### Contention One is Ecology

#### Current Mexican environmental regulations are insufficient to combat environmental pollution – instead they incentivize toxic waste dumping into the surrounding environment

**NLM, 13** – National Library of Medicine (“Maquiladora” June 10 2013, http://toxtown.nlm.nih.gov/text\_version/locations.php?id=35Maquiladoras)ah

Maquiladoras are foreign-owned factories located in Mexico that are typically found along the U.S. - Mexico border. Maquiladoras produce a variety of products including electronic components, chemicals, clothes, machinery, and auto parts. The maquiladora program began in 1965 as part of the Mexican government’s Border Industrialization Program. It was developed in response to the demise of the U.S. government’s Bracero Program, which allowed Mexican farmworkers to legally perform seasonal work within the U.S. The end of the Bracero Program caused an unemployment crisis in the border region. The Mexican government responded to this crisis by creating the maquiladora program which provided an incentive to foreign manufacturers to move production to Mexico. This incentive was created by allowing duty free import of raw materials and other supplies into the country with the stipulation that the manufactured goods and the resulting wastes were eventually exported to another country. The passing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1993 led to an increased number of maquiladoras in the border region. In 2003, there were 2,893 maquiladoras employing 1,063,123 people. The high concentration of maquiladoras combined with less rigorous environmental regulations, limited capacity to enforce environmental laws, and the expense of exporting hazardous waste has created an incentive for illegal dumping and has polluted the surrounding land, water, and air. Inside the maquiladoras, occupational hazards relating to toxic chemical exposure and workplace safety also affect human health. Occupational hazards are of particular concern in Mexico since first-time violators are rarely punished and since penalties are typically incurred only for imminent dangers and failures to address previously highlighted violations.

#### Specifically this devastates the Tijuana River region

Good 5 David Good. Dave Good is an award-winning journalist and author for the San Diego Reader. “Showdown on the Rio Alamar.”<http://www.sandiegoreader.com/news/2012/sep/05/cover-showdown-rio-alamar/?page=2&>

Before NAFTA,” (the North American Free Trade Agreement of 1994) says Mendez, “people could fish and bathe in the Rio Alamar. Before the maquilas came in 1986, you could actually drink the water.”¶ It is no longer news to anyone in San Diego that during winter storms, sewage-laden floodwaters from the Tijuana River overwhelm both the Tijuana estuary, one of the most important salt-marsh ecosystems left in the U.S., and the Pacific Ocean. The winter waters off Imperial Beach become a hellish broth of contaminants and raw sewage, and area beaches are known to remain closed to the public throughout the season. This sewage spill has a name: the Tijuana River plume, and it is tracked by the Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System.A TED (the acronym stands for Trade and Environmental Database) case study, #147, titled “Tijuana River Pollution,” placed a substantial portion of the blame for all that pollution on the maquiladora program. NAFTA, they say, provided paychecks, but in turn encouraged the migration of thousands upon thousands of job-seekers to Tijuana in advance of any sort of infrastructure. In other words, humans outnumbered toilets. Much of the workforce simply squatted in makeshift encampments on the banks of the Alamar. The maquilas themselves, some 3000 factories and assembly plants, generate additional toxic waste and sewage.Mendez says that practicing environmentalism in the midst of such third-world abuse is difficult. “You never really know where the Mexican government is at, what they’re doing, or why they’re doing it. It’s hard to get documents.”He takes one last look around the pitiful arroyo and the Alamar before we leave, but one senses that he sees something aside from the results of years of dumping. “It is a great opportunity,” he finally says, “to clean the air with all these trees.”“Tijuana is a coast city. We’re a river city.”Margarita Díaz is the director of Proyecto Fronterizo de Educación Ambiental A.C. (Border Environmental Education Project) in Tijuana. Proyecto Fronterizo is one of a list of binational environmental agencies, governmental agencies, and nonprofits that have a stake in the outcome of the Rio Alamar project.She calls from her office in Playas. “But the [Mexican] government doesn’t see it that way,” she says, “and even we don’t see ourselves as a river city. I tell people that we have a river running through the middle of our city. That’s not a river, they say. That’s a tunnel.”The Tijuana River originates in Mexico and crosses the international boundary into the United States near San Ysidro. The majority of the river was channelized and run into a concrete straitjacket during the late 1960s. The channelization of creeks and rivers and seeps and above-ground springs is an old-school engineering solution to seasonal flooding that dates back to the 1930s and possibly earlier. Channelization does exactly what it is supposed to do: it provides a concrete fast track through which large volumes of water can move out of a given area at a high rate of speed. On paper, it seems like a good solution, if, that is, one doesn’t mind the total loss of nature that comes with the process.But channelization has also been identified as a major source of ocean pollution. Along with water, urban channels transport anything and everything that happens to be in them, including, sometimes, humans. In spite of the best engineering intentions, people have drowned in such culverts during storm events.“Channelization is always bad for a river,” says Travis Pritchard, a chemist who monitors water quality for San Diego Coastkeeper. “Six months ago I went down to Tijuana and met with Margarita Díaz.” They observed what remained of the Rio Alamar. “It’s super sad. I felt like I was watching the death of a river before my eyes.”

#### The river is important ecologically

NERR 10 (“Tijuana River Comprehensive Management Plan- National Estuarine Research Reserve”. National Estuarine Research Reserve. August 2010. [http://www.nerrs.noaa.gov/Doc/PDF/Reserve/TJR\_ MgmtPlan.pdf](http://www.nerrs.noaa.gov/Doc/PDF/Reserve/TJR_%20MgmtPlan.pdf))

The Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve (TRNERR) is unique in a local, regional, national, and international context. It offers one of the best and largest remaining examples of California’s coastal wetland habitat, a habitat that has been largely lost due to urban development or seriously degraded elsewhere in southern California. This section includes a brief description of the importance of estuarine habitats and the natural resources protected within the Reserve. I. THE NEED TO PROTECT ESTUARIES A. DEFINITION Estuaries are a hydrological and biological crossroads, defined as the portion of the earth's coastal zone where there is interaction of ocean water, freshwater, land, and atmosphere. The specific plant and animal habitats that may be supported by an estuarine system are determined by conditions in the watershed and in the adjacent ocean. The rate at which fresh water enters the estuary, the amount and type of waterborne and bottom sediments, the degree of tidal flushing, and water depth (hence temperature and degree of sunlight), all combine to produce diverse biological communities in a dynamic and complex system. A significant physical change in any of those factors can trigger traumatic changes in the estuarine biologic community, greatly enlarging or reducing the size of various species' populations. B. ESTUARINE FUNCTIONS Estuarine wetlands provide a number of valuable ecological functions, or so-called “ecosystem services.” Most broadly, there are sources of recreational and aesthetic benefits, as witnessed by the boom in industries such as eco-tourism. Also, they offer critical buffers between the sea, land, and freshwater. They can protect inland areas from ocean-borne waves and storm activity. Also, they also can help protect the ocean from watershed inputs, filtering and helping to purify water. In a healthy estuarine system, the interaction of tides, unpolluted fresh water, and sediments creates some of the most productive systems on the planet. Sheltered shallow waters and soft mud or sand flats, regularly flooded by the tides, provide ideal conditions for abundant life. Among the most important estuarine species are microscopic photosynthetic organisms called phytoplankton. Phytoplankton, like green plants, make the energy of sunlight available to animals as food. Phytoplankton are consumed by microscopic and minute animals called zooplankton. These animals include small crustaceans such as copepods, and the larvae of fish, crabs, clams, and other species. These organisms themselves are part of the food supply for adults of their own or other species. Marsh plants and eelgrass growing in shallow estuarine waters are critically important to estuarine animal life. Marsh vegetation not only provides cover for many animals, but also, as it dies back each season, creates detritus that feeds and houses the species on which larger species depend. The blades of eelgrass are homes for algae, snails, and other food for larger animals. Juveniles of many species reach adulthood by hiding among estuarine vegetation. In an undisturbed estuary, the wealth of food can support huge populations of immature and adult fish, crabs, shrimp, and other species. Those animals provide essential food for populations of birds and mammals, including people. ¶ C. MODIFICATION OF ESTUARIES Estuaries--characteristically flat land that offers sheltered access to the sea, and a profusion of fish and other seafood--offer attractive conditions for human habitation, agricultural production, and transportation. Estuaries on the west coast of the U.S. supported native peoples for thousands of years and, more recently, settlers from other parts of the globe. ¶ Prior to the 1970s, the value and finite nature of estuaries were not fully appreciated. It was not recognized that estuaries are integral to ecological and human well-being. Destruction of estuaries was disastrously affecting water quality, commercial and recreational fisheries, and overall ecosystem health. Estuary-dependent plants and animal populations began to dwindle with lost habitat, food sources, and reproductive sites. Affected species included not only ¶ salmonids, crab, and clams, but also birds such as eagles and falcons, which feed on the ¶ tideflats. Increasing awareness of the value of estuaries triggered current efforts to preserve, ¶ conserve, and restore these fragile systems.

#### This modern paradigm of ecological destruction underlies a systematic understanding of ecology

Castello and Toledo, 2k (Alicia Castello and Victor M Toledo; "Applying ecology in the Third World: the case of Mexico." BioScience 50.1 (2000): 66-76; google scholar)

Ecologists and policymakers alike generally agree that ecological knowledge should be considered in setting environmental policy and that ecologists should be more involved in decisions related to the man-agement and conservation of natural resources (e.g., Ehrlich 1989, Lubchenco et al. 1991). The essence of applied ecology is that it is "solution oriented," in contrast to pure ecology, which is "problem oriented" (Newman 1993). Applied ecology seeks solutions to practical problems and is guided, at present, by the paradigm of sustain- ability. Applying ecology would mean using original research in the management and conservation of natural resources. That is, it implies that scientific methods can be used to solve problems in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, wildlife management, resource extraction, and biodiversity conservation. Despite the potential of applied ecology, there is still disagreement about the extent to which ecological science is applicable to real-world problems. This concern is intensified by the fact that, although the numbers of ecol-ogists and journals specifically dedicated to ecological topics are growing, the main global environmental problems, such as deforestation, soil erosion, loss of biodiversity, water depletion, and species exploitation, are continuing to increase at alarming rates. For example, an analysis of the influence on management practice or policy of 50 representative articles published over the last 30 years in one prominent ecology journal, the Journal of Applied Ecology, showed that most of these articles lacked an indication of the practical applications of the work or of management recommendations derived from the research (Pienkowski and Watkinson 1996). Ecology and related disciplines now confront the urgent challenge of making a relevant contribution to the wise management and conservation of Earth's resources and life support systems. Many ecologists are now taking up this challenge. For example, the publication of the Sus-tamable Biosphere Initiative (Lubchenco et al. 1991), which was based on an awareness of the need to link sci-ence with decision-making, constituted an important step. Another important contribution was an article by Ludwig et al. (1993), which served as the basis for a forum in Eco-logical Applications about natural resources exploitation. Among the conclusions of the forum was the importance of recognizing the limitations of ecologists' knowledge of managed systems and the difficulties involved in gaining the necessary understanding. Based on the recognition that environmental problems are not entirely or even primarily scientific (Levin 1993), some authors (e.g., Funtowicz and Ravetz 1991, Costanza 1993) have emphasized the need to integrate science with other sources of information. These authors relate ecology's low impact on solving problems to its limited capacity to function in an interdisciplinary context. In particular, information from the social sciences and the knowledge generated by rural societies worldwide (which are commonly referred to as indigenous or traditional) have an important role to play in formulating strategies for natural resource management and conservation (Alfieri and Hecht 1990, Toledo 1992, Costanza 1993). Ecological information is, therefore, only one part of the decision- making process for environmental management. Consequently, more integrative forms of ecological inquiry that analyze issues from a systems perspective, including the interactions of social systems with natural systems, are needed (Holling et al. 1998). In this article, we consider applied ecological research in developing countries, in which natural resources are pre-dominantly used, managed, and conserved by communi-ty-based actors. We review the situation in Mexico, using it to suggest that the perceived limits of applied ecological research is related to how knowledge is generated, com-municated, and socializedby scientists and their institu-tions. Applied ecology, at least in Mexico, seems to better accomplish its objectives when researchers and institu-tions conduct research in conjunction with the social actors involved in the management of natural resources. Such sectors include government agencies, nongovern-mental organizations, international agencies, and rural producers themselves—the complex array of agricultur-ists, cattle ranchers, forest dwellers and harvesters, hunters, gatherers, and fishermen whose lives depend directly on the appropriation of natural resources. We conclude by proposing a model that can serve as a general framework for developing more integrative forms of applied ecological research and by emphasizing the role of communication in facilitating the use of scientific findings. The management of nat ural resources in the Third World Understanding how scientific institutions and their researchers perceive the social and economic actors in nat-ural resource management is crucial for designing strategies for applying ecological research. Labels such as "users," "managers," "exploiters," "stakeholders," or "decision-makers" commonly found in the ecological literature oversimplify a complex reality. These terms fail to recognize specific actors who can be identified culturally, social-ly, and economically. The management of ecosystems is not only an ecologi-cal event but also a social—and, therefore, an economic, cultural, and even political—phenomenon. Human appropriation of nature removes minerals, water, energy, and living beings (biomass) from ecosystems. A substantial proportion of the world's biomass is directly appropriated through rural production, including agriculture, cattle raising, fisheries, hunting, gathering, and forestry. These activities are the main human activities on Earth and the principal influences on our planet's ecology (Vitousek et al. 1986). They constitute the first step in the process by which societies organize the exchange of matter and energy with nature. Although most humans live in cities, and almost no place on Earth is free of industrial artifacts, products, and services, the portion of humanity involved in the capture of biomass is still considerable. By 1950, more than half of the human population participated in the direct appropriation of the products of nature. In 1990, the total number of people was twice that of 1950, but 45% of them were still engaged in some kind of primary production activities (FAO 1991). Approximately 95% of the agricultural population occurs in Third World countries, whereas only 5% occurs in developed nations. Consequently, human appropriation of nature is carried out mainly in nations characterized by high biological richness (Mittermeier et al. 1997), a diversity of cultures, and, ironically, high social and economic poverty and high rates of environmental depletion (UNEP 1997).

