

Common Reading Series: Gender, Genocide, and Climate Migration: When Women Walk

KAREN WEATHERMON: Sort of blinded by the light here. Since it's 4:30, I'm going to go ahead and start our introductions so that I'm respectful of your time and that we are respectful of our speaker's time, as well. Good afternoon. It's always a pleasure to see you here today for today's talk by Patricia Glazebrook. A special welcome and hello to our folks who are joining us via the Global Campus. It's being filmed and and streamed out to students really across the globe who are involved in our global education program. So welcome to all of you.

I'm Karen Weathermon. I'm the director of first year programs. And one of those programs is our common reading program. And it is a delight and an honor of mine that every year that means that I get to sort of harness and marshal together all the different possibilities of resources and experts and possibilities that exist in the WSU system to look at a common, complex topic. This year, as you likely know, our topic is immigration and refugees, based on the book, *Refuge-- Rethinking Refugee Policy In a Changing World*.

So throughout this year, there is at least one event-- and often more than one event-- that compliments that broad consideration of topic. So now to introduce today's speaker. Dr. Patricia Glazebrook is professor of philosophy in the School of Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs. Among the many boards on which she serves are Gender CC, Women for Climate Justice in Berlin, Germany and the Center for Research in Environment and Sustainable Development in Lagos, Nigeria. So her reach is truly global.

Her research has generally focused on the philosophy of science and of the environment, including work on the philosopher Heidegger, on ecofeminism, environmental philosophy, climate change, and climate justice. Her current research addresses climate impacts and adaptations by women subsistence farmers in Ghana. And I understand we'll be learning more about that in her talk. So please help me welcome Dr. Glazebrook.

[APPLAUSE]

PATRICIA GLAZEBROOK: 1 of every 113 people on the planet is a refugee. Here at Washington State University, we have 20,976 students. So if the refugees were distributed evenly throughout the planet's population, we would have a total of 186 Cougs who are refugees. So think about that for a minute. Think about your community and think about 1 in 113 people and what that would mean if it was 1/113 of our community. What if it was you?

So I'm going to ask you to start with an exercise here. Close your eyes and imagine. Imagine that you are one of them, that yesterday Russian drones began flying overhead and dropping reapers that General T. Michael Moseley of the US Air Force-- Chief of Staff of it at that point-- said fulfill a true hunter killer role. Imagine that they were dropping on Moscow, Idaho.

Would you stay in Pullman? What about if they took out the airport? Would you leave then? What if they started to come down that road that goes to the agricultural colleges? Would you leave then? What if they took down Merry Cellars? Would you leave then? When would the level of threat be such that you would flee?

Where would you flee to? Do you have a car? If it runs out of gas, what will you do then if everybody else is fleeing at the same time? Will you be able to pass on the roads? If you don't have a car, would you walk? In what direction would you walk? What would you take? How long would you be able to carry that before you were obliged to drop much of it?

If what you're carrying is also your child, that will be the last thing you drop. What will happen to you when your bank card stops working? Can you feel the uncertainty? Do you understand the fear? Do you understand the sheer expanse of the unknown that is before you? What would you do?

And on that cheery note, I'm actually going to talk to you about a bunch of things today that all come together. This is a work in progress. If at any point during the conversation you want to know more about something or I wasn't clear, put your hand up, because you know, I've got so many pages, but if we don't get through them, that's OK. I'd much rather have your input so that I can use it to build this work in progress. So don't hesitate to put your hand up if you have something that you want to ask or something that you want to contribute.

The five things that I'm going to focus on now start with, I'm going to give you a response to the Betts Collier book. Has anyone actually read it? OK, that's not really a fair question. Everyone's like-- [NERVOUS HUMMING]

I read it, and I'm telling you, this is a really hard book to read. The first 90 pages almost killed me. I can read Heidegger 20 pages in an hour. I was getting through about three or four in this, because there's so much information. Fortunately after page 90 they turned to the topic of ethics. Turns out they don't know diddly squat about that, so that was actually very fast reading for me.

So what I want to do is I want to tell you, I really like this book. This book gave me so much information. It was so interesting to read. It was like wading through mud, but I couldn't stop reading it, because it's a really good book. And it taught me a lot about stuff that I already didn't know anything about and knew I didn't really know anything about, although I have a lot of experiences of what they're talking about with actual people on the ground.

So I'm going to tell you a bit about them. So I'm going to tell you I love this book. And now I'm going to tell you everything that is absolutely completely and totally wrong with this book. So we'll start with that, which will take us to the second section, because what I want to take down in the account is the proposal of specialized economic zones as being a solution to the refugee crisis for everyone-- big smile, shiny teeth. For everyone, the perfect silver bullet that's going to fix it for us.

Then I'm going to turn to a slightly more complicated topic, which is environment, oil, and conflict. In that section, I'm going to explain to you why general Soleimani of the Iranian army was killed with a drone. And I'm going to tell you how that is relevant to refugees and oil. After that section, I'm actually at last finally-- as if it was an afterthought, as if we were invisible, as if we had forgotten or I had forgotten-- I will finally then start to talk to you about women.

And I will conclude with a section on when women walk and what particular conditions belong to women who are refugees. So to start then with Betts and Collier, when they wrote their book, there were 65.3 million people who were displaced globally. That's that one person in every 113 people that I already talked about here on the planet.

Millions of these people-- but only 21.3 millions of these people-- actually cross a border. That's what makes them a refugee. Otherwise you just are an internally displaced person. And internally IDPs-- Internally Displaced People-- also need to be saved. They also need somewhere to live. But this book is about refugees. And to be a refugee, the qualifying factor is that you cross the border.

So the end of 2018, which is a year after the book was published-- so probably two years after they had their data-- the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees recorded for the first time in the Commission's 70 year history over 70 million people displaced on the planet, including almost 26 million refugees. So we went up by 3 million refugees between 2017, which means data they probably got out of 2016, early 2017. Now we're three years later early on. We went from 21.3 million of refugees to 26.

That's a pretty big jump. And it seems that the jumps are getting bigger and bigger, if you consider refugees as such only really began to be a thing in the 1980s when refugee camps were invented. People have always moved around. And they've always moved around for the reasons discussed in this book. But being a refugee with a technical definition of what that means only came around in the 1980s when camps were a way of dealing with refugees who were flooding into your country.

