

Objectivity is defined as

(Merriam Webster) <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/objectivity>

the quality or character of being objective : **lack of favoritism toward one side or another** : freedom from bias.

Framework

Standard: Minimizing structural violence

1) Structural violence preconditions high magnitude crises. Resolving impacts of the 1AC is a prior question to any other impacts

Charlesworth 02

(Hilary Charlesworth, Australian National University. Director, Centre for International Governance and Justice, Professor & ARC Laureate Fellow. "International Law: A Discipline of Crisis" *Modern Law Review* 65:3. Pages: 391-392. 2002)

A concern with crises skews the discipline of international law. Through regarding **'crises'** as its bread and butter and the engine of progressive development of international law, international law **becomes** simply **a** source of **justification for the status quo**. The framework of crisis condemns international lawyers, as David Kennedy puts it, to 'a sort of disciplinary hamster wheel'.⁷⁶ **One way forward is to refocus** international law **on issues of structural justice that underpin everyday life**. What might an international law of every day life look like? At the same time that the much-analysed events in Kosovo were taking place, 1.2 billion people lived on less than a dollar a day.⁷⁷ We know that 2.4 billion people in the developing world do not have access to basic sanitation, and that half of this number are chronically malnourished; we know that the developed world holds one quarter of the world's population, but holds 4/5 of the world's income; we know that military spending worldwide is over \$1 billion a day and that alternative uses of tiny fractions could generate real change in education, health care and nutrition; we know that almost 34 million people worldwide live with HIV/AIDS;⁷⁸ we know that violence against women is at epidemic levels the world over. Why are these phenomena not widely studied by international lawyers? Why are they at the margins of the international law world? An international law of everyday life would require **a methodology to consider the perspectives of non-elite groups**. For example, we should be able to study 'humanitarian intervention' from the perspective of the people on whose behalf the intervention took place. International lawyers' accounts of humanitarian intervention prompted by Kosovo do not take the views of the objects of intervention into account. If they did so, we would be likely to end up with a much more contradictory, complex and confusing account of humanitarian intervention than international lawyers have thus far produced. We should also enlarge our inquiries. For example, with respect to the idea of collective security, how can we think about the global security more broadly? Johan Galtung **has developed the notion of structural violence that highlights** causes other than warfare, for example poverty, as the major cause of death and suffering.⁷⁹ Other scholars have identified **the interconnections of poverty**, environmental degradation, discrimination, exploitation, militarisation **and violence as the causes of insecurity**.⁸⁰ Feminist scholars have drawn attention to the threats posed, to women not by foreign states, but by more local actors, including the men in their families. On this analysis security would mean the absence of violence and economic and social justice. If the idea of security is understood more broadly, the futility of the standard form of international collective action becomes clear. Military intervention is an inappropriate mechanism if the causes of insecurity are poverty, discrimination and violence protected by structures within the state. What if we were to change the type of questions we ask? For example, David Kennedy has pointed out that the work of international lawyers typically focuses on humanitarian objectives (such as environmental protection or protection of human rights). We could begin from the opposite end and examine what international law has to offer to the person who wants to pollute the environment or violate human rights. I imagine this as an international lawyer's version of C.S. Lewis' *Screwtape Letters* in which cheery letters from the Devil mock the ease of corrupting humans. Such a technique would destabilise the idea that international lawyers have a stable and common set of values.⁸¹ Kennedy proposes 'extravagant projects', slowing the emergence of a disciplinary middle (or third) way and encouraging dissent and disagreement.⁸² For example, how often have 'reforms' in international law obscured deep injustices? How are spatial and conceptual boundaries we take for granted made real by the law? Finally, we should consider our own personal and professional investment in crises. We need to analyse the way we exercise power, and who wins and who loses in this operation. In asking this question, we will undermine that pleasurable sense of internationalist virtue that comes with being an international lawyer, but perhaps in the end contribute something to countering the injustices of everyday life.

2] Resisting oppression is an epistemological prerequisite to any conception of morality due to moral exclusion.

Winter and Leighton 99

[Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton. Winter] [Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Leighton: PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. Knowledgeable in the fields of social psychology, peace psychology, and justice and intergroup responses to transgressions of justice] "Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century." Pg 4-5 ghs
<https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/u.osu.edu/dist/b/7538/files/2014/10/Table-of-Contents-13d9h81.pdf>

Finally, to recognize the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged elite who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so

oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opatow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that **our**

normal perceptual cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and

out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice. injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or

irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so **we draw conceptual lines**

between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside

are morally excluded, and become either invisible, or demeaned in some way

so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer. Moral

exclusion is a human failing. but Opatow argues convincingly that **it is an outcome of everyday**

social cognition.

To reduce its nefarious effects, **we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to the oppressed,** invisible, outsiders. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opatow, all the authors in this section

point out that structural violence **[it] is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation, and**

build systematic ways to mitigate its effects. Learning about structural violence may be discouraging,

overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed

structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce it. **In the long run, reducing structural**

violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, **demanding social justice** and living wages, providing prenatal care, [and]

alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, **will be our most surefooted path to building lasting**

peace.

1st Climate

a. Truths like climate change are questioned and strayed away from in the name of being objective and unbiased.

(Westervelt 19) Amy Westervelt. "How the fossil fuel industry got the media to think climate change was debatable". January 10, 2019. Amy Westervelt is an audio and print reporter who covers climate and gender, and sometimes the intersection of the two. Her podcast Drilled is about the creation and spread of climate denial and her first book "Forget 'Having It All'" was published by Seal Press in November 2018.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/01/10/how-fossil-fuel-industry-got-media-think-climate-change-was-debatable/>

Late last year, the Trump administration released the latest national climate assessment on Black Friday in what many assumed was an attempt to bury the document. If that was the plan, it backfired, and the assessment wound up earning more coverage than it probably would have otherwise.

But much of that coverage perpetuated a decades-old practice, one that has been weaponized by **the fossil fuel industry**: false equivalence. Although various business interests began pushing back against environmental action in general in the early 1970s as part of the conservative "war of ideas" launched in response to the social movements of the 1960s, when global warming first broke into the public sphere, it was a bipartisan issue and remained so for years. On the campaign trail in 1988, George H.W. Bush identified as an environmentalist and called for action on global warming, framing it as a technological challenge that American innovation could address. But fossil fuel interests were shifting as the industry and its allies began to push back against empirical evidence of climate change, taking many conservatives along with

them. Documents uncovered by journalists and activists over the past decade lay out a clear strategy: First, **target[s] media**

