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## 1NC

#### As of now, Nature is seen as meaningless unless it provides some sort of material benefit to us.

Timothy Luke, Dept. of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic University, “Generating Green Mentality.” 1996. http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim514a.htm

In and of itself, Nature is meaningless unless or until particular human beings assign significance to it by interpreting some of its many ambivalent signs as meaningful to them. The outcomes of this activity, however, are inescapably indeterminate, or at least, they are a culturally contingent function of who decodes which signs when and how they find decisive meaning there. Because human beings will observe natural patterns differently, choose to accentuate some, while deciding to ignore others Nature's meanings always will be multiple and unfixed.1 Such interpretive acts only construct contestable textual fields, which are read on various levels of expression for their manifest and latent meanings. Before scientific disciplines or industrial technologies turn its matter and energy into products, Nature already is being transformed by discursive interpretation into "natural resources." And, once Nature is rendered intelligible through these discursive processes, it can be used to legitimize many political projects.

#### The idea of nature being pure is a dying idea.

Timothy Luke, Dept. of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic University, “Generating Green Governmentality.” 1996. http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim514a.htm

The centrality of a pure, objective, unmediated Nature in the attainment of modern scientific knowledge, however, is an idea that is dying very hard in environmental and social analysis (Jameson, 1991). From the vanguard of Newtonian physics in the seventeenth century to the rearguard of sociobiology in the twentieth century, many schools of modern science have assumed that their methodologies provide a privileged foundation for knowledge of what is "real" in Nature as a definitive methodologically rigorous mapping of a God-given creation that is truly "out there." These unsullied observations, in turn, are believed to create a true knowledge of objective reality for Creation known now as "Nature." This knowledge often is idealized in the mathematical proofs of physics, and its applications in everyday life are widely believed to be the foundations of modernityâs technological proficiency. When all is said and done, humanity is believed to know how the many systemic layers of Nature work because of its disciplined application of these scientific methods for observation, experiment, and verification.

#### We only see the environment as materials. If we keep viewing it this way, we get closer to being out of control.

Timothy Luke, Dept. of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic University, “Generating Green Governmentality.” 1996. http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim514a.htm

Imagine a wondrous new machine, strong and supple, a machine that reaps as it destroys. It is huge and mobile, something like the machines of modern agriculture but vastly more complicated and powerful. Think of this awesome machine running over open terrain and ignoring familiar boundaries. It plows across fields and fencerows with a fierce momentum that is exhilarating to behold and also frightening. As it goes, the machine throws off enormous mows of wealth and bounty while it leaves behind great furrows of wreckage. Now imagine that there are skillful hands on board, but no one is at the wheel. In fact, this machine has no wheel nor any internal governor to control the speed and direction. It is sustained by its own forward motion, guided mainly by its own appetites. And it is accelerating. The machine is the subject of this book: modern capitalism driven by the imperatives of global industrial revolution. The metaphor is imperfect, but it offers a simplified way to visualize what is dauntingly complex and abstract and impossibly diffuse the drama of a free-running economic system that is reordering the world. The logic of commerce and capital has overpowered the inertia of politics and launched an epoch of great social transformations. Settled facts of material life are being revised for rich and poor nations alike. Social understandings that were formed by the hard political struggles of the twentieth century are put in doubt. Old verities about the rank ordering of nations are revised and a new map of the world is gradually being drawn. These great changes sweep over the affairs of mere governments and destabilize the established political orders in both advanced and primitive societies. Everything seems new and strange. Nothing seems certain (1996: 11). Going faster and faster, while getting closer and closer to being out of control, this wondrous new machine has been milling out equally wondrous new urban and rural built environments in the proliferating markets of global capitalism. This is our new "empiricity," and public ecology can make it more describable and orderable.

#### **Economic activity counts for far more than those of ecological preservation and appreciation.**

Timothy Luke, Dept. of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic University, “Generating Green Mentality.” 1996 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim514a.htm

In turn, these educational operations now routinely produce professional-technical workers with the specific knowledge--as it has been scientifically validated--and the operational power--as it is institutionally constructed--to cope with "the environmental crisis" on what are believed to be sound scientific and technical grounds. Still, graduate teaching in schools of the environment has little room for other social objectives beyond the rationalizing performativity norms embedded at the core of the current economic regime. To understand the norms used by this regulatory regime, as Lyotard asserts, "the State and/or company must abandon the idealist and humanist narratives of legitimation in order to justify the new goals: in the discourse of today's financial backers of research, the only credible goal is power. Scientists, technicians, and instruments are purchased not to find truth, but to augment power."2 This chapter asks how specialized discourses about Nature, or "the environment," are constructed by American university programs in graduate-level teaching and research by professional-technical experts as disciplinary articulations of "eco-knowledge" to generate performative disciplinary systems of "geo-power" over, but also within and through, Nature in the managerial structures of modern economies and societies. The critical project of Michel Foucault--particularly his account of how discursively formed disciplines operate inside regimes of truth as systems of governmentality--provides a basis for advancing this critical reinterpretation. These continuously institutionalized attempts to capture and contain the forces of Nature by operationally deploying advanced technologies, and thereby linking many of Nature's apparently intrinsic structures and processes to strategies of highly rationalized environmental management as geo-power, develops out of university-level "environmental studies" as a strategic supplement to various modes of bio-power defined by existing academic "human studies" in promoting the growth of modern urban-industrial populations. Moreover, the rules of economic performativity now count far more materially in these interventions than do those of ecological preservation.