There were obviously agreements on refugees before that. But the definition that we have of refugee now involves the conception of a refugee camp, so something unique happened in our understanding and concept of refugees at that point. So Betts and Collier tell us that the people who seek refuge in haven countries really have two choices. They can go into a camp or they can go into a city.

Those are very different things to do. Camps are designed to be intermediate solutions, to be temporary. They're designed to deal with an emergency case. They will give you food. They will give you clothes. They will give you shelter. But you're not supposed to be there for any length of time. People sometimes end up there for 50 years.

A camp is a humanitarian silo. It's intended to segregate refugees from the host population. Camps are often placed in remote areas. They're usually arid areas where things don't grow

well, because if everything was easy living there, people would already be living there. So they get put on the land that nobody else wanted to live on.

And there are also areas that can be dangerous. They can be dangerous for weather reasons. They can be dangerous because of people coming trying to take things from you. If you're near a border from other countries, there's various reasons why they're dangerous. And I'm going to talk later about why they're particularly dangerous for women.

The exclusion of refugees in this way in camps from the general population is really largely based on distrust and fear of crime, although research shows that refugees aren't strongly connected with crime. But there is this assumption that the people, the population of the country, will think that, and that they will also think that they're going to take my job. That was cited a lot in Brexit.

Why does Brexit-- Britain need to leave Europe? Because the European system lets in too many immigrants and they're taking our jobs. We don't want those refugees because they're going to be taking our jobs. So in some places, it's explicit. But in many places, it's an assumption that this will be the feeling. The most problematic thing for refugees is once you're in that camp, you don't have any options for employment. You can't get a job. Do you have a job? Who here has a job?

Probably more in here than that, right? In which case, lucky you, because I had three jobs when I was an undergraduate. But I was in Canada and I was paying almost no tuition, because it was Canada. So I can't imagine you guys don't have, like, 18 jobs to be able to afford to be here.

What happens if you can't work? So you're in a camp now. You're in a situation where someone gives you food. They give you shelter. They give you clothes. They thought they were going to be doing that for a week. They're still doing it a year later, a decade later, in some cases four decades later. Do you think you're getting good food? Do you think you're getting a lot of variety? Do you think you're getting a nice glass of Cabernet Sauvignon to go along with it?

No. You're eating the bottom of the-- bottom of the pot. Right? Does that sound like a pleasant life to you? The most unpleasant thing about it is you have no autonomy. You can't get food for yourself. You can't decide what you want to eat. And you can't work. So if you don't work, you don't have money. So you've got to find a way to get money in that camp or get some kind of power or some kind of resource to make your situation there livable.

So accordingly, refugees have no autonomy, no opportunity for education or skill, or capacity development. Camps put a person in limbo. They put their life on hold, sometimes for decades. They vary, but the block bottom line is little by way of choice of freedom in the context of extremely limited resources that encourage exploitation, competition, and loss of hope.

Cities don't do that in the same way. You have to work in the underground economy, in the informal economy, because you don't have a visa. You don't have an authority to be employed

in the country. But you can find informal work. Everybody-- you know, you can clean houses. You can do yards. There's all kinds of different things that you can do.

You can also be horribly exploited for that. If you don't get paid, what can you do about it? You don't have papers. You can't report it to the police. If you are sexually assaulted by your employer, you can't do anything about that. In fact, if you want to keep your job, you better not do anything about it. Right?

So you're very vulnerable when you're working in a city. But at least you have some sense of autonomy. And maybe you'll get lucky. Maybe you'll have a job that doesn't put you in those terrible conditions, that doesn't expose you to toxins because you are doing the job nobody else wants to do.

Why don't they want to do the job? Because it's underpaid, because it doesn't respect labor laws and labor regulation. Perhaps there isn't even any labor regulation where you are, because the rule is the first country you enter as a refugee is the country that you're going to stay in. So if it's Iraq, I don't know, what are their labor laws like?

If it's Jordan, you're lucky, because they actually have a labor law system. And they made an agreement on labor laws with the US so they actually understand US standards of labor. So one would hope that Jordan would be a better place to be. And in fact, something like 85% of the refugees who live in Jordan actually chose to go to cities. They didn't want to go to camps because they understood how that would just take their life away from them, turn them into a ghost who, in a sense, is already dead because they have no possibility of future development.

So all you can do is cross your fingers and hope that the conflict ends, because usually one thing that is most common amongst refugees is the desire to go back home. Yep.

AUDIENCE: So do these labor laws impact the percentage of refugees coming to the US or to those areas?

PATRICIA GLAZEBROOK: Well, there is this rule that you go to the place that you-- usually you go to the closest place, right? Because usually you're walking, especially if you're coming out of Africa, you're walking. So you walk to the closest place. You cross the closest border. So if you're lucky, you get replaced-- you know, re-situated into Canada or into somewhere in Denmark, because despite this rule that you stay-- the first place you-- first border you cross, that's the country that's responsible for you. And you're supposed to stay there.

But at the same time, countries understand that you can't have one country carry the whole load, right? So what they have agreed is that they each have a proportion that they're prepared to accept or a number of people that-- so you can get re-situated to Canada. You can get re-situated to other countries.

And if you get re-situated to northern Europe, it snows and the weather may not be the weather that you're used to or want, but you have all kinds of social protections. You won't have to pay for health care. You'll be given supports and a place to live, et cetera.

In Canada, what happens is people in the community come together and sponsor a refugee. And then the refugee can go there. They'll set them up an apartment. They'll help them with language skills. They'll help them prepare a resume. They'll help them get a job. So it really varies on where you go. But mostly you're going where is nearby.

So if you're in Syria, you're going to-- Jordan is a place that you would want to go. Iraq would be another place that you would want to go. So the Iraq-- the Iraq Syria situation is a bit strange because at one point there was many refugees going from Syria into Iraq, and at other times there's Iraqi refugees going into Syria. So it's a bit of a back and forth, depending on what's going on with the local politics. Does that answer it? Excellent. Thank you so much.

So let's see, then. The cities don't give you those kinds of supports that you'd get otherwise. But you've got much more freedom. So it seems like it's a lot better place to be. Well, we can solve all of this, says Betts and Collier. We can do that by inventing or introducing these special economic zones. And special economic zones have been around for a while in all kinds of different places, and they work in very different ways.

