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#### Heg solves GPW: prevent allies from getting access to weapons, stabilize regional competition. World without = pell-mell rush rearm and proliferate.

**Heg high now-the U.S. is peerless in every dimension of power**

**Brzezinski 2012**

[Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, CSIS Counselor and Trustee, 2012, Strategic Vision, uwyo//amp]

The more immediate risk of the ongoing dispersal of power is a potentially unstable global hierarchy. **The United States is still preeminent** but the legitimacy, effectiveness, and durability of its leadership is increasingly questioned worldwide because of the complexity of its internal and external challenges. Nevertheless, **in every significant and tangible dimension of traditional power—military, technological, economic, and financial—America is still peerless. It has by far the largest single national economy, the greatest financial influence, the most advanced technology, a military budget larger than that of all other states combined, and armed forces both capable of rapid deployment abroad actually deployed around the world. This reality** may not endure very long but it **is still the current fact of international life.**

**Short-term withdraw causes destroys stability in Afghanistan, India and Pakistan—better to hold on as long as possible**

**MacDonald 9**

[Paul, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science, Columbia University, Daedalus, “Rebalancing American foreign policy”, 2009, p. asp]

**If the United States cannot retain its leading position** or easily reconstruct the postwar liberal order, **what options does it possess? One possibility would be for Washington to accept the erosion** of its hegemony **and simply withdraw from global affairs. But the short-term challenges** facing the United States, **such as** the worsening insurgency in **Afghanistan,** political **instability in Pakistan, and the Iranian nuclear crisis, limit the attractiveness of a rapid retreat** from global affairs. In addition, **just because the United States will face a more complicated** and fractious international **environment does not mean that its leadership will always be ineffective.** As Fareed Zakaria has argued, **the challenge is not one of American decline, but managing the "rise of the rest." (9) There may be distinct limits to American power** in the future, especially in regions where new economic or military rivals are increasing in strength. But the United States will still be able to work with these new regional powers on select issues of common interest.

**And, Indo-Pak war causes extinction**

**Washington Times 1**

July 8, LN.

**The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir**, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. **It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary**. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries. Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

**CONFLICT IN THE SCS ESCALATES TO FULL-SCALE NUCLEAR WAR**

STRAITS TIMES 1995

[staff, “Choose Your Own Style of Democracy”, May 21, p. ln// wyo-tjc]

In his speech, Dr Mahathir also painted three scenarios for Asia.

**In the first -the worst possible scenario -Asian countries would go to war against each other, he said. It might start with clashes** between Asian countries **over the Spratly Islands** because of China's insistence that the South China Sea belonged to it along with all the islands, reefs and seabed minerals. **In this scenario, the United States would offer to help** and would be welcomed by Asean, he said. The Pacific Fleet begins to patrol the South China Sea. **Clashes occur between the Chinese navy and the US Navy. China declares war on the US and a full-scale war breaks out with both sides resorting to nuclear weapons.**

#### Rejection of securitization causes the state to become more interventionist—turns the K

Tara **McCormack, ’10**, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, (Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 127-129)

The following section will briefly raise some questions about the rejection of the old security framework as it has been taken up by the most powerful institutions and states. Here we can begin to see the political limits to critical and emancipatory frameworks. In an international system which is marked by great power inequalities between states, the rejection of the old narrow national interest-based security framework by major international institutions, and the adoption of ostensibly emancipatory policies and policy rhetoric, has the consequence of problematising weak or unstable states and allowing international institutions or major states a more interventionary role, yet without establishing mechanisms by which the citizens of states being intervened in might have any control over the agents or agencies of their emancipation. Whatever the problems associated with the pluralist security framework there were at least formal and clear demarcations. This has the consequence of entrenching international power inequalities and allowing for a shift towards a hierarchical international order in which the citizens in weak or unstable states may arguably have even less freedom or power than before. Radical critics of contemporary security policies, such as human security and humanitarian intervention, argue that we see an assertion of Western power and the creation of liberal subjectivities in the developing world. For example, see Mark Duffield’s important and insightful contribution to the ongoing debates about contemporary international security and development. Duffield attempts to provide a coherent empirical engagement with, and theoretical explanation of, these shifts. Whilst these shifts, away from a focus on state security, and the so-called merging of security and development are often portrayed as positive and progressive shifts that have come about because of the end of the Cold War, Duffield argues convincingly that these shifts are highly problematic and unprogressive. For example, the rejection of sovereignty as formal international equality and a presumption of nonintervention has eroded the division between the international and domestic spheres and led to an international environment in which Western NGOs and powerful states have a major role in the governance of third world states. Whilst for supporters of humanitarian intervention this is a good development, Duffield points out the depoliticising implications, drawing on examples in Mozambique and Afghanistan. Duffield also draws out the problems of the retreat from modernisation that is represented by sustainable development. The Western world has moved away from the development policies of the Cold War, which aimed to develop third world states industrially. Duffield describes this in terms of a new division of human life into uninsured and insured life. Whilst we in the West are ‘insured’ – that is we no longer have to be entirely self-reliant, we have welfare systems, a modern division of labour and so on – sustainable development aims to teach populations in poor states how to survive in the absence of any of this. Third world populations must be taught to be self-reliant, they will remain uninsured. Self-reliance of course means the condemnation of millions to a barbarous life of inhuman bare survival. Ironically, although sustainable development is celebrated by many on the left today, by leaving people to fend for themselves rather than developing a society wide system which can support people, sustainable development actually leads to a less human and humane system than that developed in modern capitalist states. Duffield also describes how many of these problematic shifts are embodied in the contemporary concept of human security. For Duffield, we can understand these shifts in terms of Foucauldian biopolitical framework, which can be understood as a regulatory power that seeks to support life through intervening in the biological, social and economic processes that constitute a human population (2007: 16). Sustainable development and human security are for Duffield technologies of security which aim to *create* self-managing and self-reliant subjectivities in the third world, which can then survive in a situation of serious underdevelopment (or being uninsured as Duffield terms it) without causing security problems for the developed world. For Duffield this is all driven by a neoliberal project which seeks to control and manage uninsured populations globally. Radical critic Costas Douzinas (2007) also criticises new forms of cosmopolitanism such as human rights and interventions for human rights as a triumph of American hegemony. Whilst we are in agreement with critics such as Douzinas and Duffield that these new security frameworks cannot be empowering, and ultimately lead to more power for powerful states, we need to understand why these frameworks have the effect that they do. We can understand that these frameworks have political limitations without having to look for a specific plan on the part of current powerful states. In new security frameworks such as human security we can see the political limits of the framework proposed by critical and emancipatory theoretical approaches.
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**Neolib’s inevitable and movements are getting smothered out of existence—no alternative economic system**