outlets to get them to report more on the “uncertainties” in climate science and **position[s] industry-backed contrarian scientists as expert[s]** sources for media. Second, **target conservatives with the message that climate change is a liberal hoax, and paint anyone who takes the issue seriously as “out of touch** with reality.” **In the 1990s**, oil companies, **fossil fuel industry** trade **groups** and their respective PR firms **began positioning contrarian scientists** such as Willie Soon, William Happer and David Legates as experts whose opinions on climate change should be considered equal and opposite to that of climate scientists. The Heartland Institute, which hosts an annual International Conference on Climate Change known as the leading climate skeptics conference, for example, routinely calls out media outlets (including The Washington Post) for showing “bias” in covering climate change when they either decline to quote a skeptic or question a skeptic’s credibility. Data on how effective this strategy has been is hard to come by, but anecdotal evidence of its success abounds. In the early 1990s, polls showed that about 80 percent of Americans were aware of climate change and accepted that something must be done about it, an opinion that crossed party lines. By 2008, Gallup found a marked partisan divide on climate change. By 2010, the American **public’s belief in climate change hit an all-time low of 48 percent, despite** the fact that those 20 years saw **increased research, improved climate models and several climate change predictions coming true.** By demanding “balance,” **the industry transformed climate change into a partisan issue.** We know that was a deliberate strategy because various internal documents from ExxonMobil, Shell, the American Petroleum Institute and a handful of now-defunct fossil fuel industry groups reveal not only the industry’s strategy to target media with this message and these experts, but also its own preemptive debunking of the very theories it went on to support. It need not have been such a successful strategy: If **news** purveyors really wanted to be evenhanded on coverage of climate change, they could certainly weave in the insights of more conservative scientists — those whose predictions err on the sunnier side of apocalypse. Instead, many took the industry’s bait, **routinely insert[s] denialist claims into stories about climate science in the interest of providing balance:** In an analysis of 636 articles covering climate change that appeared in “prestige U.S. outlets” from 1988 to 2002, researchers from the University of California at Santa Cruz and American University found that 52.65 percent presented climate science and contrarian theories as equal. The practice continued into the mid-2000s. As recently as 2007, PBS NewsHour invited well-known (and widely debunked) former weatherman Anthony Watts on to counterbalance Richard Muller, a former Koch-funded skeptic who had shifted his view. By about 2008, most mainstream print outlets had moved past the notion that “balance” means including climate contrarians in coverage of climate science. These outlets do still trip up occasionally, though. In 2017, ProPublica published a remarkably uncritical Q&A with Happer, for example, describing him as “brilliant and controversial,” and characterizing his view that global warming is good for the planet as merely “unusual.” That same year, the New York Times was roundly criticized for hiring climate contrarian Bret Stephens as a regular editorial columnist (and his first column didn’t help). While print outlets aren’t perfect, TV news has lagged further behind on climate, often presenting climate contrarians as an equal and opposite balance to climate scientists. In coverage of the national climate assessment, for example, multiple cable news shows featured both climate scientists and climate deniers, as though the two are simply opposite sides of a debate. “Meet the Press,” “Anderson Cooper 360” and “State of the Union” all brought on climate deniers to provide balance to their shows. Republican politicians made the cable news rounds, too, spouting familiar tall tales about climate change being normal and cyclical or sun spots and volcanoes being the real culprits. Sen. Joni Ernst (R-Iowa) repeated the “the climate always changes” story on CNN, while Rick Santorum, informal White House adviser Stephen Moore and British politician Nigel Farage pushed the “climate scientists getting rich” narrative. Though some outlets have moved to extricate deniers from the conversation, too many television news programs continue to bring on “contrarian” experts, giving a platform to tired lies. I say “lies” because fossil fuel industry scientists debunked these theories themselves decades ago, so they are knowingly perpetuating falsehoods. In a “global warming primer” prepared in the 1990s by the Global Climate Coalition, a since-disbanded consortium of fossil fuel producers, utilities, manufacturers, and other U.S. business interests (including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce), a Mobil scientist debunked all of the prevailing contrarian theories of the day on climate change. That part of the primer was left unprinted, of course, and oil companies went on to fund scientists promoting those very theories — the same ones that industry spokesmen and conservative politicians spout today. In addition to propping up experts and leaning on media to use them as sources, oil companies have spent millions on advertising and advertorials over the years. Which seems innocuous — most companies advertise — but oil companies don’t sell a consumer product so much as a commodity. Most people aren’t loyal to a particular brand of gas; they buy whatever is most convenient or cheapest. So, when oil companies take out ads, it’s with the intention of shifting the opinions of the voting public, policymakers, and the media. In an exhaustive survey of ExxonMobil’s advertorials from 1977 to 2014, science historian Naomi Oreskes and researcher Geoffrey Supran found that these pieces often took the form of “op-ads” that look and read a lot like op-eds but are paid for by an advertiser. Some simply presented positive stories about the company (heavily focused on their investments in algal biofuels, for example), but others argued for more relaxed policies on offshore drilling or a “common sense” approach to climate change regulation. The researchers found that “83 percent of peer-reviewed papers and 80 percent of internal documents acknowledge that climate change is real and human-caused, yet only 12% of advertorials do so, with 81 percent instead expressing doubt.” A 1981 internal Mobil memo discovered by the Climate Investigations Center is an evaluation of the first decade of Mobil’s advertorial program, and it makes the company’s goals clear: “Not only is the company presenting its opinion to key opinion leaders, but it has been engaging in continuing debate with the New York Times itself. In fact, the paper has even changed to positions similar to Mobil’s on at least seven key energy issues.” Granted, Mobil communications staff are giving themselves a lot of credit here, but whether they accomplished their goal is almost beside the point. This document shows the intention of these campaigns, and that’s something that should be taken seriously by any media outlet agreeing to run them, especially because many still do today. Campaigns that bring in big money at a time when the business of news is struggling are surely hard to turn down, but media outlets need to seriously consider the impact these campaigns have on their ability to inform the public, and work to mitigate that impact, above and beyond the usual “church and state” division between advertising and editorial. They could stop running these campaigns alongside climate reporting, do a better job of labeling campaigns, or refuse to run them altogether. It’s well past time the media stopped allowing itself to be a tool in the fossil fuel industry’s information war. Oreskes likens the push for “balance” on climate change to journalists arguing over the final score of a baseball game. “If the Yankees beat the Red Sox 6-2, journalists would report that. They would not feel compelled to find someone to say actually the Red Sox won, or the score was 6-4,” she says.

b. The fossil fuel industry is the only reason we see the rate of climate change that we see today

(UCS 2018) Union of Concerned Scientists, 5/24/2018 , "Global Warming FAQ,"

<https://www.ucsusa.org/resources/global-warming-faq> ZachDiesel

So how do scientists know that today’s **warming is** primarily **caused by humans putting too much carbon in the atmosphere when we burn coal, oil, and gas** or cut down forests? We know human activities are driving the increase in CO2 concentrations because atmospheric CO2 contains information about its source. **Scientists can tease apart how much CO2**

comes from natural sources, and how much comes from **burning coal, oil and gas** (called fossil fuels). **Carbon from fossil fuels has a distinct “signature,”** essentially the relative amounts of heavier and lighter atoms of carbon, than carbon from other sources. The smaller the ratio of heavier to lighter carbon atoms, the higher the proportion of carbon from fossil fuels. Over the years, the ratio of heavy to light carbon atoms has decreased while the overall amount of CO₂ has increased. This information tells scientists that **fossil fuel emissions are the largest contributor of atmospheric CO₂ concentrations since the pre-industrial era.** Moreover, **natural changes** alone **can’t explain the temperature changes we’ve seen.** For a computer model to accurately project the future climate, scientists must first ensure that it accurately reproduces observed temperature changes. When the models include only recorded natural climate drivers—such as the sun’s intensity—the models cannot accurately reproduce the observed warming of the past half century. When human-induced climate drivers are also included in the models, then they accurately capture recent temperature increases in the atmosphere and in the oceans. When all the natural and human-induced climate drivers are compared to one another, **the dramatic accumulation of carbon from human sources is by far the largest climate change driver over the past half century.**

c. Warming is an impact filter for all other scenarios –wars, food shortages, migration flows and security threats are exponentially worse on a hotter planet

(Swain 15) - Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden (Ashok, “Climate Change: Threat to National Security”, p1-3, Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, Third Edition) ZachDiesel