**This ongoing process is critical – it affects global understandings of ecology**

Hovden 99 (Eivind Hovden; Senior Research Fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway; 1999; “As if nature doesn't matter: Ecology, regime theory and¶ international relations”; Environmental Politics, 8:2, 50-74; KDUB)

It is worth emphasising that the argument presented below is not merely¶ of significance for IR as an academic discipline. IR is in many ways¶ uniquely positioned as a field which takes the planet as a whole as the centre¶ of analysis, and may therefore be able to contribute significantly to a debate¶ which so far has been dominated by philosophers, sociologists and political¶ theorists. The relevance of IR for environmental politics is clearly (albeit¶ possibly unwittingly) pointed to by Redclift, who argues that '[m]any of the¶ processes which govern our environment are established at the global level.¶ They exist at this level not because they are international in origin, but¶ because they are totalising processes, often difficult to divorce from¶ economic activities themselves. Global relations, in this sense, are¶ embodied in myriad local practices' [Redclift, 1996:148]. The relationship¶ between the individual understanding and perception of nature, and the¶ ways in which we might assume responsibility for the ecological¶ consequences of our behaviour and consumption are clearly affected by¶ processes that are not confined to the national level. The 'global relations'¶ which Redclift refers to, are, in various forms, the subject matter of IR, and¶ it is therefore well worth considering the relationship between IR theory and¶ the environmental crisis.

**This engenders anthropocentrism**

Taciano L. **Milfont** prof at univ of Auckland Preservation and Utilization: Understanding the Structure of Environmental Attitudes1 Medio Ambiente y Comportamiento Humano **2006**, 7(1), 29-50.

EA = environmental attitudes Bogner and his colleagues (Bogner, Brengelmann, & Wiseman, 2000; Bogner & Wiseman, 1997, 1999; Wiseman & Bogner, 2003) have tried to evaluate the dimensionality of EA empirically by conducting second-order factor analysis. In line with the two-dimensional tradition, Wiseman and Bogner (2003) proposed a Model of Ecological Values (MEV) with two orthogonal dimensions: Preservation and Utilization. They argued that ecological values are established by “one’s position on two orthogonal dimensions, a biocentric dimension that reflects conservation and protection of the environment (Preservation); and an anthropocentric dimension that reflects the utilization of natural resources (Utilization)’’ (Wiseman & Bogner, 2003, p. 787). In a more extensive investigation, Milfont and Duckitt (2004) evaluated the structure of EA by factor analysing 99 items from well-know EA measures. The results from both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis showed that the EA were organized in a hierarchical structure. These were ten first-order factors that loaded on one of two correlated second-order factors. Their findings indicated that Preservation and Utilization were strongly correlated and not orthogonal, as proposed by the MEV. Although purely empirically based, Milfont and Duckitt’s (2004) findings are consistent with a number of theories. These theories have argued that people-environment relations can be viewed in terms of two distinct beliefs that are very similar to these Preservation and Utilization dimensions (Corral-Verdugo & Armendáriz, 2000; Dobson, 1998; Dunlap & Jones, 2002; Dunlap & Van Liere, 1978; Kortenkamp & Moore, 2001; Thompson & Barton, 1994). For example, these Preservation and Utilization dimensions seem to be related, respectively, to the spiritual and instrumental views of people-environment relations (Stokols, 1990). According to Stokols (1990), the spiritual view sees the environment as an end in itself, whereas the instrumental view sees the environment as a means for human objectives. Kaiser and Fuhler (2003) have also argued that “if the evaluative component of people’s attitudes consists of at least two distinguishable lines of values—utilitarian values as well as moral/altruistic ones—then it would be better to consider them independently” (p. 1041). Therefore, EA can be seen as rooted in two philosophical or ideological principles that would be expressed in two correlated higher-order environmental value dimensions

#### Anthropocentric dualism creates unending violence underscores all other modes of oppression

Kochi, 2009 (Tarik, Sussex law school, Species war: Law, Violence and Animals, Law Culture and Humanities Oct 5.3)

This reflection need not be seen as carried out by every individual on a daily basis but rather as that which is drawn upon from time to time within public life as humans inter-subjectively coordinate their actions in accordance with particular enunciated ends and plan for the future. 21 In this respect, **the violence and killing of species war is not simply a question of survival or bare life, instead, it is bound up with a consideration of the good.** For most modern humans in the West the “good life” involves the daily killing of animals for dietary need and for pleasure. At the heart of the question of species war, and all war for that matter, resides a question about the legitimacy of violence linked to a philosophy of value. 22 The question of war-law sits within a wider history of decision making about the relative values of different forms of life. “Legitimate” violence is under-laid by cultural, religious, moral, political and philosophical conceptions about the relative values of forms of life. Playing out through history are distinctions and hierarchies of life-value that are extensions of the original human-animal distinction. Distinctions that can be thought to follow from the human-animal distinction are those, for example, drawn between: **Hellenes and barbarians; Europeans and Orientals; whites and blacks; the “civilized” and the “uncivilized”; Nazis and Jews; Israeli’s and Arabs; colonizers and the colonized.** Historically these practices and regimes of violence have been culturally, politically and legally normal-ized in a manner that replicates the normalization of the violence carried out against non-human animals. Unpacking, criticizing and challenging the forms of violence, which in different historical moments appear as “normal,” is one of the ongoing tasks of any critic who is concerned with the question of what war does to law and of what law does to war? The critic of war is thus a critic of war’s norm-alization.

#### Only in challenging this ideology can we reclaim meaning

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 151-152, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

But on top of this special burden nature has arranged that it is impossible for man to feel “right” in any straightforward way. Here we have to introduce a paradox that seems to go right to the heart of organismic life and that is especially sharpened in man. The paradox takes the form of two motives or urges that seem to be part of creature consciousness and that point in two opposite directions. On the one hand the creature is impelled by a powerful desire to identify with the cosmic process, to merge himself with the rest of nature. On the other hand he wants to be unique, to stand out as something different and apart. The first motive— to merge and lose oneself in something larger—comes from man’s horror of isolation, of being thrust back upon his own feeble energies alone; he feels tremblingly small and impotent in the face of transcendent nature. If he gives in to his natural feeling of cosmic dependence, the desire to be part of something bigger, it puts him at peace and at oneness, gives him a sense of self-expansion in a larger beyond, and so heightens his being, giving him truly a feeling of transcendent value. This is the Christian motive of Agape—the natural melding of created life in the “Creation-in-love” which transcends it. As Rank put it, **man yearns for a “feeling of kinship with the All.” He wants to be “delivered from his isolation” and become “part of a greater and higher whole.” The person reaches out naturally for a self beyond his own self in order to know who he is at all, in order to feel that he belongs in the universe.** Long before Camus penned the words of the epigraph to this chapter, Rank said: “For only by living in close union with a god-ideal that has been erected outside one’s own ego is one able to live at all.”55

### Advocacy

#### Thus in the face of this ongoing ecological destruction Kristof and I advocate that the United States federal government provide Mexico with assistance for environmental programs

### Contention Two is Solvency

#### The lack of assistance for environmental protection impairs effective environmental protection in Mexico – plan solves

USMBC 9 (“New Horizons in United States-Mexico Relations” A report by the U.S.-Mexico Binational Council, University of Texas at Austin Staff, CSIS Mexico Project Staff, Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo Staff, Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico Staff)

Funding Governmental Capacity to Protect the Environment The implementation of NAFTA and its environmental side accord has pushed Mexico and its Environmental and Natural Resources Ministry (SEMARNAT) to a level of environmental performance for which it is both underfunded and unprepared. SEMARNAT needs assistance in developing both its institutional and its technical ability to implement domestic environmental programs and international cooperative efforts. Therefore, additional funding should be provided and augmented by technical assistance from the United States via the CEC, along the lines proposed below. Binational Advisory Committees Independent consulting committees from both countries-including nongovernmental organizations-should work together to establish clear-cut environmental goals. These committees should also set goals and time frames for providing technical assistance to Mexican federal authorities. Harmonization of Indicators The two countries should work to improve and harmonize environmental indicators in the existing databases on environmental indicators for both countries. This measure will make clear country-to-country' comparisons possible. State and Local Authority The federal governments of both nations should look for creative opportunities to divest power to the states and localities. A presidential directive can make it possible, tor example, to authorize trans-boundary port authorities to manage fees and float bonds similar to the functions performed by the Port Authorits' of New York and New Jersey. State and Local Taxation Mexicos federal government should enhance the authority' of local and state governments to assess and collect taxes for infrastructure development and to incur debt to finance such projects. Technical Assistance to the States Federal U.S. funding should include technical assistance for environmental programs that are jointly undertaken by individual states in Mexico and in the United States. Nonprofit Sector Contributions Regional nonprofit organizations have been helpful in the binational environ men- tal relationship, including the updating of Mexico's emissions inventory system and increased application and implementation ot" current environmental laws. Enhanced U.S. and international funding can be provided to activities of nonprofit organizations that are aimed at solving environmental problems in the border region.

#### Our ecological approach to this discussion is key to REVEAL and RESIST the normalization of ecological devastation

**Orihuela and Hageman 11** - \*Sharada Balachandran Ph.D. candidate at the University of California at Davis, \*\*Andrew Carl is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of California, (“The Virtual Realities of US/Mexico” Border Ecologies in Maquilapolis and Sleep Dealer” *Environmental Communication* Vol. 5, No. 2, June 2011, pp. 166; kdub)