**Jones 11**—Owen, Masters at Oxford, named one of the Daily Telegraph's 'Top 100 Most Influential People on the Left' for 2011, author of "Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class", The Independent, UK, "Owen Jones: Protest without politics will change nothing", 2011, www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/owen-jones-protest-without-politics-will-change-nothing-2373612.html

My first experience of police kettling was aged 16. It was May Day 2001, and the anti-globalisation movement was at its peak. The turn-of-the-century anti-capitalist movement feels largely forgotten today, but it was a big deal at the time. To a left-wing teenager growing up in an age of unchallenged neo-liberal triumphalism, just to have "anti-capitalism" flash up in the headlines was thrilling. Thousands of apparently unstoppable protesters chased the world's rulers from IMF to World Bank summits – from Seattle to Prague to Genoa – and the authorities were rattled. Today, as protesters in nearly a thousand cities across the world follow the example set by the Occupy Wall Street protests, it's worth pondering what happened to the anti-globalisation movement. Its activists did not lack passion or determination. But they did lack a coherent alternative to the neo-liberal project. With no clear political direction, the movement was easily swept away by the jingoism and turmoil that followed 9/11, just two months after Genoa. Don't get me wrong: the Occupy movement is a glimmer of sanity amid today's economic madness. By descending on the West's financial epicentres, it reminds us of how a crisis caused by the banks (a sentence that needs to be repeated until it becomes a cliché) has been cynically transformed into a crisis of public spending. The founding statement of Occupy London puts it succinctly: "We refuse to pay for the banks' crisis." The Occupiers direct their fire at the top 1 per cent, and rightly so – as US billionaire Warren Buffett confessed: "There's class warfare, all right, but it's my class, the rich class, that's making war, and we're winning." The Occupy movement has provoked fury from senior US Republicans such as Presidential contender Herman Cain who – predictably – labelled it "anti-American". They're right to be worried: those camping outside banks threaten to refocus attention on the real villains, and to act as a catalyst for wider dissent. But a **coherent alternative to the tottering global economic order remains,** it seems, **as distant as ever. Neo-liberalism crashes around, half-dead, with no-one to administer the killer blow.** There's always a presumption that a crisis of capitalism is good news for the left. Yet in the Great Depression, fascism consumed much of Europe. The economic crisis of the 1970s did lead to a resurgence of radicalism on both left and right. But, spearheaded by Thatcherism and Reaganism, the New Right definitively crushed its opposition in the 1980s.This time round, there doesn't even seem to be an alternative for the right to defeat. That's not the fault of the protesters. In truth, the left has never recovered from being virtually **smothered out of existence**. It was the victim of a perfect storm: the rise of the New Right; neo-liberal globalisation; and the repeated defeats suffered by the trade union movement. But, above all, it was the aftermath of the collapse of Communism that did for the left. As US neo-conservative Midge Decter triumphantly put it: "It's time to say: We've won. Goodbye." From the British Labour Party to the African National Congress, left-wing movements across the world hurtled to the right in an almost synchronised fashion. It was as though the left wing of the global political spectrum had been sliced off. That's why, **although we live in an age of revolt, there remains no left to give it direction and purpose.**

**No nimby opposition- New Jersey proves**

**Caperton, 12**

Richard W. Caperton is the Director of Clean Energy Investment, Michael Conathan is the Director of Ocean Policy, and Jackie Weidman is a Special Assistant for the Energy Opportunity team at American Progress. “Encouraging Investment Is Key to U.S. Offshore Wind Development” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2012/01/12/10951/encouraging-investment-is-key-to-u-s-offshore-wind-development/>, accessed 10/27/12,WYO/JF

Public support isn’t the problem According to [a nationwide survey](http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/110311release.cfm) conducted by [the Civil Society Institute](http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/), about 7 in 10 Americans (71 percent) support “a shift of federal support for energy away from nuclear and towards clean renewable energy such as wind and solar.” In the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states, undeveloped land is difficult to find. That means renewable energy developers have to look further afield—in this case, to sea. **In the early days of offshore wind, the obstacles to development in the United States were largely borne of ignorance**—**concerns that offshore turbines visible on the horizon would destroy property values; that noise, or safety, or storage of lubricating fluid for the turbines would pose unacceptable risks.** As other countries around the world have moved ahead with offshore wind development and seen no ill effects from those factors, however, such concerns have dramatically abated. Support from coastal residents is fundamental to the potential success of offshore wind projects. After all, these wind farms will effectively be built in their backyards. And recently, poll after poll has shown that coastal residents are highly supportive of offshore wind energy. **According to** [**a poll of New Jersey residents**](http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/science-updates/nj-wind-energy-supported)**, offshore wind production is extremely popular among voters and its support cuts across party and geographic lines. The analysis demonstrates that 78 percent of all New Jersey voters and 77 percent of the state’s shore residents surveyed support the development of wind power 12 to 15 miles off their coast. Public support is strong in Delaware as well.** According to a [University of Delaware poll](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/we.316/abstract), general statewide support for offshore wind in Delaware is 77.8 percent, compared with an opposition of only 4.2 percent. In Maryland [The Baltimore Sun reported](http://weblogs.baltimoresun.com/features/green/2011/10/poll_mders_willing_to_pay_more.html) in October 2011 that 62 percent of Marylanders favor wind turbine construction off the coast of Ocean City and would be willing to pay up to $2 more per month on electricity bills. Mike Tidwell, head of the Chesapeake Climate Action Network, said, “Marylanders understand that the benefits of offshore wind are more than worth a modest initial investment.” This view is backed by Maryland Gov. Martin O’Malley, but as The Washington Post reported earlier this week, his efforts to make his state a leader in offshore wind [appear to be in jeopardy](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/md-politics/omalley-wind-farms-face-more-challenges-as-maryland-legislature-returns/2012/01/06/gIQA7D5ojP_story.html). Monday’s article quoted Democratic Del. Dereck E. Davis saying, “The situation has gotten worse — not better — for offshore wind since the last time it was up for debate.” So what has changed?

