### Fem K

#### Understanding methodology is a pre-requisite to policy action. Politics through a gendered lens is necessary in order to solve the conflicts posed by the 1AC.

Peterson and Runyan 1999 (V. Spike Peterson, Professor of Political Science at University of Arizona and Anne Sisson Runyan, Director, Center for Women’s Studies at University of Cincinnati, Global Gender Issues, 1999 p. 1-3)

Whenever we study a topic, we do so through a lens that necessarily focuses our attention in particular ways. By filtering or "ordering" what we look at, each lens enables us to see some things in greater detail or more accurately or in better relation to certain other things. But this is unavoidably at the expense of seeing other things that are rendered out of focus-filtered out--by each particular lens. According to Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi, various theoretical perspectives, or "images," of international politics contain certain assumptions and lead us "to ask certain questions, seek certain types of answers, and use certain methodological tools." [1](http://www.questia.com/reader/action/gotoDocId/98929566) For example, different images act as lenses and shape our assumptions about who the significant actors are (individuals? states? multinational corporations?), what their attributes are (rationality? self-interest? power?), how social processes are categorized (politics? cooperation? dependence?), and what outcomes are desirable (peace? national security? global equity?). The images or lenses we use have important consequences because they structure what we look for and are able to "see." In Patrick Morgan's words, "Our conception of [IR acts as a] map for directing our attention and distributing our efforts, and using the wrong map can lead us into a swamp instead of taking us to higher ground." [2](http://www.questia.com/reader/action/gotoDocId/98929566)  What we look for depends a great deal on how we make sense of, or "order," our experience. We learn our ordering systems in a variety of contexts. From infancy on, we are taught to make distinctions enabling us to perform appropriately within a particular culture. As college students, we are taught the distinctions appropriate to particular disciplines (psychology, anthropology, political science) and particular schools of thought within them (realism, behavioralism, liberalism, structuralism). No matter in which context we learned them, the categories and ordering frameworks shape the lenses through which we look at, think about, and make sense of the world around us. At the same time, the lenses we adopt shape our experience of the world itself because they shape what we do and how and why we do it. For example, a political science lens focuses our attention on particular categories and events (the meaning of power, democracy, or elections) in ways that variously influence our behavior (questioning authority, protesting abuse of power, or participating in electoral campaigns). By filtering our ways of thinking about and ordering experience, the categories and images we rely on shape how we behave and thus the world we live in: They have concrete consequences. We observe this readily in the case of self-fulfilling prophecies: If we expect hostility, our own behavior (acting superior, displaying power) may elicit responses (defensive posturing, aggression) that we then interpret as "confirming" our expectations. It is in this sense that we refer to lenses and "realities" as interactive, interdependent, or mutually constituted. Lenses shape who we are, what we think, and what actions we take, thus shaping the world we live in. At the same time, the world we live in ("reality") shapes which lenses are available to us, what we see through them, and the likelihood of our using them in particular contexts. In general, as long as our lenses and images seem to "work," we keep them and build on them. Lenses simplify our thinking. Like maps, they "frame" our choices and exploration, enabling us to take advantage of knowledge already gained and to move more effectively toward our objectives. The more useful they appear to be, the more we are inclined to take them for granted and to resist making major changes in them. We forget that our particular ordering or meaning system is a choice among many alternatives. Instead, we tend to believe we are seeing "reality" as it "is" rather than as our culture or discipline or image interprets or "maps" reality. It is difficult and sometimes uncomfortable to reflect critically on our assumptions, to question their accuracy or desirability, and to explore the implications of shifting our vantage point by adopting a different lens. Of course, the world we live in and therefore our experiences are constantly changing; we have to continuously modify our images, mental maps, and ordering systems as well. The required shift in lens may be minor: from liking one type of music to liking another, from being a high school student in a small town to being a college student in an urban environment. Or the shift may be more pronounced: from casual dating to parenting, from the freedom of student lifestyles to the assumption of full-time job responsibilities, from Newtonian to quantum physics, from East-West rivalry to post-Cold War complexities. Societal shifts are dramatic, as we experience and respond to systemic transformations such as economic restructuring, environmental degradation, or the effects of war. To function effectively as students and scholars of world politics, we must modify our thinking in line with historical developments. That is, as "reality" changes, our ways of understanding or ordering need to change as well. This is especially the case to the extent that outdated worldviews or lenses place us in danger, distort our understanding, or lead us away from our objectives. Indeed, as both early explorers and urban drivers know, outdated maps are inadequate, and potentially disastrous, guides.