The point with refugees to create these zones is that the refugees could then work in those special economic zones, maybe even alongside locals, because that would enhance integration into local communities and into the people who are the population of the country, which might make things easier all around. Most importantly, however, you would retain autonomy. You would have self-esteem. You would have hope for a brighter future, for something happening in your life other than being on hold forever.

I mean, after all, what refugees generally want is what we all want-- safety, survival for themselves and their families, and to return back to their home country as soon as possible at the end of the conflict that they fled from. So if you have a special economic zone and you put these people to work, the host country is going to benefit because revenue is going to be generated now.

So for example, four million Syrians began fleeing from Syria in 2011. And by 2015, only 35-- but by 2015, only 35% of the UN's \$1.3 billion USD-- American dollar regional response plan had been funded. So if you're in somewhere like Jordan, in Jordan 1,000 people flooded in there. 1,000 people flooded into a country that has a 6.5 million population. That means that over 13% of the population in a short period of time became refugees who were from-- who are from Syria.

That's a really big burden for a small country like Jordan to have to carry. And the money that was promised through the UN to support that wasn't given to them. So market interventions and doing something that creates economic income is what's called a market intervention,

because you're doing something that affects what's bought and sold and moved around the global marketplace, right?

So these market interventions are going to fund these refugee programs that heavily burden their host countries. And they only got these refugees in virtue of their proximity to the original state, the original country that the refugees came from, and also because refugees have limited travel options. If you could afford to get on a plane and fly somewhere else, you would have already done that, so they're kind of stuck with you, other than there's also a rule that you're supposed to stay in that country.

So the country that's hosting you benefits, but also the origin country benefits, because when that conflict ends and you go back home, you got a skill set now. Right? You've been in the line up. You know how to put the widget in the corner such that the other widget gets sent into an international market and sold. Who could ask for a better job? I know you could be a philosophy professor.

So they benefit. It helps them rebuild the country when people come back. And instead of atrophying in limbo, they've actually got a skill set now. They can help you rebuild your shattered country and its society and infrastructure. The global north also benefits in three ways. First, they don't have to provide one way only diplomatic return. It makes you look nice.

But when you put money into a refugee program, y'all get nothing back. Nothing's coming back to you out of that. So it's a one-way direction for money. If there's a special economic zone, you can now buy stuff cheaper, which means it's going to-- you're going to be more competitive in the marketplace. So you put that money in and you take-- so corporations that are based in your country in the global north make investments. They get a return back.

The government benefits from tax at that end, et cetera. And also they get to avoid Chancellor Merkel, who-- Chancellor's like President, but in Germany. Or elsewhere they call it that, too, right? So Chancellor Merkel opened the borders. And you'll see the tragedy that that caused. She had a movement of the heart. She saw people drowning in the Mediterranean and she thought, this ain't right. Or she thought, this is not right.

We cannot have this happen. We need to do something about this. So she did something that she shouldn't have done. She opened the border of Germany to anybody who could get there. Well, the European rule is wherever you land in Europe, remember that, you have to stay there. You can't go anywhere else. And the reason why they were particularly concerned with that in Europe is because-- I don't know if you know what the Schengen countries are, but Europe made an agreement that if you had a visa or a passport from any European country, you could go anywhere else.

So as soon as you enter France, you can go anywhere in Europe. Opening the border totally broke down that rule that you have to stay in the first country that you land in. Right? So all of Europe was like, back off, Merkel. Back off, because what you're doing is you're making it so

that we are all going to get flooded. You made a decision that's affecting all of us now. We don't have any choice now about accepting refugees. You have broken that agreement that we had.

So that was a problem. But also, who do you think is in that boat going across the Mediterranean? Is it the poorest Syrian? No, because they don't have money. People are being paid to give them those horrible dinghies, giant dinghies that people get in, right? They're paying thousands of dollars for that position there.

So who's in that boat? Mostly young men, because what the family does who has the money to send someone says, we got to send someone who's going to go there and get a job. Labor is the best way to do that. And then they're going to be able to send money back to the rest of us, and that's really going to help us all.

So that's what they did. And of course thousands of them sadly drowned in that water. But that was sort of the top elite, right? 80% were young males, males between the age of about 16 or 17 and 24, 25, because they were considered the best labor option. So that was a bad move on her part. Nobody would ever have to do that again if you have these economic zones because it won't be the same problem. Those refugees will want to stay there. They'll be making an income. It'll just work-- it will work for everyone. It'll just work for everyone.

Well, now let me tell you what will actually happen. For lots of people, being a refugee isn't something that happens to you because you're poor. It's not something that happens to you because you don't have an education. Being a refugee happens because someone is dropping a bomb on your village, or the next village, or your town. You run.

Who lives in that town? Doctors, lawyers, philosophy professors, people who work in grocery stores, people who work for the sanitation committee and dig things in the road to carry sanitation around, right? Every person of class, et cetera, wealth, lives in that city.

So you're going to retrain these people by putting them on a factory line? When they go back home that's no benefit to them or their country. They should be practicing as a lawyer or a doctor, or whatever they were initially trained to do, when they go back home. So it's not actually giving a good proportion of the refugees an education that will make them a more employable leader or really allow them to contribute to the rebuilding of the country.

They'd better contribute to the rebuilding of the country with their actual skill set that they gained when they went to university. So the assumption that these are just laborers who will work in what are, in essence, sweatshops, factory production-- which historically and typically has been what has happened with these economic zones. They usually employed people at a very low wage because they're anticipated to have little labor skills when they come in. And they train you.

So they train you to be on a production line where something's come by and you're quality control and you expect it or you're actually putting this little paperclip on the side of it and it

goes to the next person who does the next bit. Doesn't that sound like fulfilling work? Don't you want to wake up every morning and go, yeah, I'm going to do that. It's going to be real fun today. Oh, my quota is going up.

Every time you meet your quota it's like, well, obviously we're not pushing you hard enough because if you can meet the quota, you could probably do a little more, right? And for goodness sakes, never exceed the quota, because if you exceed the quota, quota's going up, right? Again, doesn't that sound like great work?