Much of the scholarship on films representing the US/Mexico border analyzes the space and the texts about the border through single critical approaches, whether feminist, Marxist, national/transnational concerns, or race and ethnicity. In contrast, our ecocritical approach is a mode of analysis and argument that works in a threepart structure comprising Ecotones, Machines, and Gender. Through this multivalent approach, we argue that placing these films in conversation with one another, despite their formalistic differences, reveals the social conditions that enable and naturalize ecological devastation along the US/Mexico border. In other words, both Maquilapolis and Sleep Dealer irrevocably disturb conventional conceptualizations of gender, machines, borders, and their interconnectedness in matters of ecology. Analyzing these disparate films together discloses the way gender, machines, and borders are constituent components of ecosystems and our prospects for thinking and acting ecologically. We begin with key interrelated events that have resulted in unequal trade and labor relations between the USA and Mexico and culminated in the ongoing construction of a barrier along the US/Mexico border: the signing of the Bracero Program of 1942, the North American Free Trade Agreement of 1994, and the ongoing environmental justice movement along the US/Mexico border. The Bracero Program of 1942, a series of diplomatic agreements that responded to a shortage of cheap labor in the USA at the onset of US involvement in World War II, also resulted in the migration of an undocumented labor population across the border in search of work. This ‘‘illegal’’ migration had the effect of discursively and socioeconomically creating an exploitable Mexican surplus labor population in the USA, which later gave rise to historic labor unions such as the National Farm Laborers Union (NFLU) and Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC), and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).1 The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), a trilateral trade bloc inaugurated on January 1, 1994, ushered in a new set of trade relations in the Americas that relies on a static and cheap labor force in Mexico that assemble imported raw components into commodities, including TVs, radios, and other small electronic items. Some of the greatest long-term effects of NAFTA have to do with the environmental impact of the maquila industry on small Mexican cities along the US-Mexico border. These small cities are often unable and/or unwilling to cope with the influx of industrial expansion. Thus, unsuitable infrastructure and lax government regulation regarding chemical dumping in these areas result in the greatest ecological impacts. The struggle to improve these living conditions are depicted in Maquilapolis, where the Chilpancingo Collective for Environmental Justice’s community-led clean-up efforts of the Metales y Derivados toxic site reflect the concern of the ‘‘serious industrial pollution impacts of NAFTA. . .in the base metals sector’’ (Reinert & Roland-Holst, 2000, p. 5). Although not represented directly in the film, the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) and the Environmental Health Coalition’s Border Environmental Justice Campaign (EHC-BEJC) become two of the most significant organizations in support of the Chilpancingo Collective for Environmental Justice’s campaign for the clean-up of the Metales y Derivados toxic site. The Chilpancingo Colectivo’s struggle for environmental justice along the border is matched by a myriad of ongoing environmental struggles around climate change, land use, and industrial pollution and waste along the border. The Environmental Health Coalition’s report, Globalization at the Crossroads: Ten Years of NAFTA in the San Diego/Tijuana Border Region Report Summary, on the impact of free trade on local Mexican communities notes that ‘‘worker injury and illness rates are 250% higher in Mexico than in comparable U.S. factories’’ (p. 2), a trend in worker treatment that is mirrored by Mexican governmental disinterest in the working conditions of the factories themselves since ‘‘Mexico’s spending on pollution monitoring and factory inspections is down 45% since 1994 [and] only 5% of companies required to report industrial toxic discharges do so in Mexico’’ (p. 2). Finally, the ‘‘66 documented toxic dumps along the border’’ (Report Summary, p. 2) point to the interrelated processes by which worker livelihood in the maquila system is interrelated with worker life outside the maquila factories in Mexico. As both Maquilapolis and Sleep Dealer illustrate, life along the border is economically and ecologically precarious. In the next section we articulate the concept of ecotone as a methodological intervention into ecocriticism, and the following sections apply an ecotone approach to the intersections of ecology, the machine, and gender in these border films. A reason that both Sleep Dealer and Maquilapolis invoke a multi-scaled ecotone approach is that they are border films of the Global South, a cinema that is different from, yet in conversation with, the Hollywood industry. Both have transnational production histories with independent financial backing and relatively low budgets that blur conventional boundaries of the nation-states and the film industries involved. They explicitly negotiate the Tijuana-to-San Diego region of the US/Mexico border, an ecotone where the boundaries of two nations meet and where the relative wealth and prosperity of San Diego comes into contact with the environmental hazards and unsafe working conditions of Tijuana. Sleep Dealer also disturbs generic frontiers as its director Alex Rivera has suggested: ‘‘To think about the future is to open up a space of possibility and it’s something that has never happened in science fiction cinema in the Global South’’ (Guillen, 2008). The film represents the future from the perspective of the Global South that figures systemic inequities through the genre of science fiction. Here the future does not idealistically erase national boundaries, but it is seen to continue systematic reinforcement of disparate access to resources. Furthermore, the US/Mexico border setting situates these films in historically contested ecotones involving land and labor, capital, people, trade, and resources. As such, these films participate in a geographic-cinematic ecotone that includes texts like Why Braceros? and Salt of the Earth, both of which engendered lasting controversies about labor, land as private property, and the selective permeability of national boundaries. Unlike those films that speak to labor migration and nation-building disenfranchisement, however, Maquilapolis and Sleep Dealer depict labor forces whose human bodies do not cross the border even as they participate in transnational economic exchanges. Let us consider the production history of Maquilapolis as a collaboration between filmmakers Vicky Funari and Sergio De La Torre, and promotoras from Grupo Factor X, the Chilpancingo Collective for Environmental Justice, and Women’s Rights Advocates, and how this might itself be ecotonal. The film brings together Tijuana maquila workers, grassroots labor, and environmental community organizers/promotoras from the USA and Mexico. The official film website notes that this bilateral process ‘‘embraces subjectivity as a value and a goal’’ in the efforts of not replicating the top-down approach to the production of value and information, or the bottom-up approach to the production of labor. The website adds that ‘‘this collaborative process breaks with the traditional documentary practice of dropping into a location, shooting and leaving with the ‘goods,’ which would only repeat the pattern of the maquiladora itself’’ (Funari & de la Torre, 2006a). Thus, the film was made with equitable input from all those involved and without the attitude that enables ‘‘natural resources,’’ including human beings, to be exploited and abandoned.

#### This is key to unlock a broader worldview which politicizes and challenges the dominant notions environmental policy – only by disrupting the current paradigm of ecological management can we truly embrace a pragmatic approach necessary for sustainability and value

Reitan, 98 – PhD, Philosophy Professor at Oklahoma State University, an award-winning scholar and writer, peer reviewed (Eric, “Pragmatism, Environmental World Views, and Sustainability”, Electric Green Journal, UCLA Library, 1;9, Article 11)ahayes

Over the last several years, there has been an emerging discussion among environmental philosophers over the question of whether philosophical pragmatism can have a place of value in the environmental movement. Pragmatism is the distinctively American philosophical school which, roughly, holds that our ideas, theories, and worldviews should be examined and evaluated in the light of their impact on lived experience, according to how well they enable us to maneuver through experience successfully. Some worry that pragmatism’s tendency to root all values in subjective human experience undercuts the environmentalist’s claim that all of us ought to care about nature, because nature has an intrinsic value independent of the human activity of valuing**.** (Katz 1987) Others insist that pragmatism’s tendency to view individuals as inextricably connected to their field of experience--to their environment--can serve as the basis for environmental concern. (Parker 1996) What has not been explicitly noted in these discussions is that one of the key ideas advocated in current environmental theory--specifically, the idea that the contemporary consumerist worldview is largely to blame for our current environmental crisis, and any solution to that crisis must be driven by a change in worldview-- is itself an essentially pragmatic idea. I would like to explore the significance of this fact for those environmental theorists who embrace this idea. My suggestion is that, while not committed to all the traditional aspects of philosophical pragmatism, theorists who insist on the importance of cultivating a new worldview are implicitly committing themselves to some core pragmatic principles, and that the environmental movement will be strengthened by paying explicit attention to these principles and what they mean for environmental theory and practice. The Environmentalist Push for a New Worldview One of the most recurring themes in contemporary environmental theory is the idea that, in order to create a sustainable human society embedded in a flourishing natural environment, we need to change how we think about our relationship with nature. A simple change in public policy is not enough. Modest social changes--such as increased use of public transportation or a growing commitment to recycling--are not enough. Nor is environmental education that stresses the dangers of current practices and the prudence of caring for the earth. Even appeals to moral duty--obligations to future generations and to the fellow creatures with whom we share the planet--are insufficient**.** What is needed is a change in our worldview. More specifically, we need to change our view of nature and of our relationship with nature. Again and again, environmental thinkers press home this point. Aldo Leopold, one of the seminal figures of the environmental movement, advocates the adoption of a "land ethic" which "changes the role of Homo sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to just plain member of it." (Leopold 1949) Deep ecologists such as Arne Naess advocate a process of deep questioning of our basic assumptions about nature and our relationship to nature, and they argue that unless we move away from "anthropocentric" conceptions of nature, and towards a more ecocentric view which accords value to all parts of the ecosphere, we will not want to do the things which need to be done to live sustainably in the natural world. (Naess 1988) Fritjof Capra, a research physicist and environmentalist, holds that the hope of the earth lies in a "new vision of reality," a "new ecological paradig**m**" currently emerging among scientists, philosophers, and other thinkers--one which views humans as part of a larger, interrelated whole. (Capra 1987) Thomas Berry insists that "to be viable, the human community must move from its present anthropocentric norm to a geocentric norm of reality and value." (Berry 1987) Psychologist Chellis Glendinning believes that Western culture imposes on us a mechanistic worldview that is fundamentally unsatisfying, leading to a "Techno-Addiction" that can be overcome only if we "integrate into our lives a new philosophy" that is "earth-based, ecological, and indigenous." (Glendinning 1992) While not all environmentalists embrace this clamoring for a new worldview, the trend is clear and unmistakable. Driving this trend is a growing suspicion that the prevailing modern worldview--a consumerist vision of life which denigrates nature to the status of property--is largely responsible for inspiring the unsustainable social and individual practices which threaten the health of our planet and ourselves. Thus, the only viable path to sustainability is the adoption of a new, environmentally friendly worldview. The Pragmatic Basis of Environmentalism The fundamental assumption here is that there exists an essential link between our outlook on the world and our behavior, one so strong that how we look at the world--our worldview--will largely determine what we do. The fundamental justification for changing our worldview, then, is that making such a change is the only realistic way to sufficiently change our harmful behavior. Anyone at all familiar with the history of American philosophy will recognize this assumption, and its concomitant justification of the environmental agenda, as essentially pragmatic--by which I mean that this mode of thinking received a central place in the American philosophical school known as pragmatism. In his 1906 lectures on pragmatism, William James (one of the central figures in American philosophical pragmatism) opened his remarks with the following quote from G.K. Chesterton: There are some people--and I am one of them--who think that the most practical and important thing about a man is still his view of the universe. We think that for a landlady considering a lodger it is important to know his income, but still more important to know his philosophy. We think that for a general about to fight an enemy it is important to know the enemy’s numbers, but still more important to know the enemy’s philosophy. We think the question is not whether the theory of the cosmos affects matters, but whether in the long run anything else affects them. (James 1991) The principle here, embraced by James as a starting point for his discussion of philosophical pragmatism, is that our worldview (or overall philosophy) has more direct impact on how we live our lives than any other single thing. And it is this principle which undergirds the current trend in environmental philosophy: according to a plethora of environmentalists, the only realistic way to move from the current unsustainable practices in human society to genuinely sustainable ones is to abandon the worldview that drives our unsustainable consumerist lifestyle and replace it with a worldview that inspires a caring and nurturing relationship with nature. To this extent at least, the majority of environmental theorists writing today are pragmatic in the philosophical sense. But if the ultimate justification for a shift in worldviews is pragmatic in this sense, then the various candidates for an "environmentally friendly" worldview should be evaluated in terms of their pragmatic effect, and the theoretic discussions that emerge among these rival worldviews should be mediated by pragmatic considerations. It is here that pragmatic philosophy can be especially helpful to environmentalism, by way of giving us criteria for evaluating worldviews and mediating theoretic discussions in terms of their pragmatic significance. Pragmatic Criteria for Evaluating Worldviews There are two principal pragmatic criteria for evaluating worldviews, both of which are articulated by James in his lectures on pragmatism. The first is what I will call the Criterion of Meaning, and it is expressed by James as the "pragmatic method," in the following way: The pragmatic method... is to try to interpret each notion by tracing its respective practical consequences. What difference would it practically make to any one if this notion rather than that notion were true? If no practical difference whatever can be traced, then the alternatives mean practically the same thing, and all dispute is idle. Whenever a dispute is serious, we ought to be able to show some practical difference that must follow from one side or the other’s being right. (James 1991) In short, the meaning of a worldview is to be evaluated in terms of the way of life which it tends to produce. From the standpoint of environmental philosophy, which calls for new worldviews in order to promote a harmonious relationship between humanity and nature, this criterion asks us to examine explicitly the effects of alternative worldviews on the sustainability of human-natural systems, and to distinguish them according to their practical impact on these systems. If two environmental worldviews have the same impact on the humannature relationship, they have the same environmental meaning (although they may have a different meaning in some other sphere of human endeavor). The second pragmatic criterion, what I will call the Criterion of Truth, is expressed by James in his pragmatic account of truth, in the following way: (Truth) means ... nothing but this, that ideas ... become true just in so far as they help us to get into satisfactory relations with other parts of our experience.... (James 1991) In other words, the ultimate test of a worldview’s truth is how well it enables us to function in the world of experience--not only how well it enables us to passively interpret our experience in a consistent way, but also how well it guides us through the active dimension of our lives. When evaluating a worldview, we must evaluate how well it works out in lived experience. Does it enable us to sustainably act in ways that are compatible with the dictates of the worldview itself and the rest of our experience? For example, a worldview which defines success as the accumulation of material wealth might be viewed as self-defeating, and hence false, if the pursuit of wealth destroys the natural resources on which wealth-accumulation depends. A worldview that cannot be lived out without running into contradictions or--as in the case above--without undermining the very preconditions for the possibility of living it out, is pragmatically false. (It is worth noting that according to this pragmatic criterion of truth, the label of "truth" is never final, since a belief that works in one experiential setting might no longer work given the advent of new experiences.) The Pragmatic Failure of the Modern Worldview Implicit in the widespread critique of the modern worldview is the observation that it has proven itself to be pragmatically false. While the modern consumerist worldview may have "worked" in the past, at least to some degree, it does not work anymore. The approaching environmental crisis can be solved only if we begin to act in ways that bring us into harmony with the ecosystems around us. We can realize such harmony only if we stop consuming more than nature can replenish--but the modern worldview defines success in terms of consumption, and thus inspires ever-increasing rates of resource depletion. We can find such harmony only if we stop contaminating natural systems more quickly than those systems can cleanse themselves--but the modern view of happiness is directly tied to the technological and industrial artifacts that are largely responsible for that contamination. We are likely to find such harmony only if harmony really matters to us--but the modern worldview is built upon a paradigm of dominating nature, of transforming and controlling nature to suit human preferences, not on realizing harmony with it. From this pragmatic framework, then, environmentalists are right to critique the prevailing modern worldview. The practical meaning of this worldview is activity that radically transforms the ecosphere, constructing human communities and habitats that are isolated from natural ecosystems and which disrupt not only the local ecosystems which they about, but also the atmosphere and hence the whole planet. That such practices are unsustainable is clear from the growing preponderance of scientific evidence. Human beings evolved in the natural environment that we are presently transforming. We evolved to be dependent upon that natural environment for our physical as well as psychological sustenance. Our actions amount to a destruction of much upon which we depend, and are therefore self-defeating in a very straight-forward way. The worldview that impels such actions is therefore pragmatically false. What I would like to do here is demonstrate, by way of an example, the value of pragmatic principles not only for the critique of the modern worldview, but also for guiding the on-going process of developing new, environmentally friendly alternatives. Perhaps the most useful role of pragmatism for current environmental philosophy lies in its capacity to identify which theoretic debates really matter, and to mediate these debates in terms of shared pragmatic goals--in particular, the goal of cultivating sustainable human-natural systems. With the urgency of the current environmental crisis, we cannot afford to get bogged down in theoretic disputes that mask a common mission and get in the way of making the practical changes that are so pressing.

