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**Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats – also causes political apathy which turns case**

**Buell 3** (Frederick Buell, cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books; “From Apocalypse To Way of Life,” pg. 185-186)

Looked at critically, then, **crisis discourse** thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “**total solution**” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “**final solution**.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into **inhumanist authoritarianism**; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “**total solution**.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode; eco-authoritarianism** was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

**That causes mass wars**

Brzoska 8 (Michael Brzoska, Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg; “The securitization of climate change and the power of conceptions of security,” Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Convention, 2008)

In the literature on securitization it is implied that when a problem is securitized it is difficult to limit this to an increase in attention and resources devoted to mitigating the problem (Brock 1997, Waever 1995). Securitization regularly leads to all-round ‘exceptionalism’ in dealing with the issue as well as to a shift in institutional localization towards ‘security experts’ (Bigot 2006), such as the military and police. Methods and instruments associated with these security organizations – such as more use of arms, force and violence – will gain in importance in the discourse on ‘what to do’. A good example of securitization was the period leading to the Cold War (Guzzini 2004 ). Originally a political conflict over the organization of societies, in the late 1940s, the East-West confrontation became an existential conflict that was overwhelmingly addressed with military means, including the potential annihilation of humankind. Efforts to alleviate the political conflict were, throughout most of the Cold War, secondary to improving military capabilities. Climate change could meet a similar fate. An essentially political problem concerning the distribution of the costs of prevention and adaptation and the losses and gains in income arising from change in the human environment might be perceived as intractable, thus necessitating the build-up of military and police forces to prevent it from becoming a major security problem. The portrayal of climate change as a security problem could, in particular, cause the richer countries in the global North, which are less affected by it, to strengthen measures aimed at protecting them from the spillover of violent conflict from the poorer countries in the global South that will be most affected by climate change. It could also be used by major powers as a justification for improving their military preparedness against the other major powers, thus leading to arms races.

**Their apocalyptic warming focus trades off with environmentalism – turns its own end**

**Crist, 7** (Eileen Crist, 2007, “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse”, http://journal.telospress.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/content/2007/141/29.full.pdf+html)

While the dangers of climate change are real, I argue that there are even greater dangers in representing it as the most urgent problem we face. Framing climate change in such a manner deserves to be challenged for two reasons: it encourages the restriction of proposed solutions to the technical realm, by powerfully insinuating that the needed approaches are those that directly address the problem; and it detracts attention from the planet’s ecological predicament as a whole, by virtue of claiming the limelight for the one issue that trumps all others. Identifying climate change as the biggest threat to civilization, and ushering it into center stage as the highest priority problem, has bolstered the proliferation of technical proposals that address the specific challenge. The race is on for figuring out what technologies, or portfolio thereof, will solve “the problem.” Whether the call is for reviving nuclear power, boosting the installation of wind turbines, using a variety of renewable energy sources, increasing the efficiency of fossil-fuel use, developing carbon-sequestering technologies, or placing mirrors in space to deflect the sun’s rays, the narrow character of such proposals is evident: confront the problem of greenhouse gas emissions by technologically phasing them out, superseding them, capturing them, or mitigating their heating effects. In his The Revenge of Gaia, for example, Lovelock briefly mentions the need to face climate change by “changing our whole style of living.”16 But the thrust of this work, what readers and policy-makers come away with, is his repeated and strident call for investing in nuclear energy as, in his words, “the one lifeline we can use immediately.”17 In the policy realm, the first step toward the technological fix for global warming is often identified with implementing the Kyoto protocol. Biologist Tim Flannery agitates for the treaty, comparing the need for its successful endorsement to that of the Montreal protocol that phased out the ozone-depleting CFCs. “The Montreal protocol,” he submits, “marks a signal moment in human societal development, representing the first ever victory by humanity over a global pollution problem.”18 He hopes for a similar victory for the global climate-change problem. Yet the deepening realization of the threat of climate change, virtually in the wake of stratospheric ozone depletion, also suggests that dealing with global problems treaty-by-treaty is no solution to the planet’s predicament. Just as the risks of unanticipated ozone depletion have been followed by the dangers of a long underappreciated climate crisis, so it would be naïve not to anticipate another (perhaps even entirely unforeseeable) catastrophe arising after the (hoped-for) resolution of the above two. Furthermore, if greenhouse gases were restricted successfully by means of technological shifts and innovations, the root cause of the ecological crisis as a whole would remain unaddressed. The destructive patterns of production, trade, extraction, land-use, waste proliferation, and consumption, coupled with population growth, would go unchallenged, continuing to run down the integrity, beauty, and biological richness of the Earth. Industrial-consumer civilization has entrenched a form of life that admits virtually no limits to its expansiveness within, and perceived entitlement to, the entire planet.19 But questioning this civilization is by and large sidestepped in climate-change discourse, with its single-minded quest for a global-warming techno-fix.20 Instead of confronting the forms of social organization that are causing the climate crisis—among numerous other catastrophes—climate-change literature often focuses on how global warming is endangering the culprit, and agonizes over what technological means can save it from impending tipping points.21 The dominant frame of climate change funnels cognitive and pragmatic work toward specifically addressing global warming, while muting a host of equally monumental issues. Climate change looms so huge ever 1964 work, an entire socio-cultural-economic life—from (actual or aspired to) ways of eating and lodging, transportation, entertainment, or emoting and thinking—“binds the consumers more or less pleasantly to the producers and, through the latter, to the whole.” Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (Boston: Beacon, 1991), p. 12. Horkheimer and Adorno traced the origins of the collective’s participation in its own domination to the “historical” moment that magical control over nature (and over the deities of nature) was relinquished to a specific elite or clique in exchange for self and social preservation. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, Dialectic of Enlightenment, trans. John Cumming (New York: Continuum, 1972), pp. 21–22. After the decisive turn when the social body became implicated in its own domination, “what is done to all by the few, always occurs as the subjection of individuals by the many: social repression always exhibits the masks of repression by a collective” (ibid.). And elsewhere: “The misplaced love of the common people for the wrong which is done them is a greater force than the cunning of the authorities” (ibid., p. 134). In light of such astute observations offered by critical theorists, neo-Marxist and anarchist analyses that indict corporate and/or state power for the troubled natural and social worlds are, at best, only partially true. 20. More than thirty years ago, environmental philosopher Arne Naess articulated the influential distinction between “shallow” and “deep” ecology, characterized by the focus on symptoms of the environmental crisis, on the one hand, versus critical attention to underlying causes of problems, on the other. Notwithstanding its unfortunate elitist overtones—implying that some environmental thinkers are capable of reflecting deeply, while others flounder with superficialities—the shallow-deep distinction has been significant for two compelling reasons. One, it clarified how “symptomology” leads merely to technical piecemeal solutions; and two, it showed how underlying causes, left unaddressed, eventually generate more nasty symptoms. In other words, shallow ecological thinking is technical and narrow: when we think about climate change as “the problem”—as opposed to confronting the limitless expansionism of the capitalist enterprise as the problem—we arguably become shallow in our thinking. Arne Naess, “The Shallow and the Deep, Long- Range Ecology Movements,” in George Sessions, ed., Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century (1973; Boston: Shambhala, 1995), pp. 151–55. on the environmental and political agenda today that it has contributed to downplaying other facets of the ecological crisis: mass extinction of species, the devastation of the oceans by industrial fishing, continued old-growth deforestation, topsoil losses and desertification, endocrine disruption, incessant development, and so on, are made to appear secondary and more forgiving by comparison with “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. In what follows, I will focus specifically on how climate-change discourse encourages the continued marginalization of the biodiversity crisis—a crisis that has been soberly described as a holocaust,22 and which despite decades of scientific and environmentalist pleas remains a virtual non-topic in society, the mass media, and humanistic and other academic literatures. Several works on climate change (though by no means all) extensively examine the consequences of global warming for biodiversity, 23 but rarely is it mentioned that biodepletion predates dangerous greenhouse-gas buildup by decades, centuries, or longer, and will not be stopped by a technological resolution of global warming. Climate change is poised to exacerbate species and ecosystem losses—indeed, is doing so already. But while technologically preempting the worst of climate change may temporarily avert some of those losses, such a resolution of the climate quandary will not put an end to—will barely address—the ongoing destruction of life on Earth.

**The system is collapsing around us – climate change, resource scarcity, militarization of society, etc. are all a result of state-centric security discourse and the failure of IR to recognize the complexity of the global system – it’s try or die to shift the frame or ensure human extinction**

**Ahmed 12** (Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, PhD in international relations from the School of Global Studies at Sussex University, executive director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development, former professor of international relations at Sussex, writer for the Guardian, 2012, “The International Relations of Crisis and the Crisis of International Relations: From the Securitisation of Scarcity to the Militarisation of Society,” *Global Change, Peace & Security* Volume 23 Issue 3)