So who does it benefit then? Well, it does benefit the people who get to make money off of what you're making, right? It benefits the host country, because they get to exploit your labor. So in a sense, then, what have you got in this context? You've got workers paid low for their labor working in poor conditions, quite likely, for a minimal salary.

In other words, these special economic zones don't really change the refugee situation. They're still in a hopeless situation, a dead end job that they don't necessarily want to do. Will they have a choice? Will you be told that, well, if you don't want to participate, then we're not going to be feeding you, right? And when you do get that money, where are you going to spend it? You going to spend it in the grocery store they put on site so that you can spend-- so you're getting just enough to spend there.

So you're not actually getting anything out of it. You're getting everything that you've got before except one more thing. Now you are more than an indentured servant. Now you are what I would call-- what I would call a slave. You are only getting subsistence rations, so you're in essence working for free. Your life is just like it was before, but now you got to go sit in a factory for eight hours.

I don't know, did they have labor laws? What is the limit? I mean, it took a lot of unions. It took a lot of work to get it down to a 40 hour week five day a week, right? People used to-- in the 19th century, people used to work-- if they got one day off a month, they were lucky. Standing in a part of die up to here passing wool by to color the wool. 16 hours a day, one day off a month, if you're lucky. Those kinds of labor conditions-- I don't know what the conditions are going to be here.

You know that expression, [NON-ENGLISH]-- anybody recognize that expression? You know what it means? [NON-ENGLISH]. Not one single German speaker in the room. Work makes you free. That sign is the gateway going into Auschwitz.

How do we know these economic zones won't be just another form of a concentration camp? And if you think I shouldn't link concentration camp-- like concentration to the word camp because it's not appropriate, we do that all the time when it comes to the south of this country. We often refer to those 60 some thousand children who are being held at the southern border of this country that they are in a concentration camp deliberately being separated from their

parents who are deported back to where they came from, or at least across the border to Mexico, in order to deter future families from trying to cross the border with their babies.

69,000, do you think the deterrent argument is working? Does it deter people from fleeing? No, because people don't flee because they're like, oh, it's kind of a dull day today. I don't know. I've not really got anything on. Oh, I know, I'll be a refugee. Right, nobody thinks that. People don't make that choice. That's what makes you a refugee is you do it because you have to do it.

Now then, I'm going to completely shift gears and I'm going to talk to you about another topic-- environment, oil, and conflict. And it's a bit slightly complicated, so I put it in the middle, because by then I was hoping that my loud talking at you would have put you in a position of sustained wakefulness, because I feel it's important if at least one of us remain awake through the entire talk. And it's probably best if that's me.

So I'm going to just read this part so that I don't lose any of it. So Betts and Collier indicate three contemporary causes of refugee flight-- environmental disturbance, including climate change-- sorry-- environmental disturbance including climate change-- violence and food and water insecurity. This section argues they are not so separable. You always find them deeply entangled with each other.

For example, the first contemporary climate refugees are thought to be the Tuvaluans, from the islands of Tuvalu, who are-- they occupy a group of islands in the Pacific, of which several have been sufficiently run over by the ocean as to be uninhabitable. Some argue that that's more of an exploitative narrative and that Tuvaluans would never tell their story that way.

But it's certainly true that people have been moved from islands because they can't anymore-- you know, palm trees and things that make coconuts, the local stuff that you eat that's the food source there simply can't grow and the soil is salted. In fact, when the Romans took cities, one thing that they used to do was go to their agricultural area and seed it with salt, because once the salt is in the ground, you can't grow food there anymore. And if your enemy can't grow food, you pretty much gotta wait about three months. And then you don't need to invade again.

So these islands are atolls. So the highest place in the highest one of these particular islands is only about 6 feet and the average is about 3 feet. So it's very easy for water to creep up. Interestingly, because of the mechanics of how the wave patterns that are determined by the currents and stuff like that, they've actually had some islands where the water's gone down rather than coming up. But other islands have been flooded and the people have had to move.

So they're supposed to be the first climate-- the first climate refugees that we know of. The truth is, however, if you go back to the Out of Africa story, why did people first leave Africa? And the story is that that's how the human species-- excuse me-- became spread across the whole planet was we started in a valley in Africa and moved out. And why did we move out? Because of meta droughts.

So it was environmental conditions that drove the first migrants, the first people who chose to move about the world. And the Out of Africa story is-- I'd personally-- my heart is in Africa. My heart is in Ghana. So I got no problem with this story. But there's a lot of debate about whether it's factually accurate or not. And I'm fully prepared to believe that it is.

So the thing about that kind of climate impact, though, is how do you know when to leave? I mean, when your population-- you can give me-- can you-- Karen, would you mind giving me a flag when I'm, like, halfway through time? I don't want to get to the point where I have to talk really fast in order to finish the paper. So I'll do my best not to-- I can talk really fast, so don't make me.

So how do you know when to leave? I mean, I asked you before. Would you leave when they bombed Moscow? Would you leave when they do the airport? Would you leave when they bomb Merry Cellars? When does it get threatening enough for you that you decide that you want to leave? And that means that the difference between being a migrant and being a refugee is a bit thin.

They say that a migrant is someone who wants to leave. You want to go to one of those honeypot countries where you actually have a better life. Right? That's just migrancy. That's why I came to this charming country of yours rather than just staying in Canada. So you move to a better life.

Refugees don't choose to move to a better life. They instead decide that they run because they're under immediate threat. Starvation isn't an immediate threat like that. Starvation takes a long time, a long time and a lot of suffering. So there's not a lot of activists going, stop starvation now. You want to start-- build a dam or a pipeline, people are going to show up. They're like, oh, this is a major event going on here. We can do this, right? Because they can mark it.

It's when the dam is going to be opened. It's when you're going to break the ground for the oil pipeline which is illegal to protest in many countries in the state before. If that doesn't bother you, it should. So starvation isn't like that at all. There's no particular event that you can go, here's the event where we're going to have the big protest. Everybody come on Tuesday.

Happens every day all the time. Right now one in four Africans does not get enough to eat. That's been true since 2007. It's just what it means not to get enough to eat changes. Right now what it means in northern Ghana is it means at least once during a year-- so up to however many times-- but at least once, you go for at least 24 hours without any access to food at all.

