# 1NC

### 1

**TEXT –**

**We bridge the heart, body and spirit divide that is absent in our academic discussions by invoking ancient ways of knowing and existing with Earth. We establish a dialogical relationship with Earth by prior consultation with Earth over whether or not… the USFG should substantially increase financial incentives for solar energy production in the United States by making Clean Local Energy Accessible Now (CLEAN) Contracts available to ratepayers for community based solar installations**

**We are at a turning point – the gap between environmental degradation and education change is widening. The AFFs human centered approach ignores the more-than-human world**

**Barrett in 2009**

M.J. Barrett. Taking Representation Seriously: Epistemological and Ontological Congruence in Hypertexual Research/Representation. Beyond Human-Nautre-Spirit Boundaries: Research with Animate EARTH.

This doctoral research is a deliberate response to what Berry & Tucker (2006) refer to as a “deep cultural pathology” that enables continuing devastation of the planet (p. 17). Poised at the cusp of what many call “the great turning” (e.g. Korten, 2006; Macy, 1998), it both calls for and provides beginning tools to support the ‘shifts in consciousness’ long called for by those working in the environmental field. It is a reconstructive text in that it both engages and talks about a different form of consciousness many (e.g. Stirling, 2007) claim is required to respond to the ongoing and persistent gap between what is known about anthropogenic environmental degradation, and what appears to be the limited effectiveness of educational and other responses to prompt significant or lasting change (Stevenson, 2007a, 2007b). This does not mean a rejection of Western scientific or rational conceptual knowing, but rather a creation of more opportunities for both/and texts: research texts which demand different forms of consciousness from both 'writer' and 'reader,' and texts that enable 'reading' and researching through an integrated mind, heart, body and spirit. Paraphrasing the oft-cited quotation from Einstein, we cannot solve the human-created environmental and social problems with the same kind of thinking, (and I would add, consciousness, and knowledge-making processes) which created them. The dissertation emerged as an effect of my own de-colonizing journey as an academic working in the field of education where most conversations are based on assumptions of reality as material or discursively produced. It is also contextualized within continued and increasing calls for different ways of thinking (e.g. Stirling, 2007; Hart, 2005; Haraway, 2004a), a different paradigm (e.g. Capra, 1982), and different languages through which to conceptualize and engage with the more-than-human (Abram, 1996; Cole, 2002; Dunlop, 2002; Haraway, 2004b; Harvey, 2006a, 2006b). Yet to engage in such difference, as Harvey (2006b) suggests, may require “a reconfiguration of academic protocols" (p. 9). It may also involve a reconsideration of who we can be as individuals, and academics (see Dillard, 20006a, 2006b).

**AFFs current communication scholarship assumes the dominant narrative of reasons – further separating us from the more-than-human world. CP’s method is key or face extinction**

**Plumwood in 2002**

Val Plumwood. Environmental Culture: The Ecological crisis of reason. Routlege: New York. 2002.

The ecological crisis requires from us a new kind of culture because a major factor in its development has been the rationalist culture and the associated human/nature dualism characteristic of the west. Human/nature dualism, as I argued in Feminism and the Mastery of Nature , is a system of ideas that takes a radically separated reason to be the essential characteristic of humans and situates human life outside and above an inferiorised and manipulable nature. Rationalism and human/nature dualism are linked through the narrative which maps the supremacy of reason onto human supremacy via the identification of humanity with active mind and reason and of non-humans with passive, tradeable bodies. We should not mistake rationalism for reason – rather it is a cult of reason that elevates to extreme supremacy a particular narrow form of reason and correspondingly devalues the contrasted and reduced sphere of nature and embodiment. Feminist thinker Elizabeth Gross puts her finger on the basic denial mechanism involved in the irrationality of rationalist forms of reason when she writes that the crisis of reason ‘is a consequence of the historical privileging of the purely conceptual or mental over the corporeal; that is, it is a consequence of the inability of western knowledges to conceive their own processes of (material) production, processes that simultaneously rely on and disavow the role of the body’. 1 The ecological crisis can be thought of as involving a centric and self-enclosed form of reason that simultaneously relies on and disavows its material base, as ‘externality’, and a similar failure of the rationalised world it has made to acknowledge and to adapt itself adequately to its larger ‘body’, the material and ecological support base it draws on in the long-denied counter-sphere of ‘nature’. Rationalism and human/nature dualism have helped create ideals of culture and human identity that promote human distance from, control of and ruthlessness towards the sphere of nature as the Other, while minimising non-human claims to the earth and to elements of mind, reason and ethical consideration. Its monological logic leads to denials of dependency on the Other in the name of an hyperbolised autonomy, and to relationships that cannot be sustained in real world contexts of radical dependency on the Other. That the Other is an independent being on whom one is dependent is the child’s first and hardest lesson, even before the lesson that the nurturing Other must in turn be nurtured. It is a lesson that some children never properly learn, and neither do some cultures of denial. Rationalist culture has distorted many spheres of human life; its remaking is a major but essential cultural enterprise. The old reason-centred culture of the west which has allowed the ecological crisis to deepen to the current dangerous point may at one time have facilitated the dominant culture’s comparative advantage over and conquest of other more modest and ecologically-adapted cultures on this planet. This is speculation, but what is not speculation is that in an era when we are reaching the biophysical limits of the planet, this reason-centred culture has become a liability to survival. Its ‘success-making’ characteristics, including its ruthlessness in dealing with the sphere it counts as ‘nature’, have allowed it to dominate both non-human nature and other peoples and cultures. But these characteristics, and the resulting successes in commodifying the world (or producing ‘cargo’), are only too clearly related to our longer-term ecological and ethical failures. We must change this culture or face extinction. The ecological crisis we face then is both a crisis of the dominant culture and a crisis of reason, or rather, a crisis of the culture of reason or of what the dominant global culture has made of reason. Some might be tempted to suggest that reason is an experiment on the part of evolution, and that its hubris and inability to acknowledge its own dependency on the ecological order show that reason itself is ultimately a hazard to survival. But we would not need to deliver the sweeping and pessimistic judgement that reason itself is dysfunctional if we recognised reason as plural, and understood its political character as part of its social context. It is not reason itself that is the problem, I believe, but rather arrogant and insensitive forms of it that have evolved in the framework of rationalism and its dominant narrative of reason’s mastery of the opposing sphere of nature and disengagement from nature’s contaminating elements of emotion, attachment and embodiment. Increasingly these forms of reason treat the material and ecological world as dispensable. The revision of our concepts of rationality to make them more ecologically aware and accountable is one of the main themes of this book. Reason has been made a vehicle for domination and death; it can and must become a vehicle for liberation and life.

### 2

*Our bodies are the flags*

By Elana Dykewomon

our bodies are the flags that advance our causes
age race culture size ability
lesbian womyn lesbian
creased into the cloth
a permanent seam
flapping in the evening chemical breeze

SJ remembers: I was a child and saw
survivors' numbers tattooed on their arms
my aunt said: cover it up shame cover it up safety cover it up
do you want them to see?

Sauda says
the darker we are
the more we represent the unknown
the thing which others are afraid of
and are embarrassed to see us carry
along with our daily lives

and Karyn says, they don't just mean:
oh you're still here, Indian
they mean: aren't you dead yet?

and Cath says
if I let myself feel or hear the names they call me on the street
I'd never leave my house

the brand has always been on the flesh
so obvious
we have to turn our eyes away
while we distract ourselves
get through the week
our bodies bear witness

#### The public sphere relies on gendered exclusion. Civil society is the arena where men exploit and dominate women by oppressing them into lesser positions

**Fraser 90**

Nancy Fraser. Rethinking the Public Sphere. Social Text. No 25/26.

Now, let me juxtapose to this sketch of Habermas's account an alternative account that I shall piece together from some recent revisionist historiography. Briefly, scholars like Joan Landes, Mary Ryan, and Geoff Eley contend that Habermas's account idealizes the liberal public sphere. They argue that, despite the rhetoric of publicity and accessibility, that official public sphere rested on, indeed was importantly constituted by, a number of significant exclusions. For Landes, the key axis of exclusion is gender; she argues that the ethos of the new republican public sphere in France was constructed in deliberate opposition to that of a more woman- friendly salon culture that the republicans stigmatized as "artificial," "effeminate," and "aristocratic." Consequently, a new, austere style of public speech and behavior was promoted, a style deemed "rational," "virtuous," and "manly." In this way, masculinist gender constructs were built into the very conception of the republican public sphere, as was a logic that led, at the height of Jacobin rule, to the formal exclusion from political life of women.4 Here the republicans drew on classical traditions that cast femininity and publicity as oxymorons; the depth of such traditions can be gauged in the etymological connection between "public" and "pubic," a graphic trace of the fact that in the ancient world possession of a penis was a requirement for speaking in public. (A similar link is preserved, incidentally, in the etymological connection between "testimony" and "testicle.")5 Extending Landes's argument, Geoff Eley contends that exclusion are operations were essential to liberal public spheres not only in France but also in England and Germany, and that in all these countries gender exclusions were linked to other exclusions rooted in processes of class formation. In all these countries, he claims, the soil that nourished the liberal public sphere was "civil society," the emerging new congeries of voluntary associations that sprung up in what came to be known as "the age of societies." But this network of clubs and associations-philanthropic, civic, professional, and cultural-was anything but accessible to everyone. On the contrary, it was the arena, the training ground, and eventually the power base of a stratum of bourgeois men, who were coming to see themselves as a "universal class" and preparing to assert their fitness to govern. Thus, the elaboration of a distinctive culture of civil society and of an associated public sphere was implicated in the process of bourgeois class formation; its practices and ethos were marker of "distinction" in Pierre Bourdieu's sense,6 ways of defining an emerge elite, setting it off from the older aristocratic elites it was intent on displacing, on the one hand, and from the various popular and plebeian strata it aspired to rule, on the other. This process of distinction, more over, helps explain the exacerbation of sexism characteristic of the liberal public sphere; new gender norms enjoining feminine domesticity and a sharp separation of public and private spheres functioned as key signifier of bourgeois difference from both higher and lower social strata. It is a measure of the eventual success of this bourgeois project that these norms later became hegemonic, sometimes imposed on, sometimes embraced by, broader segments of society.7 Now, there is a remarkable irony here, one that Habermas's account of the rise of the public sphere fails fully to appreciate.s A discourse of publicity touting accessibility, rationality, and the suspension of status hierarchies is itself deployed as a strategy of distinction. Of course, in and of itself, this irony does not fatally compromise the discourse of publicity; that discourse can be, indeed has been, differently deployed in different circumstances and contexts. Nevertheless, it does suggest that the relationship between publicity and status is more complex than Habermas intimates, that declaring a deliberative arena to be a space where extant status distinctions are bracketed and neutralized is not sufficient to make it so.