In the last two decades, many research works have pointed that **environmental stress is one main catalyst that creates societal insecurity**, that may result in armed conflict.[1–6] Not only scarcity of renewable resources, but also resources scarcity-induced population migration might become a source of violent conflicts as well.[7,8] However, in recent years, the relationship between climate change and armed conflict has received more attention. It is often assumed that climate change will intensify environmental stress and might even create new conflicts.[9–14] The loss of living space and source of livelihood attributable to climate change could force the affected people to migrate. Arguably, the mass movement of populations due to climate change may create security concerns for a nation-state. Climate change has become a global environmental problem caused by the buildup of greenhouse gases, particularly carbon dioxide and methane, in the Earth’s atmosphere. The world is warming up faster than any time in the previous 10,000 years. The predicted marked sea level rise caused by this climatic change may deprive millions of people of their living space and source of livelihood in the near future. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has predicted that sea levels could rise an average rate of 6 cm per decade over the next century.[15] A rise of this magnitude will no doubt threaten the densely populated low-lying countries and coastal zones of Asia and Africa and many island states in the Pacific and Indian Ocean. Not only developing countries, rich countries like the Netherlands and the south-eastern part of the United States will also be affected by the sea level rise. Among other predicted impacts are increases in tropical cyclones. Increased number of cyclones would also enhance the risk of coastal flooding. Climate change can also potentially alter the typical rainfall pattern, which may lead to increased flooding, drought, and soil erosion in tropical and arid regions of the world. The issue of climate change is high on the world’s policy agenda at present. The controversy over the science of global warming and the procedures adopted by the IPCC in collecting data fail to undermine decades of climate research confirming the overall global climate change. Doubts and denial give way to debates about the likely impact of climate change, particularly on developing countries.[16] Agricultural production may become highly vulnerable to climate change, given the other multiple stresses that affect food systems in the South. Response to climate change can also affect particular societies’ cultural norms and social practices related to food production. Moreover, some countries and societies are better at formulating adaptation strategies for all aspects of land use practices to safeguard them against the negative consequences of climate change. To address the adverse effects of climate change, the effectiveness and coping abilities of existing institutions matter as well. Within this context, there is general recognition that the poor in the developing countries will be the hardest hit by the impacts of climate change, as they tend to depend more on the natural environment for their livelihoods and have limited coping mechanisms and adaptive capacity.[19]

Climate change can also potentially **increase the number of poor people** by reducing the existing resource base, thereby pulling more people into poverty. It has also been argued that climate change will **compound the propensity for violent conflict,** particularly in states with weak governance, poor institutions, and low social capital. CLIMATE CHANGE AND INSECURITY Climate change has changed the discourse in international politics, bringing the conservative military security paradigm into the forefront of the debate. The interstate dimension clearly dominates this discourse. A major focus of the ongoing discussion is about the anticipated ice-free Arctic and, thus, the competition to exploit arctic oilfields. The other most discussed emerging challenge lies in the future of existing water-sharing agreements because the run-off in many of the river basins will vary more frequently and severely, because of changing climate dynamics. Challenges are

expected with extreme glacier melting while, in other regions, droughts and meteorological disasters are the major threats. The geopolitical dimensions and military security consequences of **climate change pose a severe challenge to interstate relations.** However, it is the adverse impact on human security of a large number of nations is most worrying. A critical component of human security is **food security,** which **is going to be seriously affected through** the multiple impacts of **climate change.** The agriculture sector is very sensitive to changes in climate. Climate change will consequently lead to more frequent extreme weather

events particularly in arid and tropical regions, such as droughts and floods, eventually affecting agricultural productivity and likely leading to food shortages and societal insecurity.[17] **Sea level rise** has posed a serious threat to the survival of some of the smaller island states. But it also **threatens** the sources of livelihood for **millions** of people that live in low-lying river deltas **in poor**

developing countries Rich and developed states might be able to mitigate the impact of rising sea levels to some extent, for instance, London with the Thames Barrier. Others rich countries have long experience with seawater intrusion, e.g., Netherlands, which shields parts of its inland through the Oosterscheldekering (Eastern Scheldt Storm Surge Barrier). But, the situation is quite precarious for poor developing countries. CLIMATE CHANGE AND CONFLICTS **Conflicts will increase owing to the impact of climate**

change, though not through a direct singular causal mechanism. The debate, which evolved prominently during the 1990s, frequently refers to **population migration as one of the key linking points between climate change and armed conflict** The anticipated increase in the number of climate change migrants will cause stress on receiving communities, which might themselves suffer under resource stress, and, thus, eventually lead to new security problems through increased competition.[5,7] Some preliminary research finds quantifiable connections between climate change and organized communal violence.[18] Raleigh and Kniveton[19] confirm the trend of high rainfall leading to increased risk of

localized communal conflict. However, the findings indicate that **combination of socioeconomic and political factors with climate change factors lead to conflict** The discussion regarding the causal relationship between climate change and conflicts has yet to produce

consensus.[16] On the basis of the existing literature, it can be safely argued that climate change may not generate conflicts in itself, but that **climate change can** and in some instances already does, **act as a “threat multiplier.”** CLIMATE CHANGE AND WATER CONFLICTS As **climate change can** potentially

change water supply and **demand patterns,** sharing of scarce water resources of shared rivers systems in the arid and semiarid regions will become the most likely security challenges in the near future. Climate science has been able to provide a basic understanding of how the hydrological cycle will change at the global level, but the predictions of water demand and supplies at the regional and basin level is still far from reaching some sort of consensus. It is a fact that the projected impacts of global climate change over fresh water may be huge and marked, but they will not take shape on the same scale in each and every geographical region. Even within an international river basin, the effects will vary depending on the location. This further enhances the uncertainties and anxieties over the water availability in the shared river systems. Unfortunately, as Eckstein rightly points out, “both domestic and international water laws and policies are inadequate to meet the challenges posed by this global phenomenon or to adapt to the additional consequences that appear to be inevitable.”[20] Existing water-sharing arrangements between the riparian countries of international rivers in most cases provide some mechanisms to adjust to the run-off variability while agreeing on allocation of fixed quota of water. Usually, the regular

water-sharing agreements tend to be based upon the assumption that any resulting shortages will be for a short duration only and that they can address the issue with temporary reallocation methods.[21] However, climate change not only can bring long-term increases or decreases to the average run-off of the river system, it can also influence the variability of those flows that require flexibility to be the part of the water-sharing framework to cope with emerging situations [22] As global climate change brings long-term changes to the volume and pattern of run-off in shared river systems, it becomes crucial to examine the suitability of existing agreements to address this challenge. Climate-related changes might require comprehensive adjustments in the ongoing water management structure of international rivers.[23] There is no doubt that climate change poses extreme challenges to water resource management in international river basins in the South.[24] Maarten De Wit and Jacek Stankiewicz[25] demonstrate the marked potential effects of relatively small changes in rainfall due to climate change over the perennial drainage of the river. Moreover, climate change might cause extreme weather events, water shortages, changing sea levels, or melting glaciers that can generate serious threats to critical river water management infrastructure. While the importance of adjustment of flow variability in water sharing is crucial, many of the existing provisions within agreements are not adequate enough to meet the scenarios that global climate change models project. They lack enforcement and are generally dependent upon "ideal" riparian behavior in case of eventuality. However, this approach may overcome run-off deficits in the short term, but climate change poses the risk of long-term flow reduction that would severely test existing provisions. CLIMATE "REFUGEES" AND CONFLICTS The predicted marked sea level rise caused by this climatic change may take away the living space and source of livelihood of millions of people in the near future. The IPCC has predicted that sea levels could rise an average rate of 6 cm per decade over the next century. A rise of this magnitude will no doubt threaten densely populated low-lying countries and coastal zones and many small island countries. Among the other impacts, there could be an increase in tropical cyclones. Increased cyclones would also enhance the risk of coastal flooding. Climate change can also potentially alter the usual rainfall pattern, which may lead to increased flooding, drought, and soil erosion in tropical and arid regions of the world. The problem of climate change-induced population migration ranks as one of the foremost crises of our times. To date, however, these

people have been viewed as a peripheral concern. But, their sheer size has now brought them into the fore as one of the most important issues on the global political agenda.

