

## Chapter 1: We Are at War

---

“We must declare war on the virus.”<sup>1</sup> Since March 13, 2020, we are at war. On that day, just two days after the WHO, the World Health Organization, had declared the outbreak of the novel Covid-19 virus a pandemic, António Guterres, who has been serving as the ninth Secretary-General of the United Nations since 2017, declared war on the virus. Speaking as UN chief, appealing to the 193 member states of the United Nations, and, at the same time, addressing the global public on the member states’ behalf, Guterres explained what follows from the declaration of war on the virus:

That means countries have a responsibility to gear up, step up and scale up. By implementing effective containment strategies. By activating and enhancing emergency response systems. By dramatically increasing testing capacity and care for patients. By readying hospitals, ensuring they have the space, supplies and needed personnel. And by developing life-saving medical interventions. And all of us have a responsibility, too. To follow medical advice and take simple, practical steps recommended by health authorities.<sup>2</sup>

The requirement that countries gear up, step up, and scale up is resonant with the pandemic imperative. War oratory like this is intended to unite. Its political message seeks to provide guidance and inspiration for governance, and at the same time it formulates an imperative to all the political leaders worldwide to join forces so their countries work together for finding concrete ways to solve the pandemic emergency. It seeks to enlist international cooperation for coordinated and purposeful responses to the crisis. The war imaginary is mobilized for creating national as well as international unity for a well-coordinated emergency effort. What the UN chief actually called for in his pandemic war speech on March 13, 2020, was unity and cooperation for the global provi-

sion of care. However, the UN chief did not call for a global care effort to ensure the public health measures he described. His speech relied on rhetorical mobilization for a global war effort against the virus. Public political speech seems to turn to militarist rhetoric to demonstrate resolve, to assure the public that a battle plan is in place and that all efforts will be put into applying this strategy. On March 23, just ten days after the declaration of war on the virus, the United Nations held a virtual press conference at the UN Headquarters in New York, which was shared live over the Internet. *UN News* reported: “UN chief calls for global ceasefire to focus on ‘true fight for our lives. [...] Our world faces a common enemy: the virus [...] and it attacks all, relentlessly.”<sup>3</sup> Rather than invoking global unity through imaginaries of vulnerability, care, or solidarity, his speech draws together realities of war and metaphors of war. Stating that the planet is under attack by one common enemy, he pleads for a temporary period of truce in order to focus on this one true fight for our lives. His oratory brings together the commonly understood metaphor of fighting a disease and the idea of a new global frontline between two parties at war: virus and humans. The subsequent part of his speech introduces a strange tension between the literal and the metaphorical meanings of war and disease. He makes it very plain: “The fury of the virus illustrates the folly of war.”<sup>4</sup> Fury and folly make an interesting choice of words: both have long been connected to war accounts or critical diagnoses of war. Fury evokes the raging, violent, and intense, potentially highly destructive and deadly activity of the enemy. Folly, from the French word *folie* for madness, not only means foolishness, but can also denote costly mistakes with ruinous outcomes. To all parties at war in March 2020, Guterres appeals as follows: “End the sickness of war and fight the disease that is ravaging our world”, he pleaded. “It starts by stopping the fighting everywhere. Now. That is what our human family needs, now more than ever.”<sup>5</sup> Invoking the senselessness of war, presenting what the pathogenic virus does to humans as a war, ties in well with the UN chief’s plea for a global truce and cessation of all ongoing war activities, which can also be understood to be ruinous and costly mistakes. The two-way traffic between war and disease becomes obvious. War is likened to disease and, at the same time, war and fighting are suggested as the best possible political and social response to disease. Viewing real wars to be a folly clears the space for the metaphorical use of the word war, which Guterres employs for the political mobilization of global unity in response to the threats posed by the virus. In order to begin a new war—the true fight for our lives—, all the old wars have to end. All real wars have to be put on hold if war is to appear as the desired common strategy for fighting the virus. If there is such a

clear understanding that war is sick and sickens, why, then, turn to the imaginary of war as a response to global threat? Why does war hold such power over human consciousness and collective imagination?