#### Patriarchy turns all impacts

**Ray in 1997**

A. E. Ray “The Shame of it: gender-based terrorism in the former Yugoslavia and the failureof international human rights law to comprehend the injuries.” The American University Law Review. Vol 46.

In order to reach all of the violence perpetrated against the women of the former Yugoslavia that is not committed by soldiers or other officials of the state, human lights law must move beyond its artificially constructed barriers between "public" and "private" actions: A feminist perspective on human rights would require a rethinking of the notions of imputability and state responsibility and in this sense would challenge the most basic assumptions of international law. If violence against women were considered by the international legal system to be as shocking as violence against people for their political ideas, women would have considerable support in their struggle.... The assumption that underlies all law, including international human rights law, is that the public/private distinction is real: human society, human lives can be separated into two distinct spheres. This division, however, is an ideological construct rationalizing the exclusion of women from the sources of power. 2 6 The international community must recognize that violence against women is always political, regardless of where it occurs, because it affects the way women view themselves and their role in the world, as well as the lives they lead in the so-called public sphere. 2 6 ' When women are silenced within the family, their silence is not restricted to the private realm, but rather affects their voice in the public realm as well, often assuring their silence in any environment. 262 For women in the former Yugoslavia, as well as for all women, extension beyond the various public/private barriers is imperative if human rights law "is to have meaning for women brutalized in less-known theaters of war or in the by-ways of daily life." 63 Because, as currently constructed, human rights laws can reach only individual perpetrators during times of war, one alternative is to reconsider our understanding of what constitutes "war" and what constitutes "peace. " " When it is universally true that no matter where in the world a woman lives or with what culture she identifies, she is at grave risk of being beaten, imprisoned, enslaved, raped, prostituted, physically tortured, and murdered simply because she is a woman, the term "peace" does not describe her existence. 2 5 In addition to being persecuted for being a woman, many women also are persecuted on ethnic, racial, religious, sexual orientation, or other grounds. Therefore, it is crucial that our re-conceptualization of human rights is not limited to violations based on gender." Rather, our definitions of "war" and "peace" in the context of all of the world's persecuted groups should be questioned. Nevertheless, in every culture a common risk factor is being a woman, and to describe the conditions of our lives as "peace" is to deny the effect of sexual terrorism on all women. 6 7 Because we are socialized to think of times of "war" as limited to groups of men fighting over physical territory or land, we do not immediately consider the possibility of "war" outside this narrow definition except in a metaphorical sense, such as in the expression "the war against poverty." However, the physical violence and sex discrimination perpetrated against women because we are women is hardly metaphorical. Despite the fact that its prevalence makes the violence seem natural or inevitable, it is profoundly political in both its purpose and its effect. Further, its exclusion from international human rights law is no accident, but rather part of a system politically constructed to exclude and silence women. 2 6 The appropriation of women's sexuality and women's bodies as representative of men's ownership over women has been central to this "politically constructed reality. 2 6 9 Women's bodies have become the objects through which dominance and even ownership are communicated, as well as the objects through which men's honor is attained or taken away in many cultures.Y Thus, when a man wants to communicate that he is more powerful than a woman, he may beat her. When a man wants to communicate that a woman is his to use as he pleases, he may rape her or prostitute her. The objectification of women is so universal that when one country ruled by men (Serbia) wants to communicate to another country ruled by men (Bosnia-Herzegovina or Croatia) that it is superior and more powerful, it rapes, tortures, and prostitutes the "inferior" country's women. 2 71 The use of the possessive is intentional, for communication among men through the abuse of women is effective only to the extent that the group of men to whom the message is sent believes they have some right of possession over the bodies of the women used. Unless they have some claim of right to what is taken, no injury is experienced. Of course, regardless of whether a group of men sexually terrorizing a group of women is trying to communicate a message to another group of men, the universal sexual victimization of women clearly communicates to all women a message of dominance and ownership over women. As Charlotte Bunch explains, "The physical territory of [the] political struggle [over female subordination] is women's bodies." 7 2

#### Our Alternative is a castration of the system – separating us from the phallocentric logic of the polis. A method of radical female revolution through a lesbian separatist society refuses male presence.

#### Only Reclaiming the notion of lesbianism beyond mere sexual classification breaks from the norms imposed by Male Hegemony and exposes the dehumanizing understanding of woman as an object to be fucked by man. To reclaim lesbianism is to reject the demands of the male cultural system and to create and celebrate the bonds of the female world.

**Radicalesbians 1970** [Radicalesbians, “The Woman Identified Woman” http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/wlm/womid/]

**What is a lesbian? A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion. She is the woman who**, often beginning at an extremely early age, acts i**n accordance with her inner compulsion to be a more complete and freer human being than her society** - perhaps then, but certainly later - cares to allow her. These needs and actions, over a period of years, bring her into painful conflict with people, situations, the accepted ways of thinking, feeling and behaving, until she is in a state of continual war with everything around her, and usually with her self. **She may not be fully conscious of the political implications of what for her began as personal necessity, but on some level she has not been able to accept the limitations and** oppression laid on her **by the most basic role of her society--the female role.** The turmoil she experiences tends to induce guilt proportional to the degree to which she feels she is not meeting social expectations, and/or eventually drives her to question and analyze what the rest of her society more or less accepts. She is forced to evolve her own life pattern, often living much of her life alone, learning usually much earlier than her "straight" (heterosexual) sisters about the essential aloneness of life (which the myth of marriage obscures) and about the reality of illusions. **To the extent that she cannot expel the heavy socialization that goes with being female, she can never truly find peace with herself**. For she is caught somewhere between accepting society's view of her - in which case she cannot accept herself - and coming to understand what this sexist society has done to her and why it is functional and necessary for it to do so. Those of us who work that through find ourselves on the other side of a tortuous journey through a night that may have been decades long. **The perspective gained from that journey, the liberation of self, the inner peace, the real love of self and of all women, is something to be shared with all women - because we are all women.** It should first be understood that **lesbianism**, like male homosexuality, **is a category of behavior possible only in a sexist society characterized by rigid sex roles and dominated by male supremacy**. Those sex roles dehumanize women by defining us as a supportive/serving caste in relation to the master caste of men, and emotionally cripple men by demanding that they be alienated from their own bodies and emotions in order to perform their economic/political/military functions effectively. **Homosexuality is a by-product of a particular way of setting up roles** ( or approved patterns of behavior) on the basis of sex; as such it is an inauthentic ( not consonant with "reality") category. In a society in which men do not oppress women, and sexual expression is allowed to follow feelings, the categories of homosexuality and heterosexuality would disappear. But **lesbianism is also different from male homosexuality, and serves a different function in the society. "Dyke" is a different kind of put-down from "faggot",** although both imply you are not playing your socially assigned sex role. . . are not therefore a "real woman" or a "real man. " The grudging admiration felt for the tomboy, and the queasiness felt around a sissy boy point to the same thing: the contempt in which women-or those who play a female role-are held. And the investment in keeping women in that contemptuous role is very great. **Lesbian is a word**, the label, **the condition that holds women in line. When a woman hears this word tossed her way, she knows she is stepping out of line.** She knows that she has crossed the terrible boundary of her sex role. She recoils, she protests, she reshapes her actions to gain approval. Lesbian is a label invented by the Man to throw at any woman who dares to be his equal, who dares to challenge his prerogatives (including that of all women as part of the exchange medium among men), who dares to assert the primacy of her own needs. To have the label applied to people active in women's liberation is just the most recent instance of a long history; older women will recall that not so long ago, any woman who was successful, independent, not orienting her whole life about a man, would hear this word. **For in this sexist society, for a woman to be independent means she can't be a woman - she must be a dyke.** That in itself should tell us where women are at. It says as clearly as can be said: women and person are contradictory terms. For a lesbian is not considered a "real woman. " And yet, **in popular thinking, there is really only one essential difference between a lesbian and other women: that of sexual orientation - which is to say, when you strip off all the packaging, you must finally realize that the essence of being a "woman" is to get fucked by men**. "Lesbian" is one of the sexual categories by which men have divided up humanity.While all women are dehumanized as sex objects, as the objects of men they are given certain compensations: identification with his power, his ego, his status, his protection (from other males), feeling like a "real woman, " finding social acceptance by adhering to her role, etc. **Should a woman confront herself by confronting another woman, there are fewer rationalizations, fewer buffers by which to avoid the** stark **horror of her dehumanized condition.** Herein we find the overriding fear of many women toward being used as a sexual object by a woman, which not only will bring her no male-connected compensations, but also will reveal the void which is woman's real situation. This dehumanization is expressed when a straight woman learns that a sister is a lesbian; she begins to relate to her lesbian sister as her potential sex object, laying a surrogate male role on the lesbian. This reveals her heterosexual conditioning to make herself into an object when sex is potentially involved in a relationship, and it denies the lesbian her full humanity. For women, especially those in the movement, to perceive their lesbian sisters through this male grid of role definitions is to accept this male cultural conditioning and to oppress their sisters much as they themselves have been oppressed by men. Are we going to continue the male classification system of defining all females in sexual relation to some other category of people? **Affixing the label lesbian not only to a woman who aspires to be a person, but also to any situation of real love, real solidarity, real primacy among women, is a primary form of divisiveness among women: it is the condition which keeps women within the confines of the feminine role, and it is the debunking/scare term that keeps women from forming any primary attachments, groups, or associations among ourselves**.