#### **As of now, and previously, we infrustructuralize the Earth’s resources for our own economic benefit.**

Timothy Luke. Dept. of Political Science. “Generating Green Govermentality.” 1996 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.PDF

Keying off of the managerial logic of the Second Industrial Revolution, which empowered technical experts, or engineers and scientists, on the shop floor and professional managers, or corporate executives and financial officers, in the main office, resource managerialism imposes corporate administrative frameworks upon Nature in order to supply the economy and provision society through centralized state guidance. These frameworks assume that the national economy, like the interacting capitalist firm and household, must avoid both overproduction (excessive resource use coupled with inadequate demand) and underproduction (inefficient resource use coming with excessive demand) on the supply-side as well as overconsumption (excessive resource exploitation coming with excessive demand) and underconsumption (inefficient resource exploitation coupled with inadequate demand) on the demand side. To even construct the managerial problem in this fashion, Nature is reduced--through the encirclement of space and matter by national as well as global economies--to a system of geo-power systems that can be dismantled, redesigned, and assembled anew on demand to produce "resources" efficiently and when and where needed in the modern marketplace. As a cybernetic system of biophysical systems, Nature's energies, materials, and sites are redefined by the eco-knowledges of resource managerialism as manageable resources for human beings to realize great material "goods" for sizeable numbers of some people, even though greater material and immaterial "bads" also might be inflicted upon even larger numbers of other people, who do not reside in or benefit from the advanced national economies that basically monopolize the use of world resources at a comparative handful of highly developed regional and municipal sites. Echoing California-Berkeley's declaration that environmental studies boil down to mobilizing the biological, physical and social sciences to address the major social and political effects of current and future anthropogenic environmental problems, Yale's Dean Cohon tells would-be environmental studies enrollees that their professional power/knowledge will be crucially significant in the coming years: "Your role in helping to protect and manage the integrity and survival of natural systems and human health globally could not be more important. Since so much is now in human hands, people are needed, more than ever, who are focused, informed, and dedicated to learning." Here, environmental sciences infrastructuralize the Earth's ecologies. The Earth becomes, if only in terms of technoscience's operational assumptions, an immense terrestrial infrastructure. As the human race's "ecological life-support system," it has "with only occasional localized failures" provided "services upon which human society depends consistently and without charge."19 As the environmentalized infrastructure of technoscientific production, the Earth generates "ecosystem services," or those derivative products and functions of natural systems that human societies perceive as valuable.20 This complex system of systems is what must survive; human life will continue only if such survival-sustaining services continue. And, as Colorado State's, Yale's, Berkeley's or Duke's various graduate programs all record, these infrastructural outputs include: the generation of soils, the regeneration of plant nutrients, capture of solar energy, conversion of solar energy into biomass, accumulation/purification/distribution of water, control of pests, provision of a genetic library, maintenance of breathable air, control of micro and macro climates, pollination of plants, diversification of animal species, development of buffering mechanisms in catastrophes, and aesthetic enrichment.21 Because it is the terrestrial infrastructure of transnational enterprise, the planet's ecology requires highly disciplined reengineering to guide its sustainable use. In turn, the academic systems of green governmentality will monitor, massage, and manage those systems which produce all of these robust services. Just as the sustained use of any technology "requires that it be maintained, updated and changed periodically," so too does the "sustainable use of the planet require that we not destroy our ecological capital, such as old-growth forests, streams and rivers (with their associated biota), and other natural amenities."

#### **Government’s current conception of how we relate to the environment is flawed.**

Timothy Luke, Virginia Polytechnics University ‘’The (Un)Wise (Ab)Use of Nature: Environmentalism as Globalized Consumerism?” 1997 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.PDF

In the end, terraforming tendencies suggest that we cannot adequately understand the mobilization of geo-economic and geopolitical discourses in present-day regimes, like the United States of America, without seeing how many of their tactics and institutions assume "environmentalized" modes of operation as part and parcel of ordinary practices of governance. Strategic Environmental Initiatives, despite Vice-President Gore's protests, already are standard operating procedures. To preserve the political economy of high-technology production, many offices of the American state and all transnational firms must function as "environmental protection agencies" inasmuch as they fuse a48

green geo-politics of national security with a grey geo-economics of continual growth to sustain existing industrial ecologies of mass consumption with a wise use of Nature exercised through

private property rights. Habitus is habitat, but habitat now also defines or directs habitus. Conservationist ethics, resource managerialism, and green rhetorics, then, congeal as an

unusually cohesive power/knowledge formation, whose (un)wise (ab)usefulness becomes an integral element of this fascinating new regime's order of social normalization.

#### **The Nature Conservancy see’s Nature as merely real-estate now, not for simply being nature.**

Timothy Luke, Virginia Polytechnics University ‘’The (Un)Wise (Ab)Use of Nature: Environmentalism as Globalized Consumerism?” 1997 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.PDF

Nonetheless, one must admit the Nature Conservancy's achievements are perhaps seriously flawed, even though these flaws reveal much more about the consumption of public goods through a private property system and free enterprise economy than they show about environmentalism. Because of what has happened to Nature, how capital operates, and where resources for change must be solicited, the Nature Conservancy does what it does: consume land to be held "in trust: for Nature. As a result, the tenets and tenor of the Conservancy's operations as "an environmentalist organization" are those of almost complete compliance, and not those of radical resistance to the fast capitalist global economy. In the Nature Conservancy's operational codes of land consumption, a triage system comes into play. Some lands of Nature are more "ecologically significant," some regions are much more "natural areas," but some grounds are far less "protectable" than others. The methods of the Conservancy show how it implicitly sees Nature as real estate properties inasmuch as its chapters must constantly grade the acreages they receive-- labelling some as truly ecologically significant, some as plainly natural areas, some as merely "trade lands." The latter are sold, like old horses for glue or worn-out cattle for dogfood, and the proceeds can used elsewhere to promote conservation.