# FW

**First, Our Interpretation: The resolution asks the question of desirability of USFG action. The Role of ballot is to say yes or no to the action and outcomes of the plan.**

**Second, is reasons to prefer:**

**(\_\_\_) A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac**

**(\_\_\_) B. It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action**

**(\_\_\_) C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another**

**Finally, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving.**

**Realism is inevitable—states will always seek to maximize power**

John **Mearsheimer**, Professor, University of Chicago, THE TRAGEDY OF GREAT POWER POLITICS, **2001**, p. 2.

The sad fact is that **international politics has always been a ruthless and dangerous business**, and **it is likely to remain that wa**y. Although the intensity of their competition waxes and wanes, **great powers fear each other and always compete with each other for power. The overriding goal of each state is to maximize its share of world power, which means gaining power at the expense of other states.** But **great powers** do not merely strive to be the strongest of all the great powers, although that is a welcome outcome. Their **ultimate aim is to be the hegemon**-that is, **the only great power in the system.**

#### Predictions based on existential magnitude must be considered, there is no coming back from it, and there have been no previous examples to base predictions off of, and waiting to be reactive to situations is worse

Nick Bostrom, 02

Professor, Faculty of Philosophy, Oxford [University](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html) [www.nickbostrom.com](http://www.nickbostrom.com/) [Published in the Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2002). (First version: 2001)], accessed 1/16/13,WYO/JF

Existential risks are distinct from global endurable risks. Examples of the latter kind include: threats to the biodiversity of Earth’s ecosphere, moderate global warming, global economic recessions (even major ones), and possibly stifling cultural or religious eras such as the “dark ages”, even if they encompass the whole global community, provided they are transitory (though see the section on “Shrieks” below). To say that a particular global risk is endurable is evidently not to say that it is acceptable or not very serious. A world war fought with conventional weapons or a Nazi-style Reich lasting for a decade would be extremely horrible events even though they would fall under the rubric of endurable global risks since humanity could eventually recover. (On the other hand, they could be a local terminal risk for many individuals and for persecuted ethnic groups.) I shall use the following definition of existential risks: Existential risk – One where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential. An existential risk is one where humankind as a whole is imperiled. Existential disasters have major adverse consequences for the course of human civilization for all time to come. 2 The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn2" \o ") At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn3" \o ") A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn4" \o ") Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century. The special nature of the challenges posed by existential risks is illustrated by the following points: · Our approach to existential risks cannot be one of trial-and-error. There is no opportunity to learn from errors. The reactive approach – see what happens, limit damages, and learn from experience – is unworkable. Rather, we must take a proactive approach. This requires foresight to anticipate new types of threats and a willingness to take decisive preventive action

and to bear the costs (moral and economic) of such actions. · We cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, social attitudes or national security policies that developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. We might find it hard to take them as seriously as we should simply because we have never yet witnessed such disasters.[[5]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn5" \o ") Our collective fear-response is likely ill calibrated to the magnitude of threat. · Reductions in existential risks are global public goods [13] and may therefore be undersupplied by the market [14]. Existential risks are a menace for everybody and may require acting on the international plane. Respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse for failing to take countermeasures against a major existential risk. · If we take into account the welfare of future generations, the harm done by existential risks is multiplied by another factor, the size of which depends on whether and how much we discount future benefits [15,16]. In view of its undeniable importance, it is surprising how little systematic work has been done in this area. Part of the explanation may be that many of the gravest risks stem (as we shall see) from anticipated future technologies that we have only recently begun to understand. Another part of the explanation may be the unavoidably interdisciplinary and speculative nature of the subject. And in part the neglect may also be attributable to an aversion against thinking seriously about a depressing topic. The point, however, is not to wallow in gloom and doom but simply to take a sober look at what could go wrong so we can create responsible strategies for improving our chances of survival. In order to do that, we need to know where to focus our efforts.

#### It is impossible to make a choice regarding energy policy without a fuller accounting of the costs and dangers imposed by NOT acting, not simply addressing the plan proposed

Thaler 12

[Jeffrey, University of Maine's first Visiting Professor of Energy Policy, Law & Ethics, and Assistant University Counsel for environmental, energy and sustainability projects, “Fiddling as the world burns: How climate change urgently requires a paradigm shift in the permitting of renewable energy projects”, Environmental Law, Volume 42, Issue 4, Forthcoming, p. <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2148122> //wyo-tjc]

Another area of reform that can be undertaken without legislation is use of the no-action alternative to account for the hidden costs of fossil-based energy. The CEQ should revise its NEPA regulations and policies guiding the implementing agencies so that the benefits of renewable energy sourcing (such as no greenhouse gas emissions) are quantified under project impacts; all costs, including the National Research Council’s “hidden” costs or externalities of fossil fuel sources’ emissions and resultant ecosystem consequences,273 must be assessed as part of NEPA’s no-action alternative analysis274 of not converting to renewables. Indeed, the CEQ should now act on its thirty-month old draft Guidance, “Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions,”275 which would require agency decision-making to consider climate change impacts. Although the Guidance has its flaws, it would at least acknowledge that climate change impacts must not be ignored at each stage of NEPA.276 Essential to considering all costs of an energy source is a consistent measure of its cumulative climate change impact and/or a way of measuring the reduction in GHGs associated with the project. This measurement, which can be based on in whole or part upon the life cycle assessment database developed by NREL,277 must be consistent throughout various agencies and also be applied in NEPA reviews of proposed non-renewable projects. This will even the playing field to a certain extent and help quantify/price the externalities associated w/carbon-based energy. The goal is to evolve NEPA from a statute that only looks at the costs of doing something, to a statute that also looks at the costs of doing nothing in the face of climate-driven need for more GHG emission-free electricity generation. Finally, there should also be Memoranda of Understanding signed by all relevant federal agencies, comparable to those for transmission line and high-speed rail projects, to make more rapid the federal permitting and review processes for offshore wind energy development.278