**Lesbian anger comes from a woman’s experiences of violence and oppression by the hands of men. It unleashes a frightening rage capable of changing the world around her. Women will no longer be a walking apology, and lesbian rage demands attention and even without it tears at the walls of male supremacy for new female-driven world-making.**

**Kaplow in 1973**

 Susi Kaplow. “Getting Angry” Radical Feminism. 1973.

Two scenarios: An angry man: someone has infringed on his rights, gone against his interests, or harmed a loved one. Or perhaps his anger is social--against racism or militarism. He holds his anger in check (on the screen we can see the muscles of his face tighten, his fists clench) and then, at the strategic moment, he lets it go. We see him yelling, shouting his angry phrases with sureness and confidence--or pushing a fist into his opponent's stomach with equal conviction. In either event, the anger is resolved; our hero has vented it and is content with success or accepts what he knows to be unmerited defeat. Dissolve to scene two. An angry woman: angry at her man for cheating on her or (more likely) at the other woman. If we're in the good old days, she stomps up to her man and begins to scream wildly, he holds her down with his pinky, her anger melts in his embrace. After the fade-out, we find a puzzled heroine wondering how she could have been angry at such a good man. Or she marches over to the local saloon, hurls a few choice epithets at her rival, and then the hair-pulling begins. This ludicrous scene is always broken up by the amused and slightly scandalized gentlemen on the sidelines. In modern dress the same episode would be played differently. Discovering her hsuband's or lover's infidelity, the woman would smolder inwardly until the anger had burned down to a bitter resentment or becomes such a pressurized force that it could only come out in a rage so uncontrollable that the man (and the audience) can dismiss it as irrational. "I can't talk to you when you're like this." Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned. For a woman in our society is denied the forthright expression of her healthy anger. Her attempts at physical confrontation seem ridiculous; "ladies" do a slow burn, letting out their anger indirectly in catty little phrases, often directed against a third party, especially children. A woman has learned to hold back her anger: It's unseemly, aesthetically displeasing, and against the sweet, pliant feminine image to be angry. And the woman fears her own anger: She the great conciliator, the steadier of rocked boats, moves, out of her fear, to quiet not only others' anger but also her own. Small wonder that when the vacuum-sealed lid bursts off, the angry woman seems either like a freaked-out nut or a bitch on wheels. Her frenzy is intensified by the shakiness of her commitment to her own anger. What if she's really wrong? What if the other person is right? --Or worse (and this is the greatest fear) hits back with, "You're crazy, I don't know what you're so mad about." Why can't women allow themselves the outlet of their contained anger? Why do those around them find an angry woman so frightening that they must demoralize and deflate her into a degraded, inauthentic calm? Healthy anger says "I'm a person. I have certain human rights which you can't deny. I have a right to be treated with fairness and compassion. I have a right to live my life as I see fit, I have a right to get what I can for myself without hurting you. And if you deprive me of my rights, I'm not going to thank you, I'm going to say 'fuck off' and fight you if I have to." A person's anger puts him or her on center stage. It claims attention for itself and demands to be taken seriously, or else. (Or else I won't talk to you, I won't work with you or be friendly toward you, or else, ultimately, our association is over.) Expressing anger means risking. Risking that the other person will be angry in return, risking that he or she will misunderstand the anger or refuse to deal with it, risking that the anger itself is misplaced or misinformed. So you need strength to say you're angry--both the courage of your convictions and the ability to accept that your anger may be unwarranted without feeling crushed into nothingness. You must not have your total worth as a person riding on the worth of each individual case of anger. Thus anger is self-confident, willing to fight for itself even at the jeopardy of the status quo, capable of taking a risk and, if necessary, of accepting defeat without total demise. Above all, anger is assertive. The traditional woman is the polar opposite of this description. Lacking confidence in herself and in her own perception, she backs away from a fight or, following the rules of chivalry, lets someone else do battle for her. Strong emotions disturb her for the disruption they bring to things-as-they-are. So shaky is her self-image that every criticism is seen as an indictment of her person. She is a living, walking apology for her own existence--what could be more foreign to self-assertion? Although the reality has changed somewhat, most women will recognize themselves somewhere in this description. And society clings to this model as its ideal and calls an angry woman unfeminine. Because anger takes the woman out of her earth mother role as bastion of peace and calm, out of her familial role as peacemaker, out of her political role as preserver of the status quo, out of her economic role as cheap labor, out of her social role as second-class citizen. It takes her out of roles altogether and makes her a person. It is no accident, then, that the emotion which accompanies the first steps toward liberation is, for most women, anger. Whatever sense of self-worth you have been able to emerge with after twenty or thirty years of having your mind messed with, gives you the vague feeling that your situation is not what it should be and sends you looking tentatively at the world around you for explanations. Realizations are, at first, halting, and then begin to hit you like a relentless sledge hammer, driving the anger deeper and deeper into your consciousness with every blow. Your fury focuses on the select group of individuals who have done you the most damage. You are furious at your parents for having wanted a boy instead; at your mother (and this fury is mixed with compassion) for having let herself be stifled and having failed to show you another model of female behavior; at your father for having gotten a cheap bolster to his ego at your and your mother's expense. You are furious at those who groom you to play your shabby role. At the teachers who demanded less of you because you were a girl. At the doctors who told you birth control was the woman's responsibility, gave you a Hobson's choice of dangerous and ineffective devices, then refused you an abortion when these failed to work. At the psychiatrist who called you frigid because you didn't have vaginal orgasms and who told you you were neurotic for wanting more than the unpaid, unappreciated role of maid, wet nurse, and occasional lay. At employers who paid you less and kept you in lousy jobs. At the message from the media which you never understood before: "You've come a long way, baby" -- down the dead-end, pre-fab street we designed for you. Furious, above all, at men. For the grocer who has always called you "honey" you now have a stiff, curt "don't call me honey." For the men on the street who visit their daily indignities on your body, you have a "fuck off," or, if you're brave, a knee in the right place. For your male friends (and these get fewer and fewer) who are "all for women's lib" you reserve a cynical eye and a ready put-down. And for your man (if he's still around), a lot of hostile, angry questions. Is he different from other men? How? And when he fails to prove himself, your rage explodes readily from just beneath the surface. This is an uncomfortable period to live through. You are raw with an anger that seems to have a mind and will of its own. Your friends, most of whom disagree with you, find you strident and difficult. And you become all the more so because of your fear that they are right, that you're crazy after all. You yourself get tired of this anger--it's exhausting to be furious all the time--which won't even let you watch a movie or have a conversation in peace. But from your fury, you are gaining strength. The exercise of your anger gives you a sense of self and of self-worth. And the more this sense increases, the angrier you become. The two elements run in a dialectic whirlwind, smashing idols and myths all around them. You see, too, that you can get angry and it doesn't kill people, they don't kill you, the world doesn't fall apart. Then this anger, burning white hot against the outside world, suddenly veers around and turns its flame toward you. Sure, they fucked you up and over, sure, they oppressed you, sure they continue to degrade and use you. But--why did you let it happen? Why do you continue to let it happen? All of a sudden you are up against the part you played in your own oppression. You were the indispensible accomplice to the crime. You internalized your own inferiority, the pressing necessity to be beautiful and seductive, the belief that men are more important than women, the conviction that marriage is the ultimate goal. Seeing this, you are violent against yourself for every time you were afraid to try something for fear of failing, for all the hours lost on make-up and shopping, for every woman you missed because there was a man in the room, for getting *yourself* stuck as a housewife or in a job you hate because "marriage is your career." This phase of anger turned inward is terrifying. You are alone with your own failed responsibilities toward yourself, however much you can still blame others. It is this phase that some women find unbearable and flee from, returning to the first phase of anger or dropping out altogether. Because this inturned anger demands action--change--and won't let go until its demands begin to be satisfied. You can fall back on your inability to control others and their behavior toward you. But you can't comfortably claim powerlessness over your own conduct. Nor can you, at least for long, go on being furious at others (the forty-five-year-old who still blames mommy, flounders) if you don't even try to get yourself together. This inturned anger is a constructive or rather reconstructive catalyst. For what you can do under its impetus is to restructure yourself, putting new images, patterns and expectations in place of the old, no longer viable ones. As you use your anger, you also tame it. Anger becomes a tool which you can control, not only to help you make personal changes but to deal with the world outside as well. You can mobilize your anger to warn those around you that you're not having any more bullshit, to underscore your seriousness, to dare to drive your point home. Through the exercise of your anger, as you see its efficacy and thus your own, you gain strength. And the growing feeling that you control your anger and not vice versa adds to this strength. As you gain this control, become surer of yourself, less afraid of being told you're crazy, your anger is less enraged and, in a sense, calmer. So it becomes discriminating. You reserve it for those individuals and groups who are messing with your mind--be they men or other women. This progression of anger finds its ultimate meaning as an experience shared with other women. All striving to understand their collective situation, women in a group can help each other through the first, painful phase of outward-directed anger. Through consciousness-raising each woman can (at least ideally) find sufficient confirmation of her perceptions to be reassured of her own sanity--and can find growing strength to do without such confirmation when necessary. In the second phase of inturned anger, women can support one another in their attempts at self-definition and change, change which others will try to forestall. And, at the same time, they can start to move together to create new social forms and structures in which individual changes can come to fruition. Controlled, directed, but nonetheless passionate, anger moves from the personal to the political and becomes a force for shaping our new destiny.