#### Voting aff is an endorsement of a system which values more than exclusively the human

Weston 9 (Anthony, “The incompleat eco-philosopher p. 11-13 <http://esotericonline.net/docs/library/Philosophy/Environmental%20philosophy/Ethics/Weston%20-%20The%20Incompleat%20Eco-Philosopher.%20Essays%20from%20the%20Edges%20of%20Environmental%20Ethics%20(2009).pdf)>

One problem, I argue, is that in an unnoticed but also almost tautological sense, this project remains ineradicably human-centered, despite its generous intentions. Not only is our standing never in question, but moral standing is extended to others by analogy to our own precious selves: to animals, maybe, on the grounds that they suffer as we do. But here is the most fundamental worry: Can an ethic of relationship actually remain so monocentric, homogeneous, single-featured? Might we not even wonder whether monocentrism almost by defi nition militates against real relationship? The eco-theologian Thomas Berry has declared that the essential task of environmental ethics is “to move from a world of objects to a community of subjects.” Berry’s almost Buberian language of subject-hood is not much heard in the environmental ethics we know. The phrase may call us up short. A true community of subjects must be an interacting whole of distinctive, nonhomogenized parts, in which no one set of members arrogates to themselves alone the right to gate-keep or even merely to welcome, however generously, moral newcomers. We are all “in” to start with. Thus Berry might be read as calling not merely for an alternative to anthropocentrism but for an alternative to the entire homogenizing framework of “centrism” itself. And this invitation, arguably, has very little to do with the received project of “expanding the circle” of moral consideration. What we actually need is a vision of multiple “circles,” including the whole of the world from the start. What I propose to call multicentrism thus envisions a world of irreducibly diverse and multiple centers of being and value—not one single moral realm, however expansive, but many realms, as particular as may be, partly overlapping, each with its own center. Human “circles,” then, do not necessarily invite expansion or extension, but rather augmentation and addition. In a similar pluralistic vein, William James challenges us to imagine this world not as a universe but as a “multiverse,” and thus a world that calls for (and, we might hope, calls forth) an entirely different set of skills—even, perhaps, something more like improvisation and etiquette, once again, in the all-too-serious place usually accorded ethics. Certainly it would have to be a world in which etiquette is in play: where collective understandings are negotiated rather than devised and imposed, however sympathetically, by one group of participants on the others. Introduction 13 All of these themes, I believe, are emerging from a wide variety of work both within and outside academic environmental ethics. My own emerging emphasis on the responsiveness of the world, and correspondingly how much a responsive world can be reduced by unresponsiveness on the other side; Cheney’s insistence on the constitutive role of what he calls “bioregional narrative,” co-constituted between human and more-than-human; our mutual friend Tom Birch’s argument for “universal consideration,” according to which moral “consideration” itself must, of necessity, keep itself considerately and carefully open to everything (there’s universality for you!). Many strands in ecofeminism, from a persistent and overdue attention to actual patterns and failures of human-animal relationships to Val Plumwood’s incisive exposure of the whole seamy conceptual underpinnings of “centering,” whether it be on and by males or Europeans or humans as a whole. Thomas Berry, David Abram, Gary Snyder, Paul Shepard, Sean Kane, and many others, cited and drawn upon in this paper, all speak of the human relation to nature in terms of negotiation and covenant rather than the philosophical unilateralism we have learned to expect. There is a movement here, in short: much more than a collection of scattered, hard-to-categorize complaints and idiosyncratic, extraphilosophical views, but a shared alternative vision of the world—and of the tasks of anything rightly called an “environmental ethic.” “Multicentrism” is not the perfect name for it—the chapter explores this problem too—but for the moment I think it will have to do.

#### The role of the ballot is to establish a relationship to Mexico’s ecosystem

Castello and Toledo 2k (Alicia Castello and Victor M Toledo; "Applying ecology in the Third World: the case of Mexico." BioScience 50.1 (2000): 66-76; google scholar; KDUB)

The establishment of efficient communication between research institutions and the sectors directly involved in the management of ecosystems will not, by itself, lead to improved ecosystem management and solutions to envi-ronmental problems. Solutions will be found only through new approaches to policy setting and decision making that consider what the different social sectors have to say. Governmental bodies, nongovernmental organizations, international agencies that fund research and action projects, research institutions, and rural producers all need to network and collaborate in the search for solutions. Particularly in the context of Third World countries, a change is needed in the way in which scientific activities are organized and evaluated. It is important to promote a science that, in addition to nurturing humans' under-standing of the natural world (which is of extreme importance in both cultural and utilitarian terms), also contributes more directly to solving problems. This approach to science should originate from the recognition that the function of science is not limited to the production of new knowledge but also includes its transmission, exchange, and use. The challenge of promoting this new approach to science involves whole institutions more than individual efforts. In the last decade, some ecologists have asked the scientific community to change the academic reward system to promote communication with wider audiences. Such was the message of a recent letter by several internationally recognized ecologists (Bazzaz et al. 1998), who referred strongly to the relevant role of individual ecologists. It is essential to start thinking in terms of accomplishment of goals by institutions, particularly regarding the fulfillment of their social responsibility. For science to have a relevant impact on the way human societies relate to ecosystems, institutional mechanisms must be devel¬oped that allow the participation of all professional scien¬tists—those generating the knowledge and those working on its transformation, transmission, exchange, and use. The environmental crisis is in grave need of solutions, and society as a whole—especially ecologists and their institu¬tions—must keep reacting and responding to the urgent calls from the world's reality.

**Furthermore, investigating anthropocentric assumptions is critical to formulate a productive pedagogy**

Bell and Russell 2K (Anne C. by graduate students in the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University and Constance L. a graduate student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Beyond Human, Beyond Words: Anthropocentrism, Critical Pedagogy, and the Poststructuralist Turn, http://www.csse-scee.ca/CJE/Articles/FullText/CJE25-3/CJE25-3-bell.pdf)//RSW

So far, however, such queries in critical pedagogy have been limited by their neglect of the ecological contexts of which students are a part and of relationships extending beyond the human sphere. The gravity of this oversight is brought sharply into focus by writers interested in environ-mental thought, particularly in the cultural and historical dimensions of the environmental crisis. For example, Nelson (1993) contends that our inability to acknowledge our human embeddedness in nature results in our failure to understand what sustains us. We become inattentive to our very real dependence on others and to the ways our actions affect them. Educators, therefore, would do well to draw on the literature of environ-mental thought in order to come to grips with the misguided sense of independence, premised on freedom from nature, that informs such no-tions as “empowerment.” Further, calls for educational practices situated in the life-worlds of students go hand in hand with critiques of disembodied approaches to education. In both cases, **critical pedagogy challenges the liberal notion of education whose sole aim is the development of the individual, rational mind** (Giroux, 1991, p. 24; McKenna, 1991, p. 121; Shapiro, 1994). Theorists draw attention to the importance of nonverbal discourse (e.g., Lewis & Simon, 1986, p. 465) and to the somatic character of learning (e.g., Shapiro, 1994, p. 67), both overshadowed by the intellectual authority long granted to rationality and science (Giroux, 1995; Peters, 1995; S. Taylor, 1991). Describing an “emerging discourse of the body” that looks at how bodies are represented and inserted into the social order, S. Taylor (1991) cites as examples the work of Peter McLaren, Michelle Fine, and Philip Corrigan. A complementary vein of enquiry is being pursued by environmental researchers and educators critical of the privileging of science and abstract thinking in education. They understand learning to be mediated not only through our minds but also through our bodies. Seeking to acknowledge and create space for sensual, emotional, tacit, and communal knowledge, they advocate approaches to education grounded in, for example, nature experience and environmental practice (Bell, 1997; Brody, 1997; Weston, 1996). Thus, whereas both critical pedagogy and environmental education offer a critique of disembodied thought, one draws attention to the ways in which the body is situated in culture (Shapiro, 1994) and to “the social construction of bodies as they are constituted within discourses of race, class, gender, age and other forms of oppression” (S. Taylor, 1991, p. 61). The other emphasizes and celebrates our embodied relatedness to the more-than-human world and to the myriad life forms of which it is comprised (Payne, 1997; Russell & Bell, 1996). Given their different foci, each stream of enquiry stands to be enriched by a sharing of insights. Finally, with regard to the poststructuralist turn in educational theory, ongoing investigations stand to greatly enhance a revisioning of environ-mental education. A growing number of environmental educators question the empirical-analytical tradition and its focus on technical and behavioural aspects of curriculum (A. Gough, 1997; Robottom, 1991). **Advocating more interpretive, critical approaches, these educators contest the discursive frameworks** (e.g., positivism, empiricism, rationalism) **that mask the values, beliefs, and assumptions underlying information, and thus the cultural and political dimensions of the problems being considered** (A. Gough, 1997; Huckle, 1999; Lousley, 1999). Teaching about ecological processes and environmental hazards in a supposedly objective and rational manner is understood to belie the fact that knowledge is socially constructed and therefore partial (A. Gough, 1997; Robertson, 1994; Robottom, 1991; Stevenson, 1993). N. Gough (1999) explicitly goes beyond critical approaches to advocate poststructuralist positions in environmental education. He asks science and environmental educators to adopt skepticism towards metanarratives, an attitude that characterizes poststructuralist discourses. Working from the assumption that science and environmental education are story-telling practices, he suggests that the adequacy of narrative strategies be examined in terms of how they represent and render problematic “human trans-actions with the phenomenal world” (N. Gough, 1993, p. 607). Narrative strategies, he asserts, should not create an illusion of neutrality, objectivity, and anonymity, but rather draw attention to our kinship with nature and to “the personal participation of the knower in all acts of understanding” (N. Gough, 1993, p. 621). We contend, of course, that Gough’s proposal should extend beyond the work of science and environmental educators. The societal narratives that legitimize the domination of nature, like those that underlie racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, and so on, merit everyone’s concern. And since the ecological crisis threatens especially those most marginalized and vulnerable (Running-Grass, 1996; D. Taylor, 1996), proponents of critical pedagogy in particular need to come to terms with the humancentred frameworks that structure their endeavours. No doubt poststructuralist theory will be indispensable in this regard. Nevertheless, **anthropocentric assumptions about language, meaning, and agency will need to be revisited**. In the meantime, perhaps we can ponder the spontaneous creativity of spiders and the life-worlds of woodticks. Such wondrous possibilities should cause even the most committed of humanists to pause for a moment at least.

