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#### Displacing environmental activism in global terms co-opts movements and ensures policies are crafted to serve the interests of multinational corporations

Shiva, 98 Vandana Shiva (a philosopher, environmental activist, author and eco feminist, “The Geopolitics Reader,” Volume 1 pg. 231-232)

The “global” in the dominant discourse is the political space in which a particular dominant local seeks global control, and frees itself of local, national and international restraints. The global does not represent the universal human interest; it represents a particular local and parochial interest which has been globalized through the scope of its reach. The seven most powerful countries, the G-7, dictate global affairs, but the interests that guide them remain narrow, local and parochial. The World Bank is not really a Bank that serves the interests of all the world’s communities. It is a Bank where decisions are based on the voting power weighted by the economic and political power of donors, and in this decision-making it is the communities who pay the real price and the real donors (such as the tribal of Narmada Valley whose lives are being destroyed by a Bank financed mega-dam)but have no say. The “global” of today reflects modern version of the global reach of a handful of British merchant adventurers who, as the East India Company, later the British Empire, raided and looted large areas of the world. Over the past 500 years of colonialism, whenever this global reach has been threatened by resistance, the language of opposition has been co-opted, redefined and used to legitimize future control. The independence movement against colonialism had revealed the poverty and deprivation caused by the economic drain from the colonies to the centers of economic power. The post-war world order which saw the emergence of independent political states in the South, also saw the emergence of the Bretton Woods institutions such as the World Bank and IMF which took over the language of underdevelopment and poverty, removed these independent political states’ history, and made them the reason for a new bondage based on development financing and debt burdens. The environment movement revealed the environmental and social costs generated by maldevelopment, conceived of and financed by such institutions as the World Bank. Now, however, the language of the environment is itself being taken over and made the reason for strengthening such “global” institutions and increasing their global reach. In addition to the legitimacy derived from coopting the language of dissent is the legitimization that derives from a false notion that the globalized “local” is some form of hierarchy that reflects geographical and democratic spread, and to which lower order hierarchies should somehow be subservient. Operationalizing undemocratic development projects was based on a similar false notion of “national interest”, and every local interest felt morally compelled to make sacrifices for what seemed the larger interest. It was this moral compulsion that led each community to make way for the construction of mega-dams in post-independence India. Only during the 1980s, when the different “local” interests met nationwide, did they realize that what was projected as the “national interest “was, in fact, the electoral interests of a handful of politicians financed by a handful of contractors, such as J.P. and Associates who benefit from the construction of all dams, such as Tehri and the Narmada Valley projects. Against the narrow and selfish interest that had been elevated to the status of “national” interest, the collective effort of communities engaged in resistance against large dams began to emerge as the real though subjugated national interest. In a similar way the World Bank’s Tropical Forest Action Plan (TFAP) was projected as responding to a global concern about the destruction of tropical forests. When rainforest movements formed a worldwide coalition under the World Rainforest Movement, however, it became clear that TFAP reflected the narrow commercial interests of the World Bank and multinational forestry interests such as Shell, Jaako Poyry and others, and that the global community best equipped to save tropical forests were forest dwellers themselves and farming communities dependent on forests.

#### The environment always exceeds human meddling—more intervention only worsens the cycle of crisis, guaranteeing ecological extinction- this turns the case.

Luke, 2001 (Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 33, No. 2, 2001 Education, Environment and Sustainability: what are the issues, where to intervene, what must be done? TIMOTHY W. LUKE Department of Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA, USA, also he blew up the death star)