Large-scale transborder migration has several dimensions for inducing conflict between the receiver and sender states

In some cases, giving permission to the migrants to enter into its own territory may strain the relationship between the receiving state and the sender country. The tension may arise from the exposure of the sender's inability to handle the migration crisis by itself, or the sender may suspect or allege that the receiving country is encouraging the migration. The other possibility is that the migrants, after being settled in the host country, may indulge themselves in antigovernment activities against their native government, which they may perceive as the perpetrator of their plight. The new location, physical

proximity, and protection from the former regime's retribution can provide a good opportunity for them to take revenge. In some cases, the **migrants may be encouraged or be manipulated by the host state in their effort to take revenge because of existing political differences** between the host and the sender states. This will of course result in creating negative implications for regional security.[7] **CONCLUSION** Although

climate change may not be the sole cause of conflict or large-scale population migration, it **is** considered **a threat multiplier**. [13,26] Social, economic, and political factors will also affect the vulnerability or resilience of communities. In most of the developing countries, the ability to cope with climate change decreases, and the likelihood of conflict increases, as a result of factors that include poverty, low levels of education/literacy, lack of skills, weak institutions, limited infrastructure, lack of technology and information, limited access to health care, poor access to resources, overexploitation of resources, etc.

Climate change is likely to exacerbate many of these problems

2 Movement Journalism

a. The traditional norm of objectivity in journalism prevents reporters from expressing opinions about how complicated issues affect their communities.

(Carpenter 08) [Serena Carpenter. "How Online Citizen Journalism Publications And Online Newspapers Utilize The Objectivity Standard An." J&MC Quarterly 85:3. October, 2008. Web. February 12, 2022.]

<<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/107769900808500304>>

Reliance On Objectivity. Shoemaker and Reese claim that **journalists rely on** the **objectivity** principle **as** a

defense against those who criticize what they classify as news. 14 News content featured in daily publications has typically been presented as neutrally as possible to appeal to a large audience. Objective or more detached reporting

became the standard around the 1930s. It was **strict adherence to objective reporting** that **encouraged**

journalists to fear presenting information that had the appearance of **bias.** 15 Critics maintain that

this strict, more standardized approach to journalism **limits a journalist's ability to go beyond** reporting

"just the facts," instead of interpreting whether facts truly reflect reality. 16 Instead,

journalists seek external sources to convey their interpretations. Other authors have pointed out that many journalists follow the straight reporting formula because of deadline pressures, lack of creativity, or their inability to interpret complex events. 17 Traditional journalists are not likely to include their opinions. On the other hand, recent survey research revealed that online citizen journalists seek to interpret how an issue affects their community, rather than presenting straight description of facts. 18 Blogging is one way for citizen journalists to disseminate their articles. Wall

says journalism blogs should be constructed like a column in a newspaper with highly personal and opinionated comments from bloggers. However, many news organizations do not allow the inclusion of reporter opinion in their stories. For example, two U.S. newspapers, the Washington Post and the Arizona Republic¹ do not allow reporter opinion in their blogs. If a news organization does allow journalists to include opinion, this inclusion may put journalists in an uncomfortable role because many journalists have been trained to be objective observers of news. Thus, blog and news content may be similar in nature on newspaper homepages.

b. Movement journalism is key to anti-oppression media.

(Froio 21), Nicole. "How Journalists Are Challenging Ideas Of Objectivity While Empowering Their Communities." Current. May 20, 2021. Web. February 12, 2022.
<https://current.org/2021/05/how-journalists-are-challenging-ideas-of-objectivity-while-empowering-their-communities/>

In his book *The View From Somewhere: Undoing the Myth of Journalistic Objectivity*, Wallace challenges traditional approaches to journalism that fail to recognize the context of oppression and racial hatred in the U.S. He argues that the conversation about objectivity cracks open uncomfortable truths about how journalists practice cultural dominance in newsrooms. "You cannot have a successful career in public media as somebody who publicly takes a stance on racial hostility or publicly takes a stance on patriarchy or abuse, and that is obviously messed up at a moral level," Wallace said. "But it also creates this just ridiculous conundrum for the efforts in public media to be more representative and to be more driven by the public." During the protests that followed the killing of George Floyd, some public media organizations made clear to their employees that they could take a stance on racial injustice on their social media accounts. That may indicate change in some newsrooms, but

Wallace also advocates for challenging the very concept of objectivity in journalism. "To me, **the conversation about objectivity is just a wedge conversation that opens all these other issues that are really about cultural white supremacy, and cultural racism, and cultural dominance, and oppression in these spaces**," he said. "But **we really can't have an honest conversation about oppression if we are still attached to the myth that it's possible to be neutral**, so it comes out over and over, every single time."

While Wallace was working on *The View From Somewhere*, he met Ramona Martinez, who at the time was working as a producer for the podcast *BackStory*. During a conversation about

journalism, Martinez said something that stuck with Wallace: **"Objectivity is the ideology of the status**

quo." Two years later, Martinez started producing Wallace's podcast about the history of movement journalism, also titled *The View From Somewhere*. In the first episode, Martinez explained her assertion about objectivity: "... What is considered objective or neutral is really only a matter of social agreement, or the ideological consensus of the majority or the status quo." Martinez told Current that her perspective on the myth of neutrality stems in part from her experience as an associate producer at NPR from 2012 to 2016, where she came to see the tradition of

journalistic objectivity as an obstacle to news coverage. Much like Wallace, Martinez said, she believes that her colleagues' **investment in neutrality d[oesn't] leave space for honest conversations about race and power**. "Younger journalists are being courageous about speaking up about how race and power are affecting journalistic coverage," she said. "But I don't have a lot of faith that the people in power are going to be able to divorce themselves from these ideas, which to them is the foundation of being a good journalist. And movement journalism is a completely different way of perceiving journalism."

c. Journalistic objectivity provide refuge to white supremacist rhetoric and policies

Lowery 21 [Wesley Lowery is a journalist at CBS News, formerly at The Washington Post. He was a lead on the Post's "Fatal Force" project that won the Pulitzer Prize for National Reporting in 2016 as well as the author of *They Can't Kill Us All: Ferguson, Baltimore, and a New Era in America's Racial Justice Movement*. "A Reckoning Over Objectivity, Led by Black Journalists." Current. June 23, 2020. Web.]
<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/23/opinion/objectivity-black-journalists-coronavirus.html>

The **failures of neutral objective journalism** across several beats in the news media are countless. And these shortcomings **have real consequences for the readers** we are sworn to serve — particularly **black readers, who** we know **are more likely to have interactions with the criminal justice system** (whose leaders we court), **more likely to be the targets of white supremacists** (whom we commonly indulge) **and more likely to have lives made more difficult by racist politicians and implicitly racist policies that we** repeatedly **refuse to call out**. Black journalists are speaking out because one of **the nation's major political parties and the current presidential administration** are **provid[e]ing refuge to white supremacist rhetoric and policies, and our industry's gatekeepers are preoccupied with seeming balanced**, even

ordering up ^{glossy} **profiles of complicit actors. All the while, black and brown lives** ^{and livelihoods} **remain imperiled**

A2:

Objectivity gets uniquely weaponized by the Right - leads to anti-queer violence in the name of neutrality

(Meyer 20), Will. "The Abuses Of Objectivity." The New Republic. February 06, 2020. Web. February 12, 2022.
<<https://newrepublic.com/article/156486/abuses-objectivity>>.