**Extinction is the worst impact—prioritizing anything else puts the cart before the horse**

**Schell** **1982**

(Jonathan, Professor at Wesleyan University, The Fate of the Earth, pages 136-137 uw//wej)

Implicit in everything that I have said so far about the nuclear predicament there has been a perplexity that I would now like to take up explicitly, for it leads, I believe, into the very heart of our response-or, rather, our lack of response-to the **predicament. I have pointed out that our species is the most important of all the things that, as inhabitants of a common world, we inherit from the past generations, but it does not go far enough to point out this superior importance, as though in making our decision about ex- tinction we were being asked to choose between, say, liberty, on the one hand, and the survival of the species, on the other. For** **the species not only overarches but contains all the benefits of life in the common world, and to speak of sacrificing the species for the sake of one of these benefits involves one in the absurdity of wanting to de- stroy something in order to preserve one of its parts, as if one were to burn down a house in an attempt to redecorate the living room,** or to kill someone to improve his character. ,but even to point out this absurdity fails to take the full measure of the peril of extinction, for mankind is not some invaluable object that lies outside us and that we must protect so that we can go on benefiting from it; rather, it is we ourselves, without whom everything there is loses its value. To say this is another way of saying that extinction is unique not because it destroys mankind as an object but because it destroys mankind as the source of all possible human subjects, and this, in turn, is another way of saying that extinction is a second death, for one's own individual death is the end not of any object in life but of the subject that experiences all objects. Death, how- ever, places the mind in a quandary. One of-the confounding char- acteristics of death-"tomorrow's zero," in Dostoevski's phrase-is that, precisely because it removes the person himself rather than something in his life, it seems to offer the mind nothing to take hold of. One even feels it inappropriate, in a way, to try to speak "about" death at all, as. though death were a thing situated some- where outside us and available for objective inspection, when the fact is that it is within us-is, indeed, an essential part of what we are. It would be more appropriate, perhaps, to say that death, as a fundamental element of our being, "thinks" in us and through us about whatever we think about, coloring our thoughts and moods with its presence throughout our lives.

**We cant just sit around and wait for questions of method, or epistemology to be settled, need to be able to take action in the interim**

**Cochran ‘99**

Molly Cochran Assistant Professor of International Affairs @ Georgia Institute for Technology, Normative Theory in International Relations. 1999, Page 272

To conclude this chapter, while modernist and postmodernist debates continue, while we are still unsure as to what we can legitimately identify as a feminist ethical/political concern, while we still are unclear about the relationship between discourse and experience**, it is particularly important for feminists that we proceed with analysis of both the material (institutional and structural) as well as the discursive.** This holds not only for feminists, but for all theorists oriented towards the goal of extending further moral inclusion in the present social sciences climate of epistemological uncertainty. **Important ethical/political concerns hang in the balance. We cannot afford to wait for the meta-theoretical questions to be conclusively answered.** Those answers may be unavailable**. Nor can we wait for a credible vision of an alternative institutional order to appear before an emancipatory agenda can be kicked into gear. Nor do we have before us a chicken and egg question of which comes first: sorting out the metatheoretical issues or working out which practices contribute to a credible institutional vision. The two questions can and should be pursued together, and can be via moral imagination. Imagination can help us think beyond discursive and material conditions which limit us, by pushing the boundaries of those limitations in thought and examining what yields.** In this respect, I believe international ethics as pragmatic critique can be a useful ally to feminist and normative theorists generally.

# 2AC K

#### Case outweighs and turns the k: our grid advantage is proof that tech is bad, and that the current system leads to a broken system, however if we do not fix the problem of the grid with new and better tech it will lead to meltdowns and chemical industry explosions.

#### Alt can’t solve the navy advantage. Individuals have no control over the navy or the waters that osw will be placed in. Without it leads to gpw, heg is batting 100%.

#### Also local institutions lead NIMBY backlash that prevents osw plants being built aka the cap wind debacle of the past 10 years.

#### Alt is just wishful thinking: Heidegger never attained a solution to technoscience.

Sikka 11

(Tina, Review of Communication, “Technology, Communication, and Society: From Heidegger and Habermas to Feenberg,” Vol 11 issue 2, 2011, Taylor and Francis, accessed via UW Libraries//wyo-mm)

That Heidegger was unable to resolve the difficulties satisfactorily may have deep roots in the phenomenon of modernity, an epoch that liquidates the intellectual resources that earlier times employed to think about the nature of value and meaning, such as the concept of essence, while simultaneously bringing value and meaning as such into focus as a problem for thought. Heidegger's unique contribution was to address that problem in an ontology rather than through ontic categories such as culture. 58 In his thought technoscience as a universal framework for validity both obliterates philosophy as outmoded and provokes philosophy to a new and more radical conception of itself and of being. Heidegger struggled with this dilemma throughout his long career without achieving a final resolution. As a result, Heidegger appears to describe enframing as an incurable disease with a cure. Meditative thinking, marginal practices, education, become philosophical analogues to prayer for a cure that is no ordinary cure but a kind of divine intervention.