Unfortunately, orthodox IR approaches are ill-equipped to understand the complexity of these¶ interconnected global crises and their interdependent impacts on the international system.¶ Generally, IR scholars have examined global crises as discrete phenomena. Economic and¶ financial crises are studied within the discipline of International Political Economy, particularly¶ with a view to understanding their structural causes and trajectories, sometimes including their¶ impact on development, inequality and poverty. Energy depletion as a global systemic¶ problem is rarely acknowledged in the IR literature, but when (rarely) acknowledged, it is¶ largely viewed through the lens of energy policy as an arm of ‘national security’. Similarly,¶ climate change is examined in the context of its strategic implications in exacerbating vulnerability¶ to violent conflict or scrutinised in the context of the scope for inter-state negotiations¶ and global governance.54¶ For the most part, IR as a discipline has not fully acknowledged the real-world scale of these¶ crises as inherently interdependent phenomena requiring an integrated and holistic theoretical¶ appraisal. Many traditional neorealist scholars, of course, view environmental factors as of either¶ minimal or negligible significance in identifying future security threats and explaining past,¶ present or potential inter-state conflicts.55 Yet as evidence of climate change has become more¶ disturbing, such perspectives have been increasingly contested. While some scholars tend to¶ focus on the role of natural resource shortages or abundance in engendering conditions of¶ anarchy and violence, others investigate the capacity or inability of states to negotiate viable¶ cooperative international regulatory frameworks to prevent or respond to crises. As such, most¶ theorists draw either implicitly or explicitly on neorealist or neoliberal assumptions about state¶ behaviour in the international system, debilitating their ability to understand these crises precisely¶ in their global systemic context.¶ 2.2 Neorealism: tragedy as self-fulfilling prophecy¶ In one salient example, O’Keefe draws extensively on both offensive and defensive variants of¶ neorealist theory, including the work of Jack Snyder, Robert Jervis and Kenneth Waltz, to¶ argue for realism’s continuing relevance in understanding how the ‘biophysical environment¶ plays a significant role in triggering and prolonging the structural conditions that result in conflict’.¶ She notes that standard realist concepts such as ‘anarchy, security dilemmas, and the prisoner’s¶ dilemma’ can be used to explain the emergence of environmental or resource-based violent¶ conflicts largely within, and occasionally between, the weaker states of the South. ‘Environmental¶ anarchy’ occurs in weak states which lack ‘active government regulation’ of the internal distribution¶ of natural resources, leading to a ‘tragedy of the commons’. This generates resource scarcities¶ which lead to ‘security dilemmas’ over ownership of resources, often settled by resort to¶ violence, perpetuated by ‘the prisoner’s dilemma’.56¶ Ultimately, this theoretical hypothesis on the causes of environmental or resource-related conflict¶ is incapable of engaging with the deeper intersecting global structural conditions generating¶ resource scarcities, independently of insufficient government management of the internal distribution¶ of resources in weak states. It simplistically applies the Hobbesian assumption that¶ without a centralised ‘Leviathan’ state structure, the persistence of anarchy in itself generates conflict¶ over resources. Under the guise of restoring the significance of the biophysical environment¶ to orthodox IR, this approach in effect actually occludes the environment as a meaningful causal¶ factor, reducing it to a mere epiphenomenon of the dynamics of anarchy in the context of state¶ failure. As a consequence, this approach is theoretically impotent in grasping the systemic acceleration¶ of global ecological, energy and economic crises as a direct consequence of the way in¶ which the inter-state system itself exploits the biophysical environment.¶ The same criticism in fact applies to opposing theories that resource abundance is a major¶ cause of violent conflict. Bannon and Collier, for instance, argue that resource abundance and¶ greed, rather than resource scarcity and political grievances, generated intra-state conflicts¶ financed by the export of commodities in regions like Angola and Sierra Leone (diamonds) or¶ West Africa (tropical timber). In other regions, abundance rather than shortages of oil, drugs¶ and gold fuelled and financed violent secessionist movements in the context of widespread corruption¶ and poor governance.57 Ultimately, this departs little from the theoretical assumptions¶ above, with weak central state governance still blamed for generating anarchic conditions¶ conducive to conflict over abundant resources. Furthermore, as Kaldor shows, this simplistic perspective¶ overlooks the wider context of the global political economy – the evolution of regional¶ ‘war economies’ was often enabled precisely by the devastating impact of neoliberal structural¶ adjustment programmes, which eroded state structures and generated social crises that radicalised¶ identity politics.58¶ Under traditional neorealist logic, a strategic response to global environmental crises must¶ involve the expansion of state-military capabilities in order to strengthen the centralised governance¶ structures whose task is to regulate the international distribution of natural resources, as well¶ as to ensure that a particular state’s own resource requirements are protected. Neorealism understands¶ inter-state competition, rivalry and warfare as inevitable functions of states’ uncertainty¶ about their own survival, arising from the anarchic structure of the international system. Gains¶ for one state are losses for another, and each state’s attempt to maximise its power relative to¶ all other states is simply a reflection of its rational pursuit of its own security. The upshot is¶ the normalisation of political violence in the international system, including practices such as¶ over-exploitation of energy and the environment, as a ‘rational’ strategy – even though this ultimately¶ amplifies global systemic insecurity. Inability to cooperate internationally and for mutual¶ benefit is viewed as an inevitable outcome of the simple, axiomatic existence of multiple states.¶ The problem is that neorealism cannot explain in the first place the complex interdependence and¶ escalation of global crises. Unable to situate these crises in the context of an international system¶ that is not simply a set of states, but a transnational global structure based on a specific exploitative¶ relationship with the biophysical environment, neorealism can only theorise global crises as¶ ‘new issue areas’ appended to already existing security agendas.59¶ Yet by the very act of projecting global crises as security threats, neorealism renders itself¶ powerless to prevent or mitigate them by theorising their root structural causes. In effect,¶ despite its emphasis on the reasons why states seek security, neorealism’s approach to issues¶ like climate change actually guarantees greater insecurity by promoting policies which frame¶ these ‘non-traditional’ issues purely as amplifiers of quite traditional threats. As Susanne¶ Peters argues, the neorealist approach renders the militarisation of foreign and domestic policy¶ a pragmatic and necessary response to issues such as resource scarcities – yet, in doing so, it¶ entails the inevitable escalation of ‘resource wars’ in the name of energy security. Practically,¶ this serves not to increase security for competing state and non-state actors, but to debilitate international¶ security through the proliferation of violent conflict to access and control diminishing¶ resources in the context of unpredictable complex emergencies.60 Neorealism thus negates its¶ own theoretical utility and normative value. For if ‘security’ is the fundamental driver of state¶ foreign policies, then why are states chronically incapable of effectively ameliorating the¶ global systemic amplifiers of ‘insecurity’, despite the obvious rationale to do so in the name of¶ warding off collective destruction, if not planetary annihilation?61¶ 2.3 Neoliberalism: mutual over-exploitation as normative¶ On the other hand, we have strategies of international cooperation to establish new global governance¶ regimes by which states can develop treaties and agreements to encourage mitigating action.¶ It is now clear that the massive proliferation of international legal treaties designed to regulate¶ activities impacting detrimentally on the environment and thus limit environmental degradation¶ simply cannot be explained under the realist theoretical framework. While this seemingly vindicates¶ neoliberal theoretical approaches which underscore the scope for rational state strategies of¶ mutual cooperation,62 the latter are still at a loss to explain the extent to which ethical norms and¶ values, national cultures and environmental and scientific advocacy underpin wide-ranging¶ environmental regimes which cannot be reduced purely to state interests.63¶ Much of the liberal literature also explores the regressive dynamic of the energy industry and¶ its international dimensions, though failing to escape realist assumptions about anarchy. Kaldor¶ and her co-authors, for instance, note that conflicts can erupt in regions containing abundant¶ resources when neopatrimonial states collapse due to competition between different ethnic and¶ tribal factions motivated by the desire to control revenues.64 Similarly, Collier argues that the¶ most impoverished populations inhabit the most resource-wealthy countries which, however,¶ lack robust governance, encouraging rampant internal resource predation and therefore civil¶ wars.65 Lack of robust governance thus facilitates not only internal anarchy over resource¶ control, but also the illicit and corrupt activities of foreign companies, particularly in the¶ energy sector, in exploiting these countries.66 This sort of analysis then leads to a staple set of¶ normative prescriptions concerned largely with ways of inculcating ‘good governance’, such as¶ transparency measures to avoid excessive secrecy under which oil companies indulge in corruption;¶ more robust international regulation; corporate social responsibility; and cosmopolitan principles¶ such as democratisation, political equality and freedom of civil society.67¶ Yet such well-meaning recommendations often do not lead to sufficiently strong policy action¶ by governments to rein in energy sector corruption.68 Furthermore, it is painfully clear from the¶ examples of Kyoto, Copenhagen and Cancun that international cooperative state strategies continue¶ to be ineffective, with states unable to agree on the scale of the crises concerned, let alone on¶ the policies required to address them. Indeed, while some modest successes were apparent in the¶ Cancun Accord, its proposed voluntary emissions regime would still likely guarantee – according¶ to even mid-range climate models – a global average temperature rise of 4°C or more, which¶ would in turn culminate in many of the IPCC’s more catastrophic scenarios.69¶ This calls into question the efficacy of longstanding recommendations – such as Klare’s – that¶ the international community develop unprecedented international mechanisms to coordinate the¶ peaceful distribution of natural resources in the era of scarcity and environmental degradation.70¶ While at face value such regulatory governance mechanisms would appear essential to avoid¶ violent conflict over depleting resources, they are posited in a socio-political and theoretical¶ vacuum. Why is it that such potentially effective international mechanisms continue to be¶ ignored? What are the socio-political obstacles to their implementation? Ultimately, the¶ problem is that they overlook the structural and systemic causes of resource depletion and¶ environmental degradation.¶ Although neoliberalism shares neorealism’s assumptions about the centrality of the state as a¶ unitary rational actor in the international system, it differs fundamentally in the notion that gains¶ for one state do not automatically imply losses for another; therefore states are able to form cooperative,¶ interdependent relationships conducive to mutual power gains, which do not necessarily¶ generate tensions or conflict.71 While neoliberalism therefore encourages international negotiations¶ and global governance mechanisms for the resolution of global crises, it implicitly¶ accepts the contemporary social, political and economic organisation of the international¶ system as an unquestionable ‘given’, itself not subject to debate or reform.72¶ The focus is on developing the most optimal ways of maximising exploitation of the biophysical¶ environment. The role of global political economic structures (such as centralised private¶ resource-ownership and deregulated markets) in both generating global systemic crises and inhibiting¶ effective means for their amelioration is neglected. As such, neoliberalism is axiomatically¶ unable to view the biophysical environment in anything other than a rationalist, instrumentalist¶ fashion, legitimising the over-exploitation of natural resources without limits, and inadvertently¶ subordinating the ‘global commons’ to the competitive pressures of private sector profit-maximisation¶ and market-driven solutions, rather than institutional reform.73 Mutual maximisation of¶ power gains translates into the legitimisation of the unlimited exploitation of the biophysical¶ environment without recognition of the human costs of doing so, which are technocratically¶ projected merely as fixable aberrations from an optimal system of cooperative progress.74¶ Consequently, neoliberalism is powerless to interrogate how global political economic structures¶ consistently undermine the establishment of effective environmental regimes.¶ 2.4 The socio-historical evacuation of the political ecology of power¶ Global ecological, economic and energy crises thus expose a core contradiction at the heart of¶ modernity – that the material progress delivered by scientific reason in the service of unlimited¶ economic growth is destroying the very social and environmental conditions of modernity’s¶ very existence. This stark contradiction between official government recognition of the potentially¶ devastating security implications of resource scarcity and the continued abject failure of¶ government action to mitigate these security implications represents a fundamental lacuna that¶ has been largely overlooked in IR theory and policy analysis. It reveals an analytical framework¶ that has focused almost exclusively on potential symptoms of scarcity. But a truly complete¶ picture of the international relations of resource scarcity would include not only a map of projected¶ impacts, but would also seek to grasp their causes by confronting how the present structure¶ of the international system itself has contributed to the acceleration of scarcity, while inhibiting¶ effective national and international responses.¶ It could be suggested that the present risk-oriented preoccupation with symptoms is itself¶ symptomatic of IR’s insufficient self-reflection on its own role in this problem. Despite the normative¶ emphasis on ensuring national and international security, the literature’s overwhelming¶ preoccupation with gauging the multiplicity of ways in which ecological, energy and economic¶ crises might challenge security in coming decades provides very little opening in either theory¶ or policy to develop more effective strategies to mitigate or prevent these heightened security¶ challenges. On the contrary, for the most part, these approaches tend to highlight the necessity to¶ maximise national political–military and international regimes’ powers so that states might be¶ able to respond more robustly in the event that new threats like resource wars and state failure¶ do emerge. But the futility of this trajectory is obvious – a preoccupation with ‘security’ ends¶ up becoming an unwitting accomplice in the intensification of insecurity.¶ The extent of orthodox IR theory’s complicity in this predicament is evident in its reduction¶ of inter-state relations to balance-of-power dynamics, despite a lack of determinate bases by¶ which to define and delineate the dynamics of material power. While orthodox realism focuses¶ inordinately on a military–political conceptualisation of national power, conventional attempts¶ to extend this conceptualisation to include economic dimensions (including the role of transnational¶ corporations) – as well as production, finance, ideas and institutions beyond the state –¶ do not solve the problem.75 This Weberian proliferation of categorisations of the multiple dimensions¶ of power, while useful, lacks a unifying explanatory order of determination capable of rendering¶ their interconnections intelligible.¶ As Rosenberg shows in his analysis of the dynamics of distinctive geopolitical orders from¶ Rome to Spain – and Teschke in his exploration of the changing polities of continental Europe¶ from the eighth to the eighteenth centuries – these orders have always been inseparably conjoined¶ with their constitutive relations of production as structured in the context of prevailing social–¶ property relations, illustrating the mutually-embedded nature of ‘economic’ and ‘extra-economic’¶ power.76 In contrast, orthodox IR axiomatically fragments the ‘economic’ and ‘extra-economic’¶ (and the latter further into ‘military’, ‘political’, ‘cultural’, etc.) into separate, autonomous spheres¶ with no grasp of the scope of their interconnection.77¶ It also dislocates both the state, and human existence as such, from their fundamental material¶ conditions of existence, in the form of their relationship to the biophysical environment, as¶ mediated through relations of production, and the way these are governed and contested¶ through social–property relations.78 By externalising the biophysical environment – and thus¶ human metabolism with nature – from state praxis, orthodox IR simply lacks the conceptual categories¶ necessary to recognise the extent to which socio-political organisational forms are¶ mutually constituted by human embeddedness in the natural world.79 While further fragmenting¶ the international into a multiplicity of disconnected state units whose behaviour can only be analysed¶ through the limited lenses of anarchy or hierarchy, orthodox IR is incapable of situating¶ these units in the holistic context of the global political economy, the role of transnational capitalist¶ classes, and the structural pressures thereby exerted on human and state behaviour.80¶ Indeed, the mediating structure of the global political economy – along with the beliefs and behaviour¶ of agents within it (through which this structure is constructed) – play a critical role in the transformation¶ of ecological or resource-related events into concrete politically-defined conditions of¶ ‘scarcity’ that lead to crisis or conflict. A powerful example is provided by Davis in his study of the¶ impact of the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) – the vast oscillation in air mass and Pacific¶ Ocean temperature. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, ENSO created large-scale droughts¶ in many countries peripheral to the European empires, including those in Asia (India, China, Java,¶ the Philippines and Korea), and in Brazil, southern Africa, Algeria and Morocco. Davis shows that¶ British ‘free market’ imperial policy converted these droughts into foreseeable but preventable¶ deadly famines, multiplying death tolls to gross proportions without any historical precedent.81¶ In 1874–76, northern harvests were more than sufficient to provide reserves for the 1878¶ autumn crops deficit. But most of the grain from north-western Indian subsistence farming was¶ controlled by a captive export sector designed to stabilise British grain prices, which from¶ 1876 to 1877 had increased due to poor harvests. This generated a British demand that absorbed¶ almost the entirety of north-western India’s wheat surplus. Meanwhile, profits from these grain¶ exports were monopolised by wealthy property holders, moneylenders and grain merchants, as¶ opposed to poor Indian farmers. India’s newly-constructed modern railway system shipped¶ grain from drought areas ‘to central depots for hoarding’, leading to exorbitant price hikes that¶ were ‘co-ordinated in a thousand towns at once’. Food prices rocketed out of the reach of ‘outcaste¶ labourers, displaced weavers, sharecroppers and poor peasants’. Consequently, ‘the poor¶ began to starve to death even in well-watered districts “reputed to be immune to food shortages”’.¶ Thus, between 1877 and 1878, grain merchants exported a record 6.4 million hundredweight of¶ wheat to Europe while between 5.5 and 12 million Indians starved to death. This catastrophe¶ occurred ‘not outside the modern world system, but in the very process of being forcibly incorporated¶ into its economic and political structures’.82¶ As Dalby thus argues, ‘humans live in a complex interaction with environments that adapt and¶ change in much more complex ways than is facilitated by linear thinking within the territorial¶ boxes of contemporary administrative arrangements’. This suggests ‘that “global” markets and¶ economic connections are essential to understanding the complex politics of “local” environments¶ and struggles over access to specific resources in particular places’ – because the ‘geography of¶ the domination of nature’ is precisely the continuing ‘history of colonisation and imperialism’.83¶ Hence, environmental and energy crises are generated in the context of historically-specific sociopolitical¶ systems – and whether or not they lead to conflict depends on existing relations of power¶ at local, national and transnational scales, and on how those relations are configured by structures¶ of resource ownership, mediated by ideas and values, and supported by military power.¶ 3. From securitisation to militarisation¶ 3.1 Complicity¶ This analysis thus calls for a broader approach to environmental security based on retrieving the¶ manner in which political actors construct discourses of ‘scarcity’ in response to ecological,¶ energy and economic crises (critical security studies) in the context of the historically-specific¶ socio-political and geopolitical relations of domination by which their power is constituted,¶ and which are often implicated in the acceleration of these very crises (historical sociology and¶ historical materialism).¶ Instead, both realist and liberal orthodox IR approaches focus on different aspects of interstate¶ behaviour, conflictual and cooperative respectively, but each lacks the capacity to grasp¶ that the unsustainable trajectory of state and inter-state behaviour is only explicable in the context¶ of a wider global system concurrently over-exploiting the biophysical environment in which it is¶ embedded. They are, in other words, unable to address the relationship of the inter-state system¶ itself to the biophysical environment as a key analytical category for understanding the acceleration¶ of global crises. They simultaneously therefore cannot recognise the embeddedness of the¶ economy in society and the concomitant politically-constituted nature of economics.84¶ Hence, they neglect the profound irrationality of collective state behaviour, which systematically¶ erodes this relationship, globalising insecurity on a massive scale – in the very process of¶ seeking security.85 In Cox’s words, because positivist IR theory ‘does not question the present¶ order [it instead] has the effect of legitimising and reifying it’.86 Orthodox IR sanitises globally-¶ destructive collective inter-state behaviour as a normal function of instrumental reason –¶ thus rationalising what are clearly deeply irrational collective human actions that threaten to permanently¶ erode state power and security by destroying the very conditions of human existence.¶ Indeed, the prevalence of orthodox IR as a body of disciplinary beliefs, norms and prescriptions¶ organically conjoined with actual policy-making in the international system highlights the extent¶ to which both realism and liberalism are ideologically implicated in the acceleration of global systemic¶ crises.87 ¶ By the same token, the incapacity to recognise and critically interrogate how prevailing social,¶ political and economic structures are driving global crisis acceleration has led to the proliferation¶ of symptom-led solutions focused on the expansion of state/regime military–political power¶ rather than any attempt to transform root structural causes.88 It is in this context that, as the prospects¶ for meaningful reform through inter-state cooperation appear increasingly nullified under¶ the pressure of actors with a vested interest in sustaining prevailing geopolitical and economic¶ structures, states have resorted progressively more to militarised responses designed to protect¶ the concurrent structure of the international system from dangerous new threats. In effect, the¶ failure of orthodox approaches to accurately diagnose global crises, directly accentuates a tendency¶ to ‘securitise’ them – and this, ironically, fuels the proliferation of violent conflict and militarisation¶ responsible for magnified global insecurity. ¶ ‘Securitisation’ refers to a ‘speech act’ – an act of labelling – whereby political authorities¶ identify particular issues or incidents as an existential threat which, because of their extreme¶ nature, justify going beyond the normal security measures that are within the rule of law. It¶ thus legitimises resort to special extra-legal powers. By labelling issues a matter of ‘security’,¶ therefore, states are able to move them outside the remit of democratic decision-making and¶ into the realm of emergency powers, all in the name of survival itself. Far from representing a¶ mere aberration from democratic state practice, this discloses a deeper ‘dual’ structure of the¶ state in its institutionalisation of the capacity to mobilise extraordinary extra-legal military–¶ police measures in purported response to an existential danger.89¶ The problem in the context of global ecological, economic and energy crises is that such levels¶ of emergency mobilisation and militarisation have no positive impact on the very global crises¶ generating ‘new security challenges’, and are thus entirely disproportionate.90 All that remains¶ to examine is on the ‘surface’ of the international system (geopolitical competition, the balance¶ of power, international regimes, globalisation and so on), phenomena which are dislocated¶ from their structural causes by way of being unable to recognise the biophysically-embedded¶ and politically-constituted social relations of which they are comprised. The consequence is¶ that orthodox IR has no means of responding to global systemic crises other than to reduce¶ them to their symptoms.¶ Indeed, orthodox IR theory has largely responded to global systemic crises not with new¶ theory, but with the expanded application of existing theory to ‘new security challenges’ such¶ as ‘low-intensity’ intra-state conflicts; inequality and poverty; environmental degradation; international¶ criminal activities including drugs and arms trafficking; proliferation of weapons of mass¶ destruction; and international terrorism.91 Although the majority of such ‘new security challenges’¶ are non-military in origin – whether their referents are states or individuals – the inadequacy¶ of systemic theoretical frameworks to diagnose them means they are primarily¶ examined through the lenses of military-political power.92 In other words, the escalation of¶ global ecological, energy and economic crises is recognised not as evidence that the current¶ organisation of the global political economy is fundamentally unsustainable, requiring urgent¶ transformation, but as vindicating the necessity for states to radicalise the exertion of their¶ military–political capacities to maintain existing power structures, to keep the lid on.93¶ Global crises are thus viewed as amplifying factors that could mobilise the popular will in¶ ways that challenge existing political and economic structures, which it is presumed (given¶ that state power itself is constituted by these structures) deserve protection. This justifies the¶ state’s adoption of extra-legal measures outside the normal sphere of democratic politics. In¶ the context of global crisis impacts, this counter-democratic trend-line can result in a growing propensity¶ to problematise potentially recalcitrant populations – rationalising violence toward them¶ as a control mechanism.¶ 3.2 From theory to policy¶ Consequently, for the most part, the policy implications of orthodox IR approaches involve a¶ redundant conceptualisation of global systemic crises purely as potential ‘threat-multipliers’ of¶ traditional security issues such as ‘political instability around the world, the collapse of governments¶ and the creation of terrorist safe havens’. Climate change will serve to amplify the threat of¶ international terrorism, particularly in regions with large populations and scarce resources.94 The¶ US Army, for instance, depicts climate change as a ‘stress-multiplier’ that will ‘exacerbate tensions’¶ and ‘complicate American foreign policy’; while the EU perceives it as a ‘threat-multiplier¶ which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability’.95¶ In practice, this generates an excessive preoccupation not with the causes of global crisis¶ acceleration and how to ameliorate them through structural transformation, but with their¶ purportedly inevitable impacts, and how to prepare for them by controlling problematic¶ populations. Paradoxically, this ‘securitisation’ of global crises does not render us safer.¶ Instead, by necessitating more violence, while inhibiting preventive action, it guarantees¶ greater insecurity. Thus, a recent US Department of Defense report explores the future of international¶ conflict up to 2050. It warns of ‘resource competition induced by growing populations¶ and expanding economies’, particularly due to a projected ‘youth bulge’ in the South, which¶ ‘will consume ever increasing amounts of food, water and energy’. This will prompt a ‘return¶ to traditional security threats posed by emerging near-peers as we compete globally for depleting¶ natural resources and overseas markets’. Finally, climate change will ‘compound’ these stressors¶ by generating humanitarian crises, population migrations and other complex emergencies.96¶ A similar study by the US Joint Forces Command draws attention to the danger of global¶ energy depletion through to 2030. Warning of ‘the dangerous vulnerabilities the growing¶ energy crisis presents’, the report concludes that ‘The implications for future conflict are¶ ominous.’97 Once again, the subject turns to demographics: ‘In total, the world will add approximately¶ 60 million people each year and reach a total of 8 billion by the 2030s’, 95 per cent accruing¶ to developing countries, while populations in developed countries slow or decline. ‘Regions¶ such as the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the youth bulge will reach over 50% of¶ the population, will possess fewer inhibitions about engaging in conflict.’98 The assumption is¶ that regions which happen to be both energy-rich and Muslim-majority will also be sites of¶ violent conflict due to their rapidly growing populations.¶ A British Ministry of Defence report concurs with this assessment, highlighting an inevitable¶ ‘youth bulge’ by 2035, with some 87 per cent of all people under the age of 25 inhabiting¶ developing countries. In particular, the Middle East population will increase by 132 per cent¶ and sub-Saharan Africa by 81 per cent. Growing resentment due to ‘endemic unemployment’¶ will be channelled through ‘political militancy, including radical political Islam whose concept¶ of Umma, the global Islamic community, and resistance to capitalism may lie uneasily in an international¶ system based on nation-states and global market forces’. More strangely, predicting an¶ intensifying global divide between a super-rich elite, the middle classes and an urban under-class,¶ the report warns: ‘The world’s middle classes might unite, using access to knowledge, resources¶ and skills to shape transnational processes in their own class interest.’99¶ 3.3 Exclusionary logics of global crisis securitisation?¶ Thus, the securitisation of global crisis leads not only to the problematisation of particular¶ religious and ethnic groups in foreign regions of geopolitical interest, but potentially extends¶ this problematisation to any social group which might challenge prevailing global political economic¶ structures across racial, national and class lines. The previous examples illustrate how securitisation¶ paradoxically generates insecurity by reifying a process of militarisation against social¶ groups that are constructed as external to the prevailing geopolitical and economic order. In¶ other words, the internal reductionism, fragmentation and compartmentalisation that plagues¶ orthodox theory and policy reproduces precisely these characteristics by externalising global¶ crises from one another, externalising states from one another, externalising the inter-state¶ system from its biophysical environment, and externalising new social groups as dangerous¶ ‘outsiders’. Hence, a simple discursive analysis of state militarisation and the construction of¶ new ‘outsider’ identities is insufficient to understand the causal dynamics driving the process¶ of ‘Otherisation’. As Doug Stokes points out, the Western state preoccupation with the¶ ongoing military struggle against international terrorism reveals an underlying ‘discursive¶ complex’, where representations about terrorism and non-Western populations are premised on¶ ‘the construction of stark boundaries’ that ‘operate to exclude and include’. Yet these exclusionary¶ discourses are ‘intimately bound up with political and economic processes’, such as strategic¶ interests in proliferating military bases in the Middle East, economic interests in control of oil, and¶ the wider political goal of ‘maintaining American hegemony’ by dominating a resource-rich¶ region critical for global capitalism.100¶ But even this does not go far enough, for arguably the construction of certain hegemonic discourses¶ is mutually constituted by these geopolitical, strategic and economic interests – exclusionary¶ discourses are politically constituted. New conceptual developments in genocide studies¶ throw further light on this in terms of the concrete socio-political dynamics of securitisation processes.¶ It is now widely recognised, for instance, that the distinguishing criterion of genocide is¶ not the pre-existence of primordial groups, one of which destroys the other on the basis of a preeminence¶ in bureaucratic military–political power. Rather, genocide is the intentional attempt to¶ destroy a particular social group that has been socially constructed as different.101 As Hinton¶ observes, genocides precisely constitute a process of ‘othering’ in which an imagined community¶ becomes reshaped so that previously ‘included’ groups become ‘ideologically recast’ and¶ dehumanised as threatening and dangerous outsiders, be it along ethnic, religious, political or¶ economic lines – eventually legitimising their annihilation.102¶ In other words, genocidal violence is inherently rooted in a prior and ongoing ideological¶ process, whereby exclusionary group categories are innovated, constructed and ‘Otherised’ in¶ accordance with a specific socio-political programme. The very process of identifying and¶ classifying particular groups as outside the boundaries of an imagined community of ‘inclusion’,¶ justifying exculpatory violence toward them, is itself a political act without which genocide would¶ be impossible.103 This recalls Lemkin’s recognition that the intention to destroy a group is integrally¶ connected with a wider socio-political project – or colonial project – designed to perpetuate¶ the political, economic, cultural and ideological relations of the perpetrators in the place of that¶ of the victims, by interrupting or eradicating their means of social reproduction. Only by interrogating¶ the dynamic and origins of this programme to uncover the social relations from which that¶ programme derives can the emergence of genocidal intent become explicable.104¶ Building on this insight, Semelin demonstrates that the process of exclusionary social group¶ construction invariably derives from political processes emerging from deep-seated sociopolitical¶ crises that undermine the prevailing framework of civil order and social norms; and¶ which can, for one social group, be seemingly resolved by projecting anxieties onto a new ‘outsider’¶ group deemed to be somehow responsible for crisis conditions. It is in this context that¶ various forms of mass violence, which may or may not eventually culminate in actual genocide,¶ can become legitimised as contributing to the resolution of crises.105¶ This does not imply that the securitisation of global crises by Western defence agencies is¶ genocidal. Rather, the same essential dynamics of social polarisation and exclusionary group¶ identity formation evident in genocides are highly relevant in understanding the radicalisation¶ processes behind mass violence. This highlights the fundamental connection between social¶ crisis, the breakdown of prevailing norms, the formation of new exclusionary group identities,¶ and the projection of blame for crisis onto a newly constructed ‘outsider’ group vindicating¶ various forms of violence.¶ Conclusions¶ While recommendations to shift our frame of orientation away from conventional state-centrism¶ toward a ‘human security’ approach are valid, this cannot be achieved without confronting the¶ deeper theoretical assumptions underlying conventional approaches to ‘non-traditional’ security¶ issues.106 By occluding the structural origin and systemic dynamic of global ecological, energy¶ and economic crises, orthodox approaches are incapable of transforming them. Coupled with¶ their excessive state-centrism, this means they operate largely at the level of ‘surface’ impacts¶ of global crises in terms of how they will affect quite traditional security issues relative to sustaining¶ state integrity, such as international terrorism, violent conflict and population movements.¶ Global crises end up fuelling the projection of risk onto social networks, groups and countries¶ that cross the geopolitical fault-lines of these ‘surface’ impacts – which happen to intersect¶ largely with Muslim communities. Hence, regions particularly vulnerable to climate change¶ impacts, containing large repositories of hydrocarbon energy resources, or subject to demographic¶ transformations in the context of rising population pressures, have become the focus of¶ state security planning in the context of counter-terrorism operations abroad.¶ The intensifying problematisation and externalisation of Muslim-majority regions and populations¶ by Western security agencies – as a discourse – is therefore not only interwoven with¶ growing state perceptions of global crisis acceleration, but driven ultimately by an epistemological¶ failure to interrogate the systemic causes of this acceleration in collective state policies (which¶ themselves occur in the context of particular social, political and economic structures). This¶ expansion of militarisation is thus coeval with the subliminal normative presumption that the¶ social relations of the perpetrators, in this case Western states, must be protected and perpetuated¶ at any cost – precisely because the efficacy of the prevailing geopolitical and economic order is¶ ideologically beyond question.¶ As much as this analysis highlights a direct link between global systemic crises, social polarisation¶ and state militarisation, it fundamentally undermines the idea of a symbiotic link between¶ natural resources and conflict per se. Neither ‘resource shortages’ nor ‘resource abundance’ (in¶ ecological, energy, food and monetary terms) necessitate conflict by themselves.¶ There are two key operative factors that determine whether either condition could lead to conflict.¶ The first is the extent to which either condition can generate socio-political crises that challenge¶ or undermine the prevailing order. The second is the way in which stakeholder actors¶ choose to actually respond to the latter crises. To understand these factors accurately requires¶ close attention to the political, economic and ideological strictures of resource exploitation, consumption¶ and distribution between different social groups and classes. Overlooking the systematic¶ causes of social crisis leads to a heightened tendency to problematise its symptoms, in the¶ forms of challenges from particular social groups. This can lead to externalisation of those¶ groups, and the legitimisation of violence towards them.¶ Ultimately, this systems approach to global crises strongly suggests that conventional policy¶ ‘reform’ is woefully inadequate. Global warming and energy depletion are manifestations of a¶ civilisation which is in overshoot. The current scale and organisation of human activities is¶ breaching the limits of the wider environmental and natural resource systems in which industrial¶ civilisation is embedded. This breach is now increasingly visible in the form of two interlinked¶ crises in global food production and the global financial system. In short, industrial civilisation¶ in its current form is unsustainable. This calls for a process of wholesale civilisational transition¶ to adapt to the inevitable arrival of the post-carbon era through social, political and economic¶ transformation.¶ Yet conventional theoretical and policy approaches fail to (1) fully engage with the gravity of¶ research in the natural sciences and (2) translate the social science implications of this research in¶ terms of the embeddedness of human social systems in natural systems. Hence, lacking capacity¶ for epistemological self-reflection and inhibiting the transformative responses urgently required,¶ they reify and normalise mass violence against diverse ‘Others’, newly constructed as traditional¶ security threats enormously amplified by global crises – a process that guarantees the intensification¶ and globalisation of insecurity on the road to ecological, energy and economic catastrophe.¶ Such an outcome, of course, is not inevitable, but extensive new transdisciplinary research in IR¶ and the wider social sciences – drawing on and integrating human and critical security studies,¶ political ecology, historical sociology and historical materialism, while engaging directly with¶ developments in the natural sciences – is urgently required to develop coherent conceptual frameworks¶ which could inform more sober, effective, and joined-up policy-making on these issues.