#### The knowledge production of the affirmative is gendered, this contributes to gendered practices in politics and economics. Their attempt to depoliticize gender domination guarantees that women are treated as objects, not subjects.

Youngs 4

(Gillian Youngs is a Lecturer at the Center for Mass Communication Research at the University of Leicester, “Feminist International Relations: A Contradiction in Terms? Or: Why Women and Gender Are Essential to Understanding the World 'We' Live in”, International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), Vol. 80, No. 1, January, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3569295)

The title of Charlotte Hooper's influential book Manly states: masculinities international relations and gender politics can usefully be read as a play on words that reflects the two levels of ontological revisionism.'3 'Manly states' is a description both of the masculinist nature of states, traditionally the central actors in international relations, and of the general conditions (states) of manliness, otherwise the problem (as feminist International Relations would term it) of masculinity and masculine subjectivity. Critique of the masculinist nature of states has inevitably been one of the richest and most important threads of feminist International Relations, building, to some extent on, and certainly in close relationship to, the insights of feminist political theory.'4 Let us for simplicity's sake take the masculinist nature of states as referring to the historical problem of politics as male-defined and male-dominated,15 and the problem of masculine subjectivity as a constrained and particularistic articulation of political agency at the individual level. While mainstream International Relations has tended to treat the state largely as a coherent (male-controlled) unit, feminist International Relations has assessed at length the implications of its gendered realities,i6 expressed through the 'public over private' hierarchy (sexual contract) that has traditionally framed politics (and economics) as predominantly public spheres of male influence and identification, and the home, family and social reproduction as predominantly private spheres of female influence and identification. The history of state formation and identity is therefore one of gendered (and other forms of) oppression. 'As a historical matter, early state formation marked the effective centralization of political authority and accumulation processes, institutionalization of gender and class exploitation, and ideological legitimation of these transformations. At least since Aristotle, the codification of man as "master" [subject] and woman as "matter" [object] has powerfully naturalized/ de-politicized man's exploitation of women, other men, and nature.'17 In its range of critical work on the state, feminist International Relations has, directly and indirectly, accused mainstream International Relations of depoliticizing exploitation by ignoring the relational gender dynamics integral to the political power of states as (masculinist) actors. This work makes it clear that male power can and should be explained, not just taken as given; that the state as a paramount expression of collective and historically and socially constructed male power can and should be explained in dynamic gender terms, not taken as given. The implication of such work is that the appearance of coherent masculinist power as evidenced at the collective (state) or individual level is a surface or superficial perspective. Beneath it lies the complex of gendered and other power relations that sustain it and, importantly, explain it. Thus, feminist International Relations could be characterized as seeking to explain the fuller dynamics of political and economic power that lie beneath the masculinist surface. A reflection by Steve Smith emphasizes, in this context, the importance of gender as a relational concept: 'The most productive focus is on gender, not women or feminism, because only this focus allows the examination of precisely the construction of identities in IR that shape what happens to actual women and men in IR.'I8 It is essential to add to this that, historically, feminist theory and analysis have been the spheres of critique and knowledge-building that have led the way in championing, explaining and validating attention to gender as a category. As Charlotte Hooper has usefully summarized: 'One of the achievements of feminist contributions to international relations has been to reveal the extent to which the whole field is gendered. The range of subjects studied, the boundaries of the discipline, its central concerns and motifs, the content of emnpirical research, the assumptions of theoretical models, and the corresponding lack of female practitioners both in academic and elite political and economic circles all combine and reinforce each other to marginalize and often make invisible women's roles and women's concerns in the international arena.'"9 Hooper highlights here the intimate interconnections between theory and practice in reproducing gendered realities, and thus the role of mainstream International Relations in maintaining what might be viewed as superficial rather than deep assessments of the nature of both states and political agency.