## Links

#### To satisfy lives in globalization, plans destroy the equibria of the Earthas ecologies to sustain materially.

Timothy Luke, Dept. of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic University,”Generating Green Governmentality.” 1996 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/TIM807.htm

What does it take to sustain materially satisfying lives in an age of globalization? A critical review from the vantage of public ecology suggests the everyday industrial metabolisms of urban life are denaturalizing the prehistoric equilibria of the Earthâs ecologies. There is considerable debate about these points (Lomborg, 2001; Pimm, 2001), but one can see innumerable markers of these transformations piling up rapidly as planetary alterations of incredible proportions. CFCs produced mainly as refrigerant, insulating, and packaging materials have measurably degraded the Earthâs protective ozone layer, causing more animal and human skin cancers, lower crop yields, and massive die-offs of some amphibians (Pimental et al., 1998). Tremendous increases in CO2 levels from fossil fuel and biomass burning are changing atmospheric dynamics and raising surface temperatures on the Earth (Pan, 2001). Nearly 450 million tons of hazardous wastes--ranging from heavy metals, chemical by-products, or nuclear materials to biomedical contaminants, harmful pesticides, or asbestos materials--are infiltrating soils, waters, and food chains.

#### Military involvement with the environment is bad for environment.

Dutch, Greenbay Lab Science Professor, “Military Impacts on the Environment.” 2010, http://www.uwgb.edu/dutchs/EnvirGeolNotes/Military.HTM

Eco-Terrorism is comparatively modern because only recently have we had the technological capability to create real environmental havoc, and only recently has concern for the environment become serious enough for eco-terrorism to be a credible threat. The thought of Genghis Khan or Tamerlane diverting a campaign to protect vulnerable habitat is grimly humorous. Environmental concerns would simply not have been an issue before the 20th century. Scorched earth campaigns have been directed mostly against structures and agriculture, but certainly contain a strong element of eco-terrorism. The Shenandoah Valley campaign and Sherman's March to the Sea during the Civil War are examples from American history. One of the most horrific examples was the Mongol invasion of Iraq. The Iraq of today is not the Iraq of a thousand years ago; until the Mongol invasion Baghdad was one of the cultural centers of the world, supported by an irrigation complex thousands of years old. The Mongols annihilated Baghdad, destroyed the canals, and so thoroughly depopulated the country that the canals were never restored.

#### **Military involvement with the environment causes people displacement.**

Hay-Edie, IPB Disarmament Coordinator, “THE MILITARY’S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT:A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE” www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc, 2010.

People around the world are displaced where the military take over land (and bodies of water) that the local residents need to live on or feed from, for use as bases, target ranges, weapons stores, training grounds etc. A few of the many examples are Thule in Greenland where indigenous Inuit were displaced for the US base, and the US bases in Okinawa (Japan), Guantanamo (Cuba), and Diego Garcia. Military activities often involve the use of fuels, explosives, solvents and other toxic substances. When improperly handled or stored, they can seep into the environment and affect nearby communities. Military exercises often damage farmland and other property, as heavy military vehicles travel over small roads and bridges. In the lands of the Innu (Canada) and elsewhere, noise pollution from low-flying military aircraft has proved a serious menace, including to the rearing of animals. This has prompted the development of a vigorous citizens’ campaign. Environmental and health concerns almost always take a back seat to military prerogatives. The recent protests of the inhabitants of the Caribbean island of Vieques off Puerto Rico are another good example of the environmental and social stresses caused by military bases, and the disregard shown by army planners for local people.

#### **Military aviation hurts the environment.**

Shields, Sustainable Security, “Military Vaiation and the Environment: Why the Military Should Care.” 2010. http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/military-aviation-and-environment-why-military-should-care

To conclude. Military aviation has a marked impact on the environment. It is unlikely that ecological pressures alone will change the military mindset, although they can help to shape it. There are some benefits accruing from changes in behaviour (albeit that the changes are driven by military necessity), and increased simulation in particular is having a beneficial effect. Nevertheless, military aviation will continue to be environmentally unfriendly and efforts to reinforce good behaviour will have to continue. But why should the military start to take its impact, particularly its use of hydro-carbons and the subsequent carbon output, seriously? Ask any serious military man or woman about the experience of fighting, conflict, war (or whichever synonym you care to name) and they will emphatically state that they wish it could cease. No sensible person who has experienced conflict would wish to repeat it, and all militaries wish to see a more secure world. It is therefore ironic that carbon-generation, in which military aviation in particular excels, is clearly linked to climate change, and climate change itself threatens security and the global peace. In seeking to deter or resolve conflict, it is possible that military aviators and aviatrix are inadvertently creating an even greater problem for the future than the ones they are presently seeking to resolve.

#### Military aviation contributes to noise pollution in the environment.

Shields, Sustainable Security, “Military Vaiation and the Environment: Why the Military Should Care.” 2010. http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/military-aviation-and-environment-why-military-should-care

My final area of concern is with noise pollution. While the civilian sector has invested a great deal of money in making jet engines quieter (and, of course, more fuel efficient to reduce operating costs) the same cannot be said for the engines in jet fighters and attack aircraft. The military requirements from their engines are, as intimated earlier, different from a civilian airliner, with the need for immense thrust at any moment (achieved by the use of “after-burners”: the pumping of aviation fuel into the rear of the engine where it is ignited by the hot gases) which achieves the goal, but not only burns considerably more fuel but creates a great deal of noise. Anyone who has ever attended an airshow where military jets are performing will understand! The noise issue is further evident with the large, and defensible, amount of training the military pilots undertake. Back in the 1980s low-flying jets, practicing evading enemy radar systems were a common feature of the more open space across the UK, and the source of many, many complaints for noise. While that has reduced due to a reduced requirement to low fly and a decrease in overall military jet numbers, the increasing use of night-vision devices with the need to practice night low-flying has brought a different noise disturbance. Furthermore, it is primarily in the helicopter and transport fleets that this increase has risen, with the inhabitants of those areas frequented by such aircraft subject to considerable night-time disturbance. While all is done within reason to decrease the disturbance, and the military has a fair point in claiming that it must practice, much more could and should be done to reduce further the level of noise contamination. Again, more investment in simulation would enable much more of this training to be undertaken synthetically; while live flying training will always be required, particularly in military aviation where the unexpected is more common than in the civilian sector, and while military simulators do not represent sufficient fidelity (due to under-investment), this problem is one that has a reasonable solution that should be pursued with greater vigour.