**This shift away from traditional militaristic discourse makes room for an individual and ethical approach to environmental politics**

**Deudney, 90** (Daniel Deudney, assistant professor of political science at John Hopkins’; “The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security,” Millenium – Journal of International Studies 1990, http://people.reed.edu/~ahm/Courses/Reed-POL-372-2011-S3\_IEP/Syllabus/EReadings/07.2/07.2.Deudney1990The-Case.pdf, pg. 469)

Fortunately, environmental awareness **need not depend upon co-opted national security thinking**. Integrally woven into ecological concerns are a powerful set of interests and values—most notably human health and property values, religions and ethics, and natural beauty and concern for future generations. Efforts to raise awareness of environmental problems can thus connect directly with these strong, basic, and diverse human interests and values as **sources of motivation and mobilization**. Far from needing to be bolstered by national security mindsets, a "green" sensibility can make strong claim to being the master metaphor for an emerging postindustrial civilization. Instead of attempting to gain leverage by appropriating national security thinking, environmentalists can gain much more political leverage by continuing to develop and disseminate this immensely rich and powerful worldvie Earth Nationalism Transposing existing national security thinking and approaches to environmental politics is likely to be both **ineffective**, and to the extent effective, **counterproductive**. But the story should not end with this negative conclusion. Fully grasping the ramifications of the emerging environmental problems requires a **radical rethinking** and reconstitution of many of the major institutions of industrial modernity, including the nation. The nation and the national, as scholars on the topic emphasize, are complex phenomena because so many different components of identity have become conflated with or incorporated into national identities. Most important in Western constructions of national identity have been ethnicity, religion, language, and war memories. However, one dimension of the national—identification with place—has been underappreciated, and this dimension opens important avenues for reconstructing identity in ecologically appropriate ways. Identification with a particular physical place, what geographers of place awareness refer to as "geopiety" and "topophilia," has been an important component of national identity.35 As Edmund Burke, the great philosopher of nationalism, observed, the sentimental attachment to place is among the most elemental widespread and powerful of forces, both in humans and in animals. In the modern era the nation-state has sought to shape and exploit this sentimental attachment. With the growth of ecological problems, this sense of place and threat to place takes on a new character. In positing the "bioregion" as the appropriate unit for political identity, environmentalists are recovering and redefining topophilia and geopiety in ways that subvert the state-constructed and state-supporting nation. Whether the bioregion is understood as a particular locality defined by ecological parameters, or the entire planet as the only naturally autonomous bioregion, environmentalists are asserting what can appropriately be called "earth nationalism." 36 This construction of the nation has radical implications for existing state and international political communities. This emergent earth nationalism is radical both in the sense of returning to fundamental roots, and in posing a fundamental challenge to the state-sponsored and defined concept of nation now hegemonic in world politics. It also entails a **powerful and fresh way to conceptualize environmental protection** as the practice of national security.