Watson was a victim of what Wallace dubs "journalism's purity ritual," which can be described as using objectivity as a pretext to fire someone for their politics. One particularly egregious example Wallace came across was a 1996 headline in The New York Times: "Gay Reporter Wants to Be Activist." As the paper of record reported: To labor leaders ... Sandy Nelson is an unlikely hero—a lesbian, socialist journalist. But to the top editors at The [Tacoma] News Tribune, where Ms. Nelson works, she is a walking conflict of interest whose off-duty activities threaten the credibility of journalism. During the 1980s, Nelson was involved in a local struggle to pass a human rights ordinance that would prohibit job discrimination against gay workers. Although political expression was allowed by her union, Nelson was relegated to the copy desk by her editor, a post from which she filed a lawsuit. Unlike in Watson's case, the Washington State Supreme Court ruled against her, deciding that journalists were exempt from a state law protecting employees from retaliation for political expression. When Wallace interviewed Nelson for the book, she told him, "They didn't go after people who were involved with their churches, or people who were in the Boy Scouts. They can be political, can't they?" She believed her bosses intended to make an example out of her, adding, "During the McCarthy era they went after people in the same way."

The tendency to exclude gay journalists, on the grounds of "objectivity," from conversations about issues that affected the gay community led to serious problems in media coverage. In 1982, as the AIDS death toll continued to rise to around 400, The New York Times ran only five stories; none were on the front page. For comparison, the paper ran four front page and 50 total articles on the Tylenol scare that year, which killed seven people. Yet **executives** there **refused to allow those close to the [AIDS] crisis to influence the paper's reporting.** Instead, as one critic charged in 1981, "Lesbians and gay men at **the Times** were **allowed little—if any—positive influence over the paper's coverage of gay**

people." As Wallace shows, **the Times was criticized repeatedly for its homophobic stories, often qualifying crimes with the word "homosexual"** (as in "homosexual murder"), prompting journalists and activists to pressure the paper to stop using the term. The Times never reported on violence against queer people but would go out of its way to say if the perpetrator of a crime was gay. The ideal of objectivity has led to an increase in "both-sidesism"—often elaborate attempts to avoid showing favor to any person in a story. One of the most telling examples of this was The New York Times's coverage of the killing of Michael Brown by a white police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014. In its coverage, the Times went out of its way to portray "balance." In a story about Brown's memorial, the paper remarked that he was "no angel" and went out on a limb to mention that he allegedly stole an iPod when he was in ninth grade, a fact that had nothing to do with his death. The memorial piece concerned itself with trafficking heavy-handed moral obfuscations. At one point, it quoted a violent lyric ("My favorite part is when the bodies hit the ground") in a rap song Brown had "collaborated on," as if that could somehow be morally comparable to the police violence that saw his body fall in the same manner.

HIV continues today to have a massive impact on the queer community - lack of information perpetuates this issue.

Without proper information, it's impossible to find a cure and save queer life.

(Human Rights Campaign (HRC, 17), the largest civil rights organization working to achieve equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer Americans, the Human Rights Campaign represents a force of more than 3 million members and supporters nationwide. "How HIV Impacts LGBTQ People" Last Updated: February 2017. <https://www.hrc.org/resources/hrc-issue-brief-hiv-aids-and-the-lgbt-community>)

HIV continues to be a major public health crisis both **in the United States** and around the world. While major scientific advances have made it easier than ever to prevent and treat HIV, **there remains no vaccine or cure, and** tens of **thousands of people** continue to **contract HIV every year**. Insufficient funding for public health programs, ideological opposition to common sense prevention policies, and societal barriers like stigma and discrimination, have made it especially difficult for us to turn the tide against the epidemic. Together, HRC and the HRC Foundation are committed to working with our friends, partners, members, and supporters to end the dual epidemics of HIV and HIV-related stigma. **HIV disproportionately impacts** segments of **the LGBTQ [queer] community**. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), there are 1.2 million people living with HIV (PLWH) in the United States, and approximately 40,000 people were diagnosed with HIV in 2015 alone. While the annual number of new diagnoses fell by 19% between 2005 and 2014, progress has been uneven. For example, gay and bisexual men made up an estimated 2% of the U.S. population in 2013 but 55% of all PLWH in the United States. If current diagnosis rates continue, **1 in 6 gay and bisexual men will be diagnosed with HIV in their lifetime**. For Latino and Black men who have sex with men, the rates are 1 in 4 and 1 in 2, respectively. **Transgender people have also been hit especially hard by the epidemic**, despite comprising a similarly small percentage of the U.S. population. While better data is needed to understand the full impact of HIV on the transgender community, one international analysis found that transgender women in certain communities have 49 times the odds of living with HIV than the general population. Although HIV prevalence among transgender men is relatively low (0-3%) according to the CDC, some data suggest transgender men may still yet be at elevated risk for HIV acquisition.

*Racism - Objectivity Is a privilege afforded only to white journalists

(Mattar, 20) BY PACINTHE MATTAR. ILLUSTRATION BY NATALIE VINEBERG. Updated 21:34, Feb. 10, 2022 | Published 9:58, Aug. 21, 2020
<https://thewalrus.ca/objectivity-is-a-privilege-afforded-to-white-journalists/> [Brick]

I've since faced several such roadblocks in my journalism career. Combined with the experiences of other racialized journalists, they represent a phenomenon I've come to think of as a deep crisis of credibility in Canadian media. **There is the lack of trust toward the Black, Indigenous, and other racialized people whose stories [they] are supposed to cover as a reflection of the world [they] live in.** Then there is the mistrust of the Black, Indigenous, and other racialized journalists who try to report on those stories. Our professionalism is questioned when we report on the communities we're from, and the spectre of advocacy follows us in a way that it does not follow many of our white colleagues. There is a reckoning underway that has spared almost no industry, sparked by an alarming succession of killings of Black people in the US: Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and many more. The violence of those deaths, and the inescapable racism that underpinned them all, incited a tidal wave of anger and fatigue from Black people who had long been calling out the discrimination that they face in their daily lives. From academia to theatre, the beauty industry to major tech corporations, Black and other racialized employees are publicly coming forward and detailing how their organizations have perpetuated racism against them. Newsrooms in the US and Canada, for their part, have been forced to acknowledge that they have to do better: in who they hire, who they retain, who gets promoted, what they cover, and how they cover it. This moment has resurrected a question that's haunted me since I returned from Baltimore: How can the media be trusted to report on what Black and other racialized people are facing when it doesn't even believe them? IN MANY AMERICAN CITIES, the protests calling for justice following the killings of Black people like Ahmaud Arbery, George Floyd, and Breonna Taylor have been met with violent responses from police, who have tear-gassed, chased, shoved, beaten, and arrested protesters and journalists. In May, Omar Jimenez, a Black CNN reporter, was handcuffed and led away by police while the cameras rolled. Watching the recent police violence against protesters unfold reminded me of how my interview with the two men in Baltimore had ended. It was 10 p.m., meaning the city-wide curfew was now in effect, and we were standing just outside a subway station in the Penn North neighbourhood. Lonnie Moore, the young Black man who had first approached me, had just left. I was putting my recorder away when police came rushing into the block. They told Jarrod Jones and me we had to leave. We tried to enter a nearby subway station, but a police officer blocked the entrance. We tried to turn down a side street, but another officer told us we couldn't go that way either. We tried every escape we could think of, but we were boxed in. Suddenly, one officer began charging at us, his baton out, swinging, shoving Jones and cursing at him. We ran away from him as fast as we could, my bag with my recording equipment bouncing clumsily behind me. None of this made it to air. I had made the rookie mistake of turning off my radio recorder as soon as the interview ended. But I probably would not have worked it into the documentary anyway; as a journalist, you want to avoid becoming part of the story. One of the core elements of journalism is for **reporters to maintain a distance from those they cover,** which is meant **to provide** a sense of **objectivity**. For many **white journalists, that distance is**

built in to their very life experiences. But, for many other journalists there is no distance between what happened to George Floyd and what could have happened to them. Distance is a luxury.