#### **Environmental destruction from military aviation through kinetic effect.**

Shields, Sustainable Security, “Military Vaiation and the Environment: Why the Military Should Care.” 2010. http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/military-aviation-and-environment-why-military-should-care

Nevertheless, aviation requires the use of some potentially very harmful chemicals and with the rise in use of carbon-fibre (excellent in aircraft as it is strong, light and flexible; really dangerous due to the carcinogenic properties of the material if broken by, say, an accident or hostile fire) new problems are likely to be encountered. Second, spent ammunition, as well as the destruction it causes with its initial effect (think the effects of the Dambusters Raid of WW II) there has been marked ground contamination from used ammunition in the past. Again, this article is not about the ethics of military airpower, but in terms of environmental impact it is good to note that Depleted Uranium is no longer used as ammunition by the RAF. However, destruction from the air is achieved almost exclusively through kinetic effect, and it is only recently that consideration has been given both to the environmental after-effects of destruction, and to the environmental impact of the chosen weapon system. These moves are in the right direction, and are to be welcomed, but there remains a long way to go.

#### **Military is not punished for harming environment.**

Hay-Edie, IPB Disarmament Coordinator, “THE MILITARY’S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT:A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE” [www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc](http://www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc), 2010.

Military activities place a number of stresses on the physical environment, but their contribution to over-all environmental deterioration has not received its share of attention. There are several reasons for this. One is that the military is not seen as an ‘industry’, yet in many ways it behaves like one. Another is that states operate a double standard: they are not willing to subject their armed forces to the levels of transparency and accountability that are required of other governmental or civil society actors.

#### **Military destroys human security by destroying environment.**

Hay-Edie, IPB Disarmament Coordinator, “THE MILITARY’S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT:A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE” www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc, 2010.

This includes the threats that attempts at military security have themselves created. "Human security" is an evolving concept, and a dynamic process. It starts with the recognition that all human beings are linked in inter-dependence with each other and with the natural environment. Human security draws upon our increasing understandings of the physical environment -- the webs of life in nature, and upon principles of good governance, such as transparency, accountability, human rights, civil society participation, and international standard-setting and cooperation -- principles that sustain the webs of life in the human environment. One of the milestones in the development of our understanding has been the Brundtland Report of 1987, which established the concept of sustainable development, and which underlined the notion that national and international security must transcend the traditional reliance on military power. Another milestone is the UN Development Programme’s Human Development Report of 1998, which popularized the idea of “human security”.

Some of the major threats to human security come from the deterioration of the physical environment. Air and water pollution, the depletion of underground water tables, deforestation, desertification, loss of biodiversity, and above all climate change, are having profound effects on many societies today, and, as each injury to the environment accumulates and interacts with all the other injuries, the welfare of future generations is endangered.

#### **Military discretion disturbs endangered species.**

The New York Times, Lee, “Military Seeks Exemptions On Harming Environment.” 2003. http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/06/us/military-seeks-exemptions-on-harming-environment.html

The Defense Department is asking for broad exemptions from environmental regulations in an expanded version of a bill that was defeated last year in the Senate. The proposed legislation, introduced today by the White House, would give the military more discretion in activities that affect marine mammals and endangered species. In particular, the military is asking for exemptions from sections from the Marine Mammal Protection Act, which officials said would give needed flexibility to sonar and underwater bombing exercises. In contrast, the last version of the bill gave limited exemptions for small numbers of marine mammals in specified regions. Environment groups have criticized military sonar exercises over the last several years for beaching whales, in a few cases because of burst eardrums. In a modification of last year's version, this bill also gives limited influence for the secretary of the Department of the Interior, who oversees wildlife protection, in reviewing military plans that would affect endangered species. For years, the Defense Department has argued that over-restrictive environmental regulations protecting wildlife, air and water have interfered with military exercises. For example, more than 300 endangered plant and animal sites are found on military installations. The Marine base at Camp Pendleton, Calif., has limited training with off-road vehicles and the digging of trenches because of the presence of endangered wildlife. The Pentagon also wants to override current regulations that govern the disposal of hazardous waste and the cleanup of contaminated sites. Specifically, the bill excludes explosives and munitions from the solid waste that is governed by environmental regulations if it is hazardous. The Pentagon is cleaning up dozens of contaminated sites around the country. Environmental groups say that if the bill passes, the cost of the cleanups would fall largely to state governments. While the impact of government regulations used to be on a facility-by-facility basis, the Pentagon says that in recent years they have become widespread enough to compromise military readiness.

#### **Militaries pollute, contaminate, and do significant environmental damage.**

Doolittle, Environmental economist University of Massachusetts, “Ten Reasons Why Militarism is Bad for the Environment.” 2003. http://popdev.hampshire.edu/sites/popdev/files/uploads/dt/DifferenTakes\_22.pdf

According to geographer Joni Seager,“anywhere in the world, a military presence is virtually the single most reliable predictor of environmental damage.” Since the end of the Cold War, many plans

to convert military bases to civilian use have been cancelled because the sites are contaminated beyond any hope of restoration. And military pollution isn’t limited to bases, it does significant damage

to the environment at large. In the US – the world’s most oil-thirsty country – the largest single consumer of oil is the Pentagon. Together, the world’s militaries consume as much petroleum as

Japan – the world’s second largest economy – and produce an estimated 6-10% of global air pollution. As Seager concludes: “Militaries…that have little else in common share a distinctive environmental sensibility – namely, one of disregard.”