**The impact is Extinction**

**Warren and Cady 94**—Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with **nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, **will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible**. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

### Case

#### Vast majority of the Environmental Justice Movement PRIORITIZES human rights over that of the non-human

Ripper 8 (The New Social Movement: Environmental Justice in the Bronx By Kelsey Ripper Professor Van Buren Environmental Studies Independent Project April 30, 2008, w ww.fordham.edu/images/academics/.../essayripper1.doc)

The Environmental Justice Movement is based on a set of principles which have been regarded as universal human rights. And the movement is just that, a movement for human rights and the right of each person to be treated fairly. For this reason, much of the Environmental Justice Movement is human-centered or anthropocentric. The mission of those involved is to achieve human equality and fairness when it comes to the environment in which we all live and work. Environmental Justice has risen out of other social movements including the civil rights and for this reason they chare many of the same core principles and values. The Environmental Justice Movement may also be considered a mere extension of the civil rights movement since it is people of color who are most often the victims of environmental injustices. The Environmental Justice movement, however, does not necessarily need be considered extensionist because it does not aim to extend rights to the environment, but rather to further clarify the meaning of human rights. Additionally, the Environmental Justice Movement does not claim moral standing for non-humans.

#### Solar disposal causes e-waste exports –

Nath 10(Stanford Journal of International Relations, Vol. XI | No. 2 , Spring, “Cleaning Up After Clean Energy: Hazardous Waste in the Solar Industry”, <http://www.stanford.edu/group/sjir/pdf/Solar_11.2.pdf>, Ishan Nath is a sophomore at Stanford University doublemajoring in Economics and Earth Systems with a focus on energy science and technology)

The first question facing solar firms is how to address the prospect of used panels inundating landfills and leaching toxic waste into the environment. When a solar module outlives its usefulness 20 to 25 years after installation, its disposal must be carefully handled to avoid contamination from the enclosed chemicals. But, given examples from similar industries, there is no guarantee that this procedure will take place. More than two-thirds of American states have no existing laws requiring electronics recycling and the US currently exports 80 percent of its electronic waste (e-waste) to developing countries that lack infrastructure to manage it. 1 Thus, by urging solar companies to plan for proper disposal of decommissioned panels, SVTC draws attention to an issue that currently remains unaddressed. The Coalition makes an appeal for legislation requiring Extended Producer Responsibility, which would force firms to take back and recycle their used products, but in the absence of such requirements, is the solar industry ready for the eventual onrush of solar panels? 2 “I don’t think enough people are thinking about [recycling used solar panels],” said Jamie Porges, COO and Founder of Radiance Solar, an Atlantabased startup. “I’m sure there are people who have thought about it, but I don’t think there’s been enough open discussion and I haven’t heard a plan.” 3 Another executive familiar with the solar industry frames the problem more urgently. Steve Newcomb, Founder and CEO of “One Block Off the Grid,” a firm that connects consumers with the solar industry, calls the issue of used solar modules “a big deal, and one that nobody’s thought a lot about yet.” If nothing is done, he warns, the situation could escalate into “a major disaster.” 4

#### E-waste is unjust – starvation, death, inequality

Templeton 9 Seattle Journal for Social Justice Volume 7 Issue 2 Spring/Summer 2009 Article 21 4-16-2012 The Dark Side of Recycling and Reusing Electronics: Is Washington's E-Cycle Program Adequate? Nicola J. Templeton, 1 JD, Seattle University School of Law, 2009; BSc (Eng.), Chemical Engineering, University of Cape Town, South Africa, 2002

Environmental degradation is the degradation of the quality of life. 94 Exporting toxic e-waste is unfair because rather than the manufacturers, producers, and users bearing the true costs of their products, developing countries are forced to bear the environmental and health costs of toxic ewaste in exchange for desperately needed jobs, income, and foreign currency. 95 This impedes economic growth and disproportionately burdens the poor; it is fundamentally unjust. E-waste trade is not a positive trade based on competitive advantage; rather it is an unjust exploitation of developing countries’ weak capacity for environmental and occupational regulation. Developing countries are far less equipped to effectively manage e-waste hazards in ways that protect human health and the environment than the countries that generate the waste. 96 In fact, most developing countries have little or no control over disposal of hazardous wastes. 97 Furthermore, many people working with ewaste have minimal education or are illiterate and lack basic knowledge of the dangers they are exposed to on a daily basis. 98 The e-waste trade compromises the economic potential of developing countries, making it even more difficult for them to overcome their development hurdles. The toxic waste contaminates the soil, the groundwater, and the food-chain, 99 which is especially harmful to these countries’ subsistence farmers and agrarian economies. 100 In addition, the opportunity costs of resources redirected from education or infrastructure building to deal with ill-health that is caused by polluted water and food sources are significant. High percentages of children die before the age of five if water is not safe to drink and nutritious and affordable food is not available; 101 thus, future generations that could be educated to build the economies of these countries are jeopardized. Moreover, unhealthy populations create weaker work forces, which are less able to contribute to growing the economies. Furthermore, the continued e-waste trade seems to contradict the United Nations’ impressive Millennium Development Goals of eradicating poverty, improving health and mortality rates, and ensuring environmental sustainability; 102 this raises a question about the level of commitment to these goals. This section further illustrates the injustice of e-waste exports by describing the deleterious effects of e-waste sent to China for “recycling” and to Nigeria for “reuse.” Although specific conditions in these two countries are discussed, the horrors of “recycling” and “reuse” exports are by no means limited to these countries. 103

#### E-Waste also ends up in landfills

Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition 9 “Toward a Just and Sustainable Solar Energy Industry.” 2009. Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition, January 14. http://www.svtc.org/site/ DocServer/Silicon\_Valley\_Toxics \_Coalition\_\_Toward\_a\_Just\_and\_ Sust.pdf?docID=821

The global tide of toxic electronic waste (e-waste) is an escalating environmental and health disaster, especially for countries in Asia, West Africa, and Latin America where ewaste is often shipped for cheap recycling. According to EPA estimates, in 2005 more than 2.6 million tons of e-waste were generated in the U.S., and that flood of waste is expected to increase dramatically with the nationwide switch from analog to digital TV in February 2009. In 2005, only 12.5 percent of that 2.6 million tons was collected for recycling. The remainder—more than 87 percent—was disposed of, largely in U.S. landfills or incinerators. The hazardous materials in e-waste, which include lead and other toxic heavy metals like mercury, chromium, and cadmium, can leach out of the landfills into groundwater and streams, and the burning of plastics can emit dioxins into the air. As of March 2008, at least ten states had passed laws banning disposal of some electronics in landfills. †

#### Landfills and toxic waste dumping are environmentally unjust

Useful Community Development 12 Environmental Justice Is Simply a Matter of Fair Distribution, <http://www.useful-community-development.org/environmental-justice.html#.UEgG9MFlT_k>

Environmental justice is a term that means that both the great environnmental amenities--parks, scenic views, freedom from pollution--and the environmental hazards are fairly distributed throughout communities. Often the phrase refers to clustering of undesirable environmental features in a particular neighborhood, usually implying undesirable land uses where low-income people live. It's pretty easy to show a racial disparity in locations of landfills, heavy industrial plants, utility transformers, railroad tracks, landfills or transfer stations, and noisy airports near working class neighborhoods or slums. The idea also may be more theoretical, considering crime, drug dealing, poor quality development, or homelessness are considered the environment. Environmental justice pretty abstract. No one strays into a neighborhood and says, "Oh, look at their environmental justice. Isn't that good-looking?" But well-meaning people do smile a little when we see government or business adding an improvement to a struggling neighborhood. The injustices, on the other hand, really should be called to the attention of the elected officials, corporate leaders, faith community, and neighborhood groups. Poor communities are usually the communities of choice when something not so desirable is located. Lack of political power in general and knowledge of environmental issues in particular allows this despicable situation to continue. The unfair distribution of undesirable environmental features and [toxic waste](http://www.useful-community-development.org/toxic-waste.html)sites begs the question of why society allows these hazards to exist anywhere near human activity in the first place. Because that's a broader discussion, we'll just concentrate on a few ideas about how to address existing environmental pollution. Mostly we think environmental injustices result from unconscious racism and classism, plus fear of the reaction of more educated and powerful neighborhoods. It's a vicious cycle, with minority groups tending to have lower incomes and therefore only being able to afford neighborhoods that have some negatives.