#### No link we are not the type of technology that Heidegger is critiquing

Cohen, 10

Dustin Cohen 2010 March 10 Some Notes on Heidegger’s Question Concerning Technology (Enframing, Standing Reserve and Virtual Technologies) http://cybject.wordpress.com/2010/03/11/some-notes-on-heidegger%E2%80%99s-question-concerning-technology-enframing-standing-reserve-and-virtual-technologies/

Martin Heidegger was concerned about the status of the human amidst modern technology. Tied to the changing status of the human is his assertion (and a major theme of Cybject) that modern technology displaces the “wordliness” of the world and puts a human-world in its place.¶ Heidegger uses the term “enframing” to explain the way humans, as users of modern technology, have come to relate to (and literally “frame”) the world. To demonstrate the characteristics of this modern technological “enframing” of the world he contrasts a windmill with a modern hydroelectric power plant. In describing how the windmill differs from the type of “revealing” that characterizes modern technology, he explains that the “old windmill’s…sails do indeed turn in the wind; [but are] … left entirely to the wind’s blowing. …the windmill does not unlock energy from the air currents in order to store it”.¶ In describing how the windmill differs from the type of revealing that characterizes modern technology, Heidegger explains: “But [do the the properties of contemporary technologies] not hold true for the old windmill as well? No. Its sails do indeed turn in the wind; they are left entirely to the wind’s blowing. But the windmill does not unlock energy from the air currents in order to store it.” With the windmill, the wind turns the turbines, the wind-energy instantaneously powers the turbines. At no point is the wind’s energy manipulated or stored up as a different kind of energy. The windmill only transfers motion, it “reveals” wind energy, but does not commandeer nature’s energy or store it for future use (Mitcham).

#### Double bind: Heidegger simultaneously rejects technology while embracing the conveniences, this means either the perm would solve, or their alt should be rejected.

Waddington 05

(David I., Stanford University, Educational Philosophy and Theory, “A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding ‘The Question Concerning Technology’,” July 26, 2005, Wiley Online Library//wyo-mm)

Another significant failing of Heidegger's philosophy of technology is that the benefits of technology are not acknowledged. The hydroelectric dam across the Rhine does improve people's lives, and, as Rorty (1977, p. 302) points out, the spread of modern technology across the planet has prevented many people from dying of starvation. Yet, despite the fact that Heidegger never acknowledges the benefits of technology, he does not urge giving it up: We can say ‘yes’ to the unavoidable use of technological objects, and we can at the same time say ‘no,’ insofar as we do not permit them to claim us exclusively and thus to warp, confuse, and finally lay waste to our essence. (1966, p. 54) This smacks of having one's cake and eating it too. Under Heidegger's conception, we conveniently say ‘yes’ to the modern technologies that make our lives so comfortable, while somehow apparently saying ‘no’ to them as well.

**Aff is a better approach to protecting the environment – alt can’t overwhelm the psychological drive to consume**

**Rachlinski 2k** -- Associate Professor of Law, Cornell Law School. (Jeffrey, THE PSYCHOLOGY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE, 2000 U. Ill. L. Rev. 299)

The best source of a remedy for global climate change is not the conventional remedies for commons dilemmas but a dramatic effort to eliminate the commons dilemma itself. **Government-led investment in alternative energy sources is more sensible** than pursuing a program of regulation or taxation or hoping consumers will shun fossil fuels. **Rather than try to fight psychological** (and economic) **pressures** to continue consuming fossil fuels, **the development of alternative means of generating electricity takes advantage of people's innate desire to develop** and advance **their condition** and that of their children. **Newer sources of electricity** would have to be significantly cheaper so as to compete with the readily available supply of inexpensive fossil fuels and at the same time increase rather than decrease the planet's wealth. This solution to the problem **harnesses rather than opposes economic and psychological forces in support of a solution.¶** There is precedent indicating that relatively inexpensive alternatives can successfully remedy global environmental problems. The international agreement to reduce ozone-depleting chemicals could not have been negotiated without the easy availability of alternative coolants. n91 To be sure, discontinuing the use of ozone-depleting chemicals was not cost-less. It has not, however, inflicted the kind of impoverishment that a sixty-percent reduction in fossil fuel consumption would. The availability of similarly priced alternatives gave countries a way to switch without incurring significant economic losses. Furthermore, political consensus on the issue was easily achieved because both environmentalists and one powerful industrial group, the manufacturers of alternatives to ozone-depleting chemicals, supported legislative action.¶ Developing alternatives to fossil fuels, however, requires governmental intervention. If an inexpensive means of producing electricity without consuming fossil fuels were about to become available, industry would be already rapidly pursuing it. To avoid the risk of global climate change, large-scale research regarding alternatives to fossil fuels is needed. In the past, when technological exigencies have arisen, the United States has been able to marshal its best scientists to make miraculous [\*319] scientific advances. The United States was able to construct an atomic bomb, develop the polio vaccine, and send humans to the moon, all under severe time constraints. Global climate change represents a similar exigency. Rather than spend public resources promoting green electricity or negotiating the next round of global climate change treaties, the United States should commit itself to developing a cheap alternative to fossil fuels. **Instead of trying to conquer the social and cognitive limitations of the human mind, such a program would take advantage of human motivation, determination, and imagination**. **The alternative is to convert every barrel of oil** and every ton of coal **into carbon dioxide and hope that the pessimistic climatologists are mistaken**.the so-called "managerial class."

**The alt is a false choice – we need both tech and environmental consciousness**

**Anderson 96** -- political scientist, social psychologist, and author of numerous non-fiction books. President Emeritus of the World Academy of Art and Science; a founding Fellow of the Meridian Intl Institute; a Fellow of the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute; and a Distinguished Consulting Faculty member of Saybrook U. (Walter, There's no going back to nature, Sept/Oct 96 Issue, http://www.motherjones.com/politics/1996/09/theres-no-going-back-nature)