### Case

This advantage is nonsensical – the embargo only prohibits trade with the US – if other countries haven’t adopted, that’s because they don’t think it’s profitable – if they have, the squo solves

They also don’t have a card that says the US is to exporting it

#### **US won’t adopt Cuban model – agribusiness**

Pfeiffer, 3 – energy editor for From the Wilderness (Dale, “Cuba-A Hope”, From the Wilderness,

<http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/120103_korea_2.html>.

Resistance to Cuban-style agricultural reform would be particularly stiff in the United States. Agribusiness will not allow all of its holdings and power to be expropriated. Nor is the U.S. government interested in small farms and organic agriculture. The direction of U.S. agriculture is currently towards more advanced technology, greater fossil fuel dependency, and less sustainability. The ability of small farmers and urban gardens to turn a profit is effectively drowned out by the overproduction of agribusiness.

#### **Cuba is already being modeled globally**

Ergas, 13 – graduate student in sociology at the University of Oregon (Christina, Monthly Review, March, “Cuban Urban Agriculture as a Strategy for Food Sovereignty” <http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty>

The agricultural revolution in Cuba has ignited the imaginations of people all over the world. Cuba’s model serves as a foundation for self-sufficiency, resistance to neocolonialist development projects, innovations in agroecology, alternatives to monoculture, and a more environmentally sustainable society. Instead of turning towards austerity measures and making concessions to large international powers during a severe economic downturn, Cubans reorganized food production and worked to gain food sovereignty as a means of subsistence, environmental protection, and national security.1 While these efforts may have been born of economic necessity, they are impressive as they have been developed in opposition to a corporate global food regime.¶ In Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba, Sinan Koont indicates that most of the global South has lost any semblance of food sovereignty—the ability to be self-sufficient, to practice a more sustainable form of agriculture, and to direct farming toward meeting the needs of people within a country, rather than producing cash crops for export (187). The World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposed structural adjustment programs and free trade agreements on the so-called third world. These policies increased the influence of multinational corporations, such as Monsanto and Cargill, in global food production. They also encouraged large-scale monocultures, whereby food production is specialized by region for international trade. These policies threatened the national food security of countries in several interrelated ways.2¶ First, economically vulnerable countries are subject to the vagaries of the international marketplace, fluctuating food prices, and heavily subsidized produce from the global North that undermine the ability of the former to compete. Second, in a for-profit economic system, certain crops, like sugarcane, potato, and corn, are planted to produce biofuels, primarily ethanol, instead of food for poor populations. Rich nations that can afford to buy crops for biofuels inflate market prices for food, and when droughts or floods destroy whole harvests, then scarce food still goes to the highest bidder. Third, nations that specialize in cash crops for export must import food, increasing overall insecurity and dependency on trade networks. These nations are more vulnerable to changes in the costs of petroleum, as it influences expenses associated with transportation, fertilizers, pesticides, and the overall price of food. In countries with higher per capita incomes, increasing food costs are an annoyance for many people but not necessarily life threatening. In countries with high rates of poverty, price increases can be devastating. All of the above problems converged during the 2007–2008 food crisis that resulted in riots in Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Mexico, and Bangladesh, just to name a few.¶ People worldwide have been affected by these policies and have fought back. Some nations have taken to task corporations like Monsanto, as in the case of India’s response to genetically modified eggplant, which involved a boycott of Monsanto’s products and demands for the eradication of genetically modified foods.3 There are burgeoning local food movements, even in the United States, that despite numerous challenges attempt to produce food outside the current large-scale agricultural paradigm.4 There are also international movements that are working to change agricultural policies and practices. For example, La Vía Campesina is an international movement comprised of peasants, small-scale farmers, and their allies. Their primary goals are to stop neoliberal policies that promote oligopolistic corporate control over agriculture and to promote food sovereignty.

Even if their evidence says ag reductions are necessary, there’s no evidence that says they are sufficient –

#### **That means that don’t solve because transportation is key – comparatively outweighs the aff’s internal link**

Burwell 11 (David, Director of the Energy and Climate Program – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “ROAD to RECOVERY: Transforming America’s Transportation”, http://carnegieendowment.org/files/road\_to\_recovery.pdf)

U.S. transportation is responsible for a significant share—30 to **85 percent**—of direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions and climate-forcing air pollutants (see figure 4.2).13 Given the large volume of fossil fuels they consume, on-road modes of transportation—cars and trucks—are the major source of this pollution. There is near parity between hydrocarbon (petroleum) energy use and the direct greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide (CO2 ). Essentially all the carbon contained in fossil fuels is converted to CO2 when burned.14 The amount of carbon released into the atmosphere is primarily determined by the carbon content of the fuel.15 The U.S. on-road transportation system runs almost exclusively on gasoline and diesel fuels. An average gallon of gasoline contains 19.4 pounds (8.8 kilograms) of CO2 . Diesel, the fuel primarily used in heavy-duty trucks and off-road vehicles, has 22.2 pounds (8.8 kilograms) of CO2 per gallon.16 These emission rates will vary depending on the source and composition of the fuel feedstock. Today, oil-fueled transportation is one of the **key drivers** of climate change. Research conducted by the Goddard Institute for Space Studies of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and by other climate agencies has found that on-road transportation has the **greatest negative effect** on climate, **more than power** generation or any other sector, especially in the short term.17 Cars and trucks emit almost no sulfates but are major emitters of CO2 , black carbon, and ozone—all of which cause global warming and are detrimental to human health. Throughout the twenty-first century, on-road transportation is expected to be a **leading** climate-forcing activity, in the United States and worldwide, as shown in figure 4.3. Traffic-related air pollution is estimated to cost as much as $80 billion annually in health care costs and premature deaths.18 Pricing mechanisms can reduce private vehicle use and congestion, which would then reduce the health costs associated with air pollution. The transportation strategy adopted to reduce downtown traffic congestion for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games in Atlanta, for example, was found to have decreased peak ozone levels by 28 percent and asthma-related emergency room visits by children by 42 percent.19 Given the U.S. transportation system’s contribution to carbon emissions and the connection to climate change, the exorbitant costs associated with climate change are worth considering but have yet to be fully quantified. Still, scientists warn that heavy precipitation, heat waves, drought and fires, melting ice caps, and tropical storms witnessed in 2010 are signs of troubling climate change already under way.20 About two new high temperature records were set for every low temperature record during the 2000s.21 Though the effects of climate change will vary greatly across the United States due to the country’s size, diverse topography, ecosystems, climates, and economies, as well as its dispersed populations and lifestyles, these changes are expected to impose huge costs, amounting to hundreds of billions annually, in terms of adaptation.22 Recent estimates predict that climate damage in 2100 could reach 2.6 percent of gross domestic product for the United States and 10.8 percent for the world.23 Estimates of the costs of adapting to climate change can provide insight into the benefits of maintaining and protecting societal goods and services to avoid the most severe climate effects. Mitigating the effects of climate change and air pollution would have widespread global and regional benefits. Reducing the rate of long-term carbon warming will benefit our grandchildren. Offsetting short-term climate forcing from reductions in air pollution—especially ozone, carbon monoxide, and black carbon—will directly benefit public health, reducing morbidity and mortality throughout the population. Transportation pricing will be **necessary** to make this shift in behavior.

#### Environmental alarmism is unfounded and not a justification for taking action

**Kaleita, 7** – PHD, Assistant Professor Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (Amy, “Hysteria’s History”Environmental Alarmism in Context”, <http://www.pacificresearch.org/docLib/20070920_Hysteria_History.pdf>)

Apocalyptic stories about the irreparable, catastrophic damage that humans are doing to the natural environment have been around for a long time. These hysterics often have some basis in reality, but are blown up to illogical and ridiculous proportions. Part of the reason they’re so appealing is that they have the ring of plausibility along with the intrigue of a horror flick. In many cases, the alarmists identify a legitimate issue, take the possible consequences to an extreme, and advocate action on the basis of these extreme projections. In 1972, the editor of the journal *Nature* pointed out the problem with the typical alarmist approach: “[Alarmists’] most common error is to suppose that the worst will always happen.”82 But of course, if the worst always happened, the human race would have died out long ago. When alarmism has a basis in reality, the challenge becomes to take appropriate action based on that reality, not on the hysteria. The aftermath of *Silent Spring* offers examples of both sorts of policy reactions: a reasoned response to a legitimate problem and a knee-jerk response to the hysteria. On the positive side, *Silent Spring* brought an end to the general belief that all synthetic chemicals in use for purposes ranging from insect control to household cleaning were uniformly wonderful, and it ushered in an age of increased caution on their appropriate use. In the second chapter of her famous book, Carson wrote, “It is not my contention that chemical insecticides must never be used. I do contend that… we have allowed these chemicals to be used with little or no advance investigation of their effect on soil, water, wildlife, and man himself.” Indeed, Carson seemed to advocate reasoned response to rigorous scientific investigation, and in fact this did become the modern approach to environmental chemical licensure and monitoring. An hour-long CBS documentary on pesticides was aired during the height of the furor over *Silent Spring*. In the documentary, Dr. Page Nicholson, a water-pollution expert with the Public Health Service, wasn’t able to answer how long pesticides persist in water once they enter it, or the extent to which pesticides contaminate groundwater supplies. Today, this sort of information is gathered through routine testing of chemicals for use in the environment. 20 V: Lessons from the Apocalypse Ironically, rigorous investigation was not used in the decision to ban DDT, primarily due to the hysteria *Silent Spring* generated. In this example, the hysteria took on a life of its own, even trumping the author’s original intent. There was, as we have seen, a more sinister and tragic response to the hysteria generated by *Silent Spring*. Certain developing countries, under significant pressure from the United States, abandoned the use of DDT. This decision resulted in millions of deaths from malaria and other insect-borne diseases. In the absence of pressure to abandon the use of DDT, these lives would have been spared. It would certainly have been possible to design policies requiring caution and safe practices in the use of supplemental chemicals in the environment, without pronouncing a death sentence on millions of people. A major challenge in developing appropriate responses to legitimate problems is that alarmism catches people’s attention and draws them in. Alarmism is given more weight than it deserves, as policy makers attempt to appease their constituency and the media. It polarizes the debaters into groups of “believers” and “skeptics,” so that reasoned, fact-based compromise is difficult to achieve. Neither of these aspects of alarmism is healthy for the development of appropriate policy. Further, alarmist responses to valid problems risk foreclosing potentially useful responses based on ingenuity and progress. There are many examples from the energy sector where, in the presence of economic, efficiency, or societal demands, the marketplace has responded by developing better alternatives. That is not to say that we should blissfully squander our energy resources; on the contrary, we should be careful to utilize them wisely. But energy-resource hysteria should not lead us to circumvent scientific advancement by cherry-picking and favoring one particular replacement technology at the expense of other promising technologies. Environmental alarmism should be taken for what it is—a natural tendency of some portion of the public to latch onto the worst, and most unlikely, potential outcome. Alarmism should not be used as the basis for policy. Where a real problem exists, solutions should be based on reality, not hysteria.