Confronted with and increasingly worried by my observations that the international political response to the outbreak of the novel coronavirus and the global public health crisis was cast in terms of war—in particular by the United Nations, an organization for international peace—this chapter is concerned with why war seems to be the apt choice for political imaginaries that plead for unity and collaboration in times of planetary emergency. Feminist worry caused by masculinist imaginaries of war and their militaristic implications raises a number of painful questions about the fate of care. How can it be that the idea of a global war front presents the way forward for coordinated protection against the virus? Why was the pandemic imperative to care formulated as a declaration of war? What makes the imaginary of war so very persuasive and thus deemed to be most useful to political pandemic oratory addressing world leaders and the global public? How has international politics arrived at a point at which war has come to offer the ideal semantic representation of what states and governments should do to work together in global unity? Which histories and cultural imaginaries have led to a situation of such acute poverty of imaginaries that a war effort seems to serve best the call for caring measures to prevent the spread of infection, mass disease, and death? Answers to questions like these go beyond the remit of this book. They are used here as feminist tools to examine with heightened and painful awareness how the power of meanings and the meaning of power and the two-way traffic between war and disease converge in the strategic deployment of political metaphors. Metaphors are understood as central to the formation of cultural and social imaginaries impacting upon the realities they at once articulate and shape.

Journalists, commentators, philosophers, and theorists were quick to point out that the political response to the outbreak of the virus used a highly militarist rhetoric. They diagnosed that war was used as a political metaphor. Alex de Waal, for example, stated that war is not a “harmless metaphor” as it also evokes associations of the power of winning so “that leaders feel entitled to declare ‘victory’”.<sup>6</sup> While this lucidly draws attention to how politics feed on the imaginary of the potential of winning a war, declaring its end, and celebrating the victory, what motivates me goes beyond the exploit of war on the level of political rhetoric and is concerned with how, at an ontological and existential level, the terminology of war has most deeply penetrated everyday language and imaginaries and, at the same time, how there is a growing lack and ero-

sion of language and imaginaries of care. I argue that metaphors, and figures of speech more broadly, contain at once histories of ideas as well as ecological, economic, emotional, material, social and political realities, and can help us understand, at the level of language, how thoroughly entangled ideas and realities are as they constantly feed into one another and are most intimately co-joined, as they permeate one another.

Reading slowly and closely some of the key examples of public political war oratory, as they were repeated over and over again in pandemic times, this chapter offers feminist cultural analytical reflections on war as a political metaphor as I take very seriously the “materiality of metaphor”.<sup>7</sup> I ask what this mobilization of war in the name of care asks us to think about: What does this turn to war as a response to crisis tell us about humanity? How has this militarization of the mind taken command? Of what is the lack of language, and of political imaginaries for the response to mass threat to life, a deeper symptom? Why have we ended up with war as the best possible solution for protection against vulnerabilities? The purpose is to “listen carefully” to the language of war mobilized in times of extreme crisis and deadly threat and, at the same time, raise awareness of the necessarily “long attention span” for the histories, including the histories of ideas, stored in and transmitted through figures of speech, as they convey profound insights into the ways modern human subjectivity is thought to relate to itself, to others, to nature, and to the world.<sup>8</sup> The concern is why war has become so central to the formation of modern human subjectivity that its relation to the planet came to be understood as constant acts of warfare. Starting in the here and now with the worries, and the questions, caused by public political oratory in pandemic times, the chapter opens up to a much larger historical horizon and to dimensions of futurity as it asks how to think, and act, beyond imaginaries of war as a solution to living with and caring for an infected planet.

Just a few months before this appeal that “we must declare war” on the virus, Guterres had delivered his “Remarks at 2019 Climate Action Summit”, which was held at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York in September of that year. This earlier speech can also be viewed as reliant on war rhetoric. Even though he does not actually use the term war, words, notions, and imaginaries connected to war permeate his speech. Seeking to inspire concrete climate action, Guterres fills his speech with powerful associations of attack and retaliation to address today’s disaster realities and their devastation: “Nature is angry. And we fool ourselves if we think we can fool nature. Because nature always strikes back. And around the world nature is striking