#### Even the incremental can inform our political decisions

Hirokawa 2 Keith Hirokawa, J.D. from the University of Connecticut and LL.M. from the Northwestern School of Law, 2002 (“Some Pragmatic Observations About Radical Critique In Environmental Law,” *Stanford Environmental Law Journal*, Volume 21, June, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

Changes in each instance create entirely new contexts in which more (or less) progressive arguments find a hold. Every time a change occurs, even if it is incremental or ostensibly seems benign, the change creates a new context within which an entirely new set of possibilities will arise. n230 The pragmatist therefore evaluates progress by the distance a new idea causes practices to move away from past practices and paradigms. The difference between the pragmatic version of progress and the Kuhnian version is one only of degree. In the end, the results of both versions of progress are the same - we look back at the change and realize that earlier ideas do not make sense anymore. The effectiveness of the pragmatic approach lies in the simple realization that, in adopting an innovative approach to a legal question, courts will find comfort in adopting what appears to be an incremental change, rather than a radical paradigmatic shift. In [\*278] contrast to radical theorists that deny the existence of progress because of a failure to immediately reach the radical goals of alternative paradigms, the pragmatist recognizes that a series of incremental changes eventually add up. Environmental pragmatism enables environmentalists to seek achievable gains by focusing on minor improvements in the law that incrementally close the gap between the values that pre-existed current environmental law and the alternative paradigms of environmental protection.

#### Focusing on alternative causes and mechanisms results in political deadlock and ecological destruction

Lichatowich 1 (James, Masters in Fishery Science from Oregon State University, former Marine, Assistant Chief of Fisheries, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Board Member of the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB), “Salmon Without Rivers: A History Of The Pacific Salmon Crisis”, pp 1-7, google books; Tara)

Solving the salmon’s problem has proven difficult because their extensive migrations create an ideal situation for obfuscation. Each industry, institution, or individual that contributes to the salmon’s depletion at some place in their extended ecosystem can readily point to some other industry, institution, or individual that affects the salmon at some other place in their ecosystem as the cause of the problem. For the last half-century, the salmon’s rapid decline has generated endless attempts to shift blame and prompted disingenuous evasion. Because the depletion is the cumulative effect of many human activities over a wide geographic area, proof that absolves or implicates a particular factor is impossible to obtain. Though it has sparked debate and study, the misguided search for a singular cause of salmon decline has wasted a great deal of time, effort, and money. More important, it accomplishes little in solving the salmon’s problem, which has truly become everyone’s problem. The people of the Pacific Northwest must answer some important questions: Do they value the salmon enough to restore habitat and pull the fish back from the brink of extinction? Are they willing to save the salmon even if it means changing the way the industrial economy uses the region’s land and water? And if they are not willing to make the necessary changes, will a Pacific Northwest without salmon retain its appeal as a high-quality environment for people?

#### **Catastrophe is a political device used to silence and oppress**

Bryant 11 (Levi, Prof of Philosophy at Collins College, july 26, The Scandal of Political Realism, <http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2011/07/26/the-scandal-of-political-realism/>)

It’s no wonder that realism has such a bad name. It has perpetually been ruined by political realism. Political realism has always been that despicable ideology whose name is necessity. It has always functioned at the behest of inegalitarian social arrangements, justifying one more way deny people their voice and to expropriate their goods. On the one hand it strives to regulate bodies in such a way that only some bodies are entitled to have a say, to govern, to rule, to lead, while others are relegated to silence and, above all, invisibility. Political realism is here a mechanism designed to render invisible voice and other social entities. The political realist always says “listen to those in the know”– usually oligarchs or servants of oligarchs –”they are naturally superior, they have your best interests at heart!” Speaking against the masters becomes pure folly. The voice of those that protest, that refuse the “wisdom” of the masters, is immediately coded as animal noise without reason that only “emotes”. We can think here of the difference between how the medical establishment treated hysterics before and after Freud. Prior to Freud, the hysteric was to be dismissed, to be denied voice, to be relegated to the irrational. After Freud the hysteric is to be listened to as articulating a wrong and a breach in the order of identifications. Political realism strives to silence the hysteric, claiming that their voice is no voice at all, that that voice comes from no place of knowledge or wisdom.¶ In this way, second, the political realist insures the smooth operation of exploitation and oppression. If the voice of the hysteric (the protester, the activist) is successfully silenced, then they never have a place in the process of deliberation. Their vantage need never enter into the calculus of forming ways of life, bodies, rankings, countings, etc. The oligarch and servant of the oligarch always claims that he knows what’s really best for such and such a body. That body, of course, is no longer consulted, nor is it allowed to participate in any way. Like the patients in older systems of psychiatry that are never consulted but which are subjected to everything from forced medication to electro-shock therapy to lobotomy, this part is everywhere regulated by the state, by the masters, by the oligarchs– and “for their own good” –without having any say in it. Political realism always strives for this refusal of voice. The voice of this uncounted part is reduced to mere emoting, ignorance, stupidity, lack of tactical understanding, etc., etc., etc. It’s infantalized and animalized. Of course, here the animal is the example par excellence of the voice denied voice; of the voice reduced to a grunt. The animal is what we all are within the statist framework of political realism. It is in this way that exploitation and oppression proceeds apace. The animal becomes entirely invisible, or rather reduced to a code that’s already managed by the regime of the oligarch… It is reduced to a voice that has always already spoken and been understood; which is to say that it has been reduced to what the oligarch believes the animal to be saying. As such, it is inapparent.¶ Yet the “animal” must still be convinced. This is the most despicable gesture of the political realist. The political realist naturalizes the contingent organization of the social order, perpetually arguing that this the only that can and does exist. By virtue of this effacement of the contingency of this order, by virtue of the naturalization of this order and the identities that populate it, the “animal” must accept austerity foisted on its back because the alternative is “worse”, the animal must accept second class status as a woman, a latino, a black person, a queer, a worker, etc., because the alternative is “worse”. The mechanism always consists in creating a false dilemma between catastrophe and exploitation and oppression. To avoid the former, the political realist hopes to persuade the animal to accept the latter. Of course, this deadlock only proceeds through the denial of voice to the animal, a voice which opens the possibility of different distributions of the social than those that currently reign. ¶

Any praxis that disregards anthropocentrism is doomed to failure

LEE, ‘06 (Wendy Lynne, “On Ecology and Aesthetic Experience: A Feminist Theory of Value and Praxis”, *Ethics & the Environment* 11.1 (2006) 21-41, accessed through Project MUSE, September 19, 2011, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics\_and\_the\_environment/v011/11.1lee.html)

**In light of what we now know about the intimacy of the relationships between human beings, nonhuman animals, and ecological systems, any praxis—feminist or otherwise—that does not take this intimacy seriously is destined to fail in its emancipatory quest**. **Freedom has no meaning outside the endeavour to free those others who, in virtue of their capacity for labor, their vulnerability, and/or their consumability, have sustained much of Western culture, including Western feminism. This is not to say that freedom comes packaged in some universally accessible form; it does not**. Indeed, one of our tasks is to reevaluate just what this family resemblance term means for a new century whose own distinct characteristics cannot fail to influence our pursuit of happiness. Among these distinct characteristics, however, is a far greater and more globally accessible knowledge about how this pursuit affects the welfare of nonhuman animals and ecological systems; hence **whatever luxury we may have had with respect to defining freedom solely in terms of human welfare is clearly vanquished in the recognition that an emancipation whose**
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#### Voting aff affirms rhizomatic thinking, we access a better internal link to solving their k

Carruthers 7 (David V. Carruthers; “Environmental justice and the politics of energy on the US–Mexico border”; Environmental Politics Volume 16, Issue 3, 2007; pages 394-413; KDUB)

A central demand of all environmental justice movements is greater political participation (Hunold & Young, 1998; Schlosberg, 2003). Affected communities suffer ‘procedural injustice’ when excluded from the decisions that determine environmental siting and risk. This participatory aspiration is expressed in Mexico in a strong, populist organisational infrastructure, taking the form of dozens of networks on environmental, labour, gender, community health, human rights, and other social justice concerns (Bandy, 1997; Brooks & Fox, 2002). The border reflects a broader regional trend of growth in popular movements demanding greater political voice in all matters of social justice (Alvarez et al., 1998; Lievesley, 1999; Eckstein & Wickham-Crowley, 2003). Strong, diverse traditions of education, organisation, and networking are built into the Latin American popular experience, presenting an established lattice on which justice and environment narratives thrive. David Schlosberg explores the pluralistic character of the environmental justice movement movement with reference to Deleuze & Guattari’s rhizome metaphor (1987: 7–8, 25). Rhizomes are a type of root system that spread underground in all directions; rather than producing a single stalk, they sprout in multiple locations, connecting in ways that are not always visible from above (Schlosberg, 1999: 96, 120). This is an apt metaphor for social movement networking in Latin America, where generations of activists learned to work beneath the surface during the dark years of military dictatorships and authoritarian regimes. As environmental consciousness and activism have exploded across a democratising Latin America, they continue to spread in this ‘rhizomatic’ fashion among multiple networks, demonstrating connection, heterogeneity, and multiplicity. Thus, a diverse mosaic of existing popular struggles takes on an unmistakably environmental cast throughout Latin America: urban popular movements organise and educate to confront pressing environmental health hazards, alongside traditional issues of education, land titles, crime, and public services. Women’s movements are remapping social relations, in human rights, community health, labour, and other justice movements; women lead environmental justice campaigns precisely because of threats to households, workplaces, and children’s health. Independent labour movements struggle to secure basic rights and protections, including resistance to toxic exposures in substandard workplaces. Academic activism has a strong tradition in Latin America, spawning generations of ‘organic intellectuals’ with one foot in the academy and another in the activist community, leading, supporting, and lending technical expertise. Indigenous rights struggles are a powerful catalyst to mobilisation, as native communities battle the forces that threaten to fragment, displace, and drive them toward cultural disintegration. Campesino (small farmer) rights struggles have likewise been a pillar of political participation in rural Latin America, where spoiled landscapes, poisoned watersheds, agricultural chemicals, and other environmental problems now share the platform with traditional peasant issues like land, credit, and commodity prices. Human rights activism and legislation increasingly incorporate ‘environmental rights’ as a component of human rights. The popular church of liberation theology has also been a powerful force in the struggle for social justice in Latin America, linking environmental stewardship to human rights and equity.

#### They have it backwards-- failing to plan is planning to fail

**Macy ‘95**

Macy, General Systems Scholar, 1995 (Joanna, Ecopsychology)

Macy 1995 (Joanna, general systems scholar and deep ecologist, Ecopsychology)

There is also the superstition that negative thoughts are self-fulfilling. This is of a piece with the notion, popular in New Age circles, that we create our own reality I have had people tell me that “to speak of catastrophe will just make it more likely to happen.” Actually, the contrary is nearer to the truth. Psychoanalytic theory and personal experience show us that it is precisely what we repress that eludes our conscious control and tends to erupt into behavior. As Carl Jung observed, “When an inner situation is not made conscious, it happens outside as fate.” But ironically, in our current situation, the person who gives warning of a likely ecological holocaust is often made to feel guilty of contributing to that very fate.

#### And their alternative is little more than an irresponsible escape from material reality—hollowing out all organisms in order to make way for conceptual space

**Protevi ‘7**

**John Protevi, Louisiana State University, Review: Peter Hallward’s *Out of This World*, Notre Dame Philosophy Review 3/3/2007**

In support of his thesis, Hallward's book has a two-fold structure that follows what he claims is the way reality folds for Deleuze along the line of the virtual / actual distinction. In the first three chapters he follows the creative virtual spark into the actual, into creatural "confinement." The book then pivots, and the last three chapters follow the arc of Hallward's reading of Deleuze's term "counter-effectuation": the move away from actual creatural confinement back to the virtual. Although counter-effectuation -- or the "extraction of the event" -- is not an annihilation of the creature, it is a "redemptive" move, Hallward claims, taking us "out of this world," as the book's title would have it. Deleuze seeks always, Hallward writes, "to subtract the dynamics of creation from the mediation of the created"; in this way, Deleuze supposedly seeks to show that "purely creative processes can only take place in a wholly virtual dimension" (3).  Provocatively, Hallward adds, "Deleuze is most appropriately read as a spiritual, redemptive or subtractive thinker . . . Deleuze's philosophy is oriented by lines of flight that lead out of the world; though not other-worldly, it is extra-worldly" (3; emphasis in original). Once again, Hallward is careful not to paint Deleuze as desiring the annihilation of the creature (4; 84-87) but rather its "self-transcendence," so that it may become "an adequate vehicle for the creating which sustains and transforms it" (6). This is done most purely in philosophical thought, where action and creation are one insofar as thought creates its own objects of thought. In such "abstract, immediate or dematerialized thought" (3-4), the creature is evacuated to let the creating work through it. In this way Deleuze "affirms the creative telos of thought in terms that invite comparison with what Spinoza called the 'intellectual love of God.' The subject of such thought or love is nothing other than infinite creativity or God himself, insofar as he thinks and loves through us" (2). (We will return to Hallward's use of the phrase "invite comparison with" and other similar rhetorical strategies, which closely associate while still distinguishing Deleuze from the theophantic tradition -- e.g., p. 5: "you are only really an individual if God (or something like God) makes you so".)

