#### Targeted killing = killing of persons not in state custody

Crandall, 2012

[Carla, Law Clerk to the Honorable Laura Denvir Stith, Supreme Court of Missouri and the author was previously employed by the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, READY . . . FIRE . . . AIM! A CASE FOR APPLYING AMERICAN DUE PROCESS PRINCIPLES BEFORE ENGAGING IN DRONE STRIKES, April, 2012 Florida Journal of International Law 24 Fla. J. Int'l L. 55, Lexis] /Wyo-MB

As used here, targeted killing is defined as the "extra-judicial, premeditated killing by a state of a specifically identified person not in its custody." n11 Though some have argued that targeted killing so defined amounts to illegal assassination, n12 others have instead suggested that "assassination generally is regarded as an act of murder for political reasons." n13 Given that targeted killings via drones do not, to this point, appear to have been undertaken for political reasons, the author accepts, for present purposes, that these attacks "can be a legally and morally justifiable means of protecting the American people." n14 The inquiry here is what procedures, if any, are necessary before the commencement of a drone strike to ensure that it is indeed legitimate. n15

#### And, Substantially” means to large extent

Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, 02,

Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition 2002 http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

To a great extent or degree

#### Preventing extinction needs to come first

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### Drones are inevitable

Henning, 2-20-12

[Job, NYT, Embracing the Drone, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/21/opinion/embracing-the-drone.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0] /Wyo-MB

Drones — more formally armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, or UAVs — are “in.” Since a Predator strike in Yemen against Al Qaeda in November 2002 — the first known use of a drone attack outside a theater of war — the United States has made extensive use of drones. There were nearly four times as many drone strikes in Pakistan during the first two years of the Obama administration as there were during the entire Bush administration.¶ The United States is now conducting drone strikes in Somalia as well, and their use is expected to dramatically increase in Afghanistan over the next five years as NATO troops withdraw from there.¶ Armed drones are both inevitable, since they allow the fusing of a reconnaissance platform with a weapons system, and, in many respects, highly desirable. They can loiter, observe and strike, with a far more precise application of force. They eliminate risk to pilots and sharply reduce the financial costs of projecting power. Moreover, polls show that a vast majority of Americans support the use of drones.¶

#### 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 way. 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.

#### Third, security’s inevitable—rejecting it causes the state to become more interventionist, turns the K

McCormack 10

[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 59-61)]

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.

#### There is always value to life, it is subjective—can’t determine for others

Schwartz 2004

[“A Value to Life: Who Decides and How?” www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf]