#### The permutation fails – beginning with the state as the basic ontological unit of international relations necessarily excludes the analysis of women’s issues: domestic labor, civilian casualties, and gendered violence.

Tickner, feminist IR theorist and a distinguished scholar in residence at the School of International Services, American University, 01

[J. Ann, Gendering World Politics, p. 3-6, MM]

It is this lack of connection that motivates many of the issues raised in this book. While I have attempted to site feminist perspectives within the discipline, it will become clear from the topics addressed that IR feminists frequently make different assumptions about the world, ask different questions, and use different methodologies to answer them. Having reflected on reasons for these disconnections, as well as the misunderstandings over the potential usefulness of feminist approaches raised by some of the questions above, I believe that they lie in the fact that feminist IR scholars see different realities and draw on different epistemologies from conventional IR theorists. For example, whereas IR has traditionally analyzed security issues either from a structural perspective or at the level of the state and its decision makers, feminists focus on how world politics can contribute to the insecurity of individuals, particularly marginalized and disempowered populations. They examine whether the valorization of characteristics associated with a dominant form of masculinity influences the foreign policies of states. They also examine whether the privileging of these same attributes by the realist school in IR may contribute to the reproduction of conflict-prone, power-maximizing behaviors.11 Whereas IR theorists focus on the causes and termination of wars, feminists are as concerned with what happens during wars as well as with their causes and endings. Rather than seeing military capability as an assurance against outside threats to the state, militaries are seen as frequently antithetical to individual security, particularly to the security of women and other vulnerable groups. Moreover, feminists are concerned that continual stress on the need for defense helps to legitimate a kind of militarized social order that overvalorizes the use of state violence for domestic and international purposes. Conventional IPE has typically focused on issues such as the economic behavior of the most powerful states, hegemony, and the potential for building international institutions in an anarchic system populated by self-interested actors; within a shared state-centric framework, neorealists and neoliberals debate the possibilities and limitations of cooperation using the notion of absolute versus relative gains.12 Feminists more often focus on economic inequality, marginalized populations, the growing feminization of poverty and economic justice, particularly in the context of North/South relations. Whereas IR has generally taken a “top-down” approach focused on the great powers, feminist IR often begins its analysis at the local level, with individuals embedded in social structures. While IR has been concerned with explaining the behavior and interaction of states and markets in an anarchic international environment, feminist IR, with its intellectual roots in feminist theory more generally, is seeking to understand the various ways in which unequal gender structures constrain women’s, as well as some men’s, life chances and to prescribe ways in which these hierarchical social relations might be eliminated. These different realities and normative agendas lead to different methodological approaches. While IR has relied heavily on rationalistic theories based on the natural sciences and economics, feminist IR is grounded in humanistic accounts of social relations, particularly gender relations. Noting that much of our knowledge about the world has been based on knowledge about men, feminists have been skeptical of methodologies that claim the neutrality of their facts and the universality of their conclusions. This skepticism about empiricist methodologies extends to the possibility of developing causal laws to explain the behavior of states. While feminists do see structural regularities, such as gender and patriarchy, they define them as socially constructed and variable across time, place, and culture; understanding is preferred over explanation.13 These differences over epistemologies may well be harder to reconcile than the differences in perceived realities discussed above. Subsequent chapters of this book serve two purposes. First, they elaborate upon and forge a better understanding of the ontological and epistemological differences between feminists and IR scholars. These differences will become evident as subsequent