#### **Militarism pollutes poor, weak civilians.**

Doolittle, Environmental economist University of Massachusetts, “Ten Reasons Why Militarism is Bad for the Environment.” 2003.

Those who pay the price for military pollution tend to be society’s weakest and most vulnerable. For decades the US Army contaminated a poor and largely black neighborhood in Memphis, dumping chemical weapons and other hazardous toxics without informing the residents. Pollution by Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio has elevated the cancer rates and birth defects in the surrounding Latino neighborhoods. For more than fifty years, the US Navy has contaminated Vieques, Puerto Rico, leaving residents with cancer rates 26% higher than the Puerto Rican average. Sadly, the same pattern holds internationally. As Joni Seager observes,“most nuclear weapons in the United States and Europe have been tested on indigenous peoples’ land with dramatic health consequences,” most severely for women and children. Even within the US military, soldiers whose health is threatened by poisonous weapons such as Agent Orange and Depleted Uranium (DU) – not to mention combat – are disproportionately poor and people of color. For both civilians and the rank and file, the pattern is clear: the poor and marginalized are poisoned by the pollution of the rich and powerful.

#### **Militaries (war) waste resources.**

Bertell, PhD, “Health and Environmental Effects of Militarism.” 2004. http://www.rosaliebertell.net/militarism.htm

The destruction of infrastructure for cities, the waste of scarce resources for weapon-building; the restructuring of bombed out buildings, polluting ecosystems and habitats and the stealing of these natural resources from future generations, are not frequently mentioned when discussing war. War causes disruption of weather patterns and destruction of agriculture. With the help of global satellites, the natural resources of our planet home have been estimated, and the rate of depletion of those resources relative to Earth's ability to replenish them has been calculated [See Sturm, Wackernagel and Muller, 1992. 1997 and 2000]

#### **Armed forces biggest polluters.**

Schriner, University of Wisconsin, “US Military Consumption.” 2003 http://academic.evergreen.edu/g/grossmaz/schrinrj.html

A report by a Canadian research institute states that the armed forces of the world are the single biggest polluters on the planet. Science for Peace Institute at the University of Toronto found that 10-30 percent of all global environmental degradation can be attributed to military activities. The world's military forces also use up enormous amounts of environmental and human resources while they use huge amounts of energy.

#### **US military responsible for destroying lands.**

Schriner, University of Wisconsin, “US Military Consumption.” 2003 http://academic.evergreen.edu/g/grossmaz/schrinrj.html

The world's military establishments also use and control vast amounts of land. In the U.S. alone the sum of all land set aside for military use is equivalent in size to the state of Virginia. In 1992, the military in the former Soviet republic of Kazakstan controlled an area equivalent to twice the size of Virginia. The Canadian Research Institute report states, "the military destroys large tracts of the land it is supposed to protect.... Recovery from the effects of some military activities may take thousands of years." In Indiana the U.S. Army closed its severely polluted Jefferson Proving Ground because cleanup was considered too dangerous and costly (it included contamination from Depleted Uranium testing).

#### **Militaries deplete the ozone from CFC-113.**

Schriner, University of Wisconsin, “US Military Consumption.” 2003 http://academic.evergreen.edu/g/grossmaz/schrinrj.html

Military activities have also significantly increased air pollution and ozone depletion. For instance, West Germany's Air Force produced 58% of the air pollution generated by all air traffic in the country. Low-level flights by the military interfere with wildlife migration patterns, and human health. In North America, Native communities are most affected by these flights. A German estimate has stated that 6 to 10% of global air pollution is related to military activities. Furthermore, the world’s militaries are responsible for two-thirds of the ozone depleting CFC-113 released into the air.

#### **Cost of military environment damage is one trillion dollars.**

Schriner, University of Wisconsin, “US Military Consumption.” 2003 http://academic.evergreen.edu/g/grossmaz/schrinrj.html

The report also says, "The environmental costs of militarism are compounded by the lost opportunities resulting from the annual diversion of almost $1 trillion in global resources for military purposes." Only eight percent of the world’s military expenditures would be enough to pay for safe sewage treatment programs, and water supplies, the reversal of tropical deforestation and desertification, and population control measures world wide. "If we neglect the military system when discussing the future of our planet," says David Parnas, president of Science for Peace, "we will be ignoring some of the greatest sources of environmental damage and overlooking some of the least disruptive corrective measures available to us."

### Links – Military

#### **Military involvement with the environment is bad for environment.**

Dutch, Greenbay Lab Science Professor, “Military Impacts on the Environment.” 2010, http://www.uwgb.edu/dutchs/EnvirGeolNotes/Military.HTM

Eco-Terrorism is comparatively modern because only recently have we had the technological capability to create real environmental havoc, and only recently has concern for the environment become serious enough for eco-terrorism to be a credible threat. The thought of Genghis Khan or Tamerlane diverting a campaign to protect vulnerable habitat is grimly humorous. Environmental concerns would simply not have been an issue before the 20th century. Scorched earth campaigns have been directed mostly against structures and agriculture, but certainly contain a strong element of eco-terrorism. The Shenandoah Valley campaign and Sherman's March to the Sea during the Civil War are examples from American history. One of the most horrific examples was the Mongol invasion of Iraq. The Iraq of today is not the Iraq of a thousand years ago; until the Mongol invasion Baghdad was one of the cultural centers of the world, supported by an irrigation complex thousands of years old. The Mongols annihilated Baghdad, destroyed the canals, and so thoroughly depopulated the country that the canals were never restored.

#### **Military involvement with the environment causes people displacement.**

Hay-Edie, IPB Disarmament Coordinator, “THE MILITARY’S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT:A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE” www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc, 2010.