Those who choose to reason on this basis hope that if the quality of a life can be measured then the answer to whether that life has value to the individual can be determined easily. This raises special problems, however, because the idea of quality involves a value judgement, and value judgements are, by their essence, subject to indeterminate relative factors such as preferences and dislikes. Hence, quality of life is difficult to measure and will vary according to individual tastes, preferences and aspirations. As a result, no general rules or principles can be asserted that would simplify decisions about the value of a life based on its quality. Nevertheless, quality is still an essential criterion in making such decisions because it gives legitimacy to the possibility that rational, autonomous persons can decide for themselves that their own lives either are worth, or are no longer worth, living. To disregard this possibility would be to imply that no individuals can legitimately make such value judgements about their own lives and, if nothing else, that would be counterintuitive. 2 In our case, Katherine Lewis had spent 10 months considering her decision before concluding that her life was no longer of a tolerable quality. She put a great deal of effort into the decision and she was competent when she made it. Who would be better placed to make this judgement for her than Katherine herself? And yet, a doctor faced with her request would most likely be uncertain about whether Katherine’s choice is truly in her best interest, and feel trepidation about assisting her. We need to know which considerations can be used to protect the patient’s interests. The quality of life criterion asserts that there is a difference between the type of life and the fact of life. This is the primary difference between it and the sanctity criterion discussed on page 115. Among quality of life considerations rest three assertions: 1. there is relative value to life 2. the value of a life is determined subjectively 3. not all lives are of equal value. Relative value The first assertion, that life is of relative value, could be taken in two ways. In one sense, it could mean that the value of a given life can be placed on a scale and measured against other lives. The scale could be a social scale, for example, where the contributions or potential for contribution of individuals are measured against those of fellow citizens. Critics of quality of life criteria frequently name this as a potential slippery slope where lives would be deemed worthy of saving, or even not saving, based on the relative social value of the individual concerned. So, for example, a mother of four children who is a practising doctor could be regarded of greater value to the community than an unmarried accountant. The concern is that the potential for discrimination is too high. Because of the possibility of prejudice and injustice, supporters of the quality of life criterion reject this interpersonal construction in favour of a second, more personalized, option. According to this interpretation, the notion of relative value is relevant not between individuals but within the context of one person’s life and is measured against that person’s needs and aspirations. So Katherine would base her decision on a comparison between her life before and after her illness. The value placed on the quality of a life would be determined by the individual depending on whether he or she believes the current state to be relatively preferable to previous or future states and whether he or she can foresee controlling the circumstances that make it that way. Thus, the life of an athlete who aspires to participate in the Olympics can be changed in relative value by an accident that leaves that person a quadriplegic. The athlete might decide that the relative value of her life is diminished after the accident, because she perceives her desires and aspirations to be reduced or beyond her capacity to control. However, if she receives treatment and counselling her aspirations could change and, with the adjustment, she could learn to value her life as a quadriplegic as much or more than her previous life. This illustrates how it is possible for a person to adjust the values by which they appraise their lives. For Katherine Lewis, the decision went the opposite way and she decided that a life of incapacity and constant pain was of relatively low value to her. It is not surprising that the most vociferous protesters against permitting people in Katherine’s position to be assisted in terminating their lives are people who themselves are disabled. Organizations run by, and that represent, persons with disabilities make two assertions in this light. First, they claim that accepting that Katherine Lewis has a right to die based on her determination that her life is of relatively little value is demeaning to all disabled people, and implies that any life with a severe disability is not worth Write a list of three things that make living. Their second assertion is that with proper help, over time Katherine would be able to transform her personal outlook and find satisfaction in her life that would increase its relative value for her. The first assertion can be addressed by clarifying that the case of Katherine Lewis must not be taken as a general rule. Deontologists, who are interested in knowing general principles and duties that can be applied across all cases would not be very satisfied with this; they would prefer to be able to look to duties that would apply in all cases. Here, a case-based, context-sensitive approach is better suited. Contextualizing would permit freedom to act within a particular context, without the implication that the decision must hold in general. So, in this case, Katherine might decide that her life is relatively valueless. In another case, for example that of actor Christopher Reeve, the decision to seek other ways of valuing this major life change led to him perceiving his life as highly valuable, even if different in value from before the accident that made him a paraplegic. This invokes the second assertion, that Katherine could change her view over time. Although we recognize this is possible in some cases, it is not clear how it applies to Katherine. Here we have a case in which a rational and competent person has had time to consider her options and has chosen to end her life of suffering beyond what she believes she can endure. Ten months is a long time and it will have given her plenty of opportunity to consult with family and professionals about the possibilities open to her in the future. Given all this, it is reasonable to assume that Katherine has made a well-reasoned decision. It might not be a decision that everyone can agree with but if her reasoning process can be called into question then at what point can we say that a decision is sound? She meets all the criteria for competence and she is aware of the consequences of her decision. It would be very difficult to determine what arguments could truly justify interfering with her choice. The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

#### No Impact- Biopolitics doesn’t result in atrocity

Ojakangas 05

[Mike, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, “Impossible Dialogues on Bio-Power: Agamben and Foucault,” Foucault Studies 2 (5-28), www.foucault-studies.com/no2/ojakangas1.pdf, acc. 9-24-06//uwyo-ajl]

For Foucault, the coexistence in political structures of large destructive mechanisms and institutions oriented toward the care of individual life was something puzzling: “It is one of the central antinomies of our political reason.” However, it was an antinomy precisely because in principle the sovereign power and bio-power are mutually exclusive. How is it possible that the care of individual life paves the way for mass slaughters? Although Foucault could never give a satisfactory answer to this question, he was convinced that mass slaughters are not the effect or the logical conclusion of bio-political rationality. I am also convinced about that. To be sure, it can be argued that sovereign power and bio-power are reconciled within the modern state, which legitimates killing by bio-political arguments. Especially, it can be argued that these powers are reconciled in the Third Reich in which they seemed to “coincide exactly”. To my mind, however, neither the modern state nor the Third Reich – in which the monstrosity of the modern state is crystallized – are the syntheses of the sovereign power and bio-power, but, rather, the institutional loci of their irreconcilable tension. This is, I believe, what Foucault meant when he wrote about their “demonic combination”.