But I can tell you from my experiences that there are people who regularly throughout a year go for three or four days. And the first people to cut their diet, they do it-- in the books, it's in the research. It's called strategic redeployment of food resources. That means the mother starves herself. That's what that means. It means the mother gives the food to the kid rather than eat it herself.

So you know, to say that food stressed means at least one day, at least 24 hours, opens up a whole river of hell that isn't actually being defined. You're getting the very simple, best-case scenario of not getting enough-- not getting enough food to eat.

Now, the part that's complicated that I want to tell you about is why Soleimani got killed. And it's something entirely different that is going on here than any of the things that I've talked about so far, and anything that's talked about in that book. So what is going on much more deeply of which the invasion of Iraq, for example, is just a symptom, and refugees flooding from one country to another is just a symptom.

This deeper issue was threat to the US role as a middleman of the global economy-- i.e. as the place you gotta go through to participate in the global economy. For some time, that economy was pinned down in what was called the euro dollar market. We still have the euro dollar market. It's just not as important anymore.

It started off as a situation in Europe where American dollars were being put into banks in Europe because that way you can use it to buy stuff and-- so you get your money in American dollars and you put it in your bank. And that way everybody can just work their currency against it and it's much easier to purchase things. And we're talking big money and big scale things.

In fact-- but what happens to that money then is the US has no control over it now. When American dollars are in European bank accounts, there's no control over it anymore. It's stopped being just America, just European bank accounts, and it started being bank accounts throughout the whole globe. But it's still called the Euro dollar market because that's what it was-- that's what it was originally called.

By 1985, it was estimated that there was 1.668 trillion US dollars in the Euro dollar market. That is to say 75% of American dollars were not in the country and were not under the control of the United States. That's a bit of an awkward situation to be in. People are doing all these trade deals and they're doing it with your money. But you don't have any kind of say over that or, you know, any way of managing that situation.

But it was OK, because what happened then was, as oil became more and more valuable and more and more dug up-- you ever heard of the OECD? Sorry, OPEC, the O-P-E-C, the organization for petroleum-- for petroleum, what's the E4? Is it exchanging or-- exporting companies. Organization petroleum ex-- thank you, Al. So glad you came to fix hat for me. Petroleum Exporting Countries.

Well, it turns out that the US has a really significant role of that. So the eurodollar market got replaced by the petrodollar market. And the petrodollar is just a way of talking about dollars that actually are functioning for the exchange of oil and that are the things that are fluttering around as bits of paper in this oil exchange that's going on globally, where Saudis buy oil from there and they sell oil to there and the US buys oil from Canada and also sells oil to other places, et cetera. Right?

At one point, country decided to make an oil deal with another country and didn't do it by going through OPEC. So that meant that-- well, we saw evidence, first off, when fracking in 2012-- fracking in 2012 absolutely demonstrated how powerful OPEC is. And that was the US shale boom, right? So it reinforced the role in controlling the global economy of the United States.

But countries came together to make an arrangement that didn't involve the United States. So let me just describe-- let me read to you how it was described. So fracking allowed the US to continue to control the global economy through the petrodollar instead of the eurodollar.

Recently, the murder of General Soleimani has been described-- and this is what I'm quoting from someone else-- as a "worrying picture of a desperate US lashing out at a world turning its back on a unipolar world"-- so a unipolar world, i.e. The unipole being the United States management of the global economy-- "in favor of the emerging multipolar where many countries are able to have an influence-- have their voice, as it were, appear in the global economy. So the petrodollar ensures that the US dollar retains its status as the global reserve currency, granting the US a monopolistic position from which it derives enormous benefits from playing the role of regional hegemon." i.e. leader in power.

"To threaten this comfortable arrangement is to threaten Washington's global power." That's Pieraccini, wrote that two weeks ago. "China plays an increasing role in this. Venezuela, Russia, and Iran hold a portion of the majority of the world's oil and gas reserves. They now have what's known as elevated relations with China and support the emerging multipolarity that China and Russia wish to consolidate-- allegedly to grow the euro Asian supercontinent, so Asia and Europe together, peacefully.

The rest of the majority of oil and gas reserves are in Iraq-- I mean other than Canada and the US-- are in Iraq, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. Could Saudi Arabia be swayed towards the China-Russian solidarity? There are military reasons it could. And now it looks like there is energy reasons that it could. Iraq and Qatar, those are countries that are both disturbed.

In fact, it was from Qatar that the drone was sent that killed Soleimani. They're both still disturbed by, quote, "numerous strategic errors in the region," end quote, made by the US, from Iraq in 2003-- so the invasion of Iraq and the Iraq war in 2003-- to more recently how the US has behaved in Yemen, where in one month alone 40 drone strikes killed hundreds, including children, in March 2017.

And in fact, there was one week where there were something like 25 of those drone strikes went down on Yemen in a one-week period in March 2017. Allegedly it turns out that was based on shaky intelligence. So all those people died when they weren't even really sure that they were aiming it at a place that they need to be aiming that kind of destruction.

Concerning Iraq, the 2003 US invasion was based on fabricated intelligence. And this is-- documents that were unclassified and were released about a year and a half ago made it clear

that the idea that bin Laden was in Iraq, and therefore because of 9/11 we should invade Iraq to kill bin Laden-- completely made up as an excuse to invade Iraq.

Why do you want to invade Iraq? The same reason that you want to kill Soleimani-- or someone else could have stood in for that position. Because the US was losing control of its role in the marketplace, the global economy. So what we're talking about-- what am I really telling you here? Maybe I can send you a copy of the paper and you can read it and look at it in more detail and look at the sources that I'm taking this from.

What I've just laid out for you is a Game of Thrones in which the US is increasingly facing a global power struggle. You got to admit it. This country has really ran the planet for a long time now, and things are pushing back against that. So we live in a very difficult time. As oil and gas company executives and members of parliament and governments reap massive profits, millions of people lose virtually everything.

In Iraq, after the US invaded in 2003 to teach Iraq a lesson from making an oil deal without circling it through the US-- when they invaded in 2003, by February 16, 2007, Antonio Guterres at the time, the U.N. High Commissioner of Refugees-- reported that 2 million people had fled Iraq. Another 1.7 million were internally displaced.