chapters move further away from traditional IR concerns. Although security (the subject of chapter 2) is central to both conventional IR and feminist perspectives, even though each approaches it from quite different perspectives, democratization (one of the topics in chapter 4) has not been central to IR as conventionally defined. The second goal is to demonstrate what feminist approaches to IR are contributing and can contribute to our understanding of global politics. While not suggesting that they can tell us everything we need to know about world politics, feminists are challenging us to see the inequality and domination aspects of “common sense” gender differences. For example, uncovering previously hidden gender hierarchies in policy priorities or workplace participation can show how they contribute to conflict and injustice in ways that have detrimental effects on the security of both men and women. Much of feminist analysis draws upon and intersects with that of scholars who would not consider themselves part of the discipline of IR; this suggests that feminists are charting their own voyages of discovery rather than staying within the confines of the discipline. Debates as to how connected feminism should be to the discipline are central to feminist discussions. Acknowledging these concerns, chapter 1 attempts to situate feminist scholarship within an increasingly fragmented discipline of IR. Subsequent chapters do the same in a variety of issue areas. A sharp division between realism and liberalism, and their neorealist and neoliberal versions, and critical and postpositivist approaches is now evident in IR.14 While there is no necessary connection between postpositivism and feminism, many IR feminists would identify themselves as postpositivists. Additionally, many would be uncomfortable describing themselves as either liberals or realists. For these reasons, they are closer to other critical approaches than to conventional theory; they are distinctive, however, in that their work is also grounded in contemporary feminist theoretical debates and by the fact that all of them use gender as a central category of analysis. Chapter 2 deals with war, peace, and security—issues that continue to be central to the discipline. While realists see the contemporary system as only a temporary lull in great-power conflict, others see a change in the character of war, with the predominance of conflicts of state building and state disintegration driven by ethnic and national identities as well as by material interests. Since feminists use gender as a category of analysis, issues of identity are central to their approach; chapter 2 explores the ways in which the gendering of nationalist and ethnic identities can exacerbate conflict. Feminists are also drawing our attention to the increasing impact of these types of military conflicts on civilian populations. Civilians now account for about 90 percent of war casualties, the majority of whom are women and children. Questioning traditional IR boundaries between anarchy and danger on the outside and order and security on the inside, as well as the realist focus on states and their interactions, feminists have pointed to insecurities at all levels of analysis; for example, Katharine Moon has demonstrated how the “unofficial” support of military prostitution served U.S. alliance goals in Korea, thus demonstrating links between interpersonal relations and state policies at the highest level.15 Feminist analysis of wartime rape has shown how militaries can be a threat even to their own populations;16 again, feminist scholarship cuts across the conventional focus on interstate politics or the domestic determinants of foreign policy. Feminists have claimed that the likelihood of conflict will not diminish until unequal gender hierarchies are reduced or eliminated; the privileging of characteristics associated with a stereotypical masculinity in states’ foreign policies contributes to the legitimization not only of war but of militarization more generally. Wary of what they see as gendered dichotomies that have pitted realists against idealists and led to overly simplistic assumptions about warlike men and peaceful women,17 certain feminists are cautioning against the association of women with peace, a position that, they believe, disempowers both women and peace. The growing numbers of women in the military also challenges and complicates these essentialist stereotypes. To this end, and as part of their effort to rethink concepts central to the field, feminists define peace and security, not in idealized ways often associated with women, but in broad, multidimensional terms that include the elimination of social hierarchies such as gender that lead to political and economic injustice.