#### Fourth, Shifting away from the security framework causes conflict and causes intervention – only the perm gives political content to rights

McCormack 10

[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 59-61)]

A corollary of this retreat from a political interpretation of conflict or social instability, is the delegitimation of social transformation in developing countries. Historically, social and political transformation has often been accompanied by war and strife. By pathologising conflict, the human security framework acts to prohibit social or political transformation, as such changes can only be understood in an entirely negative way (see for further discussion, Cramer 2006). As an important contributor to the human security framework has argued: ‘much human insecurity surely results from structural factors and the distribution of power, which are essentially beyond the reach of individuals’ (Newman, 2004b: 358). Thus to actually overcome human insecurity, collective action and change is needed. But this **may result in** **internal conflict or strife**, **precisely the changes that human security problematises in the first place**. People may be prepared to experience disruptions to their daily existence, or even severe societal conflict or economic deprivation in the pursuit of some other goals which are understood as worthy. The shift away from the pluralist security framework is **highly problematic**. The formal links between the state and its citizens are problematised and weak and failing states are potentially held up to increased international scrutiny and international intervention. International institutions and states have potentially greater freedom to intervene in other states, but with no reciprocal methods of control to replace the old political links between the state and its citizens which are weakened. The shift away from the pluralist security framework and the rhetorical adoption by international institutions and states of a more cosmopolitan security framework **does not challenge contemporary power inequalities, rather it serves to entrench them**. Once we separate rights from any rights bearing subject, these rights are only things that can be given by external agencies, indeed as Chandler (2009) has argued, here the subject is created by external powers. Ultimately the cosmopolitan and emancipatory framework which seeks to give universal human rights through international law or forms of intervention posits abstract rights, seeking to make the world conform to universal human rights and justice in the absence of a political constituency to give it content. Indeed this is seen as necessary in the face of the current global injustices. Yet the problem is that **without a political constituency to give content to those rights these rights are gifts of the powerful, they are closer to charity**. **Rights in themselves, without political form, are of little value**. Here rights are assumed to be able to correct political and economic and social wrongs, such as inequality or disempowerment. Yet such problems are not the result of a lack of rights, and cannot be corrected through rights. A lack of development is a political, economic and social problem (Lewis, 1998; Heartfield, 1996), the lack of rights or equality and empowerment stem from the real inequalities and power relations in the world. Divorcing rights from rights bearing subjects, and positing abstract individual rights that can only be ‘given’ by external agencies, does not enhance rights but ends up formalising real inequality (Lewis, 1998). Indeed, this is precisely what we can see with, for example, human security and contemporary interventions. Here, the old formal equality of the pluralist security framework is no longer relevant and it is increasingly accepted that more powerful states have a right to intervene in other states and to frame certain states as ‘outlaw states’ (Simpson, 2005). Conclusion In this chapter I have argued that there have been significant shifts in the post-Cold War security problematic which cannot be understood in terms of the pluralist security framework. The most striking aspect of the contemporary international security problematic seems to be a shift away from and problematisation of the old security framework in both international and national security policy discourse. I have already discussed that the pluralist security framework with its underlying commitments of non-intervention and sovereign equality is held to be both anachronistic and immoral. This chapter lends support to broadening the initial conclusions drawn about the critical security theory more generally. In their own terms critical security theorists do not seem to be very critical. Critical security theorists **are not** **critically engaging and explaining the contemporary security problematic and offering an alternative** to contemporary power inequalities. A critical question to ask would be why have international institutions and states framed their security policies in terms of a rejection of the pluralist security framework and taken up cosmopolitan rhetoric? Where does this shift come from? Despite their ostensible focus on power and power inequalities, it is striking that critical security theorists exclude the way in which power is being exercised in the post-Cold War international order from their analysis. Were critical security theorists to include this in their analysis they would discover that they seem to be sharing many of the assumptions and aims of the post-Cold War international order. Specifically in the context of the shifting international security problematic, critical security theorists seem to share a normative and ethical critique of the old security framework, combined with a depoliticised account of conflict and social, economic and political instability, and a depoliticised and idealised view of the potential of major international institutions and states to intervene. Moreover, in the behaviour and rhetoric of international institutions, the problematic theoretical implications of critical security theory’s idealised assumptions of the potential of international institutions or transnational organisations to be a force for emancipation and freedom for individuals is shown to be problematic in practice. I have argued that this rejection of the pluralist security framework does not challenge the status quo, but serves to further entrench power inequalities. In fact, it seems to reflect the increased freedom of the international community to intervene in other states.