So for this Game of Thrones, 3.7 million people had their lives if not destroyed, completely turned upside down. So we can conclude, then, from this section that climate, violence, and food and water insecurity are longstanding drivers of migration, not entirely consistent with the Betts-Collier definition of refugees as forced rather than choosing to relocate. We blur that distinction a little they made so strongly again and again and again.

Moreover, we can conclude that an international power struggle is under way in which three things that Betts and Collier argue drives refugee's thinking-- i.e., environment, violence, and food and water insecurity-- are deeply interlinked in a global economic system that depends on fossil fuels that pose the greatest harm to the human species that we have known to have been faced in history through destruction of food systems, water systems, and habitable ecosystems.

The struggle for power in that economic system and the consequence of focus on that struggle rather than on acknowledging the need for immediate transition away from fossil fuels to renewable energies is already causing massive humanitarian suffering in agricultural collapse in Africa, in unprecedented fires in Australia.

How many people died in that? How many koalas died in that? Australia will probably never be the same again. So much of it was destroyed in that fire. And what will next year's fire season be like? What will it be like-- you know, I live in Moscow. So I just bombed it, because I thought, if I'm going to bomb something I might as well have the story be bombing me and not other people. Seemed the polite thing to do.

And sometimes in the summer, I can't even see my neighbors houses, excuse me, because the smoke from the fires. So the first summer I was here, there was a fire that moved 100 miles in 24 hours. 100 miles in 24 hours. That's pretty terrifying. Go to sleep. Wake up. Leave very quickly. I have a 2 minute emergency response [INAUDIBLE]. I can have my son, two cats, and all of our passports in a car halfway up the road in two minutes in case the fire comes in-- or somebody gets reelected and I'll go back to Canada.

So I've just told you-- I've just told you-- you know, I mean, when you think about it, it's pretty horrific. There is this-- I'm sorry, I'm just here to depress you-- that there is this massive power battle going. I mean, it seriously is Game of Thrones, right? There's this power battle, this struggle that is going on, and we are underneath.

And who's paying the price for that? Not Dick Cheney, who left Halliburton Oil, where he was executive director, or whatever the title was, in order to become vice president of the United States shortly before the invasion of Iraq in 2003. He was paid 36 million dollars when he left that position. He ain't hurting from this. Who's hurting from this?

You think it's not us? Just wait. As the poorest people on the planet are gone from climate change impact, who's going to be next? It's going to be us. What are we going to eat when-- could you grow your own-- you know, I had a student from Vietnam in one class. And he was laughing when we were talking about climate change. And he's laughing.

I'm like, why are you laughing? I'm trying to get you to understand the horrors of the reality of our situation. He was like, I'm from Vietnam. I go home, my mother can get food out of the ground. You guys all dying, but my mom knows how to do that. Could you do that? Could you do that if you had to get food out of the--

Interestingly, most of the people who get food out of the ground on this planet-- in fact, 70% of them-- are women who don't necessarily even speak to the national languages of their country, who maybe have grade 2 education. They're the ones who will be able to grow food after the rest of us can't figure out how to do that.

So women in climate, then. Are they-- there's the refugee immigrant question. I already talked about that. I just told you that women contribute 70% of what the planet eats. In fact, in Ghana, this data goes between 70% and 87%, depending on who you ask. The Social Watch Coalition says that women in Ghana grow 87% of what people eat, but the World Bank says that they only grow 70% of what people eat. So who knows which is the truth.

One thing's for sure, that's a giant, honkin' big number either way. That's a lot of food that is being produced by subsistence farmers. And the ones that I work with, they live on less than \$1 a month. I'll say that again, live on less than \$1 a month. The United Nations, the World Bank, they don't even have a category for that kind of poverty. Their lowest kind of poverty is now \$2 a day. After that, you're just extreme poor. \$2 a day, these are called abject poor. Now they call

it extreme poor, because I guess abject, as I will tell you later-- and so I'm telling you now instead-- ab is-- it's just Latin. So ab actually means away from.

And the --ject part comes from [NON-ENGLISH], which just means to throw. So to be abject is to be thrown away, right? Thrown away. So these women farmers are subsistence farmers. They take their food home and they eat it. They feed their family with it when they grow it. Maybe they sell small, small in the marketplace. And whenever I ask, why do you sell that? They say schoolbooks for the children or uniform for the-- you know, uniform for the children.

Where are these women? They are the forgotten women of the world who do the work that makes the world work but are not the heads of those organizations. They are not the heads of the oil companies. They're not the heads of the different offices in government in many countries throughout the world. So the ones who were doing the work aren't the ones that own the land or the ones who are actually making a profit off of only that land.

So there's really two giant holes in the account in this gorgeous book that I adore so much. The first is, they haven't really said anything about climate change, because it doesn't really fit their model. The other thing is, when you read this, look for when they talk about women. I can tell you-- let me see if I can find the data here.

Well, I'll come back to that-- I'll come back to that point. So I raised the point of, you know, how do you know when to-- how do you know when to become a refugee when you're facing starvation? Today, tomorrow, next week? How do you know-- how do you know how to plan to be a refugee? Well, the whole point about being a refugee is you're not really planning it.

So it's not clear where, if you can't grow your food anymore so you need to leave to go somewhere else, it's not really clear how you're going to be able to decide when you should go. But I can tell you that the women that I work with who make less than \$1 a month or live off of less than \$1 a month because they grow their own food, they go and collect scraps of fabric from the seamstress so they can sew their own clothes, et cetera.

They speak Frafra. [NON-ENGLISH] and then you say [NON-ENGLISH]. And then I say, [NON-ENGLISH]. That's how we greet each other in Frafra. But they don't speak English. They don't speak Twi, which are Ghana's national languages. Their language is a language that isn't written down, so it's quite hard to learn, because you just have to learn it being there talking with people.

So they can't go anywhere. Less than \$1 a month. It's not like you can get on a bus for that kind of money, right? They're going to have to walk. And if they walk, what will they be able to take with them? Hopefully some food, but certainly their children. Beyond that, you know, I don't know. But also, you don't have the language skills.

If you don't speak Twi or English, you get outside of your 10,000 language group, how are you going to talk to people at that point? What are you going to do about that? So how are you

going to get a job? Well, what training do you have? I mean, your job is primarily getting food out of the ground. So it's very hard to leave because women are subjected to the feminization of poverty. They live on almost no money and it's a scary idea that over the last 30 years, the proportion of the global poor who are women has radically risen.