### Indo pak

**Indo-Pak war wouldn’t escalate globally**

**Khan**, Newstrack India, 20**09** [Shamsur Rabb, Price of an Indo-Pak War, Newstrack India, 1/20, http://www.newstrackindia.com/newsdetails/62680]

Let us turn to unprecedented casualty in case of a nuclear conflict: Natural Resources Defence Council (NRDC), the New York based global think tank, in its report, “The Consequences of Nuclear Conflict between India and Pakistan” has calculated the human costs of an Indo-Pak nuclear conflict. As per NRDC estimates, both countries have a total of 50 to 75 nuclear weapons. Depicting a nuclear war Scenario (10 bombs on 10 South Asian cities), it says that attack on 10 major cities – 5 each in India and Pakistan – would result in a combined death toll of 2,862,581, with 1,506,859 severely injured and 3,382,978 slightly injured. On Indian side, death toll is estimated at 1,690,702, while 892,459 and 2,021,106 would be severely and slightly injured respectively. On Pakistan side, a total of 1,171,879 people would die, while, 614,400 and 1,361,872 are to be severely and slightly injured. In another scenario (24 Ground Bursts), NRDC calculated the consequences of 24 nuclear explosions detonated on the ground – unlike the Hiroshima airburst – resulting in significant amounts of lethal radioactive fallout, which is far more severe nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan. The report was first appeared in the January 14, 2002, issue of Newsweek (A Face-Off with Nuclear Stakes). Contrary to ground burst, exploding a nuclear bomb above the ground does not produce fallout. For example, can we imagine the consequences of ground burst if the “Little Boy” detonated by the US above Hiroshima at an altitude of 1,900 feet could kill 70,000 people in the immediate effect with some 200,000 died up to 1950? NRDC calculated that 22.1 million people in India and Pakistan would be exposed to lethal radiation doses of 600 roentgen equivalents in man or REM (a large amount of radiation) or more in the first two days of the attack. In addition, about 8 million people would receive a radiation dose of 100 to 600 REM causing severe radiation sickness and potentially death. In all, as many as 30 million people of both countries would be eliminated by nuclear war. Besides fallout, blast and fire would cause substantial destruction within roughly a mile-and-a-half of the bomb craters. However, even after such a devastating annihilation of population, about 99 percent of the population in India and 93 percent of the population in Pakistan would survive the second scenario and their respective military forces would still be intact to continue the conflict. In short, there is nothing to gain from a war, just plenty to lose. Albeit loss of human life would be immense it would not be large enough to result in extinction of Indo-Pak populations or even prevent continuation of a military conflict. Thus, the consequences, though horrific, are not strong enough to rule out Indo-Pak conflict in future. Had size of the Indo-Pak nuclear arsenals equal to those of the US and Russia, a complete annihilation of entire population of the Indian sub-continent would have been possible.

**Detterrence solves escalation**

**SAT, 3** (South Asia Tribune, “Will nukes prevent or forment the next indo-pak war?” <http://antisystemic.org/satribune/www.satribune.com/archives/nov23_29_03/opinion_anwaar.htm>)

Creating a secure environment with the right mix of nuclear weapons, therefore, remains the challenge for both India and Pakistan. From now on, nuclear weapons deterrence lies at the heart of a war-free Indo-Pak environment. At the heart of this deterrence is the credibility of strategies, forces and intent to respond in the event of a direct military assault. In the absence of a credible response, deterrence is nothing but a façade.

The capacity to threaten with a believable response makes deterrence effective. Credibility, therefore, is a key component of deterrence. The question is how to make nuclear deterrence so convincing that war becomes a non-option and diplomacy the only option to resolve outstanding disputes?

**No risk of Southeast Asian war**

**Kaplan, 11** — senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security, national correspondent for the Atlantic, and a member of the U.S. Defense Department's Defense Policy Board (Robert D., “The South China Sea Is the Future of Conflict”, Foreign Policy, September/October 2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/the\_south\_china\_sea\_is\_the\_future\_of\_conflict)

EAST ASIA IS A VAST, YAWNING EXPANSE stretching nearly from the Arctic to Antarctic -- from the Kuril Islands southward to New Zealand -- and characterized by a shattered array of isolated coastlines and far-flung archipelagos. Even accounting for how dramatically technology has compressed distance, the sea itself still acts as a barrier to aggression, at least to a degree that dry land does not. The sea, unlike land, creates clearly defined borders, giving it the potential to reduce conflict. Then there is speed to consider. Even the fastest warships travel comparatively slowly, 35 knots, say, reducing the chance of miscalculations and giving diplomats more hours -- days, even -- to reconsider decisions. Navies and air forces simply do not occupy territory the way that armies do. It is because of the seas around East Asia -- the center of global manufacturing as well as rising military purchases -- that the 21st century has a better chance than the 20th of avoiding great military conflagrations.