#### Fifth, scenario creation isn't the same as threat construction, it’s crucial to see if policies are a good idea and reduce the risk of nuclear war.

Darryl S.L.**Jarvis** - School of Economics & Political Science, U. of Sydney - **2K3** "Political Risk in International Relations: Empirical Experiences and Conceptual Approaches" School of Economics and Political Science, Working Papers

Scenario generation has its origins in the Cold War when strategic analysts developed the method for helping to think futuristically about driving forces, chains of events, or possible trigger points that might lead to conflict between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and how, if this occurred, the conflict might proceed. In essence, scenario generation was used to plot logically plausible possibilities and then to model responses, strategic positioning strategies, and to formulate war-fighting and contingency plans. Cold War scenario generation was said to be so successful in modeling circumstances of possible nuclear confrontation with devastating and mass annihilation outcomes, that policy makers were moved to develop the doctrine of MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) and various avoidance strategies to avert the possibility of nuclear confrontation.64 The essence of scenario generation is defined by Geoff Coyle as “a justified and traceable sequence of events which might plausibly be imagined to occur in the future.”65 Importantly, scenarios are not “forecasts, preferences or predictions, but plausible, challenging descriptions of what might happen—in the form of a set of stories about alternative futures.”66 To this end, scenario analysis builds on many of the techniques of the Delphi method. But rather than use intermediaries to design survey questionnaires, identify experts and synthesize and interpret responses, scenario generation allows experts to develop scenarios that lay bare assumptions and the rationale on which interpretations are made, and to develop possible sketches of anticipated events and their probable time lines. The thinking behind this is to allow those who utilize scenarios to make informed decisions and to evaluate the scenarios generated relative to the assumptions on which they have been based. Apart from the military, some of the first institutions to employ scenario generation were commercial organizations. The Royal Dutch Shell Company, for example, pioneered scenario analysis under the auspices of three prominent individuals, Peter Schwartz, Kees van der Heijden and Peter Checkland.67 However, despite some 30 years of scenario generation no formal models exist; indeed the notion of formal techniques is actively resisted. Rather, scenario generation stresses creative, imaginary, challenging discourses about possible futures by looking at the dominant drivers of societal change and risk. These are normally categorized under the well known PEST acronym (political, economic, social and technological factors) as the primary drivers of change and risk, and primary determinations of future worlds, processes and events. Scenarios, however, are not used to write the future but to outline possibilities in relation to key decisions that need to be taken today and of the possible future implications of these decisions given a constantly changing environment. It is, in this sense, an attempt to map possible trajectories and outcomes and logically construct images of cause and effect so that the ramifications of decision making can be understood in terms of its collateral implications and consequences. Peter Schwartz encapsulated the process with the provocative title of his book: The art of the Long View.68 The precise methods associated with scenario generation are numerous and the method employed normally contingent on the intended purpose. Angela Wilkinson and Esther Eidinow, for example, suggest that scenario generation falls into four discrete categories: identified objectives, known constitutive / environmental elements; formally mapped trajectories; scenarios generated. 2. Inductive Method: Development of a series of scenarios from an assemblage of a series of possible events. 3. Incremental Approach: Develops images and maps and describes an “official future”—or the one the organization thinks most likely to emerge, and then develops scenarios on the basis of decisions and how they will interact with the “official future” and their possible consequences and effects. 4. Normative Approach: Starts with a set of characteristics of assumed conditions, or a scenario framed in a forward time horizon, and works backwards to see what it requires (decisions, events, processes, attributes) to get there and if this is feasible.69 Peter Schwartz suggested that just as novels have themes which provide continuity, logical connections, and thus a central narrative enabling interpretation and assessment, scenarios too need a theme. But what? Schwartz suggested several themes; challenge and response, for example: “Perhaps London’s position as a centre for financial services is challenged by Frankfurt or Tokyo; what are the drivers and uncertainties which will affect the viability of a strategic response?” Other themes suggested included winners and losers or infinite possibility. The theme is not important per se, but a tool providing a catalyst or fulcrum via which to stress test the assumptions, the logicality of outcomes, the implications of strategic decisions and the risks and opportunities that might present. As with other third generation approaches, scenario analysis is not a panacea, offering both insights but also displaying limitations. It embraces lateral creative thinking and challenges organizations (commercial, non-commercial and state based) to think about alternative futures or events otherwise not anticipated. To the extent that it is able to do this successfully, it has obvious advantages for contingency planning, risk identification, mitigation planning and risk avoidance. It thus helps various commercial, state and non-commercial actors to navigate uncertainty and risk environments rather than stumble upon them without due thought to management and response. The normal caveats about such approaches apply, however: the quality of the analysis is directly proportionate to the quality of the analysts; interpretative discretion if not managed and appropriately tested and checked, can derail the construction of quality scenarios and their utility.