When I got back to Toronto, I told my deskmates about my time in Baltimore in hushed tones. I felt at the time that to speak of it more openly would somehow implicate me, that my story could be seen through the lens of advocacy instead of hard-and-fast reporting. I also knew you never want to end up on the wrong side of police, especially as a racialized person, and leave it up to others to decide how your actions may have justified violence against you. In journalism, as in predominantly white societies at large, questioning police narratives is complicated. “The police play a very powerful role in defining what the nature and extent of crime is in our society,” says Julius Haag, a criminologist and sociology professor at the University of Toronto’s Mississauga campus. “Police also recognize that they have a powerful role in shaping public perceptions, and they use that ability within the media to help . . . legitimize their purpose and their responses.” A. Dwight Pettit, a Baltimore-based lawyer I interviewed for my documentary in 2015, told me something about why police accounts are rarely questioned by the media that stayed with me. Juries seem to have trouble confronting the violence in police-brutality cases, he said, because so often, people have grown up seeing police doing right by them and have trusted police with their safety. This is especially true for white people, who are less likely to be treated unfairly by police. Putting police on trial would be asking people to challenge their lifelong beliefs. Anthony N. Morgan, a racial-justice lawyer in Toronto, says this same dynamic plays out in Canada in both “obvious and indirect ways.” Racialized people can tell you about water cooler conversations they’ve had with white colleagues about racism they’ve experienced and witnessed, which “often end up in the ‘Did that really happen? What were they doing? Maybe we need to see more of the video?’ territory,” he says. “These kinds of frankly absurd ways of justifying and excusing murder or harm done to Black and Indigenous people play out in society more generally, and I think they play out in journalism too.” One story I produced was an interview with Ahmed Shihab-Eldin, an Emmy-nominated journalist who was in Jerusalem covering protests that had sprung up at the al-Aqsa mosque. Worshipers were praying outside the mosque, instead of inside, in an act of civil disobedience against the installation of metal detectors following the killing of two Israeli police officers by Israeli Arab attackers. In the interview, he explained the source of the tension, what the front lines of the protests looked like, and also touched on press freedom—Shihab-Eldin himself had been stopped, questioned, and jostled by Israeli security forces while he was reporting. From the moment I pitched having him on the show, the acting senior producer showed keen interest in the story. This enthusiasm made what happened next all the more confounding. We recorded the interview on a Friday. Shortly afterward, that same senior producer told me the segment was being pulled from the show and that she would not have the time to explain why. She had consulted a director, and together they had ultimately decided to kill it. The story never went to air. I spent a week trying to get an explanation. It wasn’t lost on me that the interview would have included criticism of Israeli security forces and that I was coming upon the intersection of two issues here: the media’s aversion to criticism of law enforcement coupled with its deeply ingrained reluctance to wade into the conversation about Israel and Palestine, especially if this means critiquing the Israeli government’s policies or actions. Bias or one-sidedness shouldn’t have been a concern: I had planned on incorporating the Israel Defense Force press office’s response into the story. The story couldn’t, and wouldn’t, have run without it. In the end, the director, who had been the one to make the final call to not run the interview, wrote an apologetic email to Shihab-Eldin and me, which read, in part: “Our hope was that further work on our end would allow us to give our audiences more context so that they would not leave your interview with unanswered questions. . . . We ran into unexpected difficulties in doing so.” I had heard nothing about the story needing more context, or about questions that the director and senior producer felt were unanswered, before the decision was made. Nor did I have a clear understanding of what these “unexpected difficulties” were. (The senior producer and director say they felt the interview was too opinionated.) For his part, Shihab-Eldin responded to the senior director with: “Unfortunately I’m all too familiar with ‘unexpected difficulties.’” It was the first and only time in my ten years of journalism that a story was pulled—let alone without an open editorial discussion or transparency. And I did not realize just how much this experience would mark me and my future in this profession. TO BE A JOURNALIST in any media organization or newsroom is to navigate the crush of the daily news cycle; the relentlessness of deadlines; and the pressure, care, and complexity it takes to craft a story well. To be a racialized journalist is to navigate that role while also walking a tightrope: being a professional journalist and also bringing forward the stories that are perhaps not on the radar of the average newsroom but are close to home for many of us. And it takes a toll. The stories I’ve recounted are the ones that stood out the most over my ten years in journalism. There are countless other, smaller fights that took place. When asked to comment for this article, Chuck Thompson, head of public affairs at the CBC, wrote in an email: “We are actively reviewing our journalistic standards to ensure we are interpreting policies and practices through a more inclusive lens. . . . It is just one of several recommitments we have made including hiring more Black, Indigenous and people of colour within our teams but also into leadership positions. We can point to a half dozen recent hires and promotions that show that pledge to do better, is both authentic and genuine.” His email also referenced existing initiatives, such as the CBC’s Developing Emerging Leaders Program, “which identifies and trains people of colour, as well as Black and Indigenous people, who are indeed taking their rightful place at our leadership tables.” (I am a graduate of the inaugural cohort of that program.) Diversity is a feel-good term that is often held up as a goal and priority by industries from media to law to academia and beyond. It’s supposed to be the antidote to the experiences I’ve described and a signal that employers value and seek a range of perspectives, backgrounds, world views, and experiences that run the spectrum of age, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, race, and ability. If that feels like a massive umbrella of goals and classifications, that’s because it is. Just take a look at any Canadian newsroom, even in Toronto, a city that is over 50 percent nonwhite. As a starting point, our newsrooms do not reflect the world outside of them—which does not bode well for accurately representing the breadth of stories playing out every day. As a result, from the second so many racialized journalists walk into news organizations, we are still often the Only Ones in the Room. And, where there are racialized journalists at all, there are even fewer Black and Indigenous journalists. As you go higher up the ladder of these organizations, it’s not long before Black, Indigenous, and racialized journalists aren’t in the room at all. Meanwhile, news organizations regularly see our mere presence in their newsrooms as successful examples of so-called diversity even if our roles are overwhelmingly junior and precarious. This setup often ends up placing the responsibility on the Only Ones in the Room to guarantee a spectrum of experiences and stories in news coverage and to point out where coverage misses the mark, including when there is a story involving the actions of police. The responsibility is heavy. It’s a dynamic that Asmaa Malik, a professor at Ryerson University’s school of journalism, sees playing out regularly. Her research focuses on race and Canadian media as well as on the role of diversity in news innovation. “There’s an idea in many Canadian newsrooms that, if you have one person who checks the box, then you’re covered,” she says. “So the burden that puts on individual journalists is huge.” Everyone who’s been the Only One in the Room knows what it’s like. The silence that falls when a story about racism is pitched. The

awkward seat shifting. The averted stares. We’ve felt it, and internalized it, and expected it. We know that **there is often an unspoken higher burden of proof for these stories than for others, a problem that has long been exacerbated by the fact that race-based data is rarely collected in policing, health care, and other fields.** Yet it is on us to fill this void and **[they must] “prove” the existence of racism.**

As a result, we overprepare those pitches. We anticipate your questions. We get used to having the lives of our friends and families and the people who look like them discounted, played devil’s advocate to, intellectualized from a sanitized distance.