### Solvency

#### US/MEXICAN PEACE PARKS FUEL NEOLIBERALISM

Brian **King &** Sharon **Wilcox, Geography Professors Penn State & University of Texas, 2008,** "Peace Parks and jaguar trails: transboundary conservation in a globalizing world," GeoJournal, 71:221-231, p. 221

An increasingly utilized strategy for expanding conservation in the developing world has been the promotion of protected areas that supersede national borders. Alternatively known as transfrontier biosphere reserves, transfrontier or transboundary conservation areas, or Peace Parks, these protected areas are aggressively advanced by conservation agencies for their purported ecological and economic benefits. This article provides a comparative assessment of two case studies to understand the various impacts of transboundary conservation. The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park, which unites protected areas in South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, is contrasted with efforts to protect jaguars along the United States–Mexico border. We argue that while these cases are promising for the purposes of biodiversity protection, they demonstrate that transboundary conservation can minimize political context, contributes to the hegemony of international conservation agendas, and remains closely linked to economic neoliberalism and decentralization in the developing world.

#### Neoliberal engagement of Latin America results in inequality, political oppression, and military intervention—moral obligation to put those sacrificed by Western growth at the center of decision making.

Makwana 6 (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization¶ The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.¶ The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.¶ There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.¶ The neoliberal experiment has failed to combat extreme poverty, has exacerbated global inequality, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.¶ Introduction ¶ After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.¶ Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.¶ The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.¶ There is a consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.¶ There is a huge discrepancy between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)¶ Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).¶ The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.¶ The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.¶ According to Maria Páez Victor:¶ “Since 1846 the United States has carried out no fewer than 50 military invasions and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of perceived threats to its economic control and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”¶ As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.¶ So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.¶ However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.¶ The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.¶ Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.¶ Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.¶ Economic Growth¶ Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.¶ Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.¶ Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.¶ The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.¶ Free Trade¶ Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.¶ With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.¶ The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, increased inequality and caused environmental destruction.¶ In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.¶ The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.¶ These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly biased in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.¶ Liberalization¶ The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.¶ According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.¶ Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely destroys local industries. It creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and economic crisis in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.¶ A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.

#### ECO-FRONTIERS ARE USED TO GREEN WASH ALL POLITICAL ISSUES, REASSERT EMPIRE, AND RE-COLONISE OFF-LIMITS ZONES

**Guyot ‘11** (Sylvain, Prof. @ U. of Limoges, “The Eco-Frontier Paradigm: Rethinking the Links between Space, Nature and Politics” Geopolitics, Vol. 16.3, pp. 685-687)

**Emerging processes** that **recycle and** sometimes **exaggerate the first and second generation’s ideologies** are at the heart of this third generation. Indeed, **they work in parallel** (and sometimes in association) with the dynamics of the first and second generations. First, the third generation of eco-frontiers is **produced by actors on a global scale of intervention**. Second, **these actors produce discourses and representations in the name of the eco-frontier as an** ecological**/ecologist** conquest**.** Third, **the geo-economy of the eco-frontier is very powerful, and the eco-conquest works as a new economical appropriation of the world.**44 **This third generation shows the triumph of green thinking with an** eco-recycling of everything**, such as the diffusion of** green washing**.**

Four well-connected groups of actors produce different types of processes. First, the **environmentalists map the world with new eco-frontiers with high biological value and cultural areas like biodiversity hotspots**45 **and indigenous reserves.**46 **They plead for the increase in size of protected areas** all over the world, such as trans-border parks.47 Second, **the world organisations**, like the World Bank and the UNEP, **produce new eco-frontiers related to global change and emphasise the importance and value attached to ecological services.** Third, some **scientists and the media promote ulti- mate eco-frontiers as final barriers to world environmental destruction in the last secluded and remote areas** of the world, such as Antarctica or isolated islands. Fourth, additionally, **the general public contributes to the general ‘ecologisation’ of society by way of eco-tourism based on an eco-frontier dream.** Thus, **they contribute to the development of the concept of eco-conquerors.** We will develop these aspects in the empirical study presented below.