#### China makes the impact inevitable and they don’t model

**Downs, 8**

Eric, Fellow @ Brookings, China Energy Fellow, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, China’s Energy Policies and Their Environmental Impacts, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2008/0813\_china\_downs.aspx

China suffers from a disconnect between the increasingly prominent position of energy issues on its domestic and foreign policy agendas and the capacity of the country’s institutions to manage the energy sector. Some Chinese commentators have even argued that the biggest threat to China’s energy security is posed by the very institutions responsible for enhancing it. Consequently, restructuring China’s energy policymaking apparatus has been a subject of intense debate in recent years as the country has grappled with an unexpected surge in energy demand, growing dependence on energy imports, rising global energy prices and periodic domestic energy supply shortages. Authority over China’s energy sector at the national level is fractured among more than a dozen government agencies, the most important of which is the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). Within the NDRC itself, responsibility for energy is similarly scattered among multiple departments. Prior to the restructuring in March 2008, the key component was the Energy Bureau, which had a broad mandate but lacked the authority, tools and manpower to fulfill it. In 2005, the government added another cook to the kitchen with the establishment of the National Energy Leading Group, an advisory body headed by Premier Wen Jiabao. While the leading group’s creation reflected recognition of the need to strengthen energy sector management, it did not eradicate China’s energy governance woes. China’s fragmented energy policymaking structure has impeded energy governance because there is no single institution, such as a Ministry of Energy, with the authority to coordinate the interests of the various stakeholders. For example, the implementation of energy laws is hampered by the fact that those laws often do not specify the government agencies responsible for implementation because of disputes over who should be in charge. Similarly, the fuel tax that the NPC approved in 1999 has not been implemented because of the failure of the relevant stakeholders to reach an agreement. The policy paralysis within the energy bureaucracy stands in sharp contrast to the activism of China’s state-owned energy companies. These firms are powerful and relatively autonomous actors. Their influence is derived from their full and vice ministerial ranks, the membership of some top executives in the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, industry expertise, internationally listed subsidiaries and profitability (at least until recently). More often than not, it is China’s energy firms who initiate major energy projects and policies that are later embraced by the government, such as the West-East Pipeline and the acquisition of foreign energy assets. The companies also have some capacity to advance corporate interests at the expense of national ones. For example, oil and power generating companies have periodically reduced their output to pressure the government to raise the state-set prices of refined products and electricity, which have not kept pace with increases in the market-determined prices of crude oil and coal. Similarly, China’s national oil companies have ignored guidance from the central government about where they should invest overseas. II. China’s “new” energy policymaking structure The recent changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus are the latest in a series of institutional reforms aimed at improving energy governance. In March 2008, the NPC approved two additions to China’s energy bureaucracy – the State Energy Commission (SEC) and the National Energy Administration (NEA). The SEC, a high-level discussion and coordination body whose specific functions, organization and staffing have not yet been determined, will replace the National Energy Leading Group. The daily affairs of the SEC will be handled by the NEA, a vice-ministerial component of the NDRC, which is the successor to the NDRC’s Energy Bureau. In addition to the Energy Bureau, the NEA is also comprised of other energy offices from the NDRC, the Office of the National Leading Group, and the nuclear power administration of the Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense. The NEA has a broad mandate, which includes managing the country’s energy industries, drafting energy plans and policies, negotiating with international energy agencies and approving foreign energy investments. The NEA, like its predecessor, will struggle to fulfill its mandate because it lacks the authority, autonomy, manpower and tools to deal with the country’s energy challenges. Although the NEA’s capabilities in each of these areas are greater than those possessed by the NDRC Energy Bureau, they still fall short of what the NEA needs to do its job. Authority: The NEA has more political clout than its predecessor, but not enough to mitigate the bureaucratic infighting that undermines energy decision-making. The NEA is a vice-ministerial body, which is a step above that of the Energy Bureau, which was a bureau-level organization. However, the NEA still does not have the authority it needs to coordinate the interests of ministries, commissions and state-owned energy companies. One of the frustrations of officials in the NDRC Energy Bureau was that the energy companies often undercut their authority by circumventing the Bureau to hold face-to-face discussions with China’s senior leadership. The authority of the NEA is somewhat enhanced by the appointment of Zhang Guobao, a Vice-Chairman of the NDRC with full ministerial rank, as head of the NEA. While it was widely expected that Zhang would retire, his new position is a reflection of his substantial energy expertise. Zhang, who has worked at the NDRC since 1983, is a smart and skillful bureaucrat with encyclopedic knowledge of China’s energy sector. He has overseen the development of some of the country’s major infrastructure projects, including the West-East Pipeline, the transmission of electricity from west to east, the Qinghai-Tibet Railway and the expansion of Beijing Capital International Airport. Autonomy: The NEA is a creature of the NDRC. Some Chinese media reports speculated that the fact that the NEA’s offices will be separate from those of the NDRC and that the NEA will have its own Party Group – which will give the NEA greater autonomy in managing its affairs, including personnel decisions – are signs of the NEA’s independence. However, the fact that Zhang Guobao – an NDRC “lifer” – is head of the NEA and its Party Group indicates that the NEA’s room to maneuver will be constrained by the NDRC. Moreover, the NEA’s independence is limited by the fact that key tools it needs to effectively manage the energy sector are in the hands of the NDRC. Tools: Arguably the greatest constraint on the NEA’s ability to fulfill its mandate is the fact that is does not possess the authority to set energy prices, which remain the purview of the NDRC’s Pricing Department. The issue of who would end up with the power to determine energy prices was, in the words of Zhang Guobao, a subject of “constant dispute” during the bureaucratic reorganization. Although the NEA can make suggestions about energy price adjustments and should be consulted by the NDRC on any proposed changes, the shots are still being called by the NDRC (and ultimately the State Council, whose approval is needed for any major energy price changes). The fact that the NDRC retained control over energy prices is hardly surprising. The power to set prices is one of the NDRC’s main instruments of macroeconomic control, which it understandably is reluctant to relinquish, especially to a subordinate component which might be tempted to adjust energy prices in ways that run counter to broader NDRC objectives, such as combating inflation. The NEA’s lack of authority over energy prices makes its task of mitigating the current electricity shortages, which are partly rooted in price controls, especially challenging. Electricity prices are set by the state, while coal prices are determined by the market. The failure of electricity price increases to keep pace with soaring coal prices has contributed to the national power shortage because some electricity producers can't afford coal while others are unwilling to operate at a loss. With no pricing power, the NEA has little choice but to resort to administrative measures to achieve an objective that would be more effectively realized by raising and ultimately liberalizing electricity prices. Personnel: The central government is still managing the energy sector with a skeleton crew. Contrary to rumors that the NEA’s staff would be as large as 200, it ended up with just 112 people. This staff quota is certainly larger than that of the NDRC Energy Bureau, which had only 50 people, but it does not represent a major increase in the number of people directly involved in managing the energy sector at the national level. Moreover, some Chinese media reports have speculated that the NEA may face the problem of “too many generals and not enough soldiers” because at least half of the 112 slots at the NEA are for positions at the deputy department head level and above. The Party organ that determines the functions, internal structure and staff quotas for government institutions probably resisted calls for more personnel out of concern that if it approved a large staff for the NEA, then other government bodies would also press for more manpower at a time when the State Council is trying to streamline the bureaucracy. In sum, China’s new energy administration is unlikely to substantially improve energy governance. The organizational changes are tantamount to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Although the energy bureaucracy looks a bit different, its limited capacities remain largely unchanged. Consequently, we can expect to see a continuation of business as usual: conflicts of interest will impede decision-making; the energy companies will remain important drivers of projects and policies; state-set energy prices will continue to contribute to periodic domestic energy supply shortfalls; and the NEA, with no authority to adjust energy prices, probably will resort to “second best” administrative measures to try to eradicate those shortages. The modest tinkering to China’s energy policymaking apparatus unveiled during the March 2008 NPC meeting reflects the conflicts of interest that stymie energy decision-making. Despite widespread recognition among Chinese officials and energy experts of the need to get the country’s energy institutions “right” and the growing chorus of voices calling for the establishment of a Ministry of Energy (MOE), there are powerful ministerial and corporate interests that favor the status quo. The opposition to the creation of a MOE, a hot topic of debate in Chinese energy circles in recent years, was led by the NDRC and the state-owned energy companies. The mere specter of a MOE strikes fear in the heart of the NDRC because it would deprive the NDRC of a substantial portion of its portfolio and important tools of macroeconomic control. The NDRC’s aversion is shared by the energy firms who are reluctant to have another political master and afraid that a MOE would limit their direct access to China’s leadership. Such opposition helps explain why the government was unable to forge a consensus in favor of more robust changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus. Implications for the United States First, US policymakers should recognize that China’s fractured energy policymaking apparatus may constrain the Chinese government from doing all that US policymakers would like it to do – and indeed what Chinese leaders themselves might want to do – to enhance international energy security and combat climate change. If China falls short of our expectations it may not reflect a conscious decision by Beijing to shirk its global responsibilities but rather the limited capacity of its national energy institutions to bend other actors, notably firms and local governments, to its will.

**China key to solving emissions**

**Chen et al., 10** Chen, Qian, Peridas, Qiu, Ho: Natural Resources Defense Council, Friedmann: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Li, Wei: Institute of Rock and Soil Mechanics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Sung, Fowler: Clean Air Task Force, Seligsohn, Liu, Forbes: World Resources Institute, Zhang: China Tsinghua University, Zhao: Institute of Engineering Thermophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (Jason Chen, Jingjing Qian, George Peridas, Yueming Qiu, Bruce Ho, Julio Friedmann, Xiaochun Li, Ning Wei, S. Ming Sung, Mike Fowler, Deborah Seligsohn, Yue Liu, Sarah Forbes, Dongjie Zhang, Lifeng Zhao, December 2010, “Identifying Near-Term Opportunities For Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) in China,” <http://docs.nrdc.org/international/files/int_10121001a.pdf)//DR>. H

Coal—the most carbon-laden of the three major fossil fuels (i.e., natural gas, crude oil, and coal)—supplies nearly **70 percent** of China’s energy. China’s heavy reliance on this fuel is reflected by the fact that during the last five years the country has accounted for nearly fourfifths of the global growth in coal consumption.8 In 2008, China consumed more coal than North and South America, the European Union, Russia, the Middle East, and Africa combined (see Figure 2.1). Heavy reliance on coal has sharply driven up China’s CO2 emissions. In 1994, China emitted 3.07 billion tons, or gigatons (Gt), of CO2. A decade later, in 2004, China’s CO2 emissions stood 60 percent higher, at over 5 Gt a year.9 As a result, China’s annual CO2 emissions now exceed those of the United States.10 With its CO2 emissions surging nearly eight times faster than in the rest of the world (see Figure 2.2), China has a pivotal role to play in the global effort to prevent the worst impacts of global warming from occurring.11

### Framing

#### Representation of violence as physical desensitizes us to everyday manifestations of neo-colonialism and racism—educational resistance is key

Green and Shahjahan 13 (Qiana and Riyad A., Profs @ Michigan State U, Unpacking Desensitization, Whiteness, and Violence, Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy 10(2), p. 130-3)//LA \*\*\*Clarity edits to this text marked by |||.

As we, two scholars of color, learned about the Boston marathon bombings recently, we simultaneously felt both indifferent and guilty for not feeling much—desensitization. We experienced a similar desensitization following the Sandy Hook school shootings. Why did we feel desensitized? Why didn’t we sympathize or empathize with the victims of these two events? We sug- gest that over time the racially minoritized in U.S. society become indifferent toward these violent events by repeatedly seeing and hearing |||violent events|||the same types of victims. More significantly, this repeated coverage discourages any form of advocacy against violence since our emotional responses to violent events lessen over time. Due to Whiteness (a particular system of racial domination that elevates White people over people of color), the racially majoritized become desensitized to the experiences of people of color, and people of color become desensitized to their own and the dominant group’s experiences. To address this desensitization, we suggest a more holistic definition of violence that moves beyond an exclusively physical focus to also include non-physical forms that many of us (i.e., the racially minoritized) experience daily (albeit in varying degrees due to our social positionality). Among media outlets, portraying physical violence appears the priority. However, such representation leaves out the non-physical forms of violence—including misrepresentation, invisibility, lack of resources, forced assimilation, invalidation of one’s history, absence of diverse perspec- tives, microaggressions, and bodily misrecognitions—that comprise the daily racially minoritized experience (Smith, 2005). Put together, we believe these non-physical forms of violence as vestiges of colonial domination are sig- nificant and detrimental to the experiences of the racially minoritized. Yet, by not representing or discussing these other forms of violence (which in- terconnect with physical violence), we increasingly become desensitized to mainstream physical violence as we increasingly feel negated or unheard. Centuries of interconnected systematic racism, patriarchy, heterosex- ism, and colonialism impact society’s ability to empathize with the violence perpetrated against the racially minoritized (Smith, 2006) and instead perpet- uate “stealing the pain of others” (Razack, 2007, p. 376). Whiteness perpetu- ates the dominant myth that violence toward people of color is “their issue;” however violence against White people in the United States, no matter the perpetrator, is everyone’s issue (Razack, 2007). This dominant myth is ap- parent in mainstream news reporting that privileges certain perspectives. For instance, while the Sandy Hook shooting (comprised of predominantly White victims) was covered for weeks, the July 4, 2013 Chicago shooting, which claimed the lives of 34 Black and Latino victims (including two children ages five and seven), received no mainstream air time. Such biased media coverage bolsters our desensitization as a society as both majoritized and minoritized groups repeatedly see certain faces of violence and its victims. Due to a history of colonial hegemony, Whiteness continues to carry the power to define violence and allocate value among social groups. For instance, because of colonial histories, Black males are perceived as threaten- ing and continue to suffer devastating consequences, such as racial profiling, mistaken incarceration, and death. Most recently, while the media focused on George Zimmerman, stereotypes and assumptions leading to the killing of 17-year old Trayvon Martin remained unquestioned. Through biased sto- ries, the media exacerbates paranoia, reinforces existing fear, and justifies the logic of expendability toward people of color (Smith, 2006). Unchallenged, the racially minoritized internalize the effects of Whiteness, furthering self- harm and contributing to a community of violence against people of color (Smith, 2005). Not questioning this behavior supports the exclusion of our experiences, not just via news media, but within spaces designed to protect and serve all people, such as legislation, political systems, and educational environments. As a global classroom, the media further exacerbates the dehumaniza- tion of the racially minoritized by portraying them as worthless (Martinot, 2003), thereby perpetuating White supremacy and desensitization. The me- dia constructs, reinforces, and diffuses stereotypes/assumptions among the masses. Interestingly, social media avenues (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, and blogs) have become inclusive venues for critical conversations, debates, sto- ries previously untold, and multiple perspectives. Countermedia (e.g., Color- lines magazine, Melissa Harris-Perry show, Angry Asian Man blog, Think Progress, Blacktwitter, etc.) have represented voices missing from main- stream media. The above media sources provide space for diverse perspec- tives, allowing followers to avoid desensitization. Given that interlocking systems of oppression (interconnecting White- ness, colonialism, racism, and heteropatriarchy) impart the brunt of non- physical forms of violence on the racially minoritized daily (Smith, 2005), we suggest expanding the definition of violence and working toward addressing the desensitization that many of us experience (but may not share publicly!). Sharing historically ignored stories through multiple outlets of public ped- agogy (e.g., mainstream news, countermedia, movies, television, academic spaces, etc.) (Giroux, 2003) and allowing more equitable representation will bolster a holistic understanding of violence. Such equitable representation will allow the desensitized to take a more proactive approach (as we now feel represented in and ownership of public pedagogy) toward reducing vio- lence in U.S. society in the following ways. It will support reducing violence through (1) raising awareness and understanding about its various mani- festations, (2) acknowledging all bodies (including themselves) as “really” valuable, and (3) understanding one’s complicity in perpetuating violence by ignoring it. To this end, curriculum studies/theory could help reduce violence in U.S. society and schooling by centering a more holistic vision of violence in praxis, and abate the increasing desensitization toward vio- lence in schooling by acknowledging the above questions of representation, knowledge, and interlocking systems of oppression. Through this acknowl- edgement, we believe all bodies and experiences will become equitable and valuable knowledge producers in the learning environment.

#### Thesis claim: desire lacks as a result of the structure of language on the speaking organism – the aff is an attempt at providing a palliative to the ills of the social order which results only in scapegoating and political failure

Edkins 3 (Jenny, U of Wales Aberystwyth, Trauma and the Memory of Politics, p. 11-14)//LA \*\*\*Pronoun replacements by ||| in the text.