Projects such as this inspire enthusiasm from most people -- but are scornfully dismissed as "technological fixes" by back-to-nature true believers. The term technological fix deserves some attention here, since **it's one of the staples of ecotopian rhetoric**, along with the promiscuous overuse -- to the point of meaninglessness -- of the word "natural." The argument against simply fixing up something with a technological repair job may well apply in some specific cases -- if, for example, a person is presented with the choice between having a quadruple bypass and adopting a healthy lifestyle -- but it really **doesn't have** much **relevance to most current environmental concerns**. The world is not faced with a simple choice of either adopting more environmentally sensitive attitudes or applying new technologies. Rather, **we are seeing both a rapid evolution of technology away from heavy industrialism and value shifts about the environment.** Most of the other back-to-nature terms are similarly pumped-up and carelessly repeated concepts that have a certain amount of reasonableness if taken in moderation. That great favorite, "anthropocentrism," for example. This isn't just a challenge to the habit of valuing plants and animals only for their usefulness to humans -- which is something that needs challenging. The self-described "deep ecologists" are not interested in any such sensible objective. They escalate the rhetoric and prescribe that human beings learn how to live in equality with all other living things. However charming this might sound, it has utterly nothing to do with a world that is about to have 6 billion people in it, whether we like it or not. Bioregionalism, too, is a useful idea in some contexts -- such as governance of air basins. But it becomes pure nonsense when people begin to advocate it -- as Kirkpatrick Sale does in his book Dwellers in the Land -- as a solution to be imposed on the whole world, by relocating people from the cities to rural areas where they would then take up ecologically correct lifestyles. There are indeed people who remain in one place, don't get hooked into the global economy, and rarely travel -- all parts of the bioregional answer -- and that's a perfectly fine way to live. The trouble is in turning it into a universal mandate and a political agenda -- a crusade to get everybody living that way. Not everybody does, not everybody wants to, and not everybody can. Even the people who talk bioregionalism don't live that way -- and don't seem to notice the gap between what they say and how they live. Some years back, Sierra magazine ran an interview with poet Gary Snyder, in which he advised all of us: "Quit moving. Stay where you are...become a paysan, paisano, peón." He then proceeded directly, with no evident sense of irony, to telling of his recent trips to China and Alaska. A bit further on he added: "I've been traveling eight or 10 weeks a year, doing lectures and readings at universities and community centers around the United States. I'm able to keep a sense of what's going on in the country that way." I don't think this makes Snyder a hypocrite. I think he's a perfectly honest guy who would rather recycle green platitudes for admiring listeners than think hard about what it really means to live in a global civilization. Probably the most serious weakness of pop ecophilosophy is its Luddite tilt. Technology isn't just a thing -- it is human thought, action, information, and invention, and a living part of who and what we are. Some applications of technology are lousy and some are wonderful. **But simply taking sides for or against technology is the lowest common denominator of public discourse**. Some technologies are and will always be central to environmental protection. I doubt that most people realize how important information technologies are in environmental management today. We worry about the hole in the ozone layer -- and we should worry about it -- but don't appreciate the exquisite technology involved in detecting it, monitoring its ebbs and flows, projecting its future. Nobody sees a hole in the ozone. **Like many other major environmental issues, it is accessible to our understanding only through the use of monitoring technologies.** An enormous environmental information system has grown, spreading and connecting around the world. The living Earth is now inseparable from this ever-expanding complex of satellites, transmitters, relay towers, computers, and software. With these devices, people observe the condition of the ozone, speculate on the future of the world's climate, study tectonic movements deep below the surface, brood over the oceans, track the migrations of wild animals and the changes in forests and deserts. This is technology that doesn't fit into any simplistic pro vs. con debate. It is neither the malevolent cause of our problems nor their magical solution -- just an essential means of acquiring information. And it will play a larger part in bringing greater environmental awareness than the collected works of all the writers and philosophy professors who push deep ecology and bioregionalism.

#### Even if ontology is good in the abstract, those who advocate it fail to grapple with real-world problems.

Mulligan et al 06

(Kevin, Peter Simons, and Barry Smith, Springer Science, “What’s wrong with contemporary philosophy?” 2006, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/e6hl522358431760/fulltext.pdf//wyo-mm>)

Another example of the lack of interest in the real world in analytic ontology and metaphysics is provided by the sad story of current work in such ﬁelds as bioinformatics, artiﬁcial intelligence, and the so-called ‘‘Semantic Web’’. Ontology and metaphysics ought surely to be acknowledged as of great importance in ﬁelds such as these. 1 In fact, however, philosophical confusion is the order of the day, because AP-philosophers with some knowledge of ontology, manifesting their horror mundi, have shown little interest in grappling with the problems thrown up by these ﬁelds, leaving it instead to philosophically naı¨ve exponents of other disciplines to wreak ontological havoc. Philosophers, for their part, occupy themselves with in-house puzzles, ignorant of the damage their neglect is wreaking in the wider world.

#### No agent to the alt, that is bad: kills ground allows the negative to spike out of offense made against the alternative, kills education means the aff can’t test the kritik at multiple levels and see if it solves. Voter Fairness Education.

**Renewable energy is a necessary stepping stone toward alt solvency**

**Scatena 11**--German Honors/Communication Studies Major Film Studies minor Memorial University of Newfoundland (Debora, Environment and Technology: Finding a Solution within the Modern Framework and Human Responsibilities, International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, 1;2; September 2011, http://www.ijbhtnet.com/journals/Vol\_1\_No\_2\_September\_2011/12.pdf)