back with fury.”<sup>9</sup> His choice of words suggests that there is a war going on. One strikes back after one has been attacked. The chronological sequence of Guterres’ narrative suggests the following: humans started a war against nature when they started their attacks on nature, and now nature is retaliating. In temporal terms, retaliation is a response to an action that has taken place in the past. In military terms, retaliation means responding to a military attack by launching a counter-attack. His speech makes it clear that nature did not start the war—humans did. As he calls out their war on nature, the UN chief then goes on to specifically identify the enemies of nature. They are those who subsidize a “dying fossil fuel industry”, those “who build ever more coal plants that are choking our future”, those “who reward pollution that kills millions with dirty air and makes it dangerous for people in cities around the world to sometimes even venture out of their homes.”<sup>10</sup> One might add to his list here that the enemies of nature are those who engage in land-grabbing and deforestation in order to set up large-scale plantations, which then make it dangerous for children in villages to venture out and play in hollow trees: these trees might have become the refuge for fruit bats, which have been driven away from their natural habitat that was cut down and now present a threat to humans as they are carriers of zoonotic viruses which, through the jump from animal to human, can result in epidemics or global pandemics.<sup>11</sup> The enemies of nature are the enemies of human life. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves on whom we actually must declare war when “we” are called upon to “declare war on the virus” knowing that the outbreak of the novel Covid-19 virus, like other virus outbreaks before and predicted future virus outbreaks, are in fact the result of a hegemonic way of human life created by the relentless attacks of “Man” on nature, which have long infected the planet as a whole.<sup>12</sup> These are difficult facts. Who are “we” actually declaring war on when faced with the fact that today’s pandemic is produced by the very conditions that have been created by Man-made harm of nature. Furthermore, the way political oratory casts the relation between humans and nature in terms of war thinks of nature in anthropomorphic terms. Man attacks nature. Nature strikes back. Telling history like this exposes the anthropomorphism of nature. This is yet another expression of human supremacy, which is the root of such thinking that nature might relate with humans in the way humans relate with one another and with nature. At the center of all these relations we see the idea of war.

## Political Imaginaries of War

The idea of war not only has profound political implications, but is also central to shaping understandings of the value systems of the economy and of society that are expressed in philosophical ideas, cultural creeds, and ethics. Even though the specific meanings of war invoked by the UN chief in his two speeches, one given at the beginning of the global Covid-19 pandemic and one given on the occasion of the International Climate Action Summit, are very different, they provide proof that the idea of war underpins public political oratory and its political imaginaries. Guterres' pandemic speech in early 2020 invokes meanings of war such as the formation of a closed front against the virus, military-style efficiency, and the employment of all efforts under the unified goal of defeating the disease. War is presented by the UN chief as a solution for organizing care to save human life under the deadly circumstance of the pandemic, as he calls on governments to cooperate in order to "ensure targeted support for the people and communities most affected by the disease."<sup>13</sup> Guterres' climate action speech invokes the notion of a war on nature with nature now retaliating against its enemy. War is rendered legible in this speech as the original Man-made attack on nature, in response to which nature is now striking back with fury. This war on nature constantly, relentlessly, and most violently attacks nature so it yields more of its resources, provides more raw materials, and offers more planting ground for a global economic system based on excessive profiteering. Since the beginnings of industrialization, this war has developed and refined its arsenal of weaponry put to use to colonize nature through rampant extractivism, which feeds the economy's growth based on the paradigms of over-production and over-consumption.

What appears to be a paradox, namely that war offers the imaginary to present the solution to as well as the cause behind the problem, is actually not a paradox. It shows how limited political imaginaries are. It shows that there apparently exists no other political approach outside of imaginaries of war. War is central to human-nature-virus relations. War is behind the system in crisis, but also drives the responses to it. War provided the ideas that led to ruination and destruction, putting planet Earth on the edge of the precipice. And now, there seems no other solution than to answer this war with war. War necessitates war. I propose referring to this process that makes war at once the root of the solution to the problem and the cause of the problem to start with as general warification. This general warification that entangles bodies, minds, and nature can be traced, I argue, through war figures of speech, especially

in public political oratory in times of emergency. This reveals how the Man-made world relates to planet Earth through imaginaries of war. War figures of speech make abundantly obvious that the long-spanning legacies of modern warification dominate over other imaginaries, such as imaginaries of care and imaginaries of peace. As public political speech tells us that we find ourselves surrounded by enemies, whom we have to annihilate in order to live and survive, the dominant political world view hinders our ability to see, and relate to, the world otherwise. The domination of the idea of war over imagining our relation to the world keeps us from imagining living with our infected planet in a different way.