*Queer -Queer journalists are stopped from covering queer stories for the sake of objectivity

(Baim 12) Journalism 101: The myth of objectivity by Tracy Baim, Windy City Times 2012-07-11 Tracy Baim is co-founder and publisher of Windy City Times.
<https://www.windycitytimes.com/lgbt/journalism-101-The-myth-of-objectivity/38578.html>

Brian Williams is a straight white man. Barbara Walters is a straight white woman. Both make a very good living. These facts inform who they are, what sources they seek out, what social circles they travel in and what slant they may present in their stories. The myth of some level of journalist objectivity is quite old-fashioned. In my journalism school days (1980-1984), I knew it was an impossible achievement, and that the main goal was to acknowledge your bias and try to do your best to get all sides of a story. I was an out lesbian back then, and did not see much of a future for myself in journalism. I had been warned, nicely, that I likely would not fit into the mainstream media. Anderson Cooper had many reasons for not officially coming out of the closet as a gay man during his first decades in the news business.

But I think **one of the most overriding was his fear that [they] would not be taken seriously as a journalist, nor seen as "objective" when doing reports, if he was "a gay journalist."** This is why it was so important that he come out—not just to show that he was not ashamed of being gay, although that is very important. It's because of these powerful, and mistaken, myths that a straight person can be more objective than a gay person; a white person can be more objective

than a person of color; a man more objective than a woman; and so on. This fallacy has kept down many great journalists. There were **reporters who were out of the closet [were]** and, so, **not allowed to cover gay stories**. Is someone who is straight (or closeted) any more able to cover a gay story? Every reporter has a long list of bias points. It is time we shatter this notion that being part of a minority group means you should not be able to cover that group. As a side note I also want to comment on the fact that just because LGBTs can hide, should we? As a wealthy white man, Anderson Cooper had the option that many others do not. Women and people of color usually can't hide these traits (though some have "passed" as white and/or male at great emotional expense). It is very important that we as a community don't use this ability to "hide"—not just for our own community's sake, but for our own personal sake. The closet is damaging to those on both sides. As a lesbian journalist working in LGBT newspapers since 1984, I have witnessed a tremendous shift in how LGBTs in the media have been welcomed. Back then, working in gay media was almost a death knell to one's journalism career. Now, it can be a stepping stone. Back then, the mainstream media looked down at journalists in the gay media as biased. Well, they may still do this, but there is more respect and attention, and there are even awards and associations that welcome the diversity of alternative media. **The myth of objectivity** is also not some

philosophical debate—it actually **can cause damage.** Finding the truth of a story does not always mean two sides, or all sides, are equal. There is an interesting example on Wikipedia about the goal of objectivity going too far: "Another example of an objection to objectivity, according to communication scholar David Mindich, was the coverage that the major papers (most notably the New York Times) gave to the lynching of thousands of African Americans during the 1890s. News stories of the period often described with detachment the hanging, immolation and mutilation of people by mobs. Under the regimen of objectivity, news writers often attempted to balance these accounts by recounting the alleged transgressions of the victims that provoked the lynch mobs to fury. Mindich argues that this may have had the effect of normalizing the practice of lynching." These days, I think we can agree that blaming the victim of a lynching would be objectivity gone wild. But **there are still examples of the media quoting anti-gays as a way to seem objective on a story about gay marriage**. I don't know when the moment came and went, but at some point there was enough acceptance of interracial marriage that the media stopped quoting racists on that issue with no sense of having failed in the quest for balance.

*Fem - Objectivity is based in patriarchal norms and expectations- science is projected from masculinity

(Soble 94), Alan. "GENDER, OBJECTIVITY, AND REALISM." The Monist, vol. 77, no. 4, Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 509–30,
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/27903407> [Brick]

Evelyn Fox Keller's *Reflections on Gender and Science*¹ was a provocative, interdisciplinary contribution to the feminist critique of science. Keller has continued her iconoclastic ways with *Secrets of Life, Secrets of Death*,² a collection of essays published in various books and journals after *Reflections*. She is renowned, in particular, for her intriguing psychoanalytic exploration of the masculinity of science, which was received with some fanfare, although primarily only among feminists.³ Still, Keller's essay "Feminism and Science" is the token feminist piece in the gigantic, mainstream teaching anthology *The Philosophy of Science*,⁴ so her work has been noticed, and will be scrutinized, by a wider audience. Many scholars occupied with the feminist

epistemology project tip their hats to Keller for having done ground-breaking work.⁵ She proposed, for example, that **"masculine" and "scientific"**

have, historically, been yoked together, but also that men's (or a masculine) cognitive/emotional style does not have to be the principal or only mode of investigating the world. In light of this latter supposition, we are naturally prompted to wonder how far the feminist revamping of science can be pushed. Would women's (or a feminine) cognitive/emotional style have even more to contribute to our understanding of the world? In this paper I examine to what extent Keller's work grounds this exciting, but extreme, idea. Keller's attitude toward science can be situated in the humanist tradition that is more suspicious than congratulatory. We get a taste of this antipathy in Russell, whose *The Scientific Outlook*⁶ voiced sixty years ago some of the concerns that animate Keller in *Reflections and Secrets*. According to Russell, "We may seek knowledge of an object because we love the object or because we wish to have power over it. The former impulse leads to the kind of knowledge that is contemplative, the latter to the kind that is practical" (p. 261). The original, ancient impulse for knowledge was the love for the world that sought the "ecstasy" (p. 262) of contemplating it, not the love for the material benefits of manipulating it. Where science went wrong was in replacing contemplation with manipulation. "In the development of science the power impulse has increasingly prevailed over the love impulse" (p. 261), and science became "sadistic" (p. 263). Russell is here anticipating a motif of Keller's, for in speaking about the difference between love-knowledge and power-knowledge he is alerting us to an alternative women's (or feminine) nonaggressive way of confronting nature. For Keller, too, the ancients and moderns had different notions of science: knowledge in Plato is associated with love and union, in Bacon it is associated

with power (Ref., p. 95). Plato's objects of knowledge, the Forms, were thought of as male, and the seeker of knowledge desired communion with them. **The material world, being female, was not a fitting object of knowledge.** When the object of knowledge does become the physical world, with the rise of materialism, "the meaning of understanding changes. Consistent with the shift from male to female object, the goal of understanding is no longer primarily that of communion but of power; its aim is the domination of nature" (Ref., p. 30), i.e., men scientists now attempt to control and exploit a female Nature.