People around the world are displaced where the military take over land (and bodies of water) that the local residents need to live on or feed from, for use as bases, target ranges, weapons stores, training grounds etc. A few of the many examples are Thule in Greenland where indigenous Inuit were displaced for the US base, and the US bases in Okinawa (Japan), Guantanamo (Cuba), and Diego Garcia. Military activities often involve the use of fuels, explosives, solvents and other toxic substances. When improperly handled or stored, they can seep into the environment and affect nearby communities. Military exercises often damage farmland and other property, as heavy military vehicles travel over small roads and bridges. In the lands of the Innu (Canada) and elsewhere, noise pollution from low-flying military aircraft has proved a serious menace, including to the rearing of animals. This has prompted the development of a vigorous citizens’ campaign. Environmental and health concerns almost always take a back seat to military prerogatives. The recent protests of the inhabitants of the Caribbean island of Vieques off Puerto Rico are another good example of the environmental and social stresses caused by military bases, and the disregard shown by army planners for local people.

#### **Military aviation hurts the environment.**

Shields, Sustainable Security, “Military Vaiation and the Environment: Why the Military Should Care.” 2010. http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/military-aviation-and-environment-why-military-should-care

To conclude. Military aviation has a marked impact on the environment. It is unlikely that ecological pressures alone will change the military mindset, although they can help to shape it. There are some benefits accruing from changes in behaviour (albeit that the changes are driven by military necessity), and increased simulation in particular is having a beneficial effect. Nevertheless, military aviation will continue to be environmentally unfriendly and efforts to reinforce good behaviour will have to continue. But why should the military start to take its impact, particularly its use of hydro-carbons and the subsequent carbon output, seriously? Ask any serious military man or woman about the experience of fighting, conflict, war (or whichever synonym you care to name) and they will emphatically state that they wish it could cease. No sensible person who has experienced conflict would wish to repeat it, and all militaries wish to see a more secure world. It is therefore ironic that carbon-generation, in which military aviation in particular excels, is clearly linked to climate change, and climate change itself threatens security and the global peace. In seeking to deter or resolve conflict, it is possible that military aviators and aviatrix are inadvertently creating an even greater problem for the future than the ones they are presently seeking to resolve.

### Military aviation contributes to noise pollution in the environment.

Shields, Sustainable Security, “Military Vaiation and the Environment: Why the Military Should Care.” 2010. http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/military-aviation-and-environment-why-military-should-care

My final area of concern is with noise pollution. While the civilian sector has invested a great deal of money in making jet engines quieter (and, of course, more fuel efficient to reduce operating costs) the same cannot be said for the engines in jet fighters and attack aircraft. The military requirements from their engines are, as intimated earlier, different from a civilian airliner, with the need for immense thrust at any moment (achieved by the use of “after-burners”: the pumping of aviation fuel into the rear of the engine where it is ignited by the hot gases) which achieves the goal, but not only burns considerably more fuel but creates a great deal of noise. Anyone who has ever attended an airshow where military jets are performing will understand! The noise issue is further evident with the large, and defensible, amount of training the military pilots undertake. Back in the 1980s low-flying jets, practicing evading enemy radar systems were a common feature of the more open space across the UK, and the source of many, many complaints for noise. While that has reduced due to a reduced requirement to low fly and a decrease in overall military jet numbers, the increasing use of night-vision devices with the need to practice night low-flying has brought a different noise disturbance. Furthermore, it is primarily in the helicopter and transport fleets that this increase has risen, with the inhabitants of those areas frequented by such aircraft subject to considerable night-time disturbance. While all is done within reason to decrease the disturbance, and the military has a fair point in claiming that it must practice, much more could and should be done to reduce further the level of noise contamination. Again, more investment in simulation would enable much more of this training to be undertaken synthetically; while live flying training will always be required, particularly in military aviation where the unexpected is more common than in the civilian sector, and while military simulators do not represent sufficient fidelity (due to under-investment), this problem is one that has a reasonable solution that should be pursued with greater vigour.

### **Environmental destruction from military aviation through kinetic effect.**

Shields, Sustainable Security, “Military Vaiation and the Environment: Why the Military Should Care.” 2010. http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/military-aviation-and-environment-why-military-should-care

Nevertheless, aviation requires the use of some potentially very harmful chemicals and with the rise in use of carbon-fibre (excellent in aircraft as it is strong, light and flexible; really dangerous due to the carcinogenic properties of the material if broken by, say, an accident or hostile fire) new problems are likely to be encountered. Second, spent ammunition, as well as the destruction it causes with its initial effect (think the effects of the Dambusters Raid of WW II) there has been marked ground contamination from used ammunition in the past. Again, this article is not about the ethics of military airpower, but in terms of environmental impact it is good to note that Depleted Uranium is no longer used as ammunition by the RAF. However, destruction from the air is achieved almost exclusively through kinetic effect, and it is only recently that consideration has been given both to the environmental after-effects of destruction, and to the environmental impact of the chosen weapon system. These moves are in the right direction, and are to be welcomed, but there remains a long way to go.

### **Military is not punished for harming environment.**

Hay-Edie, IPB Disarmament Coordinator, “THE MILITARY’S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT:A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE” [www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc](http://www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc), 2010.

Military activities place a number of stresses on the physical environment, but their contribution to over-all environmental deterioration has not received its share of attention. There are several reasons for this. One is that the military is not seen as an ‘industry’, yet in many ways it behaves like one. Another is that states operate a double standard: they are not willing to subject their armed forces to the levels of transparency and accountability that are required of other governmental or civil society actors.

### **Military destroys human security by destroying environment.**

Hay-Edie, IPB Disarmament Coordinator, “THE MILITARY’S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT:A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE” www.sdissues.net/SDIN/.../Mil-Envir%20JOBURG%20version.doc, 2010.