The main geographical/geopolitical concepts supporting this third generation of eco-frontiers focus on the non-linearity of borders and on mobile borders.48 For instance, **the transfrontier**/trans-border **protected areas linked to environmental networks that are supported by worldwide NGOs are** central **to this new geopolitical reality** linking nature to space.49 However, the South African example50 makes it clear that **such notions still serve State security or** Empire-style territorial hegemony **and refer to the first and second generations of eco-frontiers.** In Southern Africa, **protected areas serve many diverse interests, such as nature conservation, racial segregation, and elitist hedonism.** These motivations can be ambiguous and contradictory. Transfrontier parks have the capacity to be used as geopolitical tools at a supranational scale. During the apartheid era, South African border parks were buffer zones for Mozambican and Angolan civil wars. Currently, these protected areas have been relegitimised by official discourses on peace and by environmental and tourist cooperation between South African States: the concept of **Transfrontier Peace Parks** (TPP). TPP **are a method for politico- economic domination, rather than a social redistribution tool. They thrust a proto-colonial discourse into the post-colonial era of global capitalism.** The TPP could be legitimised by real diplomatic actions in favour of democracy in the bordering countries or by a real political integration at a regional level. However, **the TPP do not resolve the issues of illegal immigrants, evidence that denying boundaries also benefits black people, and serious developmental gaps** between South Africa and most of its neighbours.

**Colonial conservation, through its European imaginings of wild nature and avoidance of the technical and aesthetic sensibilities of black Africans, has allowed for the creation of a vast system of South African national parks and the disenfranchisement of indigenous populations.** **Conservation and natural-resource management were two sides of the same coin, and they produced similar effects of** (a) **the ordering and** (b) **the othering of the “black African”. Through a moral and economic visionary discourse masked in technical and scientific terminology, colonial conservation furthered the othering of Africans from their lands and resources. It also created opportunities for territorial claim staking by the postcolonial state and international stake- holders. A neo-liberal market ideology, combined with romantic ‘dreams’ of ‘tourism nature parks’, has allowed** South African **political** and economic **actors to recolonise** southern Africa **through TPPs.** (In this context, supple- mentary notions of environmental racism51 and environmental justice52 may be useful, but these will not be developed here.) This example shows pre- cisely how the three generations of eco-frontiers can be combined within one territorial geopolitical strategy.

#### TRANSBOUNDARY CONSERVATION CORRIDORS NOT ACCOUNTABLE TO LOCAL POPULATIONS

Liza **Grandia, Department of International Development, Clark University, 2007,** "Between Bolivar and Bureaucracy: The Mesoamerican Biological Corridor," Conservation and Society, Vol. 5, Issue 4, [http://conservationandsociety.org/article.asp?issn=0972-4923;year=2007;volume=5;issue=4;spage=478;epage=503;aulast=Grandia] p. 478-503

Following their success in the early 1990s in demarcating so many bi- and tri-national parks, conservationists logically began imagining ways in which they might string together these building blocks into a more ambitious, trans­national corridor. Yet while obviously related, transnational corridors like the MBC and peace parks are not necessarily synonymous. The coordination of a peace park belongs to two sovereign nations, whereas transboundary corridors lend themselves to management by international organisations or multilateral institutions that are not necessarily accountable to local organisations and governments. Moreover, early advocates for peace parks such as Arias and Nations (1992) invoked rationales for cross-border environmental coordina­tion broader than just the preservation of biodiversity, citing, for example: public health benefits of addressing pollution from pesticides or oil refineries; political benefits in resolving border conflicts; and agricultural benefits such as preventing soil erosion or the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease. Their ar­guments implicitly challenged big business and seemed almost a prescient call for regional environmental justice. As we shall see, however, the World Bank funding in the mid-1990s shifted the Bolivarian effort led by Central Ameri­can environmentalists to a different kind of corridor that reflected the Bank's own peculiarly capitalist interpretation of the relationship between people and the environment.

#### PROTECTED AREAS GROUNDED IN COLONIALISM AND TODAY IN N ECOLIBERALISM

Brian **King &** Sharon **Wilcox, Geography Professors Penn State & University of Texas, 2008,** "Peace Parks and jaguar trails: transboundary conservation in a globalizing world," GeoJournal, 71:221-231, p. 221-2

