## Ruralism

#### The perm solves—the alternative requires an international coalition of voices in unison—multiple social locations are necessary to oppose militarism

Butler 2004. (Judith, Precarious Life, p 47-48)

A feminist opposition to militarism emerges from many sources, many cultural venues, in any number of idioms; it does not have to— and, finally, cannot—speak in a single political idiom, and no grand settling of epistemological accounts has to be required. This seems to be the theoretical commitment, for instance, of the organization Women in Black." A desideratum comes from Chandra Mohanty's important essay "Under Western Eyes," in which she maintains that notions of progress within feminism cannot be equated with assimilation to so-called Western notions of agency and political mobilization." There she argues that the comparative framework in which Firs: World feminists develop their critique of the conditions of oppression for Third World women on the basis of universal claims not only misreads the agency of Third World feminists, but also falsely produces a homogeneous conception of who they are and what they want. In her view, that framework also reproduces the First World as the site of authentic feminist agency and does so by producing a monolithic Third World against which to understand itself. Finally, she argues that the imposition of versions of agency onto Third World contexts, and focusing on the ostensible lack of agency signified by the veil or the burka, not only misunderstands the various cultural meanings that the burka might carry for women who wear it, but also denies the very idioms of agency that are relevant for such women.14 Mohanty's critique is thorough and right—and it was written more than a decade ago. It seems to me now that the possibility of international coalition has to be rethought on the basis of this critique and others. Such a coalition would have to be modeled on new modes of cultural translation and would be different from appreciating this or that position or asking for recognition in ways that assume that we are all fixed and frozen in our various locations and "subject-positions." We could have several engaged intellectual debates going on at the same time and find ourselves joined in the fight against violence, without having to agree on many epistemological issues. We could disagree on the status and character of modernity and yet find ourselves joined in asserting and defending the rights of indigenous women to health care, reproductive technology, decent wages, physical protection, cultural rights, freedom of assembly. If you saw me on such a protest line, would you wonder how a postmodernist was able to muster the necessary "agency" to get there today? I doubt it. You would assume that I had walked or taken the subway! By the same token, various routes lead us into politics, various stories bring us onto the street, various kinds of reasoning and belief. We do not need to ground ourselves in a single model of communication, a single model of reason, a single notion of the subject before we are able to act. Indeed, an international coalition of feminist activists and thinkers—a coalition that affirms the thinking of activists and the activism of thinkers and refuses to put them into distinctive categories that deny the actual complexity of the lives in question-— will have to accept the array of sometimes incommensurable epistemological and political beliefs and modes and means of agency that bring us into activism.

#### Globalization and militarism destroys the environment

Ramachandra **Guha**, Center for Ecological Sciences, “Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique,” ENVIORNMENTAL ETHICS, Spring 19**89**, http://www.eci.ox.ac.uk/~dliverma/articles/Guha%20on%20radical%20environmentalism.pdf

Insofar as it has begun to act as a check on man’s arrogance and ecological hubris, the transition from an anthropocentric (human-centered) to a biocentric (humans as only one element in the ecosystem) view in both religious and scientific traditions is only to be welcomed.4 What is unacceptable are the radical conclusions drawn by **deep ecology**, in particular, that intervention in nature should be guided primarily by the need to preserve biotic integrity rather than by the needs of humans. The latter for deep ecologists is anthropocentric, the former biocentric. This dichotomy **is**, however, **of very little use in understanding t**he dynamics of **environmental degradation. The two fundamental ecological problems facing the globe are** (i) overconsumption by the industrialized world and by urban elites in the Third World and (ii) growing **militarization,** both in a short-term sense **(i.e., o**ngoing regional **wars) and i**n a long-term sense (i.e., the arms race and the prospect of **nuclear annihilation). Neither of these problems has any** tangible **connection to** the **anthropocentric**-biocentric **distinction**. Indeed, **the agents of these processes would barely comprehend this** philosophical **dichotomy. The proximate causes** of the ecologically wasteful characteristics of industrial society and of militarization **are far more mundane**: at an aggregate level, the dialectic of economic and political structures, and at a micro-level, the life-style choices of individuals. These causes cannot be reduced, whatever the level of analysis, to a deeper anthropocentric attitude toward nature; on the contrary, **by constituting a grave threat to human survival, the ecological degradation they cause does not even serve the best interests of human beings!** If my identification of the major dangers to the integrity of the natural world is correct, **invoking the bogy of anthropocentricism is** at best **irrelevant and** at worst **a dangerous obfuscation.**