This includes the threats that attempts at military security have themselves created. "Human security" is an evolving concept, and a dynamic process. It starts with the recognition that all human beings are linked in inter-dependence with each other and with the natural environment. Human security draws upon our increasing understandings of the physical environment -- the webs of life in nature, and upon principles of good governance, such as transparency, accountability, human rights, civil society participation, and international standard-setting and cooperation -- principles that sustain the webs of life in the human environment. One of the milestones in the development of our understanding has been the Brundtland Report of 1987, which established the concept of sustainable development, and which underlined the notion that national and international security must transcend the traditional reliance on military power. Another milestone is the UN Development Programme’s Human Development Report of 1998, which popularized the idea of “human security”.

Some of the major threats to human security come from the deterioration of the physical environment. Air and water pollution, the depletion of underground water tables, deforestation, desertification, loss of biodiversity, and above all climate change, are having profound effects on many societies today, and, as each injury to the environment accumulates and interacts with all the other injuries, the welfare of future generations is endangered.

## Impacts

#### By preserving the environment, we do more harm to the environment and the people who inhabit it.

Timothy Luke, Virginia Polytechnics University ‘’The (Un)Wise (Ab)Use of Nature: Environmentalism as Globalized Consumerism?” 1997 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.PDF

Like most preservationist-minded ecology groups first inspired by IUCN habitat protection agendas, then, the WWF essentially is devoted to "Nature preservation," or creating small reservations of select real estate populated by rare wildlife species in expanses of undeveloped habitat. The ethos of its aristocratic founders with their experiences as hunters of trophy animals on game preserves remains alive in the WWF's approach to Africa, Asia and Latin America as the best sites to preserve big game animals. As WWF-US President Kathryn S. Fuller indicates, the WWF has helped "establish, fund or manage nearly 450 parks and reserves worldwide, from the Wolong Panda Reserve in China to Peru's spectacular Manu National Park. The protected areas WWF-US has supported cover more than 260 million acres of wildlife habitat--an area twice the size of California." This achievement is highly touted in WWF literature, underscoring how thoroughly the organization has reimagined Nature as a bio resources trust, an eco mutual fund, or an environmental endowment to be kept under its diligent surveillance as loosely held inventories of land. The work of the WWF as a result is often ironically seen by its American managers as a kind of "green man's burden" spreading the advances made by conservationists in the United States abroad because, as Train notes, "there has been almost total neglect of the problems outside our borders until the WWF came along." Under the presidencies of Russell E. Train, Bill Reilly and Kathryn Fuller, the WWF grew from 25,000 members with an annual budget of about $2 million in 1978 to a membership of 1.2 million and an annual budget of $79 million in the mid-1990s by pushing this ecocolonialist agenda. The WWF has specialized in propagating its peculiar global vision in which experts from advanced industrial regions, like the United States, Great Britain, or Switzerland, take gentle custody of biological diversity in less advanced regions, like Third World nations, asbenevolent scientific guardians by retraining the locals to be reliable trustees of Earth's common endowments in their weak Third World nation-states.

#### **Conservationists continuing to buy and trade lands mean lands get devastated.**

Timothy Luke, Virginia Polytechnics University ‘’The (Un)Wise (Ab)Use of Nature: Environmentalism as Globalized Consumerism?” 1997 http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.PDF

When it asks for land to protect wildlife and create sanctuary for ecosystems. However, the Nature Conservancy tends not to detail the ultimate cause of its concern. Protect it from what? Create sanctuary from what? The answer is, of course, the same consumeristic economy that is allowing its members to accumulate stock, mail in donations, buy and sell land. In many ways, the Conservancy is disingenuous in its designation of only some of its lands as trade lands. Actually, all of its protected lands are trade lands, trading sanctuary and protection here (where it is commercially possible or aesthetically imperative) to forsake sanctuary and protection there (where it is commercially unviable or aesthetically dispensable). It extracts a title for partial permanence from a constant turnover of economic destruction anchored in total impermanence. The Conservancy ironically fights a perpetually losing battle, protecting rare species from what makes them rare and building sanctuary from what devastates everything on the land elsewhere with the proceeds of its members' successful capitalist rarification and despoliation.

#### Shifting the Focus of Environmental Education

TIMOTHWY. L UKE

Department of Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic Institute aiid State University, Blacksburg, VA, USA

This paper contests the conventional understandings of ‘nature’ and ‘society’ in today’s debates about the environment and sustainability. Typically, environmentalists take their stand ‘at the end of the pipe’ when and where horrendous ecological destruction, pollution or toxic events occur in ‘nature’. Yet, they rarely go back up those pipes into the realm of ‘society’ during those times when there are no obvious environmental disasters. This reactive approach to environmental destruction has, in effect, created a conceptual zoning code that keeps most environmentalists from investigating how society is organised, how industrial metabolisms are fabricated and where ecological efficiencies might be realised before end of the pipe disasters occur. This paper argues in favour of new types of environmental education that would begin their struggle for a better environment in society’s factories, economies and technologies. For better or worse, we now mostly live in a processed world. Even wilderness is a place left wild by larger forces in the processed world letting it be. While the quest to stop ecological destruction through direct action out in the wild should not cease, other battles along another front must question how housing is built to reduce timbering, how food is grown to reduce agrochemical use, how labour is performed to lower pollution, and how ownership is defined to increase collective responsibility. These interventions in social and economic processes would have a goal of changing work and social relations, and they offer another approach to the environmental crisis that needs to be popularised at all levels of education. Environmental education is vitally important.

Mangerialism is a risk

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA

These visions of environmental science recapitulate the logic of technical networks as they already are given in the states and markets of the existing world-system. Rather than the environment surrounding humanity, the friction-free global marketplace of transnational capital is what envelopes Nature. Out of its metabolisms are produced ecotoxins, biohazards, hydrocontaminants, aeroparticulates, and enviropoisons whose impacts generate inexorable risks. These policy problematics unfold now on the global scale, because fast capitalism has colonized so many more sites on the planet as part and parcel of its own unique regime for sustainable development. As Yale's Dean Cohon asserts: The challenge we all face now, as you know, is not limited to one resource in one nation, but extends to the protection of the environment worldwide. The fabric of natural and human communities is currently torn or tattered in many places. There is hardly a place on earth where human activity does not influence the environment's current condition or its prospects for the future. In turn, well-trained environmental professionals must measure, monitor or manage these risks, leaving the rational operations of global fast capitalism wholly intact as "risks won" for their owners and beneficiaries, while risk analyses performed by each environmental school's practitioners and programs deal with the victims of "risks lost."