**Their alt makes action impossible** Hallward, 06 (Peter; Professor in the Centre for Research in Modern European Philosophy at Middlesex University-London, Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation, p. 162-4)

Deleuze writes a philosophy of (virtual) difference without (actual) others. He intuits a purely internal or self-differing difference, a difference that excludes any constitutive mediation between the differed. Such a philosophy precludes a distinctively relational conception of politics as a matter of course. The politics of the future are likely to depend less on virtual mobility than on more resilient forms of cohesion, on more principled forms of commitment, on more integrated forms of coordination, on more resistant forms of defence. Rather than align ourselves with the nomadic war machine, our first task should be to develop appropriate ways of responding to the newly aggressive techniques of invasion, penetration and occupation which serve to police the embattled margins of empire. In a perverse twist of fate, it may be that today in places like Palestine, Haiti and Iraq, the agents of imperialism have more to learn from Deleuzian rhizomatics than do their opponents. As we have repeatedly seen, the second corollary of Deleuze’s disqualification of actuality concerns the paralysis of the subject or actor. Since what powers Deleuze’s cosmology is the immediate differentiation of creation through the infinite proliferation of virtual creatings, the creatures that actualise these creatings are confined to a derivative if not limiting role. A creature’s own interests, actions or decisions are of minimal or preliminary significance at best: the renewal of creation always requires the paralysis and dissolution of the creature per se. The notion of a constrained or situated freedom, the notion that a subject’s own decisions might have genuine consequences -the whole notion, in short, of strategy - is thoroughly foreign to Deleuze’s conception of thought. Deleuze obliges us, in other words, to make an absolute distinction between what a subject does or decides and what is done or decided through the subject. By rendering this distinction absolute he abandons the category of the subject altogether. He abandons the decisive subject in favour of our more immediate subjection to the imperatives of creative life or thought. Deprived of any strategic apparatus, Deleuze’s philosophy thus combines the self-grounding sufficiency of pure force or infinite perfection with our symmetrical limitation to pure contemplation or in-action. On the one hand, Deleuze always maintains that ‘there are never any criteria other than the tenor of existence, the intensification of life’. Absolute life or creation tolerates no norm external to itself. The creative movement that orients us out of the world does not depend on a transcendent value beyond the world. After Spinoza, after Nietzsche, Deleuze rejects all forms of moral evaluation or strategic judgement. Every instance of decision, every confrontation with the question ‘what should we do?’, is to be resolved exclusively in terms of what we can do. An individual’s power or capacity is also its ‘natural right’, and the answer to the question of what an individual or body should do is again simplicity itself — it should go and will always go ‘as far as it can’ (WI~ 74; EP, 258). But on the other band, we know that an individual can only do this because its power is not that of the individual itself. By doing what it can, an individual only provides a vessel for the power that works through it, and which alone acts — or rather, which alone is. What impels us to ‘persevere in our being’ has nothing to do with us as such. So when, in the conclusion of their last joint project, Deleuze and Guattari observe that ‘vitalism has always bad two possible interpretations’, it is not surprising that they should opt for the resolutely in-active interpretation. Vitalism, they explain, can be conceived either in terms of ‘an Idea that acts but is not, and that acts therefore only from the point of view of an external cerebral knowledge; or of a force that is but does not act, and which is therefore a pure internal Feeling [sentir]’. Deleuze and Guattari embrace this second interpretation, they choose Leibnizian being over Kantian act, precisely because it disables action in favour of contemplation. It suspends any relation between a living and the lived, between a knowing and the known, between a creating and the created. They embrace it because what feeling ‘presents is always in a state of detachment in relation to action and even to movement, and appears as a pure contemplation without knowledge’.’8 As Deleuze understands it, living contemplation proceeds at an immeasurable distance from what is merely lived, known or decided. Life lives and creation creates on a virtual plane that leads forever out of our actual world. Few philosophers have been as inspiring as Deleuze. But those of us who still seek to change our world and to empower its inhabitants will need to look for our inspiration elsewhere.

The alternative will be coopted

ATTEBERRY ’03 (Jeffrey; Professor of Comparative Literature – University of California-Irvine, “Political Planomenon and the Secret Thereof,” Critical Horizons, v. 4 n. 2)

Given that philosophy is a process of metaphorisation, Derrida is deeply concerned with the rhetorical strategies and gestures that are at work within any thought. The rhetorical choices made by philosophers have a profound effect on how philosophical thought is received, on the way it will be interpreted, and the value it will assume in the process of exchange. As mentioned already, Derrida’s reservations are not with the content of Deleuze’s own thought, but with how his rhetorical practices will determine its reception. In other words, and as Derrida mentions in “I’ll have to wander all alone,” Derrida is not concerned with any particular ‘theses’. Rather, his reservations seem to address the question of rhetorical practices, gestures, and strategies. Given what Derrida refers to as their ‘near total affinity’ on such fundamental concerns as the liberation within philosophical thought of a “difference that is not reducible to dialectical opposition, a difference ‘more profound’ than a contradiction,” Derrida would most likely not be too quick to charge Deleuze with being entirely complicit with the metaphysics of presence, although Derrida would be the first to stress the degree to which all philosophical thinking remains caught within its closure. If anything, Derrida would surely recognise that Deleuze was among those philosophers, those of their ‘generation’, who most rigorously and trenchantly worked through such a closure. Derrida’s concern with rhetorical strategy, then, seems addressed to the process of reception and appropriation. As I hope to have shown, Deleuze’s conception of immanence does not articulate itself within the closure of the metaphysics of presence. By the same token, however, the rhetorical equivocity of ‘immanence’ would seem to expose him to a dangerous recuperation within a metaphysics of presence. As an example of why Derrida might have reason for his concerns, I would like to take a brief look at the work of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. In their collaborative projects such as Empire, both men make extensive use of a markedly Deleuzean rhetoric. Despite the sophistication of their work and its importance for our times, their appropriation of Deleuze’s rhetoric often seems to take place through a brutal literalisation of his terminology. Of course, Deleuze and Guattari’s own rhetorical practice, along with their continual declarations that their thought is not metaphorical, would seem to legitimate such a practice.40 Deleuze and Guattari may well have their own strategic reasons for making such claims. Their rejection of metaphor functions as a disavowal of the controlled difference that the philosophical metaphor has always put to work in view of liberating a deterritorialising difference that would not be reducible to the sets of determined oppositions that govern the philosophical use of metaphor. Nevertheless, Hardt and Negri’s reception and use of Deleuze’s rhetoric would seem to bear witness to an arrogant carelessness in face of the continued force of the most established philosophisms of the Western tradition. This force stems from the controlled difference at work within the philosophical metaphor and continues to dictate how Hardt and Negri appropriate Deleuze’s terminology. They do not hide their own arrogance in this regard. In Empire, for instance, one finds the stunning declaration that their ontology “does not risk repeating the old models of the metaphysical tradition, even the most powerful ones. In fact, every metaphysical tradition is now entirely worn out.”41 Rather than making such rash declarations, they would do well, good Marxists that they are, to bear in mind Althusser’s famous dictum that “those who are in ideology believe themselves by definition outside ideology.”42 Derrida, more than anyone, has continually reminded us of the continued ideological force of Western metaphysics, its white mythology. Derrida’s reservations concerning Deleuze’s rhetoric speak to the danger and ease of its ideological misappropriation.

### 2AC Ecoprag []

#### Eco-pragmatism avoids totalizing theory and allows solutions to the environmental issues of the squo

Hirokawa 2 (Keith Hirokawa, J.D. from the UConn and LL.M. from the Northwestern School of Law, 2002, "Some Pragmatic Observations About Radical Critique In Environmental Law," Stanford Environmental Law Journal, Volume 21, June; lexis; Kristof)

By rejecting commitments to theory, pragmatists are denied the benefit of having a justifying principle (such as free will, equality, utility, ecocentrism, etc.) under which they can rally support. However, what pragmatists lose by rejecting meta-theory they replace by widening the field of potential solutions. **Avoiding commitment to** a **substantive meta-theory frees the environmental thinker from worry about whether the solutions proposed for a given problem are consistent with an ultimate theoretical grounding**; that is, the pragmatist is not bound by deductive reasoning within the confines of any particular analytic scheme. Visionary reasoning becomes an eclectic array of possibilities, limited only by those contextual needs that make the inquiry important in the first place. The turn to pragmatism thus symbolizes a rejection of the alleged [\*251] relationship between theory and answers to practical questions. To the pragmatist, this rejection comes for very good reason. Competing conclusions can often be derived from the same incomplete set of premises, and divergent theories can often produce the same conclusions. Pragmatists redirect human inquiry to avoid the indeterminacy of theory, since the "knowledge of obstacles is not itself an obstacle unless it leads to defeatism; for pragmatists it serves as a spur to seek a way to overcome those obstacles." n118 In the final analysis, although theories are important, the pragmatist warns against theory commitments, because theories provide "no more than commentary on practice, based on premises drawn from that practice itself." n119 Accordingly, the pragmatic position against theory is not a broad, sweeping dismissal of every idea derived from a theoretical framework. n120 Rather, **the pragmatist is free to consider a variety of ideas, approaches and solutions without committing to particular theoretical foundations**. The method and strength of problem solving, n121 if not the purpose, is to ensure conversation participants [\*252] that their theories are duly considered. n122 **The resulting formation of policy is "inclusive, treating current theories as perspectives, each of which can add to the understanding of law**." n123 **Pragmatism**, then, **is a helpful tool** (especially **to environmental debate**) **because of its freedom from any particular method of inquiry and any particular metaphysical "good"** of society. For the pragmatist, **theories** "**are not** Euclidean axioms or Kantian categorical **imperatives, but** graffiti, **practical guidelines to be noticed** by the alertly street-wise **when context makes them applicable**." n124 **When unbounded by consistency** with or loyalty to any particular theory, **all relevant ideas become useful to the resolution** of a dilemma. The lesson from pragmatism is that to see the law as something more than a refined, yet interminably eclectic conglomerate of ideas, taken from all forms of social and cultural practices, would be to give too much credit to our insight into the nature of justice. The resulting amalgam - the plurality of perspectives arranged for inclusive discourse - is not mandated by pragmatism. n125 Nonetheless, since pragmatism is in its most useful capacity when put to the task of dispute resolution, pragmatism inevitably finds itself confronted with opposing and incompatible perspectives. A pragmatic conclusion is one in which those opposing and incompatible perspectives are represented. To this end, some pragmatists have tried to surmount the foundationalists' problem of theory-hope (that the right theory will supply the right solutions) by proposing pluralist perspectives to bridge the gaps between competing paradigms. Pluralism serves as a helpful model for pragmatism's [\*253] application. n126 In summary, pragmatic inquiry illustrates three main themes. First, **pragmatism embodies "anti-foundationalism" in that it** is not loyal to any particular substantive theory. Second, pragmatism **allows negotiation between** purportedly **uncompromising positions for the purpose of solving real problems, due** in large part **to its lack of dependency on any "truths" claimed** in these positions. Finally, particular theory determines the right answers to difficult questions. The **pragmatist uses these tools to transcend barriers between alternative perceptions by critically examining such perspectives to determine how each of them can be applied in a helpful, non-exclusive manner**. **These tools can be applied to debates over environmental protection, which were** above portrayed as **deadlocked dialogues between deeply held beliefs**. Below, the problems of frustrated belief are contrasted to examples of pragmatic environmentalism, verifying the potential benefits of legal pragmatism for advocates and judges engaged in environmental disputes.

#### Even if their ideas are good, their presentation fails. The perm frames the alt in a persuasive manner

Hirokawa 2 (Keith Hirokawa, J.D. from the UConn and LL.M. from the Northwestern School of Law, 2002, "Some Pragmatic Observations About Radical Critique In Environmental Law," Stanford Environmental Law Journal, Volume 21, June; lexis; Kristof)

**Pragmatism's success in** the **environmental debate is owed to its** [\*257] **understanding of the operation of context as a constraint on persuasion and discourse**. **Persuasion** between foundational theories **may result from the attempt to reconcile differing approaches**. **Pragmatists rely on a reconciliation-based description of how paradigms** and belief systems **transform in the face of competing paradigmatic structures**, n147 **in which new** problems, predictions and **solutions can be translated into an existing structure** of beliefs **by displacing the fewest other beliefs**. **Effective dialogue** on solutions espoused from otherwise incommensurable positions simply **requires** a touch of **flexibility toward traditional philosophical questions**. n148 **In applying this** maxim **to legal change, the lesson** to be learned from the pragmatist's understanding of paradigm shifts **is that revolutionary ideals can be presented in light of dominant beliefs,** rather than in spite of them.

#### Pragmatism can situate anthropocentrism within a dialogic forum. Totalizing critique cuts off any possibility of transcending cultural norms.