#### Much US solar production relies upon Federally Authorized Prison labor

Koenig 12 6/21, Obama Admin. Uses Prison Labor to Advance “Green” Agenda, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/energy/item/11805-obama-admin-uses-prison-labor-to-advance-%E2%80%9Cgreen%E2%80%9D-agenda>

The Obama administration is utilizing the U.S. prison system to help bolster its green-energy agenda, while boosting foreign companies and funneling cash into the hands of Obama’s largest campaign donors, according to a startling new [report](http://freebeacon.com/green-energy-gulag/) by the Washington Free Beacon. Federal Prison Industries, more commonly known as UNICOR, is a wholly owned corporation of the U.S. government that uses penal labor from the Federal Bureau of Prisons to produce various products and services. Established in 1934, the organization was designed as a voluntary vocational-training program for federal prisoners, but has recently gone into business providing green-energy technology to federal agencies. Federal inmates in Oregon and New York are earning between $.23 and $1.15 per hour building solar panels, which are then sold to a range of government agencies. In rationalizing the program, administration officials say it provides federal agencies with an opportunity to buy solar panels from domestic manufacturers. UNICOR emphasizes this rationale on its website, [asserting](http://www.unicor.gov/electronics/solar/index.cfm) that its panels “are domestically sourced and produced, meeting the requirements of the Buy American Act, Trade Agreement Act, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.” However, in 2009 UNICOR entered into a [$219-million contract](https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&tab=core&id=0a6cb333c605e0f250cf214d719b0c1e&_cview=0) with a Taiwanese company that supplies the solar cells used to build the panels. It’s the typical maneuver to work around the “Buy American” rhetoric, Rep. Bill Huizenga (R-Mich.) charged, because products built using foreign parts are still considered “American-made” as long as they are physically assembled in the United States. “It’s yet another outrage on what is happening with our tax dollars,” Huizenga said in an interview with the Beacon. One of the more evident problems is that the effort produces virtually no benefit to the private sector, as the parts are foreign-made, and everything is assembled by prison inmates. And if that’s not enough, the law requires that government agencies buy the products from, ironically, the government agency itself. Officials contend that the effort “prepar[es] inmates for the green economy” and that it “reduces the recidivism rate among prisoners.” However, as the Beacon affirms, a 2011 report by the Congressional Research Service debunks those claims, asserting that they are “not conclusive.” Further yet, UNICOR has an extensive history of undercutting private enterprise. For example, a military clothing manufacturer with a long history of selling to the Defense Department was recently undercut by UNICOR for a [$45-million contract](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/15/business/private-businesses-fight-federal-prisons-for-contracts.html?pagewanted=all). The company’s CEO, Steven Eisen, said he had to lay off about 100 workers after losing the contract. “Our government screams, howls and yells how the rest of the world is using prisoners or slave labor to manufacture items, and here we take the items right out of the mouths of people who need it,” he charged. Such practices have become so widespread that Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) intervened to prevent UNICOR from pirating business from the private sector in his home state. UNICOR oftentimes partners with private businesses to install the solar panels and assist government agencies in implementing other energy-efficient measures. One prominent beneficiary is Constellation Energy, an energy-efficient supplier that was recently acquired by the Exelon Corporation, a Chicago-based utility company intimately tied to the Obama administration. Only weeks after the two companies merged, Constellation was awarded a 20-year contract to supply renewable energy to 10 State Department buildings, as well as a segment of the White House campus. In what was called a “first-of-its-kind federal contract,” the effort will help “contribute to President Obama's executive order to reduce federal-wide greenhouse gas emissions 28 percent by 2020,” according to a [press release](http://freebeacon.com/green-energy-gulag/) from the company. Constellation has secured a market that the bankrupt solar firm Solyndra sought to tap before it filed for bankruptcy late last year, despite raking in a half-billion-dollar, taxpayer-backed loan guarantee from the federal government. Like Solyndra, Constellation collected hundreds of millions of dollars from Obama’s 2009 economic stimulus package. The firm’s new parent company, Exelon, has become one of the most politically connected companies in the country, and has been a prominent investor in Obama’s campaign endeavors. Company employees, including many top executives, have doled out more than $240,000 to the President since 2007. “Chicago-based Exelon stands out as one of the best patrons throughout Obama’s political career,” Politico recently [reported](http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4608D1E0-D381-4D57-BB54-1774112A32C8). “Its employees make up the largest group of donors this cycle from the energy and natural resource sector.” Exelon was the President’s fourth-largest campaign donor during his 2006 Senate run, funneling more than $73,000 to Obama’s campaign. Frank Clark, a retired CEO of another Exelon subsidiary, was an advisor to Obama before his 2008 presidential campaign. The Beacon reported further: Exelon board member John Rogers has bundled more than $500,000 for the president this cycle, as he did in 2008, and has personally contributed at least $100,000 to the pro-Obama Super PAC Priorities Action. Rogers, who played on the Princeton basketball team with Obama’s brother-in-law, Craig Robinson, recently attended the wedding of senior White House adviser Valeria Jarrett’s daughter in Chicago. The connections extend well beyond the large campaign contributions of top executives. Obama campaign adviser David Axelrod is a former consultant to the company. Former White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel helped broker the $8.2-billion merger between PECO Energy and Unicom that led to the firm’s creation in 2000. It was the biggest deal of Emanuel’s two-year career as an investment banker in Chicago, during which he pocketed more than $16.2 million, according to congressional disclosure forms. All in all, the intimate relationship between the green-energy industry and the Obama White House has been prolific, and UNICOR has been a driving force in forging these two parties together. “Why are we going to use taxpayer dollars to purchase materials that are literally taking business away from the private sector?” Rep. Huizenga asked. “And let’s be honest, let’s pull the pin on the hand grenade. If this was Chinese prison labor, we’d be rejecting every single one of these imports.”

#### Prison labor is racist and classist

Khalek 11 (Rania, <http://www.alternet.org/story/151732/21st-century_slaves%3A_how_corporations_exploit_prison_labor>, “21st-Century Slaves: How Corporations Exploit Prison Labor

It’s no secret that America imprisons more of its citizens than any other nation in history. With just 5 percent of the world’s population, the US currently holds [25 percent of the world's prisoners](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/23/world/americas/23iht-23prison.12253738.html) . "In 2008, over 2.3 million Americans were in prison or jail, with one of every 48 working-age men behind bars," according to a [study](http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/incarceration-2010-06.pdf) by the [Center for Economic and Policy Research](http://www.cepr.net/) (CEPR). That doesn’t include the tens of thousands of detained undocumented immigrants facing deportation, prisoners awaiting sentencing, or juveniles caught up in the school-to-prison pipeline. Perhaps it’s reassuring to some that the US still holds the number one title in at least one arena, but needless to say the hyper-incarceration plaguing America has had a damaging effect on society at large. The CEPR [study](http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/incarceration-2010-06.pdf) observes that US prison rates are not just excessive in comparison to the rest of the world, they are also "substantially higher than our own longstanding history." The study finds that incarceration rates between 1880 and 1970 ranged from about "100 to 200 prisoners per 100,000 people." After 1980, the inmate population "began to grow much more rapidly than the overall population and the rate climbed from "about 220 in 1980 to 458 in 1990, 683 in 2000, and 753 in 2008." The costs of this incarceration industry are far from evenly distributed, with the impact of excessive incarceration falling predominantly on African-American communities. Although black people make up just 13 percent of the overall population, they account for [40 percent](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incarceration_in_the_United_States#cite_note-prisoners2009-36)  of US prisoners. [According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics](http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2008/12/10/us-world-s-leading-jailer-new-numbers-show)  (BJS), black males are incarcerated at a rate "more than 6.5 times that of white males and 2.5 that of Hispanic males and "black females are incarcerated at approximately three times the rate of white females and twice that of Hispanic females." Michelle Alexander points out in her book [The New Jim Crow](http://www.amazon.com/dp/1595581030/ref%3Dnosim/?tag=tomdispatch-20)  that more [black men](http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/03/prison_system_holds_more_black_men_than_slavery_did.html)  "are in prison or jail, on probation or on parole than were enslaved in 1850." Higher rates of black drug arrests do not reflect higher rates of black drug offenses. In fact, whites and blacks engage in drug offenses, possession and sales at roughly comparable rates. Incentivizing Incarceration Clearly, the US prison system is riddled with racism and classism, but it gets worse. As it turns out, private companies have a cheap, easy labor market, and it isn’t in China, Indonesia, Haiti, or Mexico. It’s right here in the land of the free, where large corporations increasingly employ prisoners as a source of cheap and sometimes free labor. In the eyes of the corporation, inmate labor is a brilliant strategy in the eternal quest to maximize profit. By dipping into the prison labor pool, companies have their pick of workers who are not only cheap but easily controlled. Companies are free to avoid providing benefits like health insurance or sick days, while simultaneously paying little to no wages. They don’t need to worry about unions or demands

#### Environmental destruction is a symptom of the refusal to accept sexual difference - the attempt to unify and control the non-male creates violence

**Stone, 2003**,Alison Stone, December of 2003 Professor at the Centre for Philosophy at Lancaster continental philosophy review 36, 415-432, irigaray and holderlin on the relation between nature and culture <<http://www.springerlink.com/content/k7610803152l2026/fulltext.pdf> >

Besides paraphrasing Heidegger, Irigaray distances herself subtly from him (and, indirectly, from Hölderlin) by highlighting the sexually differentiated nature of the humanity through whom nature enacts violence upon itself. At first, she uses Heidegger’s language of “man” mimetically, but as her essay unfolds, she marks increasingly firmly that male humanity is in question, not humans per se. Thus, she states that the violence of culture “can be explained beginning from a masculine subjectivity” (TBT, 76). She also writ es that: The feminine is not called to carry out the task of constructing a world which is similar to man’s: a violent, uncanny world, which exists through the domination of nature. . . . To . . . cultivate herself without violence or power over what surrounds her – all of these correspond more to feminine being (72). Irigaray suggests that men are violent due to their special difficulty in accepting sexual difference: “man chooses to ignore this irreducible difference . . . Is this not because he feels foreign to this life which lives without him, this life which reproduces itself . . .?” (70) Or, as she states later on, man’s violence is “probably related to man’s relationship with the one who generates him: he will never generate in himself and must fabricate things outside of himself, in order to separate himself from the mother; he must manufacture externally, while she generates internally” (76). For Irigaray (drawing on her earlier analysis in Thinking the Difference), it is men’s difficulty in accepting sexual difference which leads them to turn against women, and, simultaneously, against the nature of which they themselves are part – as when men engineer technologies which damage their own nature. While Irigaray agrees with Hölderlin and Heidegger that nature turns against itself, she holds that only males mediate this turn. Man’s, but not woman’s, nature is to be uncanny and violent. Through men’s activities, women become embroiled in a non-natural mode of life that is fundamentally alien to them. Evidently, Irigaray can only identify men as the sole mediators of nature’s violence because she believes in an original sexual differentiation within nature (against which men, as one pole of this differentiation, react). This contrasts with Hölderlin’s view of nature as original, absolute, unity. Believing in an originary differentiation, Irigaray understands male violence to consist, typically, in the forcible imposition of sameness upon awomen and other natural beings. Hölderlin, on the other hand, conceives humans as separated from nature insofar as their power of judgement leads them to divide, analyse, and reflectively partition natural beings. But for Irigaray, Hölderlin’s conception of nature as primordially unitary instantiates the same disavowal of sexual difference which underpins male hostility to nature. By denying originary difference, Hölderlin’s account of nature becomes complicit with the very separation from nature that he wishes to question.