It is possible to move past the challenge solely after a process of democratization has been put into place, specifically that example has come into being in Germany in October 2008 when the Renewable Energy Act (EEG, 28.10.2008) was approved. The act enables companies as well as private to invest in renewable energies and profit from it. However regulations are in place to preserve the quality and well being of nature as well. It is possible to see the German Renewable Energy Act, as a step that Heidegger foresaw, when discussing the impact of technology within nature. It is also possible to see the Act as an expansion of a philosophy and way of being within nature that a certain culture has developed. Moreover it is interesting to see how throughout the Act people have limitations on the use of nature they can have as well, nature is protected as it is the element can allow humanity to continue its development and sustain itself. If nature was not preserved in the Act it would be only a new energy policy but it wouldn't be able to take culture as well as people forward. Even so it is possible to see how technology as illustrated by Heidegger can move people ahead and through it the contemplative state can be achieved and captured, so that humanity actually improves thanks to technology. Nevertheless Germany is also the only country that put such regulations ahead for its citizen and its environment, so the road ahead is pretty steep unless people start realizing that those are not solely ideas, but they can be put into place. It is also possible to see a certain level of nature democratization is the Renewable Energy Act in question, since right after each way that people can use to support themselves with natural energy there are also as many rules to make sure nature is protected and not hurt in the balance. As a manmade Act it isn't perfect, but it is a possible way to create a unity front for both people and nature, also it is a beginning of the democratization of nature too. Latour states that “due process for the discovery of the common world” (Latour, 224) can be [hard] heard to get to**, but if a stepping stone is set**, certainly **people and nature can start a discourse which benefits both.** The realm of possibilities and solutions is achievable, but if the will of moving forward does not arise it is unlikely to reach a solution. Many things can be said and done, but it is important to always move towards the best ethics within a balance for humanity as well as nature. Technology is a tool that can enable men to get closer to the aim to be reached. It is also the tool that can move knowledge of the issue ahead, as it is seen in many reports released by institutions such as NASA and various Governments. In other words the road ahead is possible but not always straightforward. Heidegger as well as Latour present possible solutions, which as seen in Germany can be achieved, but they come with a series of challenges. Technology does reveal itself as a **starting point**

to take humanity as well as knowledge and handling of the situation people are faced with more manageable, but it isn't the solution, it is the way to reach a two step solution. Nature does deserve the same level of democratization humanity is entailed to, for this reason it is possible to see the German approach through the Renewable Energy Act as a first step. How long until the rest of the world will catch up? Not an easy question to deal with, but a stepping stone to foresee how human future can co-exist with nature, through the use of technology and a new framework in approaching life. Not likely easy but possible, and by possible it is achievable with dignity by all parties. Solutions are out there, the contemplative status can lead people to reach the goal of overcoming the climate challenge as well as many more, **but steps need to be made to get started.**

#### Perm do plan and consider the alternative-

#### Perm solves: Heidegger is incapable of accounting for a specific alternative to understand our ontology, he only provides techniques to guide our actions.

Schwartz 05

(Michael, Professor of History and Philosophy of Art at Augusta State University, “Introspection and Transformation in Philosophy Today,” 2005, http://www.contemplativemind.org/programs/academic/Schwartz-Introspection.pdf//wyo-mm)

In the phenomenological tradition, Heidegger’s critique of intentional consciousness in Sein und Zeit, notably the sections devoted to being-towards-death and authenticity, is a profound expression of modern thought’s impetus to transform. Becoming authentic, as a modification of one’s socialization, gathers and aligns Dasein’s being in the world with the destiny and fate of a community. Yet, in a characteristically modern move (or lack of one), Heidegger never suggests a specific technique to enact, empower, or provoke our seeing into the groundlessness of our received identities and spark awakening into a more authentic life – whereas such practices abound in the religious lineages of world. Even in the more mystical dialogue on Gelassenheit, we are given no injunctions or instructions that might enable the “leap” into the Open, the letting go of representation’s subject-object horizon into the more primordial open region where thinking, freed from willing, comes forth in its essence. Here too, the religious lineages in their esoteric strains as well in their contemporary Western offshoots offer “techniques” for releasing the subjective stance: the pointing out instructions in the Dzogchen teachings of Tibetan Buddhism, Self-inquiry as introduced by Ramana Maharshi, the effortless effort of just sitting proper to the Zen “practice” of Zazen, the prayer of union and centering prayer in contemplative Christianity, the yoga of supreme rest as taught by the contemporary American Eli Jaxon-Bear, and more. In each case the “technique” or instruction uniquely helps us notice and release our subjective stance into the Open. 9

**The only way life becomes meaningless is when it’s labeled as such**

Victor **Frankl**, Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry at the University of Vienna, Man’s Search for Meaning, **1946**, p. 90-93

We have stated that that which was ultimately responsible for the state of the prisoner’s inner self was not so much the enumerated psychophysical causes as it was the result of a free decision. Psychological observations of the prisoners have shown that **only the men who allowed their inner hold on their moral and spiritual selves to subside eventually fell victim to the camp**’s degenerating influences. The question now arises, what could, or should, have constituted this “inner hold”? Former prisoners, when writing or relating their experiences, agree that the most depressing influence of all was that a prisoner could not know how long his term of imprisonment would be. He had been given no date for his release. (In our camp it was pointless even to talk about it.) Actually a prison term was not only uncertain but unlimited. A well-known research psychologist has pointed out that life in a concentration camp could be called a “provisional existence.” We can add to this by defining it as a “provisional existence of unknown limit.” New arrivals usually knew nothing about the conditions at a camp. Those who had come back from other camps were obliged to keep silent, and from some camps no one had returned. On entering camp a change took place in the minds of the men. With the end of uncertainty there came the uncertainty of the end. It was impossible to foresee whether or when, if at all, this form of existence would end. The latin word finis has two meanings: the end or the finish, and a goal to reach. A man who could not see the end of his “provisional existence” was not able to aim at an ultimate goal in life. **He ceased living for the future**, in contrast to a man in normal life. Therefore the whole structure of his inner life changed; **signs of decay set in which we know from other areas of life.** The unemployed worker, for example, is in a similar position. His existence has become provisional and in a certain sense he cannot live for the future or aim at a goal. Research work done on unemployed miners has shown that they suffer from a peculiar sort of deformed time—inner time-which is a result of their unemployed state. Prisoners, too, suffered from this strange “time-experience.” In camp, a small time unit, a day, for example, filled with hourly tortures and fatigue, appeared endless. A larger time unit, perhaps a week, seemed to pass very quickly. My comrades agreed when I said that in camp a day lasted longer than a week. How paradoxical was our time-experience! In this connection we are reminded of Thomas Mann’s The Magic Mountain, which contains some very pointed psychological remarks. Mann studies the spiritual development of people who are in an analogous psychological position, i.e., tuberculosis patients in a sanatorium who also know no date for their release. They experience a similar existence—without a future and without a goal. One of the prisoners, who on his arrival marched with a long column of new inmates from the station to the camp, told me later that he had felt as though he were marching at his own funeral. His life had seemed to him absolutely without future. He regarded it as over and done, as if he had already died. This feeling of lifelessness was intensified by other causes: in time, it was the limitlessness of the term of imprisonment which was most acutely felt; in space, the narrow limits of the prison. Anything outside the barbed wire became remote—out of reach and, in a way, unreal. The events and the people outside, all the normal life there, had a ghostly aspect for the prisoner. The outside life, that is, as much as he could see of it, appeared to him almost as it might have to a dead man who looked at it from another world. A man who let himself decline because he could not see any future goal found himself occupied with retrospective thoughts. In a different connection, we have already spoken of the tendency there was to look into the past, to help make the present, with all its horrors, less real. But **in robbing the present of its reality there lay a certain danger. It became easy to overlook the opportunities to make something positive of camp life, opportunities which really did exist.** Regarding our provisional existence” as unreal was in itself an important factor in **causing the prisoners to lose their hold on life; everything in a way became pointles**s. Such people forget that often it is just such an exceptionally difficult external situation which gives man the opportunity to grow spiritually beyond himself. **Instead of taking the camp’s difficulties as a test of their inner strength, they did not take their life seriously and despised it as something of no consequence**. They preferred to close their eyes and to live in the past. **Life for such people became meaningless**.