The global expansion of national parks and protected areas has produced a wealth of research that examines their effectiveness in promoting biodiversity protection (Terborgh 1999; Zerner 2000), in impacting livelihoods for neighboring populations (Neumann 1998; King 2007), and enabling the ascendancy of international conservation organizations in shaping policies in the developing world (Schroeder 1999; Chapin 2004; Zimmerer 2006). Driven in part by the discourses of sustainable development and economic neoliberalism, the aggregate territory set aside for conservation has increased dramatically over the past three decades. It is estimated that the total area dedicated to conservation has increased from less than 1.0 million square kilometers in 1970 to more than 19.6 million square kilometers in 2006 (IUCN and WCMC 1998 in Zimmerer 2006; IUCN and WCMC 2006). While much of the initial impetus for establishing conservation areas in the developing world was tied to colonialism, the recent expansion has been facilitated by a ‘‘third wave’’ that emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s that has produced ‘‘an unprecedented variety and extent of spatial arrangements whose environmental management goals and prescribed activities may vary from strict nature protection to sustainable utilization’’ (Zimmerer 2006, pp. 65–66).

**\*HE IMPACT IS EXTINCTION – DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT HAS BECOME A GLOBAL CIVIL WAR BETWEEN PROTECTED AND UNINSURED FORMS OF LIFE THAT WILL END IN SELF-ANNIHILATION**

**Duffield ‘8** (Mark, Dept. of Politics, U. of Bristol, “Global Civil War: The Non-Insured, International Containment and Post-Interventionary Society,” Journal of Refugee Studies Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 161-162)

This essay began with the proposition that to complete the nexus between development and security, the term containment needs to be included; in the sense that **you cannot have development or security without** containing the **circulation of underdeveloped life.** Rather than emerging with the end of the Cold War, or even less convincingly with 9/11, the origins of this nexus can be traced to decolonization. While its constituent parts have an even longer history, **decolonization publicly signalled the generic division of humankind into insured and non-insured species-life. It foregrounded the coexistence of a developed life**, supported by the welfare bureaucracies associated with social insurance, **with an underdeveloped life expected to be self-reliant.** While the former was secure within the juridico-political framework of the nation-state, the latter was synonymous with deficient but aspiring states. **As an appendage of this new world of states, decolonization also called forth a volatile world of peoples having**, for the first time, **the potential to circulate globally. In meeting this threat**, since the 1960s, the resilience of **consumer society has been regularly scored in** terms of **the ability** of effective states **to contain the circulatory effects of the permanent crisis of self-reliance, including political instability and the mobile poverty of irregular migration.** In the intervening decades, containment has deepened and extended to constitute a virtual global ban on the free movement of spontaneous or non-managed migration. This necessity was first articulated in terms of the risks posed to community cohesion and the finite resources of the welfare state. Spurred by the threat of terrorism, such concerns have now been generalized to include the critical energy, transport and service infrastructures of mass consumer society. **The international security architecture** that emerged with decolonization **interconnects** the **containment** of irregular migration with measures to integrate migrant communities already settled within consumer society **and**, at the same time, **state-led development initiatives to improve the self-reliance and stasis of underdeveloped life in situ. This episodic architecture has deepened with each crisis of global circulation. It marks out a terrain of a** globalcivil war, or rather tableau of wars, **which is being fought on and between the modalities of life itself. Through their associated modalities of circulation**—and the need to police them—**global civil war connects the livelihood conflicts of the global South with threats to critical infrastructure in the North.** Since the end of the Cold War, **the radical interdependence of world events has placed a renewed emphasis on the need for social cohesion at home while**, at the same time, **urging a fresh wave of intervention abroad to reconstruct weak** and fragile **states, or remove rogue ones.** What is at stake in this war is the West’s ability to contain and manage international poverty while maintaining the ability of mass society to live and consume beyond its means. **Supported by the massed ranks of career politicians and big business, there is a real possibility that this** disastrous **formula for sharing the world with others will be defended** to the death**.** Certainly, that a large part of humanity is deemed to be self-reliant and potentially sustainable—if limited to basic needs—must give hope to many in the environmental lobby. As a lived reality, however, it is less convincing. **Reflected within the globalization of containment, imposing and maintaining this putative life-style has become** increasingly violent **and coercive. In one way or another, we are all involved in this war**; it cannot be escaped since **it mobilizes societies as a whole, including policy makers and academics.** Because this war is being conducted in our name, however, we have a right as citizens to decide where we agree and disagree, and at what point, or over which issues, we need to establish our own terms of engagement.