What is going on with this world? You know, I'm getting on in age. And I'm like, oh, it wasn't like that in my day, right? Kids these days, right? Am I just-- is it just me, or am I just at that age, or is it actually the case that the world isn't the place that it was 30 years ago, that 30 years ago there was less poverty? For the first time on record there has been a poverty increase since 2019, according to the FAO and other organizations that track poverty.

So the previous report was something like 795 million people in 2018 were, you know, in abject poverty and extreme poverty. And of those 795,000 people-- sorry, million people-- 780 of them are in the global south. So think about that story I told you about oil exploitation of resources. Is that fair in that kind of poverty for such a large proportion to be in the global south? And the large proportion of them also are women who are carrying that burden.

So where I work in Northeast Ghana, that's millet. They often eat millet. Millet is really cool. It's kind of like-- I mean, you can see how pretty it is. It's a bit like wheat, but it's different than wheat. And it's really high in protein. And it's really high in calcium. So the protein is great because, you know, you feed it to your kids and they make this great breakfast thing and also a nice thing-- you put sauce on top and then you can roll it up and get the sauce on it and it's lovely to have. It's sort of the main starch. It's lovely to have that for dinner. It's one of my favorite things to eat anywhere.

So it's great to have the protein. It develops the child's brain. It develops their muscles, et cetera, right? The calcium is also great if you're pregnant, if you're lactating, or if you're a little kid trying to grow up and have your bones grow and stuff, right? They can't really grow that anymore because the rains don't come in regularly enough.

As the women tell me, "In the morning, I see rain. Afternoon, rain no come." And convectional rainfall doesn't usually work like that. Convectional rainfall-- you know, the heat on the ocean sucks up some water and then it cools, and so the stuff coming up behind pushes it to the side and it gets pushed over to the land.

And after going over the land for a while, the water is kind of like, yeah, I'm tired. I can't do this anymore. And it drops in the form of rainfall that hits-- you know, collects in little brooks and streams and rivers and flows back into the ocean, and the circle goes again. It basically is the rain and the rainy season at 3:30 in the afternoon, pretty much every day in the rainy season. Now it won't rain for four or five days straight.

So you'll get some millet, but you won't get enough. And you only grow once because you only grow with the rains. So by the time, you know, you're waiting for the next growing season next year, if your food won't reach that far, you're going to be going extremely, extremely hungry. So

you can't really grow millet anymore. It's not dependable enough when rains are sporadic and they come or they don't or they don't come for three weeks and then there's a massive flood.

So there is Africa. Here is Ghana. And-- that was painted on the wall where I was somewhere. I said, wow, it's so cool. I got to take a picture of that. And way, way-- you see that white sign? You go over a little to where it says-- you see where it says Upper East? Should have got one of those little pointy things.

That's where I work. So it's 14 hours by bus from Accra, the capital-- well, actually, no. Sorry, 16. It's not that the roads are that long, it's just that they're that bumpy, so they have to go kind of - you have to go kind of slow. So it's pretty remote up there. It's very agricultural area. Only 10% of women have any kind of support other than other women in the village and family when they give birth. 10%, not even a doula, not even a midwife.

You know, you only get taken to the hospital if there's a crisis. But if there is a crisis in the birth, your chances of survival are not that good. So that's the area that I'm working in in Africa. And in that area-- oh, there's a kid playing a drum in the market. I just like to show these pictures because so often the only pictures of Africa we see are pictures of people who are in camps, who are starving, who are completely numbed, who are like that. And fly is crawling across their face.

There are many people in Africa who have absolutely functioning lives and practice as lawyers or work in grocery stores or work in, you know, whatever. So this is the typical house in Ghana if you're not in a, you know, the city, where you can get a different kind of house. In a rural area, house looks like that. So you get mud. You mix it with the water and then you make a round building.

And then you make another one. And then you make a wall. And you end up with something like that. And each one of them is a room. So this was the kitchen. This was your bedroom. This is somebody else's bedroom. This is where you entertain people, you know, et cetera. So that's a house. And also I should've taken-- they paint them beautifully up there, but you know, I decided to take this picture for whatever reason.

This is a chief's house. You can see there's even a concrete thing built that somebody has-- the chief has built a concrete thing. You can also see that-- it's not the rainy season so nobody's worrying that they don't have a roof on them at this point. This is what happens after the flood. So in 2007 flood, 31 killed, 100,000 displaced. 15,000 homes destroyed.

When you built your house of mud-- which is great, because it keeps it cool in summer, and it keeps it warmer in the cold regions. And I know you don't think there would be a cold region, but seriously, it gets to be 68 degrees down there and everybody's got cold. They seriously have physically manifested the kinds of stuff we do in February, because that's so cold for them.

You see kids having a good time. You can see the mango tree behind that he can stand under. He could stand under it like that, and as one falls on his hand, eat it. Well, four or five, because you know, no kids can eat one of those.

So now I'm going to talk about-- I mean, the-- let me leave that. I'll come back to a point if we need to. What I'm going to talk about now is another kind of situation. It's not the environmental flight, but what I'm going to show is this also flight because of environmental consequences. But in fact, these are-- I'm going to talk to you now about the [NON-ENGLISH]. And the [NON-ENGLISH] are a cultural group.

Here you would say tribe, but as someone who does African Studies, I just find that a barbaric, completely colonial word. Tribe, I can't believe you guys still use that in this country. It's sort of - there's a history to that word. I don't know. You're looking at me like I'm, you know, sort of crazy. But you know, try saying tribe in African Studies. You're not in African Studies anymore if you do that.

So these are people in flight. And they're in flight because originally they-- I mean, it goes way back to the late 1800s. But I'm not going to take it too far back there. They decided that they wanted this group they're actually a Tutsi-- you remember the Tutsi Hutu-- when the Hutus genocided many Tutsi? So in the 1880s, long before that, they decided they wanted to go to the other side of the mountain, which is what the [NON-ENGLISH] means. It means the people who are now on the other side of the mountain.

And so they did that. But then every country that was-- had colonial holdings in Africa got together in the 1880s. There was a Berlin Conference. There was a bunch of other stuff that went on. And they partitioned Africa. They decided who owned what. And when they cut the line, the [NON-ENGLISH] ended up on the side of the Democratic Republic of Congo-- [NON-ENGLISH], because they speak French. They didn't end up on the Rwanda side.