### **The Pandemic ‘We’: Unite in the Fight against the Invisible Enemy**

Pandemic war oratory serves the creation of a pandemic ‘we’ standing in unity against the enemy. This ‘we’ is imagined as a united warfront against the virus. Very soon after the first international pandemic war speech was delivered by UN Secretary General on March 13, 2020, there was a turn to war by political leaders. Public pandemic address to nations turned into speeches of war. Only a few days after the speech by Guterres, Emmanuel Macron, who has served as the elected President of France since 2017, delivered his pandemic address to the French nation on March 16, 2020. His speech drew global attention and was widely commented on in international media. “We are at war,” the French president informed his nation. While the UN Secretary General had urged that we need to declare war, the French President took that one step further and stated that his country was already at war. He had already ordered his country’s land borders to be closed and all French people to stay at home. “The enemy is invisible and it requires our general mobilization,” President Macron stated, safely assuming that he could leave out the name of the invisible enemy, as everybody would be able to fill it in by themselves.<sup>14</sup> In his speech, the virus was addressed as the enemy of all French people, and, therefore, became a national concern. The nation had to fight as one against the virus.

Ten days after President Macron delivered his war speech, on March 26, 2020, war and care are, again, most closely joined together at a global level in a speech to the most powerful world leaders, the G20. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, the Ethiopian biologist and public health researcher, who was elected by the World Health Assembly as Director-General of the World Health Organization in 2017, gave an address to the world leaders who had gathered virtually

for the G20 Extraordinary Leaders' Summit on Covid-19 organized and hosted by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which had assumed the G20 Presidency in December 2019.<sup>15</sup> Understanding that the World Health Organization holds the global authority to declare a disease a pandemic makes the fact that Tedros's address to the G20 world leaders framed the pandemic through the idea of war of particular interest. Tedros addressed the world leaders as follows:

My brothers and sisters. We come together to confront the defining health crisis of our time. We are at war with a virus that threatens to tear us apart – if we let it. Today I have three requests for our esteemed leaders: First, fight. Fight hard. Fight like hell. Fight like your lives depend on it – because they do. [...] Second, unite. No country can solve this crisis alone. [...] Third, ignite. [...] ignite a global movement to ensure this never happens again.<sup>16</sup>

The pandemic is the defining health crisis of our time and this crisis is seen as a war that can only be solved through war efforts. With the nexus pandemic, health crisis, and war firmly established, it is of particular importance to keep in mind that declaring a pandemic, but also a declaration of war, are formal acts. A pandemic may already have been a pandemic before being declared to be one. A pandemic may still be ongoing but already have been declared to have come to an end. The declarations of beginnings and endings of pandemics do not necessarily correspond to the realities of a disease, but they do create political realities. The only organization globally with the authority to officially declare the beginning as well as the end of a pandemic is the World Health Organization. In awareness of the impact on the economy of declaring a pandemic, and of how countries are reliant on their own economies as well as on globalized economies, the appeal of the World Health Organization's highest ranking official to the G20, self-described on their website as the "premier world forum for international economic cooperation", carries particular weight.

Both the French President and the Director-General of the World Health Organization make use of the word war to stress, and politically justify, the necessity of the extraordinary measures required. War enlists everyone. In times of war, those who do not fight the common threat become a threat themselves, as they jeopardize the unity in fighting, as they endanger the unified front against the enemy. The French president imagines a 'national we' and national unity for the French war against the virus, while the Director-General of the World Health Organization—in his address to the world leaders of the multilateral G20 forum, whose member states include some of the largest economies globally—speaks to the possibility of a 'global we' and of necessary