Hirokawa 2 (Keith Hirokawa, J.D. from the UConn and LL.M. from the Northwestern School of Law, 2002, "Some Pragmatic Observations About Radical Critique In Environmental Law," Stanford Environmental Law Journal, Volume 21, June; lexis; Kristof)

Recent decades have witnessed a resurgence of experiments in testing these limits of anthropocentrism. **The pragmatists**, in particular, **have set out to defend a human perspective that is not limited by anthropocentric interests**. n205 **They have found that human insights create a context in which environmentally protective doctrines come to light** in common terms and concepts. **Besides avoiding** some of the more **agitating epistemological debates, the** [\*272] **human perspective limits dialogue only to the extent of our ability to empathize and theorize**. **It is because humans are able to seek** both economic and **non-use values, while reconciling** the competing **ends, that the human perspective** is **demands attention.** Our **philosophical underpinnings may** in fact **be confined by our distinctively human perspective, but they are concurrently liberated by our sense of selves**, "**characterized** not so much **by** [**our**] ability to produce a culture but by [our] **ability to transcend** old **cultural forms**." n206

### 2AC Praxis first []

#### Your role as an academic is to evaluate conceptual approaches to environmental praxis

Schlosberg 13 (David Schlosberg; Environmental Politics Volume 22, Issue 1, 2013 Special Issue: Coming of Age? Environmental Politics at 21; “Theorising environmental justice: the expanding sphere of a discourse”; pages 37-55; KDUB)

Theory and movements: environmental justice discourse and praxis All of this, to me, illustrates how environmental justice in practice offers a rich form of politics and practice – one that academics in the field would do well to engage. One of the signature characteristics in much environmental justice scholarship has been a relationship between academic work and movement groups. The original articulation of an environmental justice movement came out of academic studies and conferences. The early history of the academic side of the movement was based on the work of Robert Bullard (1990, 1993) and early conferences, such as that organised by Bryant and Mohai (1992), that helped articulate and publicise findings of inequitable distribution of environmental goods and bads.14 The relationship between academic studies and the environmental justice movement has been integral to its development and growth, and its discourses, in the past three decades. Sze and London (2008) see this relationship as one of the continuing elements of reflection in the recent literature, and one of the promising trends in the field. In part, this relationship is about the idea of praxis – that theory and practice must inform each other (Sze and London 2008, p. 1347). As Holifield et al. (2010, p. 18) insist, there is ‘a need for environmental justice scholarship to actively work at its connections to activism and its engagement with those at the sharp end of injustice, however it is understood, and to bring theory to bear in meaningful ways into praxis and diverse forms of public engagement’. Theorising from movement experience works to expand our understanding of those movements; in return, those movements can and do inform theory in productive ways. There are numerous examinations of this intersection in the United States, from my own work on movement pluralism (Schlosberg 1999), to Di Chiro’s (2008) work on social reproduction in environment/feminist coalitions, to Sze et al’s (2010) examination of water politics in California, to the range of responses to community organising after Katrina (Bullard and Wright 2009). All of this illustrates the relationship between environmental justice as an academic idea and a social movement, to the benefit of each. This focus on the relationship between practice and theory has also been central to my attempts to understand the ‘justice’ of environmental justice (Schlosberg 2004, 2007). Many attempts to define environmental or climate justice have been too detached from the actual demands of social movements that use the idea as an organising theme or identity. This does assume that there is a value to movement practice – that theory can, and should, actually learn from the language, demands, and action of movements. Why, the more purist academic or sceptic might ask, should we prioritise what activists believe or do? But the question should not be about who is the best judge of a conception of justice – activists or theorists. The point is that different discourses of justice, and the various experiences and articulations of injustice, inform how the concept is used, understood, articulated, and demanded in practice; the engagement with what is articulated on the ground is of crucial value to our understanding and development of the concepts we study. It continues to be unfortunate that there are those in the study of environmentalism, or in the theoretical realm, who simply cannot see the importance, and range, of these articulations at the intersection of theory and practice – especially when movement innovation is as broad and informative as it is in environmental justice.

### Method first

#### The justification for an action is itself an action

Risman 2004 (Barbara J. Risman is Associate Professor of Sociology and Found Director of Women 's Studies at North Carolina State University, “Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism” Gender and Society, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Aug., 2004), pp. 429-450 Jstor)

Giddens's (1984) structuration theory adds considerably more depth to this  analysis of gender as a social structure  with his emphasis on the recursive  relation ship between social structure  and individuals.  That is, social structures  shape individuals, but simultaneously, individuals shape the social structure. Giddens  embraced  the transformative  power of human action. He insisted that  any structural theory must be concerned with reflexivity and actors' interpretations of their own  lives. Social structures  not only act on people; people act on social structures.  Indeed,  social structures  are created  not by mysterious  forces but by human action.  When people act on structure, they do so for their  own reasons.  We must, therefore,  be concerned with why actors choose their acts. Giddens insisted that  concern with meaning must go beyond the verbal justification easily available from actors because so much of social life is routine and so taken for granted that actors will not articulate, or even consider, why they act. This nonreflexive habituated  action is what I refer to as the cultural component  of the social structure:  The taken  for granted  or cognitive image rules that  belong to  the situational  context (not only or necessarily to the actor's personality).  The cul tural  component of the social structure  includes the interactional expectations  that  each of us meet in every social encounter.  My aims are to bring women and men  back into a structural theory where gender is the structure  under analysis and to  identify when behavior is habit (an enactment of taken for granted  gendered cul tural norms) and when we do gender consciously, with intent, rebellion, or even  with irony. When are we doing gender and re-creating inequality without intent?  And what happens to interactional dynamics and male-dominated institutions  when we rebel?  Can we refuse to do gender or is rebellion simply doing gender  dif ferently, forging alternative masculinities and femininities?  Connell (1987) applied Giddens's (1984) concern with social structure  as both  constraint  and created by action in his treatise on gender and power (see particu larly chapter  5). In his analysis, structure  constrains action,  yet "since human  action  involves free invention  ... and is reflexive, practice  can be turned  against  what con strains it; so structure  can deliberately  be the object of practice"  (Connell 1987, 95).  Action may turn against structure  but can never escape it. We must pay attention both to how structure shapes individual choice and social interaction  and to how  human agency creates, sustains, and modifies current  structure.  Action itself may change the immediate or future  context. A theory of gender as a social structure  must integrate  this notion of causality as  recursive with attention to gender  consequences at multiple  levels of analysis. Gen der is deeply embedded  as a basis for stratification  not just in our personalities,  our  cultural  rules, or institutions  but in all these, and in complicated ways. The gender  structure  differentiates  opportunities  and constraints based on sex category and  thus has consequences on three dimensions: (1) At the individual level, for the  development  of gendered  selves; (2) during  interaction  as men and women face dif ferent cultural  expectations even when they fill the identical structural  positions;  and (3) in institutional domains where explicit regulations regarding resource  distribution  and material  goods are gender specific.

### 2AC Anthro first

### 2AC Ontology WM

### 2AC Epistemology []

**Ethics comes before knowledge— accurate knowledge STARTS with willingness to risk responding to mysterious ecologies demanding your ethical concern.**

**Weston** **2009** Anthony, Professor of Philosophy at Elon University,

[*The Incompleat Eco-Philosopher* p. 9-11]

If theworld is a collection of more or less ﬁxed facts to which we  must respond, then the task of ethics is to systematize and unify our  responses. This is the expected view, once again so taken for granted  as to scarcely even appear as a “view” at all. Epistemology is prior to  ethics. **Responding to the world follows upon knowing** it—and what  could be more sensible or responsible than that? If **the world is** not  “given,” though—if the world is what it seems to **be in part because  we have made it that way**, as I have been suggesting, and if therefore  the process of **inviting** its **further possibilities** into the light **is funda-  mental to ethics** itself—then **our very knowledge of the world**, of the  possibilities of other **animals** and the **land** and even **ourselves** in relation  to them, follows upon “invitation,” and ethics must come ﬁ rst. **Ethics  is prior to epistemology**—or, as Cheney and I do not say in the paper  but probably should have said, what really emerges is another kind of  epistemology—“etiquette,” in our speciﬁ c sense, as epistemology.  But then of course we are also speaking of something sharply  different from “ethics” as usually understood. **We are asked** not **for** a  set of well-defended general moral commitments in advance, but rather  for something more visceral and instinctual, **a mode of** **comportment** more than a mode of commitment, more **ﬂeshy and** more **vulnerable**.  Etiquette so understood requires us **to take risks**, to offer trust before  we know whether or how the offer will be received, and to move with  awareness, civility, and grace in a world we understand to be capable  of response. Thus Cheney and I conclude that **ethical action itself must** be “ﬁ rst and foremost an attempt to **open up possibilities**, to enrich  the world” **rather than** primarily an attempt to **respond to the world  as already known**.  Cheney, true to his nature, also takes the argument on a more  strenuous path, exploring indigenous views of ceremony and ritual.  Once again the question of epistemology turns out to be central.  Euro-Americans, Cheney says, want to know what beliefs are encoded  in the utterances of indigenous peoples. We treat their utterances as  propositional representations of Indigenous worlds. But what if these  utterances function, instead, primarily to produce these worlds? Cheney  cites the indigenous scholar Sam Gill on the fundamentally performa-  tive function of language. When Gill asks Navajo elders what prayers  mean, he reports, they tell him “**not what messages** prayers **carry, but  what prayers do.”** More generally, Gill asserts that “the importance of  religion as it is practiced by the great body of religious persons for  whom religion is a way of life [is] a way of creating, discovering, and  communicating worlds of meaning largely through ordinary and com-  mon actions and behavior.”11  What then, Cheney and I ask, if **this performative dimension of language is fundamental** not just in indigenous or obviously religious   settings, but generally? How we speak, how we move, how we carry  on, all the time, also literally brings all sorts of worlds into being—and  thus, again, the ethical challenge put mindful speech, care, and respect  ﬁ rst. Indeed we would now go even further. Here it is not so much  that epistemology comes ﬁ rst but that, in truth, it simply fades away.  The argument is not the usual suggestion that the West has misunder-  stood the world, got it wrong, and that we now need to “go back” to  the Indians to get it right. Cheney is arguing that understanding the  world is not really the point in the ﬁ rst place. We are not playing a  truth game at all. **What matters is how we relate** to things, **not what  things are in themselves**. Front, center, and always, the world responds.  **The** great **task is not knowledge but relationship**.

### 2AC Lytics

### 2AC perception = RC []

#### The way you relate to ecosystems is the ROOT CAUSE of all injustice and conflict – we acknowledge that utopia is impossible, but ONLY our approach provides a framework for effective ADVOCACY and PROBLEM SOLVING

Schlosberg 13 (David Schlosberg; Environmental Politics Volume 22, Issue 1, 2013 Special Issue: Coming of Age? Environmental Politics at 21; “Theorising environmental justice: the expanding sphere of a discourse”; pages 37-55; KDUB)