Commoner also presents these two worlds as being `at war’ . As humans in the technosphere disrupt the ecosphere, the ecosphere responds with equally or more disruptive secondary effects in the technosphere. In some sense, the environment is `nature’ for Commoner, but it is also `society’ , or, perhaps more accurately, a new composite of `nature-as-transformed-by-society’ . Commoner stresses this interpretation in The Closing Circle when he claims `the environment is, so to speak, the house created on the earth by living things, for living things’ (Commoner, 1971, p. 32). This representation of the environment as life’ s house, however, does little more than reduce it to a biophysical housing of all living thingsÐ or, again, the setting that surrounds organisms.Pesticides often are used to typify how environmental destruction happens in this conceptual register. A chemical agent is applied by humans in the technosphere on something in the biosphere, like weeds or animal pests. While this application was intended to eradicate only those plants or animals that destroyed crops, carried disease and infested dwellings, its impact was much broader. Soon pesticides jumped the dualist chasm and spread through everything in the ecosphereÐ both human technosphere and non-human biosphereÐ returning from `out there’ in natural environments back into plant, animal and human bodies situated `in here’ , affecting those arti® cial environments with unintended, unanticipated and unwanted negative effects. This recognition begins with Carson (1962). Many environmental educators accept this ontological momentum in ordinary Education 195 language use and allow the reductionist and dualist vision of the environment to in® ltrate their visions of human concern for the Earth’ s ecologies. Up to a point, this view works, but the limited advantage it provides culminate in resource, risk and recreationist managerialism. When the world is divisible into environment and society, nature and community, ecology and economics, environmental education’ s charge is to enlighten everyone about how to mitigate the damage caused by the latter on the former. Hence, various environmental protection agencies, built `in here’ by society to safeguard what is `out there’ in nature, can mobilise agents and activities to reduce resource use, mitigate risks, and contain recreational degradation in the environment. These approaches `work’ , but their workability is short-term and limited. They overlook how resources are misused, risks are avoidable and recreations are mutable.

#### Vote negative to unravel the 1ac.

#### Interrogating the way contemporary environmental policy is bound within market relations best enables more sustainable ethics

Luke, 2001 (Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 33, No. 2, 2001 Education, Environment and Sustainability: what are the issues, where to intervene, what must be done? TIMOTHY W. LUKE Department of Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA, USA, also he blew up the death star)

To create a truly more sustainable society, environmental education must unravel the complicated cycles of production and consumption, which are interwoven through most technological and economic practices in contemporary transnational commerce and this unravelling must show how these cycles are verging upon almost complete chaos. Highly planned programmes for economic growth are creating many unintended and unplanned outcomes of environmental destruction, boosting society’ s already high ecological risks to even higher levels. Most steps taken to mitigate these risks will not be executed with much certainty of successfully gaining their intended ends. Doing anything could make everything worse, doing nothing might make something better. At this juncture, environmental education must redefine some shared values for an ecological society. Unfortunately, most academic disciplines, from ecology to economics, are shackled by a set of disciplinary practices that constrain the imagination to ® t the approved scope and correct method of normal disciplinary inquiry. When Eugene Odum, for example, asserts that ecology is a `major interdisciplinary science that links together the biological, physical, and social sciences’ (Odum, 1975), very few biological, physical, or social scientists accept this broad interdisciplinary charge. Any ecology worth of its name would concede immediately that the economy and society are the Earth’ s main environments. This reality is acknowledged by Moscovici in his re¯ ections about the question of nature in the contemporary world system. That is, science and technology have reconstituted humanity as a new material force, working on planetary basis. `In 200 T. W. Luke short’ , he asserts, `the state of nature is not now just an economy of things; it has become at the same time the work of human beings. The fact is that we are dealing with a new nature’ (Moscovici, 1990). This fact and how the work of human beings continuously remediates this new nature are what environmental education must address to attain sustainability. Without sinking into a green foundationalist stance, environmental education must weave an analysis of power, politics and the state into an ecology’ s sense of sustainability, survival and the environment. This kind of interdisciplinary effort could develop a deeply contextual understanding of nature and society as holistic cluster of interdependent relations. This view should integrate a clear sense of how ecological constraints must reshape social/political/economic/cultural practices to move past the technological and environmental failings of the present global economy. In turn, this critical account of humanity’ s ecological failings, once it came common in environmental education classes, should open broader dialogues about how individuals, as both citizens and consumers, can intervene as defenders of their local habitats in many corners of today’ s global economy