# 2NC

## Earth

### OV

**The AFF produces human centered scholarship that is saturated by an Eurocentric education model. We need a more complete and ethical framework for research.**

**Barrett in 2011**

M. J. Barrett. “Doing Animist Research in Academia: A methodological framework” Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 16, 2011.

Since receiving knowledge directly from “nature” requires a quieting of what Bai (2009) refers to as the discursive mind—in other words, not thinking in the normative sense of the word—it challenges the fundamental premises of much Eurocentric educational practice and is too often considered immature imaginings or just plain weird in Western contexts (Jensen, 2004; Plumwood, 2002). Consequently, animism has not been explicitly supported as a legitimate form of knowledge-making in academic research. This is not to say that its principals have not been euphemistically alluded to in various forms of qualitative inquiry, including much arts-based research (e.g., Lipsett, 2001), intuitive inquiry (e.g., Anderson, 2004, in press), Indigenous methodologies (e.g., Cole, 2002), or even scientific inquiry (e.g., Keller, 1983), yet specific acknowledgement of the role of other-than-human “persons” remains elusive in discussions of research methodologies (for exceptions, see Barrett, 2009, in press; Harvey, 2006a, 2006b; O’Riley & Cole, 2009). Yet it is through a “practiced ability to enter into a heightened sense of awareness of the natural world” and participation with it that “gifts of information from nature” are received (Cajete, 2000, pp. 20-21). It is also in this state of awareness that communication with other-than-human “persons” most often occurs. While researching with and explicitly acknowledging the many morethan-human partners in the research process does not require one to be Indigenous, it does require disrupting many well-inscribed discourses, and extending episto-ontological boundaries kept intact by Western language, worldviews, and lifestyles, including assumptions that those who are not human neither have consciousness nor interact with humans in dialogic relationship. It also requires extending the search for “protocols, processes, and etiquette by which dialogue is promoted to the encounter between human and other-than-human persons” (Harvey, 2006b, p. 15), while simultaneously addressing issues related to power, privilege, and cultural appropriation (Battiste & Henderson, 2000; Smith, 1999). While it is critical to recognize past and current inequities, including the risk and reality of appropriation of Indigenous knowledges by researchers, as well as inappropriate interpretations of Indigenous cultural practices, it is also important to recognize the potential universality of animism as a way of knowing and experiencing relations with those who are not human. Being animist is not acting as an Aboriginal “wannabe” (O’Riley, 2003; see also, Stuckey et al., 2009; Stuckey, 2010); rather, it is being more whole and human in a wide circle of relations. Animism can be a particularly valuable part of a researcher’s way of coming to knowing regardless of cultural context, and as such, is worth serious consideration in research methodology and methods.

## Separatism

### 2NC Alt OV

**Voting Neg as an act of symbolic castration is the only option – key to cause “Castration anxiety” and transformation**

**Larvalsubjects in 2007**

Symbolic Castration. <http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2007/01/15/symbolic-castration/>

What is particularly frustrating about the evaporation of desire is that the desire to write insists. For the blessed Lars of [Spurious](http://spurious.typepad.com/), the [question](http://spurious.typepad.com/spurious/2007/01/sainthood.html) is always one of how to continue to write, and he has gone so far as to conceive a writing that is not driven by content but a content driven by writing. Yet what of this desire to write in the first place, this oppressive sense that I am somehow violating some duty if I don’t write? Is this not the phenomenon of phallus or symbolic castration? As Zizek puts it,The status of possibility, while different from that actuality, is thus not simply deficient with regard to it. *Possibility as such exerts actual effects which disappear as soon as it ‘actualizes’ itself.*Such a ‘short-circuit’ between possibility and actuality is at work in the Lacanian notion of ‘symbolic castration’: the so-called ‘castration-anxiety’ cannot be reduced to the psychological fact that, upon perceiving the absence of the penis in woman, man becomes afraid that ‘he also might lose it.’ ‘Castration anxiety’ rather designates the precise moment at which the possibility of castration takes precidence over its actuality, i.e., the moment at which the very possibility of castration, its mere threat, produces actual effects in our psychic economy. This threat as it were ‘castrates’ us, branding us with an irreducible loss. (*Tarrying With the Negative*, 159)In this context Zizek is speaking specifically of the manner in which power functions. What is important where power is concerned is the threat of force and not the exercise itself. That is, a certain potentiality is seen as pervading intersubjective relations– the potentiality of violence –and this potentiality leads to transformations at the level of actuality or how we act.However, generalizing the notion of symbolic castration or the phallic function, then, it can be said that symbolic castration is that moment where possibility enters the world, where the world becomes haunted by incompleteness, and this incompleteness compels us to produce regardless of whether there is any need to produce. Over and above the need to communicate something, over and above the aim of “padding my CV”, or intervening in some situation, there is the insistent call to write even where there is nothing and no reason to write. And even though there is no concrete call to write anything, even though there is nothing to be accomplished in writing, even though there is nothing to be said, I nonetheless feel as if I am failing in some crucial way when I’m not writing, that something in the world is fundamentally incomplete. Why should writing function as such an aim in itself? And why must I feel so wretched when I have nothing to write?

**The only way out is to cut off the power at its source – voting negative is an act of castration, severing our ties with men’s civil society. Our method of radical lesbianism builds bonds among women based on real love, solidarity and primacy. Lesbian rage brings together all women in an effort to metaphorical chop off the system’s dick and making it inoperable to continue its rape of women and the earth. Even if the alternative can’t burn it all down – the very process of radical lesbianism creates fissures in our self-development key to self love and self worth. A radical female revolution turns its back on the system by refusing mechanism for reform.**

**Hoagland 95**

Sarah Lucia, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies at Northeastern, “Separating from Heterosexuality” in *Feminism and Community*. 276-

In certain respects, to engage, to participate; in a situation 7 or in a system is to affirm its central values. **This is** true whether we actively uphold the system, **attempt to change it through designated avenues of reform**, or rebel against it through designated avenues of rebellion (**act in ways named evil or bad within the system**). For in acting in any of these capacities, we are operating within the system's parameters and are thus giving the system meaning by helping to hold its axis (what goes unquestioned) in place. While a great deal is accomplished through reform, the change that occurs must fit within the (usually unacknowledged) parameters of the system. Thus "votes for women" was achieved only when women's suffrage was generally perceived as not altering the structure and value of patriarchal, heterosexual society. As Kat􀂝 Millett points out in Sexual Politics, the first wave of the feminist movement failed to challenge the institution of the family, thereby ending in reform rather than revolution. She argues that without radical change in value, that which reformers found most offensive - "the economic disabilities of women, the double standard􀂞 prostitution, venereal disease, coercive marital unions. and involuntary parenthood" -could not be eradicated.5 **Reform perpetuates existing value**. . In the first place, feminist reform forces women to focus on men and address men's conceptions of women rather than creating and developing women's values about themselves. It forces women to focus on men's reactions and mass media stereotypes of women; it forces women to respond by means of apology to masculinist depictions of witches, manhaters, lesbians, and amazons. It forces women to prove that men's fears are unfounded-to prove that women, or "real" women, are not lesbians or manhaters. It forces women to appear feminine and prove they are not threatening. Feminist reform forces women to attend male fantasies and validate masculinist value. **As a result men are invited to act out and are given even greater license to project their insecurities on women**, while women must soothe and tend male egos. In other words**, reform keeps women focused on finding ways of seducing men**. I want a moral revolution. Secondly, feminist reform makes the actual success of women's efforts depend on the intelligence, willingness, and benevolence of the men they're seeking to convince to enact reform. Efforts in this regard may at times gain relief for women, relief which is badly needed even if selective. But it is a relief of symptoms, not a removal of causes.6 In this respect reform forces the reformer to restrict her imagination and efforts to the limits of those she's trying to convince. A feminist striving for change by working for reform within the dominant/subordinate framework is like a starving person seeking nourishment in junk food. Finally, feminist reform sets up women to value change in men more highly than change in women.? It makes any failure a failure of effort on women's part, not a refusal on men's part. And it sets up women to fear risking any small gain they might have gotten. As a result, **to avoid offending men, they promote** lesbian erasure**, thereby reinforcing heterosexualism**. 8 This is one of the reasons some french-speaking radical lesbians insist that feminism is the last stronghold of patriarchy.