So they're not considered citizens there, and now they're being genocided. It started in April. These pictures are from June of-- these pictures are from-- these pictures are from early December. You can see women walking now. That's a-- look at the proportion. That's a lot of women walking for it not to be mentioned in this book, right, for women never to be mentioned in this book, except once when they're quoting another organization.

And I forget with the first reason was. And then there's several instances where they talk about young men or older men. They have several expressions that they use to describe men. So you know, as they're not really woman, so you could say it's related to gender. Those are the only times that that shows up here.

How many of those are women? They're a large part of migration. And they're fundamental to migration, because what are you going to eat? What are you going to eat on the road? And she's going to actually carry it. She's going to carry it and then she knows how to cook it. And then the younger one, the daughter, is going to go find the water so that she can do that.

We're sort of running out of time, so I'm just whipping through to the end here. I just-- I know you're all antsy to go, but I just want to take-- I'm just going to say 10 seconds. I'm going to count to 10 because this woman was killed on Monday.

So what's happening here is the [NON-ENGLISH] are being killed by the [NON-ENGLISH] and other rebel groups that are coming over from Burundi. They're from South Kivu, which is an area on the east side. It's where the Ebola always is, on the east side of democratic-- DRC, Democratic Republic of Congo. [NON-ENGLISH] means water water. And the reason why they call themselves after water is because they believe that if they immerse themselves fully in water before they go into battle that no-- nothing will be able to wound them-- to harm them.

So the government says, you are not citizens because you only moved here in the late 1800s. So you're not really citizens. So we don't really care what happens to you. And the soldiers laugh, randomly shoot them at this point for no known reason. And also they-- after the [NON-ENGLISH] has come through, raped and murdered the women, murdered men, burned down houses, burned down entire villages-- after that has happened, the soldiers say, and here are their cows, because these are pastoralists who raise cows.

And they go back-- they go back to-- they go back to Burundi. I'm not sure if these women can run. You can see there are women that are already running. Let me just describe to you something that might happen. I mean, this is actually an environmental situation because the land that they are on is wanted now and it's wanted-- this competition for the land, and mostly for grazing rights, because people in the area who weren't [NON-ENGLISH] also have cows.

So the [NON-ENGLISH] is supporting the [NON-ENGLISH] and the other rebel groups and killing them because many of the [NON-ENGLISH] actually are-- because that's also a cultural group-- are [NON-ENGLISH]. So this is a coalition of the government, the military, and these rebel groups coming across the border who are interested in getting rid of these people so they can have their cows, right?

So it's economic. And it also is based on having access to arable land. So what happens to you, then, if you end up in a camp if you're a woman? And this is going to be quite short, because the last bit is just mostly bibliography. Well, in Jordan, in a Zaatari refugee camp-- and Jordan is one of the best places to be around. The actual best, if you want to be a refugee, is going to be Uganda, because in Uganda, they'll say, wow, OK, sure, here's some land. Work there and make your life. Go for it. Which is pretty pleasant compared to other places.

So of all the places, this would be a good camp. So there's reports there. So women can flee there to escape the violence that is going on at home with bombings, et cetera. But now they live in fear of kidnap, rape, and sham marriages, in the very camp that's supposed to keep them safe. In the Zaatari camp, the reports of Jordanians harassing girls as young as six or seven, and reports of kidnapping of girls who are raped and then returned to the camp, women and girls who were afraid to go to the toilet at night. Some were accompanied by a family member.

Others simply wait until morning, which isn't actually healthy to do, because if they go to the toilet, they can be attacked while they're there.

There's no policing structure, so roving bands of Syrian youth patrol the camp, allegedly to protect them. It's not the women-- it's not clear, however, that their vigilante justice is not doled out for other reasons, or if it's even effective as a deterrent to assaulters, or if it protects the victims. But it is what it is. In 2013, the UN worked with the Jordanian government to announce a security initiative, but risks of sexual exploitation, especially younger women and girls, is not just a nighttime affair.

Some women become marriage brokers who also sell girls to men from Saudi Arabia or other Gulf states, seeking pleasure marriages. One such woman sells coffee. And if the consumer wants to marry the serving girl who gave him the coffee, he has to pay 1,000 or more diners, she says, equivalent of about 1,400 US dollars. I wonder how much of that goes to the girl, and if she agrees, even?

He signs a marriage agreement. And this woman says he takes her. And even after one hour, they can get divorced. It's none of my business. Of course it's her bloody business. It's precisely her business. She's running a business of sex trafficking young women in a camp. That's women harming women in order to make profits themselves.

Because \$1,400 when you're in a refugee camp in which you're not allowed to work, that's a lot of money. It's a lot of money to me. I don't know about you guys, but that's a lot of money to me. It's unclear if the girl gets any or if she decides whether or not to participate in it.

Fathers also offer-- are offered money for their daughter. One father of two daughters said that people from Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar offered as much as 200,000 Turkish lira for one of his daughters. That's roughly \$33,000 USD, United States Dollars. \$33,000 to have your daughter.

And he promised also that she would live like a princess. Often what happens to the daughters who are purchased in this way, however, is that they are a few days later dumped somewhere in Jordan, obliged to find their way back to the camp on their own. Who knows what will happen to them on their way, abused and humiliated-- in effect, at the bottom of the pecking order are women who provide food security and girls who are trafficked as disposable.

They are abject-- literally thrown away-- in male driven conflicts. So it's the male driven conflicts, conflicts over oil, conflicts over power, that are putting them in this situation in which women-- girls are reduced to disposable bodies. Women become bodies. Women's bodies are then treated as disposable.

This is capital power in the phallic order. The refugee experience lays bare the absolute incapacity of human society in the capitalist phallic order to respect and support the thriving of any life form or ecosystem. Until capital shifts from this logic of an economic system aimed at

the individual accumulation of private wealth to the care logic of a societal system that promotes thriving-- until that happens, there is no hope for a future for any of us.

There are, in fact, some places, cultures, and systems that operate in non-capital exchanges and are driven by care rather than capital. There is a gleam of hope. But that's a topic for another day. Thank you so much for your patience.