In the psychoanalytic account the subject is formed around a lack, and in the face of trauma. We become who we are by finding our place within the social order and family structures into which we are born. That social order is produced in symbolic terms, through language. Language does not just name things that are already there in the world. Language divides up the world in particular ways to produce for every social grouping what it calls 'reality'. Each language - each symbolic or social order has its own way of doing this. Crucially, none of these |||social orders||| are complete; none of them can find a place for everything. This is a logical limitation, not a question of a symbolic or social order being insufficiently developed. Completeness or closure is impossible. There is always, inevitably, something that is missed out, something that cannot be symbolised, and this is one part of what psychoanalytic theory calls 'the real'. In its birth into the symbolic or social order, into language, the subject is formed around, and through a veiling of, that which cannot be symbolized the traumatic real. The real is traumatic, and has to be hidden or forgotten, because it is a threat to the imaginary completeness of the subject. The 'subject' only exists in as far as the person finds their place within the social or symbolic order. But no place that the person occupies as a mother, friend, consumer, activistcan fully express what that person is. There is always something more. Again, this is not a question of people not fitting into the roles available for them and a call for more person-friendly societies. Nor does it concern multiple or fragmented identities in a postmodern world. It is a matter of a structural impossibility. If someone is, say, a political activist, there is always the immediate question of whether they are sufficiently involved to count as an activist: don't activists have to be more committed, to take part in more than just demonstrations, shouldn't they stand for office? On the other hand, are they perhaps more than an activist does that description do justice to what they are, to their role in the party? There is always an excess, a surplus, in one direction or the other. However, we choose on the whole to ignore this - to forget this impossibility, and to act as if completeness and closure were possible. We hide the traumatic real, and stick with the fantasy of what we call social reality. As I have argued elsewhere, the political is that which enjoins us not to forget the traumatic real but rather to acknowledge the constituted and provisional nature of what we call social reality. Politics refers to the sphere of activity and institutions that is called 'politics' as opposed to 'economics' or 'society'. Politics is part of what we call social reality. It exists within the agendas and frameworks that are already accepted within the social order. The political, in its 'properly traumatic dimension', on the other hand, concerns the real. It refers to events in which politics of the first sort and its institutions are brought into being. This can be the day-to-day production and reproduction of the social and symbolic order. This continual process has to take place; the social order is not natural, it doesn't exist unless it is produced continually. The political also takes place at moments when major upheavals occur that replace a preceding social and legal system and set up a new order in its place. At such points, the symbolism and ideology that concealed the fragile and contingent nature of authority collapse altogether and there is a brief interregnum before the new order imposes a different form of concealment. The way that time figures in the psychoanalytic account is interesting. A certain non-linearity is evident: time no longer moves unproblematically from past through present to future. In a sense, subjects only retrospectively become what they already are - they only ever will have been. And the social order too shares this retroactive constitution. The subject and the social order in which the subject finds a place are both in a continual process of becoming. Neither exists as a fixed entity in the present moment, as the common-sense view in western culture mightlead us to expect. Both are always in the process of formation. This is because the two are so intimately related. The person is formed, not through a process of interaction with the social order (since that would mean thinking of the social as already there), but by imagining or supposing that the social order exists. This supposing by the individual is what brings the social into being. We have to imagine that others will respond to us before we speak, but it is only our speaking, of course, that enables them to respond. But supposing that the social exists does not only produce the social order, it also, simultaneously, brings the individual into existence too. When our speaking elicits a response, we recognise ourselves as subjects in that response. This recognition is belated when viewed through the lens of a linear temporality: it is not at the moment we decide to speak that we see who we are, but only a moment later, when we get a response. The response tells us not who we are now, since we are no longer that - we have already changed. It tells us who we were, at the moment when we spoke. This is the sense in which we never are, we only ever will hazy been. Like the distant stars, whose past we know from the light that has taken millions of years to reach us but whose present we can only guess at, we can only know what we were, not what we are. And even that is also a guess, of course. In a similar way, when we listen to a sentence being spoken, we can predict what is being said, but we cannot be sure we were right until the sentence is completed and over. Some forms of speech - rhetoric and jokes for example - play on that unpredictability. The uncertainty and unpredictability that this involves can be unsettling. In the rational west, we tend to seek certainty and security above all. We don't like not knowing. So we pretend that we do. Or that if we don't we could, given sufficient scientific research effort and enough money. We forget the uncertainties involved and adopt a view that what we call social reality - which Slavoj Zizek calls social fantasy -- is basically knowable. We adopt an ontology– a view of being and the nature of things - that depends on a progressive linear notion of time. Things can 'be' in our modern western sense only in the context of this temporality. They 'are' because they have a history in time, but they are at the same time separate from that history. But central to this solution to doubt is forgetting, as we have seen. The fantasy is only convincing if, once it has been put in place, we can forget that it is a fantasy. What we are forgetting some would say deliberately - is the real, that which cannot be symbolised, and that which is produced as an excess or surplus by any attempt at symbolisation. We do not remember the trauma that lies at the root of subjectivity, the lack or gap that remains, even within what we call social reality. This position leads to a depoliticisation. We forget that a complete, non-antagonistic society is impossible. We strive for completion and closure, often at any price. There are a number of ways in which this is done, according to Zizek.'' The first is communitarian attempts to produce a close homogeneous society arche-politics. Political struggle disappears because everyone agrees on everything. 'The second, most common in the liberal west, Zizek calls para-politics. Here the political is replaced by politics. Standardised competition takes place between accepted political parties according to pre-set rules, the prize being a turn at executive control of the state bureaucracy. Politics has become policing or managerial control. In the third meta-politics, political conflict is seen as a shadow theatre, with the important events taking place in another scene, that of economic processes. Politics should be cancelled when economic processes have worked themselves out (as scientific materialism predicts) and matters can be decided by rational debate and the collective will. Finally, we have ultra-politics, where political struggle becomes warfare, and the military are called in. There is no common ground for debate and politics is militarised. If we are to resist such attempts to 'gentrify' or depoliticise the political we have to recall the constituted, provisional and historically contingent nature of every social order, of every ontology. This position, which Zizek calls 'traversing the fantasy', 'tarrying with the negative' or fidelity to the ontological crack in the universe, is uncomfortable." It involves an acceptance of the lack of trauma at the centre of the subject and the non-existence of any complete, closed social order.

#### This only perpetuates university discourse – actually prevents action to “solve” warming, whatever that means

Bryant 13 (Levi R., Collin College, TX, The Intentional Stance and the Functional Stance, 9/18/13, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2013/09/18/the-intentional-stance-and-the-functional-stance/)//LA

Do we need to believe in anthropogenic climate change? I pose this question, of course, to be provocative as I do think it’s useful to believe in things like anthropogenic climate change. However, the point of posing the question is to draw attention to how a lot of us academics think and what intellectual movements such as actor-network theory and the new materialisms and realisms might bring to the table at the level of political strategy. A lot of us seem to think that our political work consists in persuading others to believe certain things. People must be persuaded to believe that neoliberal economic philosophy pervades all aspects of contemporary life (true). People must be persuaded to believe that current climate change is caused by human activity (true). Etc., etc., etc. The idea seems to be that if people have the right theory about the world or the correct set of propositional attitudes, then they’ll modify their action accordingly and do the right thing. Let’s call this the intentional attitude. The premise of the intentional attitude or intentionalism is that since action is based on belief or propositional attitudes, persuasion is a key component of political activism. The intentional attitude can be contrasted with the functional attitude. The functional attitude doesn’t deny that people have intentions and that these intentions play a significant role in why they do what they do, but it notes that functionally much of what our action produces has very little to do with what we intend in our action. For example, as I write this post I intend to persuade and convey certain ideas; however, functionally I am also contributing to the reproduction of the English language (and am probably making it worse!). When I go to the supermarket to get food for dinner I do so because I intend to feed myself, but I am also contributing to the reproduction of agrocapitalism. A lot of work in Continental political thought is undertaken for the sake of various emancipatory projects (intentional stance), but because it ends up accessible only to other expert level academics it functionally just reproduces university discourse, the tenure system, and contributes to the publication of new journal issues. In Latour’s famous example, we slow down for the cement speed bump not because of any particular belief we have about speed laws, but because of how the speed bump functions. Things that happen at the level of functionality are independent of beliefs and intentions, but contribute to why we act as we do all the same. From a functional standpoint, let’s look at intentionalist strategies again. My strategy is to persuade my interlocutor that climate change is human caused so that they will take action against these causes and support things like reducing carbon emissions and whatnot. That’s my intention. But looks at what happens. Now a massive debate goes on between the climate change denier and the person defending anthropogenic climate change theories. The denier wins either way, because functionally we end up discussing the issue to death rather than taking action. In continuing to debate we’re still doing nothing even though that’s not our intention to debate.

## 2NC

**2nc motivation fails**

The link turn is empirically denied - alarmism is high now and responses to warming are low

Foust and Murphy 2009 (Christina R. Foust is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver. William O’Shannon Murphy is a doctoral student in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver. "Revealing and Reframing Apocalyptic Tragedy in Global Warming Discourse" , Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, 3:2, 151-167 )

Since the release of Al Gore's award-winning documentary, An Inconvenient Truth, the American public has been faced with steadily increasing amounts of communication regarding climate change. Leiserowitz (2007) concludes, "Large majorities of Americans believe that global warming is real and consider it a serious problem, yet global warming remains a low priority relative to other national and environmental issues" (p. 44). Though the USA emits a shockingly disproportionate amount of greenhouse gases, large-scale policy changes or even a precursory conversation about overhauling the energy economy have been slow in coming. Meanwhile, climate scientists and others concerned about global warming have continued to sound the alarm with increasing urgency (Moser & Dilling, 2004).

No long run solvency from fear appeals - best studies prove

O'Neill and Nicholson-Cole 2009 (Saffron O’Neill is a tutor at the University of East Anglia, and a research fellow with the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. Sophie Nicholson-Cole is a senior research associate in the Tyndall Centre for Climate

Change Research at the University of East Anglia, United Kingdom. “Fear Won’t Do It” Promoting Positive Engagement With Climate Change Through Visual and Iconic Representations)

The laboratory studies reviewed by Hastings et al. (2004) often tell nothing of the long-term effectiveness of fear campaigns or about exposure to repeated fearful messages. There is also little literature examining longitudinal attitudes toward climate change and decarbonization-oriented behavior change. For example, Lowe et al. (2006) report that fear-inducing appeals are unlikely to have long-lasting impacts. Lowe et al. carried out a pre/post-test survey before and after watching the climate change disaster movie The Day After Tomorrow (Emmerich, 2004), with survey themes followed up a month later with focus groups. They found that although the majority of participants (67%) in the post-test agreed that “everybody has to do something” about climate change, this sense of urgency had substantially diminished by the time the focus groups took place.

**2nc fw**

**Representations come first in the context of climate change**

**Foust et al. 8** (Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, et al., with William O. Murphy, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and Chelsea Stow, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 2008, “Global Warming and Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Critical Frame Analysis of US Popular and Elite Press Coverage from 1997-2007,” Paper Submitted to the Environmental Communication Division of the National Communication Association Convention in San Diego, 11/20, p. 22-23)

Along with critiquing the misinformation created through poorly educated reporters, “balance-as-bias,” and media-corporate ties; and parsing out the complexities which render climate change so difficult to sustain on the public agenda; communication scholars have employed frame analysis to identify the peculiar constructions of climate change in the press. Following Entman (1993), Jones (2006) defines frames as “clusters of messages” which draw “attention on some aspects of reality while ignoring others” (pp. 14-15). As such, frames can create “subtle alterations” in the way that readers judge an event or issue (Iyengar, 1991, p. 11). Frames structure an event’s or issue’s meaning through partial and selective views, with consequences that stretch beyond readers’ interpretations. For example, the persistent tragic framing of the Matthew Shepard murder case relieved the public from a sense of responsibility, which in turn stalled the passage of hate crime prevention legislation (Ott & Aioki, 2002). Frame analysis proves important for the present analysis of global warming discourse, permitting us not only to consider the appearance of an underlying structure, but also to interrogate its possible impacts in terms of public agency, public opinion, policy, and democratic discourse. Though the general framing of climate change in American, European, and global news outlets has been explored, the apocalyptic frame remains underrepresented in the conversation. As noted in the introduction, Killingsworth and Palmer (1996) associate global warming with apocalyptic narratives, but do not fully consider the consequences of this frame on environmental issues. Likewise, Leiserowitz mentions a link between climate change and apocalypse without fully developing how this link is created, or what the full extent of its consequences might be. Leiserowitz (2007) concludes his analysis of the public’s affective images of climate change by cautioning us against taking an “alarmist” stance, as apocalyptic responses (such as “predicting ‘the end of the world’ or ‘the death of the planet’”) could “lead some to a sense of resigned fatalism” (p. 60). Because of its potential to stifle agency, as we elaborate below, a full exploration of apocalyptic frame in elite and popular press accounts of global warming is warranted.

Environmental reformism is merely an exercise in blame shifting and assuaging guilt, shielding us from ever having to take responsibility for our own personal complicity in the environmental crisis

**Bobertz, 95** (Bradley, Nebraska Law, Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory, 73 Tex. L. Rev. 711)

A routine pattern in environmental lawmaking is a tendency to blame environmental problems on easily identifiable objects or entities rather than on the social and economic practices that actually produce them. [n17](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n17) Once identified as the culprit of an environmental problem, this blame-holder comes to symbolize and embody the problem itself. Lawmaking then begins to resemble a re-enactment of a scapegoat ritual, in which the community's misfortunes are symbolically transferred to an entity that is then banished or slain in order to cleanse the community of its collective wrongdoing and remove the source of its adversity. The topic of scapegoating is commonly encountered in studies of racism, [n18](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n18) family psychology, [n19](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n19) and mass sociology, [n20](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n20) but is not often associated with law and legal scholarship. Nevertheless, parallels appear to exist between the general scapegoat phenomenon and environmental lawmaking.The term "scapegoat" derives from the guilt offerings ceremony set forth in the biblical book of Leviticus. According to the Levitical  [\*717]  scapegoat ceremony, Aaron placed both hands on the head of a live goat and confessed the sins of the people of Israel. [n21](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n21) Having thereby transferred the collective guilt of the people to the goat, he drove the goat into the desert "to carry off their iniquities to an isolated region." [n22](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n22) This ceremony was to be repeated each year on the Day of Atonement. Other sacrifice rituals, including the "sin offering for the community" [n23](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n23) and the "guilt offerings," [n24](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n24) were to be performed on a periodic basis. Essentially identical, [n25](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n25) these other ceremonies involve the slaying of a young bull as a means for forgiving inadvertent transgressions of the people. [n26](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n26)Other cultures also employ similar sacrifice rituals to expunge evils brought about by the collective misconduct of the community. Beginning with James Frazer's The Golden Bough, [n27](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n27) anthropologists have catalogued a remarkable variety of sacrifice rituals intended to expel collective sin. [n28](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n28) Despite subtle variations in form and emphasis, these ceremonies follow a remarkably similar pattern: the participants view the ritual as a necessary measure for expelling collective wrongdoing, often after some misfortune or calamity has befallen the community. [n29](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n29) Often, both the transference of the community's sins to the scapegoat object and the sacrifice of the object itself are performed by persons having special standing in the community, typically of a religious character. [n30](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n30) [\*718]  While we might view these sacrifice rituals as acts of merely symbolic import, the participants themselves clearly believe the ceremonies accomplish their desired ends. The people of Southern Africa do not place the blood of their sick people on the head of a goat (which is then banished to the veldt) to engage the curiosity of European anthropologists. They simply intend to make sick people well. [n31](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n31) Likewise, the people put to death in Salem were killed because they were thought (proven!) to be witches, not because they were personifications of some other social anxiety. [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n32) To the detached observer, the bizarre and gruesome aspects of the ceremonies may stand out, but the participants do what they do because they believe it will work. [n33](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n33)This Article is not intended to support the notion that the targets of environmental regulation, in one way or another, are "scapegoats" in the common understanding of the term -- deserving of pity and freedom from compliance with environmental laws. Instead, I intend to shed light on a simple but troubling pattern: Environmental legislation is more likely to emerge from the lawmaking process when the problem it seeks to control is readily symbolized by an identifiable object, entity, or person -- a "scapegoat" in the sense discussed above. In the absence of such a scapegoat, however, lawmakers are less likely to take action. This pattern is particularly problematic because the identified scapegoat often bears an incomplete or distorted relationship to the actual problem at hand, resulting in laws that are likewise incomplete or distorted. As discussed below in Part V, because we deal harshly with culturally accepted symbols of environmental problems, it is less likely that we will deal with the problems (and their causes) themselves. For anyone concerned about the correlation between social problems and the legal regimes we create to solve them, this phenomenon should be cause for concern.