### A2 – case t/ k

**The impact is Extinction**

**Warren and Cady 94**—Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with **nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, **will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible**. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

### FWK

**This framework is another link—it’s patriarchal censorship that silencing the feminist worldview—this independently warrants a negative ballot to fight against gendered censorship**

**Mojab 02 (**Shahrzad, director of the Women and Gender Studies Institute and an Associate Professor in the Department of Adult Education and Psychology at University of Toronto, Canada; “Information, Censorship, and Gender Relations in Global Capitalism” Information for Social Change 1)

It is important to know more about the ties that bind censorship to gender. Even when one barrier is removed, others emerge to ensure the reproduction of the status quo**.** For instance, after decades of struggle, beginning in late nineteenth century, legal barriers to women's access to parliament and political office were removed in the West and, later, in many non-Western states. This was achieved, not simply through access to information, but rather due to women's determination to create knowledge and consciousness, and engage in mobilizing and organizing (sit-ins, demonstrations, picketing, leafleting, singing, etc.) in schools, homes, streets, churches, and university campuses. However, states and state-centred politics continue to be male-centred**.** Even when women have a proportionate participation in the parliament, there is no guarantee that they would all advocate feminist alternatives to an androcentric agenda; and this is the case for the simple reason that women can be as patriarchal in their politics as some men are.A more adequate approach to the understanding of censorship is, I believe, to see it not as an irrational practice, as a mischievous attitude, or a technical problem of obstructing channels of communication. Censorship is an integral part of the exercise of gender power, class power, and the powers of the nation, ethnicity, religion and governance. Not only does it deny women access to information, but also limits their participation in the creation of knowledge, and denies them the power to utilize knowledge.If in pre-modern times the church was the major player in creating knowledge, today the market produces, disseminates, and utilizes much of the knowledge, which has achieved the status of a commodity. Knowledge is "intellectual property." Even the knowledge created in public and semi-public institutions such as universities is increasingly geared to the agenda of the market, and serves the promotion of market interests. Moreover, Western states primarily entertain the market as the lifeline of economy, culture and society. They increasingly aim at giving all the power to the market. In dictatorial regimes, however, the state still plays a prominent role in censoring the creation and dissemination of knowledge. From Peru to Turkey, to Iran and to China, states suppress activists, journalists, libraries, bookstores, print and broadcast media, satellite dishes and the Internet**.** They often do so by committing violence against the citizens and the communication systems they use.Although we may find much gender-based subtlety in the techniques of limiting women's access to information, I believe that the subtlest censorship is denying feminist knowledge a visible role in the exercise of power. The state, Western and non-Western, rules through privileging androcentric knowledge as the basis for governance.The conduct of national censuses, for instance, continues to be based on androcentric worldviews in spite of devastating feminist critique. To give another example, women are now recruited into Western armies in combat functions, but states continue to ignore feminist and pacifist knowledge that challenges the very phenomenon of war and violence (Cynthia Enloe, 2000). Women themselves can be and, often, are part of the problem. In the absence of feminist consciousness, they generally act as participants in the reproduction of patriarchal gender relations. In Islamic societies, when men engage in the "honour" killing of their wives, daughters or sisters, sometimes mothers participate in or tolerate the horrendous crime (Mojab, 2002). The democratisation of gender relations is a conscious intervention in a power structure that is closely interlocked with the powers of the state, class, race, ethnicity, religion and tradition. For both women and men, challenging patriarchy means defying one's own values, worldviews, emotions, and traditions. At the same time, it involves risk taking including, in some situations, loss of life. Women's full access to androcentric knowledge will not disturb the status quo. I argue that, in the absence of feminist consciousness, women may even act as ministers of propaganda and censorship. They will not be in a position to exercise the democratic right to revolt against oppressive rule. In the West, feminist knowledge cannot be suppressed through book-burning, jailing, torture, and assassination. Censorship is conducted, much more effectively, by stigmatizing and marginalising feminist knowledge as "special interest," while androcentrism is promoted as the norm, the canon, and "human nature." That is why, I contend, that if we fill all the media institutions with female managers and staff, if we give all educational institutions to women, or hand over all high-rank military positions to women, the androcentric world order with its violence, war, poverty, and degenerating environment will continue to function. Globalization, as it is understood in mainstream media and in state discourses, is nothing new; it emerged with the rise of capitalism; the main engine of globalization is the capitalist market, and it is promoted and planned by capitalist states through various organs such as the G8, World Bank, European Union, World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, etc. The impact of this globalization on women has been largely negative, especially in the developing world. Millions of girls aged 5 to 15 are recruited into the global prostitution market. Millions more leave their families and countries to raise some income as maids. However, other forms of globalization or, rather, internationalization have been in the making. For instance, feminism has evolved as an international movement in spite of the opposition of conservatives in many parts of the world. It has been able to put women's demands on the agenda of states and international organs such as the United Nations. Media are also important actors in globalisation. Women have had more presence in the media both as producers and as targets or sources of entertainment and information programming. There is considerable progress, for instance, in the production of women and feminist press in many developing countries. The Internet and desktop publishing present new opportunities for more media activism. Egypt has a women's television channel. Focusing on the question of censorship, the crucial issue is freedom of speech not only for women but also more significantly, for feminists and feminist knowledge. Feminist knowledge and consciousness is the primary target of censorship. Do the globalizing media allow women of the developing countries to learn about the achievements of Western women in fighting patriarchy? Do women of the West learn from the struggles of women in India, Jamaica or Saudi Arabia? Do the global media allow women everywhere to know about the Beijing Conference and its aftermath? Do they disseminate adequate and accurate information about the World March of Women? My answers are rather in the negative. The cyberspace is much like the realspace that creates it. The fact that many individual women or groups can set up their websites does not change power relations in the realspace. The negative stereotyping of women, for instance, cannot change without the dissemination of feminist consciousness among both men and women. Even if stereotyping is eliminated, gender inequality will persist. "Gender-based censorship" cannot be overcome as long as gender relations remain unequal and oppressive. It can, however, be reduced or made less effective. While the concept "gender-based censorship" is useful, it should be broadened to include "censorship of feminist knowledge." The following are just a few ideas about what we may do:A) Creating theoretical and empirical knowledge about gender-based censorship, and especially the censorship of feminist knowledge and feminist movements. B) Disseminating this knowledge and awareness among citizens. Using this knowledge for the purpose of dismantling patriarchal power. Knowledge makes a difference when it is put into practice. C) Making this knowledge available to policy makers and integrating it into policy making in the institutions of the market, the state, and non-state and non-market forces. These goals will not be achieved in the absence of feminist and women's movements. If censorship is not a mistake, but rather it is an organ for exercising gender and class power, resistance to it, too, should be a part of the struggle for a democratic regime.

### Racism

**Lesbianism is a direct kick in the nuts to male supremacy – it offers up a refusal to submit to any man, of any race, class or creed on the very basis that he is a man. We will not accept reformist strategies to the system because it only authorizes future paternalism over women’s bodies**

**Bunch in 1975**

Charlotte Bunch. “Lesbians in Revolt.” Published in The Furies feminist newspaper (Washington DC), January 1972; reprinted in Lesbianism and the Women's Movement, edited by Nancy Myron & Charlotte Bunch (Diana Press, 1975), pp. 29-37.

Lesbianism is a threat to the ideological, political, personal, and economic basis of male supremacy. The Lesbian threatens the ideology of male supremacy by destroying the lie about female inferiority, weakness, passivity, and by denying women's "innate" need for men. Lesbians literally do not need men (even for procreation if the science of cloning is developed). The Lesbian's independence and refusal to support one man undermines the personal power that men exercise over women. Our rejection of heterosexual sex challenges male domination in its most individual and common form. We offer all women something better than submission to personal oppression. We offer the beginning of the end of collective and individual male supremacy. Since men of all races and classes depend on female support and submission for practical tasks and feeling superior, our refusal to submit will force some to examine their sexist behavior, to break down their own destructive privileges over other humans, and to fight against those privileges in other men. They will have to build new selves that do not depend on oppressing women and learn to live in social structures that do not give them power over anyone. Heterosexuality separates women from each other; it makes women define themselves through men; it forces women to compete against each other for men and the privilege which comes through men and their social standing. Heterosexual society offers women a few privileges as compensation if they give up their freedom: for example, mothers are respected and 'honored,' wives or lovers are socially accepted and given some economic and emotional security, a woman gets physical protection on the street when she stays with her man, etc. The privileges give heterosexual women a personal and political stake in maintaining the status quo. The Lesbian receives none of these heterosexual privileges or compensations since she does not accept the male demands on her. She has little vested interest in maintaining the present political system since all of its institutions--church, state, media, health, schools--work to keep her down. If she understands her oppression, she has nothing to gain by supporting white rich male America and much to gain from fighting to change it. She is less prone to accept reformist solutions to women's oppression. Economics is a crucial part of woman oppression, but our analysis of the relationship between capitalism and sexism is not complete. We know that Marxist economic theory does not sufficiently consider the role of women or Lesbians, and we are presently working on this area. However, as a beginning, some of the ways that Lesbians threaten the economic system are clear: In this country, women work for men in order to survive, on the job and in the home. The Lesbian rejects this division of labor at its roots; she refuses to be a man's property, to submit to the unpaid labor system of housework and childcare. She rejects the nuclear family as the basic unit of production and consumption in capitalist society. The Lesbian is also a threat on the job because she is not the passive/part-time woman worker that capitalism counts on to do boring work and be part of a surplus labor pool. Her identity and economic support do not come through men, so her job is crucial and she cares about job conditions, wages, promotion, and status. Capitalism cannot absorb large numbers of women demanding stable employment, decent salaries, and refusing to accept their traditional job exploitation. We do not understand yet the total effect that this increased job dissatisfaction will have. It is, however, clear that as women become more intent upon taking control of their lives, they will seek more control over their jobs, thus increasing the strains on capitalism and enhancing the power of women to change the economic system.

# 1NR

### Perm

### Link - EJ

#### EJ are not safe spaces for women

**People of Color Organize**, no date [staff, “(En)gendering Resistance: Exploring the Possibilities of Gender, Resistance and Militancy [#Feminist Friday]”, http://www.peopleofcolororganize.com/activism/general/engendering-resistance-exploring-the-possibilities-of-gender-resistance-and-militancy-feminist-friday/]

Patriarchy and gendered oppressions are everyday perpetuated within our communities and movements. Sexism, queer and transphobia permeate social justice groups and organizations. Gender violence and sexual assault occur with tragic frequently within our ‘safe’ spaces. How can we challenge the reproduction of gender oppression within broader social and environmental justice movements? How can we develop non-state responses to issues of sexual violence? What potential exists for the construction of holistic and nurturing communities of resistance? How can we strengthen our ongoing work, and build our collective capacity to resist?