Beyond human Finally, one of the remaining border challenges of environmental justice theory is to make important connections with the environment itself. There is a reason that we discuss environmental justice – the issues involved are about how, exactly, we are immersed in the environment, and the manipulation of nature, around us. Yes, most of the discussion is about environmental bads and injustices to human beings, but the origins of environmental injustices are as much in the treatment of the nonhuman realm as in relations among human beings. The shift suggested here is one from environmental conditions as an example or manifestation of social injustice to one where justice is applied to the treatment of the environment itself. A number of analysts have made these connections. In the notion of just sustainability, Agyeman (2005) insists on a conception of environmental justice that goes beyond socio-cultural impacts alone to the interactions between social and environmental communities. Post-Katrina, many reflections have involved not only the conditions of the people in the city, but also consideration of the ecological damage done to surrounding ecosystems that have led to greater vulnerabilities for both human and non-human communities (Ross and Zepeda 2011). Sze et al. (2010) have continued their innovative work on environmental justice in the Sacramento (California) delta region by engaging this element of the socio-natural context. They see the examination of the relationship between the manipulation of nature and people for economic gain as a crucial component of an environmental justice analysis. I have been making the argument that a capabilities approach to justice is a crucial tool for addressing the relationship between environment and human needs and, potentially, the functioning of ecosystems themselves (Schlosberg 2007, 2012). A capabilities approach could enrich conceptions of environmental and climate justice by bringing recognition to the functioning of these systems, in addition to those who live within and depend on them. In this approach, the central issue continues to be the interruption of the capabilities and functioning of living systems – what keeps those living systems from transforming primary goods into the functioning, integrity, and flourishing of those that depend on them. When we interrupt, corrupt, or defile the potential functioning of ecological support systems, we do an injustice not only to human beings, but also to all of those non-humans that depend on the integrity of the system for their own functioning. It is the disruption and increasing vulnerability of the integrity of ecosystems that is at the heart of the injustice of climate change, for example, both in terms of its impact on vulnerable human communities and non-human nature. The treatment – or abuse – of human and non-human individuals and systems is based on the same loss of the ability to function. This application of a capabilities approach to non-human nature brings both benefits and potential conflicts. The first benefit is that a focus on the needs of non-human systems would entail that human beings actually recognise the link between environmental conditions and the basic needs of both human beings and the non-human. In other words, extending a capabilities approach to non-human environments entails recognition of the value of the processes and provisions of natural systems. The second benefit is a discursive one, as a capabilities approach applied to both human and non-human can serve as a bridge between conceptions of social justice and a wide range of environmental concerns. The main problem with this approach, of course, is the potential for conflict between the capabilities and functioning of human beings and those of the natural world (Cripps 2010). Fully addressing this issue would take more space than is available here, but I would simply note that any conception of justice, as it is applied to actual issues and injustices, would entail potential conflict. One of the major problems of ideal justice theories is that they seek to eliminate the potential for conflict – at least in theory. But such theorists are mistaken to believe that the elimination of such conflict in theory makes for more harmonious application to social policy or practice. Conflicts of justice arise, whether in the human realm, or, in this example, between human beings and the nature in which they are immersed, no matter what the ideal. Actual problemsolving entails the negotiation of different conceptions of (in)justice in and across different participants, from community or stakeholder groups to corporations or states; it requires recognition, conceptions of disadvantage, and political engagement. This is where potential conflicts can be addressed, and ways of life attentive to the creation and experience of disadvantage and disabled functioning – human and non-human alike – can be negotiated and designed. One of the clear developments in the past decade, then, has been a thorough expansion of the scope of the environmental justice frame. Against the early warnings of some in the US environmental justice community that the term should remain limited to the experience of racial discrimination, my suggestion has always been that environmental justice has the potential to be an integrative and empowering framework for a variety of movements and concerns (Schlosberg 1999, 2007). Likewise, Sze and London (2008, p. 1332) have insisted that ‘instead of imposing a restrictive boundary around the concepts of environmental justice, scholarship in this emerging field should embrace its wide-ranging and integrative character’. Clearly, the trend of environmental justice in both theory and practice has been this expansion of the discourse into new spaces, and across many boundaries.

### 2AC Narcissism DA []

#### The K cannot be divorced from the narcissism of man – causes us to repeat the tragedy of narcissus

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 14, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

One such vital truth that has long been known is the idea of heroism; but in “normal” scholarly times we never thought of making much out of it, of parading it, or of using it as a central concept. Yet the popular mind always knew how important it was: as William James—who covered just about everything— remarked at the turn of the century: “mankind’s common instinct for reality … has always held the world to be essentially a theatre for heroism.”1 Not only the popular mind knew, but philosophers of all ages, and in our culture especially Emerson and Nietzsche—which is why we still thrill to them: we like to be reminded that our central calling, our main task on this planet, is the heroic.\* One way of looking at the whole development of social science since Marx and of psychology since Freud is that it represents a massive detailing and clarification of the problem of human heroism. This perspective sets the tone for the seriousness of our discussion: we now have the scientific underpinning for a true understanding of the nature of heroism and its place in human life. If “mankind’s common instinct for reality” is right, we have achieved the remarkable feat of exposing that reality in a scientific way. One of the key concepts for understanding man’s urge to heroism is the idea of “narcissism.” As Erich Fromm has so well reminded us, this idea is one of Freud’s great and lasting contributions. Freud discovered that each of us repeats the tragedy of the mythical Greek Narcissus: we are hopelessly absorbed with ourselves. If we care about anyone it is usually ourselves first of all. As Aristotle somewhere put it: luck is when the guy next to you gets hit with the arrow. Twenty-five hundred years of history have not changed man’s basic narcissism; most of the time, for most of us, this is still a workable definition of luck. It is one of the meaner aspects of narcissism that we feel that practically everyone is expendable except ourselves. We should feel prepared, as Emerson once put it, to recreate the whole world out of ourselves even if no one else existed. The thought frightens us; we don’t know how we could do it without others—yet at bottom the basic resource is there: we could suffice alone if need be, if we could trust ourselves as Emerson wanted. And if we don’t feel this trust emotionally, still most of us would struggle to survive with all our powers, no matter how many around us died. Our organism is ready to fill the world all alone, even if our mind shrinks at the thought. This narcissism is what keeps men marching into point-blank fire in wars: at heart one doesn’t feel that he will die, he only feels sorry for the man next to him. Freud’s explanation for this was that the unconscious does not know death or time: in man’s physiochemical, inner organic recesses he feels immortal. None of these observations implies human guile. Man does not seem able to “help” his selfishness; it seems to come from his animal nature. Through countless ages of evolution the organism has had to protect its own integrity; it had its own physiochemical identity and was dedicated to preserving it. This is one of the main problems in organ transplants: the organism protects itself against foreign matter, even if it is a new heart that would keep it alive. The protoplasm itself harbors its own, nurtures itself against the world, against invasions of its integrity. It seems to enjoy its own pulsations, expanding into the world and ingesting pieces of it. If you took a blind and dumb organism and gave it self-consciousness and a name, if you made it stand out of nature and know consciously that it was unique, then you would have narcissism. In man, physiochemical identity and the sense of power and activity have become conscious. In man a working level of narcissism is inseparable from self-esteem, from a basic sense of self-worth. We have learned, mostly from Alfred Adler, that what man needs most is to feel secure in his self-esteem. But man is not just a blind glob of idling protoplasm, but a creature with a name who lives in a world of symbols and dreams and not merely matter. His sense of self-worth is constituted symbolically, his cherished narcissism feeds on symbols, on an abstract idea of his own worth, an idea composed of sounds, words, and images, in the air, in the mind, on paper. And this means that man’s natural yearning for organismic activity, the pleasures of incorporation and expansion, can be fed limitlessly in the domain of symbols and so into immortality. The single organism can expand into dimensions of worlds and times without moving a physical limb; it can take eternity into itself even as it gaspingly dies.

#### This narcissism leads to oppressive systems such as Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia and contemporary capitalism

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 15, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

If we were to peel away this massive disguise, the blocks of repression over human techniques for earning glory, we would arrive at the potentially most liberating question of all, the main problem of human life: How empirically true is the cultural hero system that sustains and drives men? We mentioned the meaner side of man’s urge to cosmic heroism, but there is obviously the noble side as well. Man will lay down his life for his country, his society, his family. He will choose to throw himself on a grenade to save his comrades; he is capable of the highest generosity and self-sacrifice. But he has to feel and believe that what he is doing is truly heroic, timeless, and supremely meaningful. The crisis of modern society is precisely that the youth no longer feel heroic in the plan for action that their culture has set up. They don’t believe it is empirically true to the problems of their lives and times. We are living a crisis of heroism that reaches into every aspect of our social life: the dropouts of university heroism, of business and career heroism, of political-action heroism; the rise of anti-heroes, those who would be heroic each in his own way or like Charles Manson with his special “family”, those whose tormented heroics lash out at the system that itself has ceased to represent agreed heroism. The great perplexity of our time, the churning of our age, is that the youth have sensed—for better or for worse—a great social-historical truth: that just as there are useless self-sacrifices in unjust wars, so too is there an ignoble heroics of whole societies: it can be the viciously destructive heroics of Hitler’s Germany or the plain debasing and silly heroics of the acquisition and display of consumer goods, the piling up of money and privileges that now characterizes whole ways of life, capitalist and Soviet.

### Externalization []

#### Turn – the K prevents us from solving institutional environment destruction

Maniates, Allegheny College, Professor of Political Science, 1

(Michael F., “Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?”, Global Environmental Politics, August 1, EBSCO, p. 33-34)

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.”4 Instead, the serious work of confronting the threatening socio-environmental 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, when really what we wish for is clean, efficient, and effective public transportation of the sort we read about in science fiction novels when we were young—but which we can’t vote for with our consumer dollars since, for reasons rooted in power and politics, it’s not for sale. So we ponder the “energy stickers” on the ultra-efficient 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 study carefully the merits of this and that environmental group so as to properly decide upon the destination of our small annual donation, and meticulously sort our recyclables. And now an increasing number of us are confronted by opportunistic green-power 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. The Lorax is not why the individualization of responsibility dominates the contours of contemporary American environmentalism. Several forces, described later in this article, are to blame. They include the historical baggage of mainstream environmentalism, the core tenets of liberalism, the dynamic ability of capitalism to commodify dissent, and the relatively recent rise of global environmental threats to human prosperity. Seuss’s book simply has been swept up by these forces and adopted by them. Seuss himself would probably be sur-prised by the near deidication of his little book; and his central character, a Lorax who politely sought to hold a corporate CEO accountable, surely would be appalled that his story is being used to justify individual acts of planting trees as the primary response to the threat of global climate change.6 Mark Dowie, a journalist and sometimes historian of the American environmental movement, writes about our “environmental imagination,” by which he means our collective ability to imagine and pursue a variety of productive responses (from individual action to community organization to whole-scale institutional change) to the environmental problems before us.7 My claim in this is that an accelerating individualization of responsibility in the United States is narrowing, in dangerous ways, our “environmental imagination” and undermining our capacity to react effectively to environmental threats to human well-being. Those troubled by overconsumption, consumerism and commodification should not and cannot ignore this narrowing. Confronting the consumption problem demands, after all, the sort of institutional thinking that the individualization of responsibility patently undermines. It calls too for individuals to understand themselves as citizens in a participatory democracy first, working together to change broader policy and larger social institutions, and as consumers second. By contrast, the individualization of responsibility, because it characterizes environmental problems as the consequence of destructive consumer choice, asks that individuals imagine themselves as consumers first and citizens second. Grappling with the consumption problem, moreover, means engaging in conversation both broad and deep about consumerism and frugality and ways of fostering the capacity for restraint. But when responsibility for environmental ills is individualized, space for such conversation disappears: the individually responsible consumer is encouraged to purchase a vast array of “green” or “eco-friendly” products on the promise that the more such products are purchased and consumed, the healthier the planet’s ecological processes will become. “Living lightly on the planet” and “reducing your environmental impact” becomes, paradoxically, a consumer-product growth industry.

#### Turn – the government makes it easier for individuals to change

Fahlquist, Department of Philosophy, Delft University of Technology, 8

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 14,15 EP)

Although it is questionable to hold individuals responsible in the backward-looking sense, it is reasonable to hold individuals responsible in a forward-looking sense. Again, the different contexts and the different extent to which individuals have the capacity and resources to assume such responsibility should be taken into account. The most important conclusion is that governments and corporations have a great forward-looking responsibility to create opportunities for individuals to behave responsibly and act in environmentally friendly ways. Although acknowledging individual responsibility is beneﬁcial, we should make sure that institutional responsibility is not overlooked or ignored as a consequence. There are good reasons to argue that responsibility ascriptions and distributions should be both i) fair and ii) efﬁcient. They should be fair for reasons of social cooperation and humanity. Cooperation is easier to achieve in a society where the norm is to hold someone responsible only when it is fair to do so and such a society is arguably more humane. Of course there is no simple answer to the question when it is fair to hold someone responsible. However, it is common both in social practice and philosophical discussions to apply a number of conditions when ascribing responsibility. For instance, an agent should only be held responsible if she is eligible for normative assessment, meaning she is a mentally well grown-up, she contributed causally to the event, she knew what she was doing, she did it voluntarily, and what she did was wrong according to some set of norms.30 Of course, there is disagreement on the content of these conditions as well as how important each one of them is. The point is that we commonly use some set of conditions when ascribing responsibility and this can be seen as a way to make sure that responsibility is ascribed and distributed fairly. The efﬁciency aim is about the way in which ascriptions and distributions of responsibility contribute to solving societal problems. Whether it be public health, poverty, education, or the environment—when discussing to whom we should ascribe responsibility and the question how responsibility should be distributed between different actors (individuals, governments, corporations, teachers, parents, and so forth) we do not merely care about what is fair, but also who is best apt at solving the problem. To use this notion, my conclusion can be stated as follows. It is not fair to ascribe responsibility in the backward-looking sense, i.e., to blame individuals, for environmentally destructive actions unless they have reasonable alternatives and resources to act in environmentally friendly ways. However, it is fair to ascribe forward-looking responsibility to individuals, based on their capacity to contribute to solutions to environmental problems. Furthermore, a considerable share of forward-looking responsibility should be ascribed to governments and corporations because they can make the group of capable, hence responsible, individuals larger. The urge to ascribe forward-looking responsibility to institutional agents is motivated by the efﬁciency aim of responsibility distributions. Simply put, if we ascribe responsibility to governments and corporations we have a better chance of creating a society in which the opportunities to act in an environmentally friendly way increase.