about Smokers and Fat People”, Concha’s Cauldron Political Analysis website, http://conchacastaneda.blogspot.com/2009/11/letter-to-joe-bagent-about-smokers-and.html, November 17, 2009] //khirn

There are a million ways to be smug and the American left holds the copyright on three quarters of them. Down inside most lefties feel superior to the majority of Americans for the simple reason that they are indeed superior. Morally superior (at least in the justice sense), intellectually and politically superior too, if you exclude every member of the Democratic Party. However, the American left is void of compassion, the thing that is at the very heart of the true left the world round. And by true left I mean the people dying for the cause in places we never heard of and never will. Given the afore named virtues and qualities possessed by most lefties, they are convinced they know everything about the people around them and what is best for everyone else. People should not own guns, or eat meat, wear fur or shop at WalMart. They should be able to obtain abortion on demand and pot should be legal. Maybe so, but those who do not agree will never be convinced of that by people they will never meet, but who insist upon calling them "sheeple" and "'Merkins" on the Internet and in other public venues. All of which is not the worst thing in the world. In a nation that proclaims every citizen to be an individual, precious and special in his or her own right, merely for being born, well, a lot of folks are bound to take such bullshit a mite too seriously. As in, "I'm special, and you might be too, but the rest of them are just sheeple." I've done that myself, so I'm throwing stones from a glass house. It took a lifetime to recognize the lack of compassion in American society. Hell, I was raised there too. And it took the raw obscenity of George Bush for me to realize that ideology had taken over the political and civic arenas, the only venues where a society can exercise compassion collectively and by force of legislation and law demonstrate its humanity and evolution. It was the snuffing out of what compassion remained in the Democratic Party that ceded the political stage to hard rightist forces.

The Democratic leadership, fickle spineless cunts that they are, let the rightists reduce everything to ideological warfare, handing the rightists the field of play. It no longer matters if Democrats are the majority. We don't see our warfare abroad decreasing. It's expanding. And following an ideological war over healthcare reform, we "won." We got reform. Reform which forces 40 million of America's poorest and hardest working folks into bed with insurance corporations, sucking an additional 70 billion dollars a year in public funds from the citizens' pockets into insurance industry coffers. We don't need the insurance companies at all. Never did. Never will. But they are still leeching us because "we won." We the supposed proponents of universal healthcare, we who believe in the right of all children and old folks, the right of all people to freedom from pain and misery, we won. After the ceding of issues and principles to ideology, the only exposure to politics the people got was to ideological warfare. And the only way they got to vote was based on ideology. The left was entirely sucked into this game. Now it's the only game in town and will remain so. You cannot backtrack on pure meanness once it is unleashed, because if you quit playing the game, soften up and exhibit compassion, the opposition eats you alive next election. Calls you the kumbaya crowd and mocks you mercilessly through its extensive network of media puppets, a la Beck, Limbaugh. The crowd loves mockery. Meanwhile the nation continues to rot under a soulless ideological sun. Perishing for want of a drink from compassion's cup. I think many Americans voted for Obama because in their minds he represented the promise of a more compassionate America. They forgot, or chose to forget, that the promise was a political promise. Which is to say it was all either just smoke, or unfulfillable by even the best intended mortal in such a heavily armed high stakes whorehouse. Some of the best among us have thrown in the towel, lost all faith in the political process. Frankly, in my 63 years as an American I've never seen more hearts broken nor more bitter people created by a single event. And that includes the Vietnam War. Those who remain politically involved have internalized politics as ideological warfare. Which means no thing nor person is now safe from the toothy maw of ideology. As the Red Brigades in China showed us, ideology is the big grinder, baby.

**Policy-making—making the debate about competing policies naturalizes problem solving theory and calculative thought as the only approach to the world—Burke says hegemonic ontologies reduce the scope of debate—our framework is a pre-requisite to sound policy formation**

**Bleiker 2k**—Ph.D. from the Australian National University, Professor of International Relations at the University of Queensland (Roland, © 2000 First Published, 2004 Edition, Cambridge University Press, “Popular Dissent, Human Agency and Global Politics,” p. 210-1, RBatra)

While providing compelling evidence of subtle forms of domination, a discursive approach may run the risk of leaving us with an image of the world in which the capacity for human agency is all but erased, annihilated by impenetrable discursive forces. This risk is particularly acute in a world that is characterised by increasingly heterogeneous and perhaps even elusive cross-territorial dynamics. But recognising these transversal complexities does not necessarily lead into a pessimistic cul de sac. Discourses, even if they take on global dimensions, are not as overarching as some analysts suggest. They contain fissures and cracks, weak points which open up chances to turn discursive dynamics against themselves. The previous chapter has outlined this position in detail. A brief rehearsal – even at the risk of appearing slightly repetitive – is necessary to provide the prerequisite for an adequate discursive conceptualisation of human agency in global politics. For this purpose we must, as the prologue has already stressed, seek to see beyond the levels of analysis problematique that has come to frame international relations theory. Rather than limiting the study of global politics to specific spheres of inquiry – those related to the role of states and the restraints imposed on them by the structures of the international system – an analysis of transversal struggles pays attention to various political terrains and the crossterritorial dynamics through which they are intertwined with each other. One of these terrains is the sphere of dailiness, which is all too often **eclipsed by investigations that limit the domain of global politics to more visible sites** of transversal struggle, such as wars, diplomatic negotiations, financial flows or trade-patterns. **The domain of dailiness, though, is at least as crucial to the conduct of global politics**, and an investigation into discursive dynamics illustrates why this the case.