Personal responsibility outweighs

Nayar, 99 (Jayan, Warwick Law, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall)

Rightly, we are concerned with the question of what can be done to alleviate the sufferings that prevail. But there are necessary prerequisites to answering the "what do we do?" question. We must first ask the intimately connected questions of "about what?" and "toward what end?" These questions, obviously, impinge on our vision and judgment. When we attempt to imagine transformations toward preferred human futures, we engage in the difficult task of judging the present. This is difficult not because we are oblivious to violence or that we are numb to the resulting suffering, but because, outrage with "events" of violence aside, processes of violence embroil and implicate our familiarities in ways that defy the simplicities of straightforward imputability. Despite our best efforts at categorizing violence into convenient compartments--into "disciplines" of study and analysis such as "development" and "security" (health, environment, population, being other examples of such compartmentalization) -- the encroachments of order(ing) function at more pervasive levels. And without doubt, the perspectives of the observer, commentator, and actor become crucial determinants. It is necessary, I believe, to question this, "our," perspective, to reflect upon a perspective of violence which not only locates violence as a happening "out there" while we stand as detached observers and critics, but is also one in which we are ourselves implicated in the violence of ordered worlds where we stand very much as participants. For this purpose of a critique of critique, it is necessary to consider the "technologies" of ordering.

**2nc authoritarianism**

**Furthermore, political scapegoating ensures targeting of the third world**

**Gilbert 12**

Emily Gilbert, Canadian Studies and Geography University of Toronto, 2012, "The Militarization of Climate Change," ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies, 11 (1), 1-14 7

First, the military’s interest in climate change resurrects a narrow concept of security. Although the 2010 QDR recognizes impending concerns associated with human security (eg migration, disease and food security), it models the anticipated conflict through a traditional state-to-state war scenario, refracted through a neo- Malthusian conflict over resources (Dalby, 2009; Homer-Dixon, 1999). Resource conflict and other climate change impacts are mapped onto already vulnerable places in Sub Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and South and Southeast Asia (Broder, 2009; CNA, 2007; Podesta and Ogden, 2007-08; Werz and Manlove, 2009), where, it is argued, they will act as ‘threat multipliers’ that will escalate into ‘failed state’ scenarios. This perpetuates a model whereby the enemy to the nation is elsewhere, and that ‘environmental threats are something that foreigners do to Americans or to American territory,’ not as a result of domestic policies (Eckersley 2009: 87). In this vein, the CIA has established a Center on Climate Change and National Security to collect foreign ‘intelligence’ on the national security impact of environmental change in other parts of the world.6

The bifurcation of domestic security and external threat reinforces a fiction of territorial and nationalist integrity, and works against thinking about climate change **as a global problem with a need for global responsibility and global solutions** (Dalby 2009: 50; Deudney 1999: 189).7 Moreover, the model of external threats coheres easily with the competitive frame that has been established between China and the US, as they vie not only for economic ascendency and resource- acquisition, but also for energy security and environmental policies and initiatives.8 In this vein, Thomas Freidman has proposed a militant green nationalism, something along the lines of a triumphalist Green New Deal that will recapture US global hegemony (Friedman, 2009).9 Achieving this result requires, however, more political agreement across US Democrats and Republicans, and it is precisely here that reframing climate change as a military issue seems to be an effective strategy for cross-partisan agreement.10 But what are the costs when militarization becomes necessary to legitimize climate change action?

The upshot is that the military is also legitimized, to the detriment of formal and informal politics. In a secretive and hierarchical military framework there is limited scope for public participation or legislative debate (UNEP 2007: 403). Militaries are about the ‘maintenance of elite power’ (Barnett 2001: 25). Issues regarding social justice are disregarded in favour of national objectives, while the vulnerabilities institutionalized through climate change are perpetuated (Barnett, 2006). This is particularly apparent vis-à-vis environmental refugees, which the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates will swell to 150 million by 2050 (Reuveny, 2007). Militarism encourages the use of force against foreigners, with barriers erected to exclude those who bear the immediate impact of climate change, even though they are usually the least responsible for climate change. As Paul Smith notes, Operation Seal Signal, which the US deployed in 1994 to deal with 50,000 refugees from Haiti and Cuba, offers an instructive example of how the military addresses refugees, most of whom were held at Guantanamo Bay while their cases were processed (Smith, 2007). The responses to human tragedy in Haiti and Hurricane Katrina, when military priorities took hold over the immediate needs of the racialized, impoverished victims, speaks to the dangers of concocting security threats so that abandonment is prioritized over assistance (Giroux, 2006; Hallward, 2010). This is part of a worrisome trend of the rise of an ‘aid-military complex’ and military ‘encroachment’ on civilian-sponsored development (Hartmann 2010: 240).

### **t/**

**Securitization undermines cooperation – turns the environment**

**Trombetta 8** (Maria Julia Trombetta, postdoctoral researcher at the department of Economics of Infrastructures, Delft University of Technology; “Environmental security and climate change: analysing the discourse,” Outh Cambridge Review of International Affairs, Volume 21, Number 4, December 2008)

Opponents were quick to warn that the term 'security' **evokes a set of confrontational practices** associated with the state and the military which **should be kept apart from the environmental debate** (Deudney 1990). Concerns included the possibilities of **creating new competencies for the military—militarizing the environment rather than greening security** (Kakonen 1994)—or the rise of **nationalistic attitudes** in order to protect the national environment (Deudney 1999, 466-468). Deudney argued that not only are practices and institutions associated with national security inadequate to deal with environmental problems, but security can also **introduce a zero-sum rationality** to the environmental debate that can create winners and losers, and **undermine the cooperative efforts** required by environmental problems. Similar objections came from a southern perspective: environmental security was perceived as a discourse about the security of northern countries, their **access to resources** and the **protection of their patterns of consumption** (Shiva 1994; Dalby 1999; Barnett 2001). Although the debate waxed and waned, the concept slowly gained popularity. In April 2007 the security implications of climate change were discussed by the United Nations (UN) Security Council but the state representatives remained divided over the opportunity of considering climate change and, more generally, environmental degradation as a security issue (United Nations Security Council 2007).

The divide between those who oppose the use of the term environmental security by arguing that the logic of security is fixed and inflexible and those who support it by suggesting that the logic of security should be changed distracts attention away from the question of whether practices associated with providing security have been transformed by environmental security discourses. In the literature there is a debate about whether and how **security language transforms the method of dealing with an issue**—the debate focuses 'on the implications of using security language for the definition and governance of migration and the environment' (Huysmans 2006, 16)—but there is little on the reverse process or on the implications of using environmental language for the definition and governance of security. This article is an attempt to develop the latter type of analysis by exploring the meaning and function of environmental and climate security. The purpose is to consider how the use of a word in different contexts challenges and transforms the practices and meanings associated with it. It aims to explore 'what the practices of definition and usage do to a concept, and what the concept in turn does to the world into which it is inscribed' (Bartelson 2000,182). To undertake this analysis it is necessary to explore how different discourses about environmental and climate security have developed and **'conditioned the possibility of thought and action'** (181).

The article is presented in three parts. The first explores why the environment has been excluded from security considerations. By adopting a perspective that is **attentive to the social construction of security issues** and its implications, the article assesses the potential of a **discursive approach in transforming existing security practices**. The analysis draws on the theory of securitization elaborated by the Copenhagen School (inter alia Buzan and Waever 1998) and integrates it with elements borrowed from Beck's work (inter alia 1992, 1999, 2006) on risk society to provide a framework that accounts for transformation. It argues that the securitization of environmental issues can reorient security logics and practices. The second and third parts apply this framework to explore the development of environmental security and climate security discourses respectively.

### **AT: policy key**

#### THIS IS A NEG CARD – TRY OR DIE FOR THE ALT BECAUSE WE CAN ONLY CHANGE OURSELVES – (YELLOW)

McCormack 10 (Tara, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, (Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 59-61)

In chapter 7 I engaged with the human security framework and some of the problematic implications of ‘emancipatory’ security policy frameworks. In this chapter I argued that the shift away from the pluralist security framework and the elevation of cosmopolitan and emancipatory goals has served to enforce international power inequalities rather than lessen them. Weak or unstable states are subjected to greater international scrutiny and international institutions and other states have greater freedom to intervene, but the citizens of these states have no way of controlling or influencing these international institutions or powerful states. This shift away from the pluralist security framework has not challenged the status quo, which may help to explain why major international institutions and states can easily adopt a more cosmopolitan rhetoric in their security policies. As we have seen, the shift away from the pluralist security framework has entailed a shift towards a more openly hierarchical international system, in which states are differentiated according to, for example, their ability to provide human security for their citizens or their supposed democratic commitments. In this shift, the old pluralist international norms of (formal) international sovereign equality, non-intervention and ‘blindness’ to the content of a state are overturned. Instead, international institutions and states have more freedom to intervene in weak or unstable states in order to ‘protect’ and emancipate individuals globally. Critical and emancipatory security theorists argue that the goal of the emancipation of the individual means that security must be reconceptualised away from the state. As the domestic sphere is understood to be the sphere of insecurity and disorder, the international sphere represents greater emancipatory possibilities, as Tickner argues, ‘if security is to start with the individual, its ties to state sovereignty must be severed’ (1995: 189). For critical and emancipatory theorists there must be a shift towards a ‘cosmopolitan’ legal framework, for example Mary Kaldor (2001: 10), Martin Shaw (2003: 104) and Andrew Linklater (2005). For critical theorists, one of the fundamental problems with Realism is that it is unrealistic. Because it prioritises order and the existing status quo, Realism attempts to impose a particular security framework onto a complex world, ignoring the myriad threats to people emerging from their own governments and societies. Moreover, traditional international theory serves to obscure power relations and omits a study of why the system is as it is: [O]mitting myriad strands of power amounts to exaggerating the simplicity of the entire political system. Today’s conventional portrait of international politics thus too often ends up looking like a Superman comic strip, whereas it probably should resemble a Jackson Pollock. (Enloe, 2002 [1996]: 189) Yet as I have argued, contemporary critical security theorists seem to show a marked lack of engagement with their problematic (whether the international security context, or the Yugoslav break-up and wars). Without concrete engagement and analysis, however, the critical project is undermined and critical theory becomes nothing more than a request that people behave in a nicer way to each other. Furthermore, whilst contemporary critical security theorists argue that they present a more realistic image of the world, through exposing power relations, for example, their lack of concrete analysis of the problematic considered renders them actually unable to engage with existing power structures and the way in which power is being exercised in the contemporary international system. For critical and emancipatory theorists the central place of the values of the theorist mean that it cannot fulfil its promise to critically engage with contemporary power relations and emancipatory possibilities. Values must be joined with engagement with the material circumstances of the time.

## 1NR

## Critique

### AT: Perm

#### **B. Use of security reps is a strategic political choice – they already shifted the focus of the debate away from the reality of environmental impacts when they chose to represent them in apocalyptic terms**

Trennel 6 (Paul Trennel, Ph. D from the University of Wales, Department of International Politics; “The (Im)possibility of Environmental Security,” September 2006, http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/bitstream/handle/2160/410/trenellpaulipm0060.pdf?sequence=2)

With the understanding of security as a performative rather than descriptive act in place the debate over environmental security takes on a new character. As Ole Waever has detailed, under the speech act conception of security, the “use of the security label does not merely reflect whether a problem is a security problem, it is also a political choice, that is a decision for conceptualization a special way. When an issue is “securitized” the act itself tends to lead to certain ways of addressing it” (Waever, 1995: 65). Therefore, the focus shifts from the question of whether the environment is in reality a threat to human well being – the question which underpinned the early work on the topic by those such as Mathews and Ullman – and onto the issue of whether the conditions invoked by applying the security tag are desirable for addressing the issue at hand. As Huysmans has said “One has to decide…if one wants to approach a problem in security terms or not…the is-question automatically turns into a should-question” (1998: 234, 249). The response to the should-question of environmental security is dependent on whether or not the way in which security organizes social relations can be seen as beneficial to the attempt to develop effective environmental policy.