The fact that **men have been in charge of science** explains, in part, the victory of the masculine quest for power-knowledge over the feminine quest for love-knowledge. However, Keller urges us to "take serious notice not only of the fact that **science has been produced by** a particular subset of the human race? that is, almost entirely by **white, middle-class men**? but also of the fact that it **[science] has evolved under the formative influence of a particular ideal of masculinity**" (Ref., p. 7). Keller

ties this "ideal" to the exclusion of women (and the feminine) from science: With the rise of modern science, **knowledge came to be understood as . . . the power to dominate** nature. In this history we can see the construction of gender as the construction of exclusion? Of women, of what is labeled

feminine. . . . **The exclusion of the feminine from science has been historically constitutive of** a particular definition of science? as incontrovertibly objective, universal, impersonal? and

Masculine.⁷ The implication is that the inclusion of women would make love-knowledge more important in science; in *Reflections* (p. 125), Keller quotes the scientist June Goodfield: "the best analogy [for the doing of science] is always love." At least, taking the masculinity of science "seriously . . . would suggest that, were more women to engage in science, a different science might emerge" (Ref., p. 76). Hence "there are many reasons . . . for thinking that gender (itself constructed in an ideological context) . . . does make a difference in scientific inquiry."⁸ Despite Keller's protest at the beginning of *Secrets* (p. 2) that readers have misinterpreted her as attacking science, there is plenty of harping in her writings about science's uncaring exploitation of nature. It is clear that Keller doesn't much like men's science, in particular? but on her own account that is virtually all science. Indeed, the damnation of science in *Secrets* is relentless, largely on the grounds that men's science gave us the two disasters of nuclear physics and molecular biology. Men's nuclear physics solved the secret of death, unveiling a monstrously efficient way to destroy everything. Molecular biology, which on the surface appears benignly to explore the secret of life, is actually an agent of death, reducing the living to the dead (Sec, p. 52). "Men love death" is what we heard from Andrea Dworkin, who found that terrifying message to be the deep meaning of men's pornography.⁹ Men love to build and detonate bombs is what we hear from Keller, who detects this message in men's physics.¹⁰ Keller offers no counterbalancing praise for the magic of computers or life-preserving antibiotics, contributions to civilization due to men. What to do about science? The platitude? we need to decide carefully what we want to accomplish with science? concludes Russell's *The Scientific Outlook* (p. 265). It is also the finale of one of Keller's essays in *Secrets* (p. 92): Given our remarkable ingenuity . . . I have no doubt that . . . we could develop representations of natural phenomena adequate to the task of changing the world in different ways? perhaps . . . giving us solar energy, rather than nuclear power; ecological rather than pathogenic medicine; better rearing rather than better breeding of our offspring. . . . [I]t's time we thought more about what we want. Keller expresses the optimism that if we would only opt for the right goals, science would come into its own. Given how badly she thinks science has been done by white, middle-class men over the years, there is reason to consider earnestly the idea that this superior science of ecological medicine and solar power would be a feminine science, and would shine in what it aims at, in how it approaches nature, and, as a result, epistemologically. Taking a cue from Goodfield: women would love and nurture Nature, and thereby learn a lot more from and about it, a style much preferable to men's hating and aggressively destroying it.⁷ Gender Even though these claims? it has always been men doing science in a masculine way; science infused with women could very well be different? are central pieces of Keller's critique of science, there is another ingredient in her work that is distinctive, bold, and ambitious: Keller is also doing the psycho analysis of the genesis of ideas. In one principal

instance of this strategy, Keller claims that (1) **people in our culture believe that the scientific is masculine and that the masculine is objective and autonomous,** that is, **we "associate" both masculinity with objectivity and autonomy, and science with masculinity?** Where

masculinity is composed of a narrow type of autonomy and objectivity; and (2) our holding these associations? our believing that what is masculine is objective? can be explained by the psychoanalytic object-relations theory of childhood development. "Our early maternal environment . . . leads to the association of female with the pleasures and dangers of merging, and of the male with the comfort and loneliness of separateness."¹¹ "For all of us? male and female Alike? Our earliest experiences [being parented mostly by the mother] incline us to associate the affective and cognitive posture of objectification with the masculine, while all processes that involve a blurring of the boundary between subject and object tend to be associated with the feminine" (Ref., p. 87). In virtue of our childhood experience with a single woman and a single man? being attended to primarily by mother, while father hovers in the background? We mentally associate men with detachment (autonomy, objectivity), women with a lack of those things. Note that no claim is made here, nor is one implied, that men are autonomous and objective, women not. The bold ingredient of Keller's project, that is, does not involve describing actual cognitive/emotional gender differences. Thus, when Keller remarks, "to the extent that my analysis rests on the significance of the gender of the primary parent, changing patterns of parenting could be of critical importance" (Ref., p. 93), she means "of critical importance" in changing specifically our beliefs about gender differences, not in changing gender differences themselves. This fact makes Keller's thesis interesting⁷, if the cultural belief that men, but less so women, are autonomous and objective is merely a false or exaggerated bit of gender ideology or stereotyping, then the program of explaining why the belief is held is quite exciting. The question of the reality of gender differences has been the territory of others with whom Keller is often identified, including Dorothy Dinnerstein, Nancy Chodorow, Carol Gilligan, and Lillian Rubin,¹² who have discerned the existence of gender differences and explained them in various ways. Keller, by contrast, claimed in the early stages of her work that whether there are any gender differences "remains ultimately an empirical question" (Ref., p. 89; see p. 88) that she does not address: "It is important to emphasize that what I have been discussing is a system of beliefs about the meaning of masculine and feminine rather than any either intrinsic or actual differences between male and female". In her most recent writings, Keller claims to be continuing this distinctive

aspect of her work. She says, in "Gender and Science: An Update," that one of her chief concerns is what "has been accomplished [in science] by the association of gender with virtually all the root categories of modern science" (Sec, p. 20), by which she means that she is continuing to study how the association of science with masculinity (as objectivity/autonomy) has affected the doing of science. Keller remarks that this question must be "cleansed of any implication about the real abilities of actual women." In an interview in Science,^{1*} Keller says the same thing: "I'm interested in the ideological equation of masculinity and science and how that equation has shaped the forms, the questions, and the goals of scientific research." By contrast, whether men and women have different scientific styles, she says, is both "difficult to resolve" and "irrelevant." And Keller avows that she has never said that men and women do science differently: "That mistranslation [of my work] is so insistent, I have really puzzled over it for years." Whether there are cognitive/emotional gender differences that differentially equip men and women for science is apparently

not Keller's concern, despite the fact (among others noted above) that the **science** she complains about **is gendered**: men's science **carried out in a masculine way**. The distinction between the study of the genesis of beliefs about gender and the study of actual gender differences is crucial, because the following is

not Keller's view. Living in this culture, we straightforwardly observe that lots of men are bossy, manipulative, calculating, and emotionally aloof (i.e., in some ordinary?and unflattering?sense autonomous and objective), while women are less so. This is, by and large, the way men and women are made in our culture (= **the social construction of**

gender). On the basis of these observations of men, which we make in late childhood and beyond, we come to believe in a **link[s]** among **men,**

masculinity, objectivity, and autonomy?rather than by an object-relations process, in early childhood, involving the relatively absent father.

This simple account of the genesis of our beliefs is a discrete alternative to Keller's; it explains our beliefs about gender differences by referring, somewhere in the causal sequence, to the existence of real (even if rough) gender differences. Why should we bother with Keller's psychoanalytic explanation of our belief in the autonomy/objectivity of the masculine when a simple alternative exists? Keller often does assert that there are cognitive/emotional differences between men and women. Comments such as "to the extent that boys rest their sexual identity on an opposition to what is both experienced and defined as feminine, the development of their gender identity is likely to accentuate the process of separation" (Ref., p. 88) and "it is a persistent fact of our culture that men tend to be especially preoccupied with questions of their autonomy and are considerably more likely than women to seek to support that autonomy through the pursuit of mastery and domination" (Ref., p. 106) indicate that Keller is also developing the psychoanalysis of the genesis of gender differences.¹⁴ Keller speaks about gender differences so often¹⁵ that it is hard to resist concluding that empirical observations of the gendered natures of men and women are already plentiful and that their substance makes the direct mechanism of the alternative explanation of our beliefs more plausible than an explanation in terms of object relations processes.