#### Conservation is Everybody's Business

Igoe, J. 2004. Conservation and Globalization: a Study of National Parks and

Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota. Riverside,

Wadsworth/Thompson.

The idea of synchronizing the environmental and economic function of our planet has lately been rendered more credible by the emergence of new types of technologies and related forms of media representation. GIS models and predictive software models are used to maximize theconservation impacts of protected areas while minimizing their economic costs (Brockington et al 2008: 3). Increasingly these technologies are used to design and implement interventions premised on the idea that market expansion will facilitate biodiversity conservation by financing and biodiversity conservation will facilitate market expansion by creating new types of value.

#### Ecology and Economics are intertwined

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA

These interconnections become even more intriguing in the aftermath of the Cold War. Having won the long twilight struggle against communist totalitarianism, the United States is governed by leaders who now see "Earth in the balance," arguing that global ecologies incarnate what is best and worst in the human spirit. On the one hand, economists, industrialists, and political leaders increasingly tend to represent the strategic terrain of the post-1991 world system as one on which all nations must compete ruthlessly to control the future development of the world economy by developing new technologies, dominating more markets, and exploiting every national economic asset. However, the phenomenon of "failed states," ranging from basket cases like Rwanda, Somalia or Angola to crippled entities like Ukraine, Afghanistan or Kazakhstan, often is attributed to the severe environmental frictions associated with the (un)wise (ab)use of Nature by ineffective strategies for creating economic growth.4 Consequently, environmental protection issues--ranging from resource conservation to sustainable development to ecosystem restoration--are getting greater consideration in the name of creating jobs, maintaining growth, or advancing technological development.

#### Environment And Capitalism

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA Presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 18-22, 1997

Putting earth first only establishes ecological capital as the ultimate basis of life. Infrastructuralizing Nature renders everything on Earth, or "humanity's home," into capital--land, labor, animals, plants, air, water, genes, ecosystems. And, mainstream environmentalism often becomes a very special kind of "home eco nomics" to manage humanity's indoors and outdoors household accounts. Household consumption is always home consumption, because human economics rests upon terrestrial ecologics. Here the roots of ecology and economics intertwine through "sustainable development," revealing its truest double significance: sustainably managing the planet is the same thing as reproducing terrestrial stocks of infrastructorialized green capital. Whether or not environmentalists prevent the unwise abuse or promote wise use of natural resources is immaterial; everything they do optimizes the sign value of green goods and serves to reproduce global capital as environmentalized sites, stocks or spaces--an outcome that every Worldwatch Institute State of the World report or Club Sierra ecotour easily confirms. Likewise, the scarcity measures of Nature Conservancy or World Wildlife Fund scare campaigns show how everything now has a price, including wildlife preservation or ecological degradation, which global markets will mark and meet in their (un)wise (ab)use.

#### We need ecological protection on a global level

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA Presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 18-22, 1997

By becoming an agency of environmental protection on a global level, the United States sees itself reasserting its world leadership after the Cold War. As the world's leader, in turn, America stipulates that it cannot advance economic prosperity and ecological preservation without erasing the dividing lines between domestic and foreign policy. In the blur of the coming Information Age and its global villages, the United States cannot separate America's common good from the common goods of the larger world. To be truly secure in the 21st century, each American's personal, family, and national stake in their collective future must be served through the nation's environmental policies. Secretary of State Christopher confirmed President Clinton's engagement with the environment through domestic statecraft and diplomatic action: "protecting our fragile environment also has profound long-range importance for our country, and in 1996 we will strive to fully integrate our environmental goals into our diplomacy--something that has never been done before."

#### We need to focus on the environment

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA Presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 18-22, 1997

In the final analysis, ecologically sustainable development, as Makower observes, boils down to another expression economic rationality. It is "a search for the lowest-cost method of reducing the greatest amount of pollution" in the continued turnover of consumer-centered production processes.22 Almost magically, sustainable development can become primarily an economic, and not merely an environmental, calculation. The initiatives taken by some businesses to prevent pollution, reduce waste, and maximize energy efficiencies are to be supported. Ecology can win, but only if it can reaffirm on a higher, more perfect register most of fast capitalism's existing premises of technology utilization, managerial centralization, and profit generation now driving advanced corporate capitalism.

#### Solving environmental problems will lead to other solutions

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA Presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 18-22, 1997

Humanity stands at a defining moment in history. We are confronted with a perpetuation of disparities between and within nations, a worsening of poverty, hunger, ill health and illiteracy, and the continuing deterioration of the ecosystems on which we depend for our well-being. However, integration of environment and development concerns and greater attention to them will lead to the fulfillment of basic needs, improved living standards for all, better protected and managed ecosystems and a safer, more prosperous future. No nation can achieve this on its own; but together we can - in a global partnership for sustainable development.'

#### We can’t use the environment for our personal needs.

Timothy W. Luke Department of Political Science Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA Presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 18-22, 1997

40 percent of the earth's annual net primary production on land now goes directly to meet human needs or is indirectly used or destroyed by human activity--leaving 60 percent for the millions of other land-based species with which humans share the planet. While it took all of human history to reach this point, the share could’ double to 80 percent by 2030 if current rates of population growth continue; rising per capita consumption could shorten the doubling time considerably. Along the way, with people usurping an ever larger share of the earth's life-sustaining energy, natural systems will unravel faster.79