### Science

**They say combine science-**

**Science claims are inherently a patriarchal system – Science is solely based in current views that has empirically excluded and undervalued feminist views.**

**Nhanenge 7 –** Master of Arts at the development studies @ the University of South Africa (Jytte “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the concerns of women,, poor people and nature into development” <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/570/dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>)//AA

One of the most interesting directions ecofemimst analyses has proceeded concerns science, technology, economy and the scientific understandings of nature. When science is historically examined from a feministic point of view, it becomes clear that the scientific epistemology is far from universal, value-neutral and objective. Rather, science is an ideological and an aggressive patriarchal way of perceiving the world founded on power and control. The analysis and critique of science has therefore been helpful to understand the patriarchal domination of women, Others and nature. The purpose of this chapter is consequently to show how science in general and the discipline of economics in particular, together with their manifestations in technology, have dominated and exploited women Others-nature. (Des .lardins 200l: 255). Science is based on a dualised world-view, which has undervalued and excluded from its system of knowledge everything that is perceived as being "the dualised other". Thus, man is seen as being superior to women, reason to emotion, mind to matter, culture to nature, humans to animals, quantity to quality, etc. It can be difficult clearly to perceive this dualism in science. One reason is that most people are socialised into seeing science as a universal and objective knowledge system. This is because all social, educational, political, economic and cultural institutions in most societies are scientifically based. People therefore have no alternatives to compare with and therefore cannot clearly perceive the dualised nature of science. It is similar with fish. They also do not know that they live in water. Since they never lived on land, they cannot compare. Another reason is the complex interconnections of the various dualised pairs. Some of them contribute directly to domination of women-Others-nature, while others contribute only indirectly by being pan of a web, which ends up in dominating women, Others and nature. Thus, each dualised pair may not be perceived as being dominant in itself. It is similar to a bird in a cage. It is not the individual steel bar that retains the bird, but when all bars are connected as a network then the bird remains his imprisoned in the cage. For example, early scientists decided to exclude all non-quantifiable elements from science in order to overcome methodological problems. This has ever since meant that all issues relating to quality was considered irrelevant to a pure, mathematical epistemology. The result of such exclusion may not altogether be obvious on the surface. However, searching deeper and wider, as will be done below, such omission has had grave consequences for the quality of life of people and nature. The main point, however, is that the scientific ideology consistently prioritizes rational, quantitative and masculine elemenss, which are yang forces, over emotional, qualitative and feminine issues, which are yin forces. Due to their similarity, those in the latter category are perceived as the dualised other. It is this scientific choice, which has created disharmony, and lead to subordination of women, Others and nature, all of which are feminine or yin forces. Therefore, this dualism is the essence of this chapter.

### 1NR – Warming

#### Steps taken to manage and control nature are reflective of societal domination over women

[Mallory](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v006/6.2mallory.html#top), **Chaone** (philosophy instructor in the Environmental Ethics Program at the University of North Texas in Denton). 2001. “Acts of Objectification and the Repudiation of Dominance Leopold, Ecofeminism, and the Ecological Narrative.” Ethics & the Enviornment. Project Muse. Accessed July 14, **2008.** <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics\_and\_the\_environment/v006/6.2mallory.html>

The attitude of domination and the reinforcement of a nature/culture dualism lurking in the narrative of Aldo Leopold's life and work can be better spotted if viewed through the lens of ecofeminism. Ecofeminism is an emerging theoretical and praxis-oriented field which insists that there are important conceptual connections between the oppression of women and the domination of nature. Many ecofeminists claim that what lies at the heart of contemporary Western culture's ecodestructive practices is what Karen Warren (1990) terms the "logic of domination"--the notion that there exist some ontological entities that are "above" others, and that said superiority then entitles them to dominate and oppress those "below." Because both women and nature have historically been [13](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v006/6.2mallory.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT13) relegated to the inferior realm of the lower, the same logic or kind of reasoning serves to justify the oppression of both. An important corollary of the ecofeminist position is that since the domination of women and nature is conceptually twinned, whatever serves to oppress one acts similarly on the other. Likewise, whatever liberates nature will relieve the oppression of women as well (Davion 1994).

### 1NR – Master Tools

#### The Master’s Tools will never break down the Master’s house –the alternative allows women to finally question racism and homophobia within their communities. Only voting negative for a separatist strategy reveals women’s creativity and love. The material differences of women are a critical starting point because it gives a unquie position to question civil society.

Lorde in 84

Audre Lorde. “The Master’s Tools will Never Dismantle the Master’s House.” From Sister Outsider, The Crossing Press Feminist Series (1984) http://lists.econ.utah.edu/pipermail/margins-to-centre/2006-March/000794.html

It is a particular academic arrogance to assume any discussion of feminist theory without examining our many differences, and without a significant input from poor women, Black and Third World women, and lesbians. And yet, I stand here as a Black lesbian feminist, having been invited to comment within the only panel at this conference where the input of Black feminists and lesbians is represented. What this says about the vision of this conference is sad, in a country where racism, sexism, and homophobia are inseparable. To read this program is to assume that lesbian and Black women have nothing to say about existentialism, the erotic, women's culture and silence, developing feminist theory, or heterosexuality and power. And what does it mean in personal and political terms when even the two Black women who did present here were literally found at the last hour? What does it mean when the tools of a racist patriarchy are used to examine the fruits of that same patriarchy? It means that only the most narrow perimeters of change are possible and allowable. The absence of any consideration of lesbian consciousness or the consciousness of Third World women leaves a serious gap within this conference and within the papers presented here. For example, in a paper on material relationships between women, I was conscious of an either/or model of nurturing which totally dismissed my knowledge as a Black lesbian. In this paper there was no examination of mutuality between women, no systems of shared support, no interdependence as exists between lesbians and women-identified women. Yet it is only in the patriarchal model of nurturance that women "who attempt to emancipate themselves pay perhaps too high a price for the results," as this paper states. For women, the need and desire to nurture each other is not pathological but redemptive, and it is within that knowledge that our real power is rediscovered. It is this real connection which is so feared by a patriarchal world. Only within a patriarchal structure is maternity the only social power open to women. Interdependency between women is the way to a freedom which allows the I to be, not in order to be used, but in order to be creative. This is a difference between the passive be and the active being. Advocating the mere tolerance of difference between women is the grossest reformism. It is a total denial of the creative function of difference in our lives. Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening. Only within that interdependency of different strengths, acknowledged and equal, can the power to seek new ways of being in the world generate, as well as the courage and sustenance to act where there are no charters. Within the interdependence of mutual (nondominant) differences lies that security which enables us to descend into the chaos of knowledge and return with true visions of our future, along with the concomitant power to effect those changes which can bring that future into being. Difference is that raw and powerful connection from which our personal power is forged. As women, we have been taught either to ignore our differences, or to view them as causes for separation and suspicion rather than as forces for change. Without community there is no liberation, only the most vulnerable and temporary armistice between an individual and her oppression. But community must not mean a shedding of our differences, nor the pathetic pretense that these differences do not exist. Those of us who stand outside the circle of this society's definition of acceptable women; those of us who have been forged in the crucibles of difference -- those of us who are poor, who are lesbians, who are Black, who are older -- know that survival is not an academic skill. It is learning how to stand alone, unpopular and sometimes reviled, and how to make common cause with those others identified as outside the structures in order to define and seek a world in which we can all flourish. It is learning how to take our differences and make them strengths. For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. And this fact is only threatening to those women who still define the master's house as their only source of support. Poor women and women of Color know there is a difference between the daily manifestations of marital slavery and prostitution because it is our daughters who line 42nd Street. If white American feminist theory need not deal with the differences between us, and the resulting difference in our oppressions, then how do you deal with the fact that the women who clean your houses and tend your children while you attend conferences on feminist theory are, for the most part, poor women and women of Color? What is the theory behind racist feminism? In a world of possibility for us all, our personal visions help lay the groundwork for political action. The failure of academic feminists to recognize difference as a crucial strength is a failure to reach beyond the first patriarchal lesson. In our world, divide and conquer must become define and empower. Why weren't other women of Color found to participate in this conference? Why were two phone calls to me considered a consultation? Am I the only possible source of names of Black feminists? And although the Black panelist's paper ends on an important and powerful connection of love between women, what about interracial cooperation between feminists who don't love each other? In academic feminist circles, the answer to these questions is often, "We did not know who to ask." But that is the same evasion of responsibility, the same cop-out, that keeps Black women's art out of women's exhibitions, Black women's work out of most feminist publications except for the occasional "Special Third World Women's Issue," and Black women's texts off your reading lists. But as Adrienne Rich pointed out in a recent talk, white feminists have educated themselves about such an enormous amount over the past ten years, how come you haven't also educated yourselves about Black women and the differences between us -- white and Black -- when it is key to our survival as a movement? Women of today are still being called upon to stretch across the gap of male ignorance and to educate men as to our existence and our needs. This is an old and primary tool of all oppressors to keep the oppressed occupied with the master's concerns. Now we hear that it is the task of women of Color to educate white women -- in the face of tremendous resistance -- as to our existence, our differences, our relative roles in our joint survival. This is a diversion of energies and a tragic repetition of racist patriarchal thought. Simone de Beauvoir once said: "It is in the knowledge of the genuine conditions of our lives that we must draw our strength to live and our reasons for acting." Racism and homophobia are real conditions of all our lives in this place and time. I urge each one of us here to reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives there. See whose face it wears. Then the personal as the political can begin to illuminate all our choices.