Cracks and weaknesses in globalised discursive practices can be seen best by shifting foci from epistemological to ontological issues. This is to say that in addition to analysing how discourses mould and control our thinking process, **we must scrutinise how individuals, at the level of Being, may or may not be able to escape aspects of the prevalent discursive order**. Being is always a product of discourse. **But Being also is becoming**. It contains future potential, **it is always already that which it is not**. Being also has multiple dimensions. Hyphenated identities permit a person to shift viewpoints constantly, to move back and forth between various ways of constituting oneself. Resulting methods of mental deplacement, of situating knowledge, open up possibilities for thinking **beyond the narrow confines of the transversally established discursive order**. This thinking space provides the opportunity to **redraw the boundaries of identity which control the parameters of actions** available to an individual. **Exploring this thinking space already is action**, Heidegger claims, for ‘thinking acts insofar as it thinks’. Such action, he continues, is ‘the simplest and at the same time the **highest**, because it concerns the relation of Being to man’.3 But how is one to understand processes through which critical thinking breaks through the fog of discourse and gives rise to specific and identifiable expressions of human agency?

The concept of tactic offers the opportunity to take a decisive step towards exploring the practical dimensions of Dasein, the existential awareness of Being, without losing the abstract insight provided by Heidegger. **The sphere of dailiness is where such practical theorising is most effective.** Entering this ubiquitous sphere compels us to one more shift, away from contemplating the becoming of Being towards investigating specific ways in which individuals employ their mobile subjectivities to escape discursive forms of domination. The focus now rests on everyday forms of resistance, seemingly mundane daily practices by which people constantly shape and reshape their environment. One can find such forms of resistance in acts like writing, laughing, gossiping, singing, dwelling, shopping or cooking. It is in these spheres that societal values are gradually transformed, preparing the ground for more open manifestations of dissent.

### Humanism

**Humanism results in the exaltation of humanity, this legitimizes collective suicide and extinction**

**Kalt** boston college **2k6** (Stefan, “Heidegger's Critique of Technology” http://www.ostina.org/index2.php?option=com\_content&do\_pdf=1&id=1431)

While many championed - and continue to champion - humanity's new role as arbiter of the cosmos, Heidegger bewails it. For him, the true meaning of this role, and the meaning of the humanistic philosophy which celebrates it, comes to light in the thought of Friedrich Nietzsche. Although humanism dreams of liberating human beings from the shackles of political and religious oppression, Nietzsche saw another motive at work beneath the surface: the Will to Power. To be sure, Nietzsche exalted the Will to Power, and pined away for the days of its healthiest expression - in his opinion, the aristocratic-heroic period of archaic Greece. He interpreted the democratic character of modern humanism as a sign of spiritual sickness and dissipation, a slackening of the Will to Power. But while both Heidegger and Nietzsche agree that modern man is sick, Heidegger rejects Nietzsche's diagnosis. For Heidegger, modern man does not suffer from a weakening of the Will to Power. He suffers from its intensification: The Will to Power has become the dominant principle only in modern times. This principle exerts itself most forcefully not through the exercise of heroic virtue (as Nietzsche contended it did in ancient times), but in modern scientific-technological thinking. In Heidegger's view, such thinking has transformed not only the world, but mankind itself, into a governable object. In particular, man has become the object of cybernetics. The human mind and soul have thus become machine-like. Man-the-Machine can be controlled - "operated" - with pills and implanted devices. Our genetic inheritance can be "reprogrammed," our social condition reengineered. We are now a "thing" to be tinkered with. Correlatively, our environment is subject to profound alteration: Rivers are dammed, natural resources extensively mined, transportation systems and cities make greater claims on the earth's surface (which has turned from a configuration of "places" into abstract "space," thus becoming invested with a mathematical-geometrical structure open to scientific determination). According to Heidegger, we regard our environment as merely a "standing reserve" of energy which can be tapped at will. For example, a river ceases to have any "being" of its own; it becomes fodder for a hydroelectric power plant. But as we try to perfect our mastery over ourselves and "our" world (now demoted to the status of property), **Heidegger fears that we court catastrophe**. Who can predict what the ultimate fruits of biological research will be? We could turn ourselves into monsters, not happier humans. How can we really avoid the threat of biohazard on a planetary scale (including the spread of virulent man-made antigens), worldwide environmental degradation (oil spillage, deforestation, and global warming), and - most terrifying of all - instant nuclear annihilation? These evils seem increasingly inescapable. The humanistic philosophy which cheered on a technological revolution that was intended to liberate us from ignorance and fear has, in fact, made the world less predictable and more terrifying than ever before. **At its core, humanism is thus profoundly dehumanizing: It legitimates the pact of our collective suicide.**