**Energy management is key to resilience and to prevent catastrophic attacks.**

**Coaffee 08**

(Jon, School of Environment and Development, The University of Manchester, PhD in Urban Geography analysing at the impacts of risk, terrorism and security on urban development and planning, Energy Policy, “Risk, resilience, and environmentally sustainable cities,” October 18, 2008, Science Direct//wyo-mm)

**Although initial concerns with the ‘risk society’ were stimulated by environmentalism, more recent appraisals have focused upon the need to counter the occurrence and impact of international terrorism and the fear of catastrophic attack against urban areas and their critical infrastructures. Sites of energy production and transmission are often regarded as being vulnerable to attack, and as requiring increased fortification** (Alexander et al., 2004). **Resilience—reliable supplies and stable costs—is regarded as vital for energy security** (see for example IEA, 2001) due to the growing reliance of developed nations on imported energy and the increased likelihood of supply disruption (Costantini et al., 2007). The geo-**political tensions surrounding the attainment of this goal add an entirely new dimension to the traditional pillars of energy security: energy efficiency, diversification of energy supplies, and dealing with volatility** (Sahir and Qureshi, 2007; World Bank Report, 2005). This is leading in many cases to national legislation (e.g. the US Energy Policy Act of 2005) that seeks to reduce reliance on foreign energy supply (Mignone, 2007).

#### Heidegger’s ontology is terrible: it reaffirms the status quo, its essentialist, and ends after the initial questioning of language.

Strathausen 06

(Carsten, University of Missouri-Columbia, Postmodern Culture, “A Critique of Neo-Left Ontology,” 2006, accessed via ProjectMuse//wyo-mm)

The recent interest in political ontology thus departs from the traditional leftist position to equate ontological thinking (via Heidegger) with German fascism. Since Heidegger and up until the mid-1980's when a deconstructive version of Marxism emerged in the works of Laclau, Mouffe, Zizek, Badiou, a.o., ontology was synonymous with Heideggerianism: "Contemporary philosophical 'ontology' is entirely dominated by the name of Heidegger," Alain Badiou correctly stated in 1988 (Being and Event 9). Badiou himself, of course, will break with this tradition; yet this general identification of ontology and Heidegger allowed most leftist intellectuals at the time to dismiss the entire ontological tradition as a dangerous aberration in Western thought. As a philosophical tradition, ontology is not only suspect among leftist intellectuals. It is part of an oppressive super-structure that affirms rather than challenges the existing status quo. "In all its mutually excluding and defaming versions, ontology is apologetic," Adorno unequivocally states in 1966 (69).4 For Adorno, the basic fault of ontology in general, and of Heidegger's "foundational ontology" in particular, is its essentialism, which seeks the eternal, self-identical truth underneath the flow of history. "Heidegger," we read, "refuses to reflect [the difference between expression and thing]; he stops after only the first step of the language-philosophical dialectics" (117).

**Alt fails—Individual approaches to environmentalism fail and trade of with institutional approaches**

**Maniates, 2002**

[Michael, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, Confronting Consumption, “Individualization: plant a tree, buy a bike, save the world.” Pg. 43-66. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

For the lack of a better term, call this response the individualization of responsibility. **When responsibility for environmental problems is individualized, there is little room to ponder institutions, the nature and exercise of political power, or ways of collectively changing the distribution of power and influence in society— to, in other words, ‘‘think institutionally**,’’ as UC Berkeley sociologist Robert Bellah says. 4 **Instead**, **the serious work of confronting the threatening socioenvironmental processes** that The Lorax so ably illuminates **falls to individuals, acting alone,** usually as consumers. **We are individualizing responsibility when we agonize over the ‘‘paper-or-plastic’’ choice at the checkout counter, knowing somehow that neither is right given larger institutions and social structures**. We think aloud with the neighbor over the back fence about whether we should buy the new Honda or Toyota hybrid-engine automobile now or wait a few years until they work the kinks out. What we really wish for, though, is clean, efficient, and effective public transportation of the sort we read about in science fiction novels when we were young— but we cannot vote for it with our consumer dollars since, for reasons rooted in power and politics, it is not for sale. So we ponder the ‘‘energy stickers’’ on the ultraefficient appliances at Sears, we diligently compost our kitchen waste, we try to ignore the high initial cost and buy a few compact-fluorescent lightbulbs. We read spirited reports in the New York Times Magazine on the pros and cons of recycling while sipping our coffee, 5 carefully study the merits of this and that environmental group so as to properly decide on the destination of our small annual donation, and meticulously sort our recyclables. And now an increasing number of us are confronted by opportunistic greenpower providers who urge us to ‘‘save the planet’’ by buying their ‘‘green electricity’’—while doing little to actually increase the quantity of electricity generated from renewable resources.