#### Alt fails to create a sustainable model for our species- Using crisis driven politics is the only way to mobilize people in a way necessary to interrogate actions that threaten extinction

Schatz 12

(JL, Binghampton University, The Journal of Ecocentrism, “The Importance of Apocalypse: The Value of End-Of-The-World Politics While Advancing Ecocriticism,” 2012, <http://ojs.unbc.ca/index.php/joe/article/view/394/382>) /wyo-mm

Third, and most importantly, ecocritics must adopt tactics that can most effectively influence other ¶ people without proscribing end goals. By this I mean that ecocritics must use those tools that can ¶ appeal to the masses while simultaneously making their appeals in such a way as not to force a choice ¶ upon them. Apocalyptic imagery is ideal for this task. It appeals to notions of shared planetary concerns¶ that serve as motivation for others to act, even without fully knowing how the apocalypse can truly be ¶ averted. By creating a compelling urge to do something that arises out of the image of planetary ¶ annihilation ecocriticism can influence a variety of people to take up arms through a multitude of ¶ techniques. Society as a whole will never mobilize to halt the very practices that threaten life without ¶ such compelling inspiration. When ecocriticism helps other people see how certain actions risk their¶ very survival it will enable our planet to evolve differently. So long as ecocriticism never gives up on the struggle, even if this different direction may bring new scenarios of apocalypse, humanity as a species ¶ can continually evolve its patterns and behaviors to advert extinction. This is not to say we will live ¶ forever. Rather it is to say that as a species we can continue to exist in harmony with the lives all around ¶ us and give our deaths meaning. Ultimately, it is through imagining the end of the world that we will be ¶ able to envision how to save it.

#### Sixth, No impact –threat construction isn’t sufficient to cause wars

Kaufman, Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware, ‘9

(Stuart J, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” *Security Studies* 18:3, 400 – 434)

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed. Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence.

A virtue of this symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why ethnic peace is more common than ethnonationalist war. Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

#### And, failure to interrogate human relationships first ensures that we cause wa that turns the environment- means we’re a pre-req to the K

Duncan Clark 9, editorial environmental consultant to the London Guardian, co-director of GreenProfile, January 2, 2009, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions

Almost 700m [million] tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by even the smallest nuclear conflict, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, even a very limited nuclear exchange, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere – more than UK's annual total. The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms – just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though, the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures an extra few notches. The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%." But why would a Stanford engineer bother calculating such a thing? Given that the nuclear exchange would also kill up to 17 million people, who's going to be thinking about the impact on global warming? The purpose of the paper is to compare the total human and environmental costs of a wide range of different power sources, from solar and wind to nuclear and biofuels. One of the side-effects of nuclear power, the report argues, is an increased risk of nuclear war: "Because the production of nuclear weapons material is occurring only in countries that have developed civilian nuclear energy programs, the risk of a limited nuclear exchange between countries or the detonation of a nuclear device by terrorists has increased due to the dissemination of nuclear energy facilities worldwide." "As such," Jacobson continues, "it is a valid exercise to estimate the potential number of immediate deaths and carbon emissions due to the burning of buildings and infrastructure associated with the proliferation of nuclear energy facilities and the resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons … Although concern at the time of an explosion will be the deaths and not carbon emissions, policy makers today must weigh all the potential future risks of mortality and carbon emissions when comparing energy sources."