#### The alt cannot incorporate environmental threat construction – rethinking has to come before policy deliberation to ensure the new politics of the alt are effective

**Dalby 99** (Simon Dalby, Asst Prof Intl Affairs @ Carleton; “Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics,” pg. 158-9)

But there is much more than an academic research agenda involved in these discussions. The debate about environmental security is about how politics will be rethought and policy reoriented after the Cold War. Conflating this and the academic agenda often simply causes confusion.8 The use of the term by the U.N. Development Program and the Commission on Global Governance suggests clearly a political exercise about whose issues are part of the international policy agenda. It is also to be expected that policymakers and institutions with specific political interests will attempt to co-opt advocates of positions and arguments that they find useful. The military can sometimes be “green"’ when it suits its institutional purpose, and intelligence agencies may also seek roles in monitoring environmental trends.9 In this process it is not surprising that broad generalizations proliferate along with assumptions of common global interests among all peoples. But global or universal political claims often have a nasty habit of turning out to be parochial concerns dressed up in universalist garb to justify much narrower political interests. This chapter argues that much of the policy literature linking environmental issues and security (broadly defined) is in danger of overlooking important political issues unless analysts are alert to the persistent dangers of the traditional ethnocentric and geopolitical assumptions in Anglo-American security thinking.10 Security thinking is only partly an academic discourse, it is, as recent analysts have made clear, much more importantly part of the process of international politics and the formation of American foreign policy in particular.11 This suggests that if old **ideas of security are added to new concerns** about environment the policy results may **not be anything** like what the original advocates of environmental security had in mind. There are a number of very compelling arguments already in print that suggest some considerable difficulties with the positing of environmental security as a “progressive” political discourse.12 While the argument in this chapter acknowledges the efficacy of the case against environmental security as a policy focus, the point of departure takes seriously the political desire to fundamentally rethink the whole concept of security as a strategy to reorient political thinking and to extend definitions of security, of who and what should be rendered secure, and also who should be the political agents providing these new forms of security While these “progressive” ideas may be a minority concern on the political landscape, they are interesting both because they shed light on conventional thinking and because they suggest possibilities for rethinking conventional state-dominated political concepts and practices. In particular the assumptions that state really do operate in the interests of their national population needs to be reexamined. Military organizations are not necessarily in the business solely of protecting domestic populations from external threats. As the persistence of at least some military dictatorships, and the numerous intrastate conflicts of the 1990s indicate, they often endanger “domestic” populations more than they protect against external intrusions. In addition, the common assumptions that economic development as conventionally practiced is necessarily going to provide either directly, or indirectly though state agencies, security for populations in underdeveloped parts of the world is also dubious. It is important to remember that the premise of the term sustainable development is that conventional development is not environmentally sustainable. Finally, in considering the questions of environmental security at the large scale it is also important to keep in mind the international flows of resources and wealth in the global economy, matters that conventional international relations thinking often obscures by its focus solely on states as political actors.13

**Framing the environment in terms of the economy makes collapse inevitable – we control terminal uniqueness**

**Weiskel 97** (Timothy - Research Director @ the Cambridge Climate Research Associates – PhD in Anthropology from Oxford, “Selling Pigeons in the Temple:

The Danger of Market Metaphors in an Ecosystem”, Harvard Seminar on Environmental Values, <http://www.ecoethics.net/OPS-008.HTM>) //MD

The natural order of the world and our role within it is affirmed by market enthusiasts and politicians alike to be an inevitable manifestation of the ongoing logic of an economy of unending, capitalist accumulation. In recent electoral history, politicians took pride in mouthing the simple syllogism, "it's the economy, stupid!" -- as if the only significant role of political leadership was to "grow the economy." Whether we like it or not -- whether we fully know it or not -- this entire worldview is subconsciously enlisted whenever we surrender to the use of market metaphors in devising public policy. It is no wonder that in this framework it is impossible to formulate effective environmental policy to protect biodiversity. Such a worldview arbitrarily restricts the notion of what is possible to what is profitable. Market metaphors truncate the range of policy options open to environmental leaders, and the vocabulary and images these metaphors generate completely fail to capture what we humans value most about our rich and complex world of everyday human experience. The insidious thought control exercised by market metaphors in the public discourse needs to be squarely confronted and firmly rejected. Only by stepping outside the make-believe world of these market metaphors is it possible to see why they mystify rather than clarify our environmental circumstance. Essentially, market metaphors are based on a logical fallacy that projects a fundamental falsification of reality. Despite frequent appeals to the "real world," market advocates live in a self-contained world of abstract modeling, statistical fantasies and paper currency that serves as a proxy measure of wealth. In fact, the real world is quite a different place, consisting of the physical parameters of all life forms that can be measured in terms of meters from sea-level, metric tons of gas emissions and degrees of temperature variation. The human economy needs to be understood as a subset of this physical ecosystem and not the other way around. Environmental policy based on an inverted representation of reality cannot help but fail in the long run. It is for this reason that economism -- the belief that principles of market economics can and should always be used to resolve environmental public policy dilemmas -- represents such a palpable failure of political leadership. Further, the attempt to substitute economism for meaningful public policy constitutes a blatant abdication of the public trust. This tragic abdication of the public trust through the relentless pursuit of economism has fueled the current righteous indignation of global citizens sensitive to the environment and concerned about the prospect of human survival. Politicians under the spell of economism fail to grasp what growing numbers of decent citizens sense and seek to affirm from a very deep level of conviction, and that is simply this: biodiversity must be saved for its intrinsic, expressive, and relational value -- not simply for the momentary advantage it may yield in some economist's cost-benefit calculations. If global policy makers do not free themselves from the trap of market mantras, their claim to leadership will be seen to be vacuous and illegitimate in the long run. This will be so because misplaced market metaphors cannot help but prove fatal in mediating human relationships with the environment. Taken together they have the power to drive industrial civilization into the sad syndrome of "overshoot-and-collapse" so often characteristic of failed economies of accumulation throughout human history. Unless radically different forms of valuation can be rediscovered, unless public leaders can learn to embrace and articulate them, and unless these leaders can then proceed to formulate effective public policy based on these new values to change collective human behavior, we will witness the demise of industrial society as the unavoidable outcome of "business as usual." In short, public leadership needs now to define, declare and defend the public good in terms that transcend private self-interest. There are no doubt connections between the public good and private gain, but to justify the former exclusively in terms of the latter is a fundamental mistake of moral reasoning. Without political leadership that can understand this fundamental difference and learn to defend the public good in its own right, industrial civilization will become irretrievably consumed in a scramble for private profit and personal advantage in a dismal world of diminishing resources. The Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, expressed this fear with a rivetting sense of urgency in his opening remarks at the Earth Summit Plus Five conference in New York.(6) Failure to act now could damage our planet irreversibly, unleashing a spiral of increased hunger, deprivation, disease and squalor. Ultimately, we could face the destabilising effects of conflict over vital natural resources....We must not fail. In past epochs individual religious and spiritual figures emerged to warn society of this kind of impending doom. Prophets of old inveighed against gluttonous consumption based on inequity and iniquity, and they warned societies of the physical consequences of failing to mend their ways. Perhaps more importantly, they served to remind societies of the natural order of the created world and the proper place for humankind within it. Amos, Jesus of Nazareth and Mohammed of Medina all arose in the ancient near east with strikingly parallel messages in this regard. Jews, Christians and Muslims to this day retain scriptural traditions which remind them that the earth does not ultimately belong to humans, nor will their mistreatment of the earth or their fellow creatures go unpunished. In these religious traditions arrogant, self-centered behavior with regard to the created order is thought to be morally wrong, however expedient or profitable it may prove to be for individuals in the short run. We are not fully informed by the preserved text, but one suspects that selling pigeons in the temple prompted a sense of moral indignation on the part of Jesus of Nazareth, not because the prices were a bit too high. Rather such activity inspired moral outrage because selling pigeons in the temple involved a fundamental confusion of the market place with sacred space. It is -- perhaps not surprisingly -- the scientists who speak with the prophetic voice of conviction in our day. Physicists like Nobel Laureate Henry Kendall, the late astronomer Carl Sagan, the evolutionary biologist Edward Wilson and renowned "public" scientists like the late oceanographer Jacques Cousteau now provide us with the clarion call to awareness and action that parallels the prophetic message of old. In a document entitled World Scientists' Warning to Humanity the Union of Concerned Scientists representing more than one hundred Nobel laureates put the message quite plainly:(7) Human beings and the natural world are on a collision course. Human activities inflict harsh and often irreversible damage on the environment and on critical resources. If not checked, many of our current practices put at serious risk the future that we wish for human society and the plant and animal kingdoms, and may so alter the living world that it will be unable to sustain life in the manner that we know. Fundamental changes are urgent if we are to avoid the collision our present course will bring about. It is hard to image a more thorough embodiment of the ancient prophetic tradition. Nevertheless, economists and politicians -- the scribes and Pharisees of our day -- do not yet seem to have understood the point. It is not that their prices are inaccurate -- goodness knows we have some of the world's most clever economists and accountants devoted to the task of assigning nature its cash value. We cannot expect much better on this score. But the issue before us is more fundamental than this. The essential problem is that to approach the issue of biodiversity as if it were an exercise in global bean-counting is fundamentally wrongheaded. It is wrong because it mistakes price for value, proffering market valuations as a proxy surrogate for a meaningful discussion of values. In such a constricted framework there can never be a purposeful debate -- only a mindless, mechanical and endless set of calculations. Given the two-year time frame of the electoral cycle and the pressures to craft policy to please rich and influential interest groups, there are powerful and evident reasons why politicians may well wish to avoid meaningful discussions about values and the environment. In this sense, the alliance between economists and politicians is a marriage of considerable convenience for both partners, but it must be made clear to each of them that this is not acceptable as a mode of public leadership. On this point, scientists and spiritual leaders agree, and it is for this reason that they have joined forces in such impressive numbers to express themselves in terms of the moral obligations facing the human community. The Union of Concerned Scientists has joined with the National Religious Partnership for the Environment to reiterate the prophetic message in churches, temples and mosques across the country and around the world. In a similar vein, research scientists at Harvard have provided strong support for the activities of the Harvard Seminar on Environmental Values convened by the University's Committee on Environment and the Center for the Study of Values in Public Life in order specifically to explore the full range of valuation -- not just economic costs -- which can be drawn upon in developing public policy to protect the environment and biodiversity. The message from spiritual leaders and research scientists alike is as clear as it is forceful: we did not create the world; we cannot control it; we must not destroy it. More precisely: we must not commodify and merchandise biodiversity merely because in the short run it may appear profitable for us to do so. Convinced that we know the price of everything we will soon have lost the ability to value anything that is priceless. The capacity to value some things and human experiences beyond all measure of worldly worth and to esteem them without any thought of their exchange value or sale is surely one of the most cherished attributes that makes us human. To forget this or deny it is to disavow our humanity, and down that road lies our swift and certain extinction. The capacity to appreciate intrinsic value is not a quality of humanity that it would be wise to denigrate, dismiss or eliminate in formulating environmental public policy. On the contrary, it may well constitute our last, best hope for survival as a species.

## Ag
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#### Utilitarian calculability justifies mass atrocity and turns its own end

Weizman 11 (Eyal Weizman, professor of visual and spatial cultures at Goldsmiths, University of London, 2011, “The Least of All Possible Evils: Humanitarian Violence from Arendt to Gaza,” pp 8-10)

The theological origins of the lesser evil argument cast a long shadow on the present. In fact the idiom has become so deeply ingrained, and is invoked in such a staggeringly diverse set of contexts – from individual situational ethics and international relations, to attempts to govern the economics of violence in the context of the ‘war on terror’ and the efforts of human rights and humanitarian activists to manoeuvre through the paradoxes of aid – that it seems to have altogether taken the place previously reserved for the ‘good’. Moreover, the very evocation of the ‘good’ seems to everywhere invoke the utopian tragedies of modernity, in which evil seemed lurking in a horrible manichaeistic inversion. If no hope is offered in the future, all that remains is to insure ourselves against the risks that it poses, to moderate and lessen the collateral effects of necessary acts, and tend to those who have suffered as a result. In relation to the ‘war on terror,’ the terms of the lesser evil were most clearly and prominently articulated by former human rights scholar and leader of Canada’s Liberal Party Michael Ignatieff. In his book *The Lesser Evil*, Ignatieff suggested that in ‘balancing liberty against security’ liberal states establish mechanisms to regulate the breach of some human rights and legal norms, and allow their security services to engage in forms of extrajudicial violence – which he saw as lesser evils – in order to fend off or minimize potential greater evils, such as terror attacks on civilians of western states.11 If governments need to violate rights in a terrorist emergency, this should be done, he thought, only as an exception and according to a process of adversarial scrutiny. ‘Exceptions’, Ignatieff states, ‘do not destroy the rule but save it, provided that they are temporary, publicly justified, and deployed as a last resort.’12 The lesser evil emerges here as a pragmatist compromise, a ‘tolerated sin’ that functions as the very justification for the notion of exception. State violence in this model takes part in a necro-economy in which various types of destructive measure are weighed in a utilitarian fashion, not only in relation to the damage they produce, but to the harm they purportedly prevent and even in relation to the more brutal measures they may help restrain. In this logic, the problem of contemporary state violence resembles indeed an all-too-human version of the mathematical minimum problem of the divine calculations previously mentioned, one tasked with determining the smallest level of violence necessary to avert the greater harm. For the architects of contemporary war this balance is trapped between two poles: keeping violence at a low enough level to limit civilian suffering, and at a level high enough to bring a decisive end to the war and bring peace.13 More recent works by legal scholars and legal advisers to states and militaries have sought to extend the inherent elasticity of the system of legal exception proposed by Ignatieff into ways of rewriting the laws of armed conflict themselves.14 Lesser evil arguments are now used to defend anything from targeted assassinations and mercy killings, house demolitions, deportation, torture,15 to the use of (sometimes) non-lethal chemical weapons, the use of human shields, and even ‘the intentional targeting of some civilians if it could save more innocent lives than they cost.’16 In one of its more macabre moments it was suggested that the atomic bombings of Hiroshima might also be tolerated under the defence of the lesser evil. Faced with a humanitarian A-bomb, one might wonder what, in fact, might come under the definition of a greater evil. Perhaps it is time for the differential accounting of the lesser evil to replace the mechanical bureaucracy of the ‘banality of evil’ as the idiom to describe the most extreme manifestations of violence. Indeed, it is through this use of the lesser evil that societies that see themselves as democratic can maintain regimes of occupation and neo-colonization. Beyond state agents, those practitioners of lesser evils, as this book claims, must also include the members of independent nongovernmental organizations that make up the ecology of contemporary war and crisis zones. The lesser evil is the argument of the humanitarian agent that seeks military permission to provide medicines and aid in places where it is in fact the duty of the occupying military power to do so, thus saving the military limited resources. The lesser evil is often the justification of the military officer who attempts to administer life (and death) in an ‘enlightened’ manner; it is sometimes, too, the brief of the security contractor who introduces new and more efficient weapons and spatio-technological means of domination, and advertises them as ‘humanitarian technology’. In these cases the logic of the lesser evil opens up a thick political field of participation belonging together otherwise opposing fields of action, to the extent that it might obscure the fundamental moral differences between these various groups. But, even according to the terms of an economy of losses and gains, the conception of the lesser evil risks becoming counterproductive: less brutal measures are also those that may be more easily naturalized, accepted and tolerated – and hence more frequently used, with the result that a greater evil may be reached cumulatively, Such observations amongst other paradoxes are unpacked in one of the most powerful challenges to ideas such as Ignatieff’s – Adi Ophir’s philosophical essay *The Order of Evils*. In this book Ophir developed an ethical system that is similarly not grounded in a search for the ‘good’ but the systemic logic of an economy of violence – the possibility of a lesser means and the risk of more damage – but insists that questions of violence are forever unpredictable and will always escape the capacity to calculate them. Inherent in Ophir’s insistence on the necessity of calculating is, he posits, the impossibility of doing so. The demand of his ethics are grounded in this impossibility.17