#### **Dissent is critical learn tolerance and activism**

Atkins, 11 (Linda, Representative to Ward 2 on the Eureka City Council. Eureka, CA, Democracy and dissent go together, http://www.times-standard.com/guest\_opinion/ci\_18584956, 7/30/2011, SSM)

Throughout the history of our country, dissent has been important to bringing change to our government. Without dissent and protest, we would still be English citizens, people would still own other people as slaves, women would not have the vote. Promoting a world view that doesn't allow citizens to protest the actions of their government is to take on the philosophy of all of the despots and dictators who kept their citizens silenced and afraid of retribution. Democracy is a living form of government that embraces the right of its citizens to protest decisions that they disagree with. A governing body taking a vote is sometimes just the beginning of the process. As an elected official, I have the duty to listen to and encourage the people of Eureka to speak out when their representatives act in ways that the public disagrees with. I consider those people who show up to speak to our council week after week as involved and caring citizens who want to be a part of shaping our community. Others have dismissed these citizens' concerns because they continue to come to our meetings and voice their ideas. I don't understand that reasoning. Somehow, their very involvement at our meetings bothers some who would prefer that the community just shut up and let them do whatever they want, without the complaint from the citizenry. I agree that participating in a democracy means that we continue to work with the people with whom we disagree in order to come to future compromises that benefit our community. I would never refuse to work with, or treat badly, council members or staff with whom I've had disagreements. I expect the people I work with to have the same resilience. Politics is often a rough-and-tumble exercise. Dissent and protest stretch our ability to take criticism and should lead us to examine what it is that people are upset about, not simply dismiss their complaints as unimportant. Unlike some past council members, I don't have the capacity to know what the people who are not communicating with me are thinking. During the protest of the city's recent action, I received overwhelming input against the action the city had taken. I responded to that input by encouraging the citizens to express themselves. Talking to fellow citizens and circulating petitions are time-honored ways for people to express their concerns. I will continue to support the people of Eureka actively participating in their government. I think that increased participation is the key to solving many of the issues that face our city today. Innovative ideas about how to address problems often come from outside of a bureaucracy, because it sometimes takes a different perspective to come up with alternative solutions. The stifling of citizen involvement cuts us off from others' viewpoints and leaves us with no new information with which to make our decisions. I want to encourage the people of Eureka to continue to give input to their elected officials about decisions that are important to our community. Don't be discouraged by the disregard of your concerns from some in the community; you know you were heard because of the nature of their response to your vocal protest in their July 22 My Word. It sometimes takes sustained communication to convince some elected officials that the public should not be ignored. I don't believe that, as a public official, I somehow know better than my fellow citizens what the correct direction is to move our city forward. I rely on all of you to help steer my decisions in a way that will help to bring positive changes and open communication between all people in our city. I challenge my fellow council members to join me in becoming aware of our use of the divisive language that has become so popular in our country today. It's easy to slip into this destructive habit of dismissing the people we disagree with. Dissent and protest represent the health of our democracy, while dismissal and divisiveness represent its deterioration. I will continue to speak up when I think something is wrong or when I disagree with a decision. I will continue to encourage others to do so, too. The framers of our democracy were very wise to include the right to dissent and protest in our governing documents. These rights allow our democracy to remain a strong and vibrant form of government.