And shouldn’t prioritize some lives over others

Lillehammer, 2011

[Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, <http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism_and_Global_Ethics-1-2.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Contemporary discussions of consequentialism and global ethics have been marked by a focus on examples such as that of the shallow pond. In this literature, distinctions are drawn and analogies made between different cases about which both the consequentialist and his or her interlocutor are assumed to have a more or less firm view. One assumption in this literature is that progress can be made by making judgements about simple actual or counterfactual examples, and then employing a principle of equity to the effect that like cases be treated alike, in order to work out what to think about more complex actual cases. It is only fair to say that in practice such attempts to rely only on judgements about simple cases have a tendency to produce trenchant stand-offs. It is important to remember, therefore, that for some consequentialists the appeal to simple cases is neither the only, nor the most basic, ground for their criticism of the ethical status quo. For some of the historically most prominent consequentialists the evidential status of judgements about simple cases depends on their derivability from basic ethical principles (plus knowledge of the relevant facts). Thus, in The Methods of Ethics, Henry Sidgwick argues that ethical thought is grounded in a small number of self-evident axioms of practical reason. The first of these is that we ought to promote our own good. The second is that the good of any one individual is objectively of no more importance than the good of any other (or, in Sidgwick’s notorious metaphor, no individual’s good is more important ‘from the point of view of the Universe’ than that of any other). The third is that we ought to treat like cases alike. Taken together, Sidgwick takes these axioms to imply a form of consequentialism. We ought to promote our own good. Yet since our own good is objectively no more important than the good of anyone else, we ought to promote the good of others as well. And in order to treat like cases alike, we have to weigh our own good against the good of others impartially, all other things being equal. iv It follows that the rightness of our actions is fixed by what is best for the entire universe of ethically relevant beings. To claim otherwise is to claim for oneself and one’s preferences a special status they do not possess. When understood along these lines, consequentialism is by definition a global ethics: the good of everyone should count for everyone, no matter their identity, location, or personal and social attachments, now or hereafter. v Some version of this view is also accepted by a number of contemporary consequentialists, including Peter Singer, who writes that it is ‘preferable to proceed as Sidgwick did: search for undeniable fundamental axioms, [and] build up a moral theory from them’ (Singer 1974, 517; Singer 1981). For these philosophers the question of our ethical duties to others is not only a matter of our responses to cases like the shallow pond. It is also a matter of whether these responses cohere with an ethics based on first principles. If you are to reject the consequentialist challenge, therefore, you will have to show what is wrong with those principles

#### No root cause – war causes their impacts

Goldstein 01

[Professor of International Relations at American University, 2001 (Joshua S., War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, pp.411-412) ]

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice”. Then if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influences wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.  So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gener and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes toward war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression/” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

#### Anti-anthropocentric rhetoric reinforces a more dominant frame of human value because they reify ideological opposition to respect for non-human life

Hayward 97

[PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

Anthropocentrism, widely used as a term of criticism in environmental ethics and politics, is something of a misnomer: for while anthropocentrism can intelligibly be criticised as an ontological error, attempts to conceive of it as an ethical error often involve conceptual confusion. I point out that there is no need for this confusion because a more appropriate vocabulary to refer to the defects the ethical ‘anti-anthropocentrists’ have in mind already exists. My argument is not just about semantics, though, but engages directly with the politics of environmental concern: blanket condemnations of ‘anthropocentrism’ not only condemn some legitimate human concerns, they also allow ideological retorts to the effect that criticisms of anthropocentrism amount to misanthropy. My argument, therefore, is that a more nuanced understanding of the problem of anthropocentrism allows not only a more coherent conceptualisation of environmental ethics but also a more effective politics. The article has five main sections. The first notes the paradox that the clearest instances of overcoming anthropocentrism involve precisely the sort of objectivating knowledge which many ecological critics see as itself archetypically anthropocentric. The second section then notes some ways in which anthropocentrism is not objectionable. In the third section, the defects associated with anthropocentrism in ethics are then examined: I argue, though, that these are better understood as instances of speciesism and human chauvinism. In order to explain why it is unhelpful to call these defects anthropocentrism, I note in section four that there is an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism in any ethic at all, and in the fifth section that the defects do not typically involve a concern with human interests as such anyway. Because of this last point, I also argue, the rhetoric of anti-anthropocentrism is not only conceptually unsatisfactory, it is counterproductive in practice.