#### **Dissent is key to flipping the balance of power for the oppressed – without it, change is impossible**

Zinn 10 (WAJAHAT, a writer, journalist, blogger and attorney, An Interview with Howard Zinn, Political Scientist, author of *A People's History of the United States,* Counter Punch, Dissent as Democracy, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2010/01/29/dissent-as-democracy/>, 1/29/10, SSM)

ALI: You said the democratic spirit of the American people is best represented when people are picketing and voicing their opinion outside the White House. How does this nature of dissent and protest serve as the crux of a democracy and a healthy, functioning civic society? Many would argue this is divisive, no? ZINN: Yes, dissent and protest are divisive, but in a good way, because they represent accurately the real divisions in society. Those divisions exist – the rich, the poor – whether there is dissent or not, but when there is no dissent, there is no change. The dissent has the possibility not of ending the division in society, but of changing the reality of the division. Changing the balance of power on behalf of the poor and the oppressed. ALI: The People’s History of The United States is now considered a seminal work taught in high schools and universities across the country. Why do you think the work has had such lasting, influential impact? ZINN: Because it fills a need, because there is a huge emptiness of truth in the traditional history texts. And because people who gain some understanding on their own that there are things wrong in society, they look for their new consciousness; their new feelings to be represented by a more honest history. ALI: Minority voters, like Hispanic Catholics, voted solidly for Bush in 2002, and some sons of immigrants have virulent anger and disdain against “illegal” immigrants. It seems many marginalized voices have forgotten their history and now side with those actively intent on keeping them either on the sidelines or in some form “oppressed.” How do we explain this discrepancy? ZINN: It is to the interest of the people in power to divide the rest of the population in order to rule them. To set poor against middle class, White against Black, Native born against immigrants, Christians against other religions. It serves the interest of the establishment to keep people ignorant of their own history, ALI: Most say that corporations now own American media. What is the proper outlet for democratic discourse and dissemination of information if indeed there is a biased monopoly over media? ZINN: Because of the control of the media by corporate wealth, the discovery of truth depends on an alternative media, such as small radio stations, networks like Pacifica Radio, programs like Amy Goodman’s Democracy Now. Also, alternative newspapers, which exist all over the country. Also, cable TV programs, which are not dependent on commercial advertising. Also, the internet, which can reach millions of people by-passing the conventional media.

#### The public sphere is reflexive and self-correcting—any criticism they have can be overcome by our method because the public sphere critiques itself

Simon **Susen**, Lecturer, Social and Political Theory, Birbeck College, University of London, “Critical Notes on Habermas’s Theory of the Public Sphere,” SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS, v. 5 n. 1, Spring 20**11**, p. 46-47.

 (c) The bourgeois public sphere is critical not only of premodern and modern states, but also of **itself,** for it constitutes an intersubjectively constructed realm based on open and **reflexive** discourses. “It provide[s] the training ground for a critical public reflection still preoccupied with itself” (ibid.: 29; italics added). The self-critical reflexivity of linguistically equipped entities―who, as communicatively interconnected subjects, form the public sphere―is an **invaluable resource** for discursively mediated forms of action coordination in the modern era. Dialogically created public spheres cannot exist without the critical reflection upon the socio-historical constitution of potentially uncritical subjects. The rational-critical character of the modern public sphere is rooted in social actors’ capacity to engage in intersubjective discourse oriented towards the communicative coordination and normative regulation of social life. It is not irrelevant to note that the rational-critical analysis of the public sphere forms part of the rational-critical constitution of the public sphere. Hence, Habermas’s theory of the public sphere is situated in, and can be critiqued by, the public sphere itself. “His theory and his practice assume that critical debate is at the heart of all intellectual activity and every healthy public sphere, and it is clear that he expects his own writing to face the criticisms and contestations with which he regularly confronts his opponents” (Kramer 1992: 256). Engagement in critical discourses, produced by prolific public spheres, is a constitutive element of modern social life. The normative potential of the bourgeois public sphere emanates from critical discursiveness able to question the taken-for-grantedness of accepted forms of quotidian experience. In this sense, the struggle over the creation of an emancipatory society “is a struggle to make publicity a source of reasoned, progressive consensus formation” (Calhoun 1992a: 28). The public sphere is a collective realm in which individuals’ cognitive ability to take on the role of critical and responsible actors is indicative of society’s coordinative capacity to transform itself into an emancipatory project shaped by the normative force of communicative rationality.