global unity in the war against the pandemic. This imagined global political ‘we’ in Tedros’s speech is carefully crafted. He constructs and mobilizes this ‘global we’ by moving through different scales, through which he reminds individual world leaders of their obligation toward their countries as well as toward the global community. Tedros very carefully introduced two different threats posed by the pandemic: the threat to individual life and the threat of losing global unity. He stated that “we are at war with a virus that threatens to tear us apart.”<sup>17</sup> As I read it, this statement not only allows for more than one interpretation, but is actually meant to be understood through different readings which are intended to complement one another. The Covid-19 virus exposes us to our physical and existential vulnerability. The virus can tear our lives away from us. Therefore, we have to fight to tear our lives away from deadly contagion and pandemic death. The outcome of existing global inequalities which define public health and access to medical infrastructures around the world is the very uneven distribution of the threat of having one’s life torn away by the virus. The conditions under which people are able to fight to tear their lives away from contagion and death are highly unequal. At the same time, Tedros’s pronouncement can be read to mean that standing in unity against the virus can be torn apart by political leaders, can be torn apart by individuals who do not follow pandemic measures, and can be torn apart by pre-existing economic and social realities of inequality and injustice. The war effort is not shared equally. Not all of us can keep safe and stay in shelter. Not all of us are obliged to contribute to the war effort in the same way. Some are frontline workers, while others live in relative safety. This inequality tears us apart.

When people are torn apart in social, in political, and importantly, in economic terms, they are divided. This division is a threat to unity which tears apart the war effort and makes it impossible to defend all of us, to protect us against contagion, to provide us with tests and vaccines. The message of the opening speech of the General-Director of the World Health Assembly at the G20 Extraordinary Leaders’ Summit is the following: the loss of unity presents the most serious threat to the war against the virus. In order for there to be unity, existing divisions that cannot be overcome need to be put aside. The logic of war is based on the idea that only unity can beat the enemy. If there is no unity, it is less likely the enemy will be defeated. If the war is not united, the virus will win and the human beings on planet Earth will suffer the loss of millions of lives, as humans were not able to organize politically and socially in such a way that disease and death were prevented. Those who will not have had

access to the kinds of support that would have been necessary for them to fight the virus, to tear their lives away from Covid-19 death, will be counted as the casualties of this failed war against the virus. The futures of those who will have been failed by the war against the virus will have been torn from them, but also from planet Earth, to whose future they can no longer contribute. The threat of our being torn apart by this war against the virus is just as deadly as the deadly threat posed by the virus. The threat that the war will divide us will make many more people especially vulnerable to the virus and exponentially increase existing health inequalities that tear apart societies around the world.

Presenting his three requests to the assembled G20 world leaders, the Director-General of the World Health Organization makes an appeal for a global united war against the virus. Constructing his requests as pandemic imperatives, Tedros binds them together along the three different, yet inextricably interconnected scales of the individual, of countries and, finally, of a not-yet existing and yet to be formed future global movement. In his first request, he addresses the world leaders as individuals and asks them to fight as if fighting for their own lives. In his second request, which actually instructs the world leaders to unite, he does not address them as individuals at all; much rather, he now refers to the countries, and therefore metonymically to all the people, whom these political leaders not only represent, but also have an obligation toward. He makes it clear that no country alone can fight a pandemic. His third request invokes the future and demands a global movement to prevent further pandemics. He lays out a sequence of actions for this war effort which build upon one another and are necessary in order to defeat the enemy. This sequence is captured through the three imperatives: fight, unite, ignite. "Fight like your lives depend on it," the Director-General of the World Health Organization told the world leaders, reminding them of their own existence through their bodies, which are also under threat by the deadly virus. This addresses them as bodily beings and political leaders, vulnerable and in positions of wielding global power and responsible to millions of people. The political rationale behind the imperative is that if the world leaders imagine having to fight for their own lives, they will do a better political job in fighting for the lives of all human beings, and if all of them, individually, fight for their lives together, they will all fight for all. Metonymically, the bodies and lives of the world leaders stand in for the bodies and lives of all the people living in the countries which they represent. Metonymy in this political rhetoric turns the lives of the world leaders into a representation of all lives under the new pandemic realities. The lives of the world leaders are the part that represents the

whole, for which the world leaders are to fight as if their lives depended on it. The second imperative, unite, moves from the scale of the individual to the scale of the country. As he tells the world leaders to unite, he speaks of their countries. When he states that “no country can solve this crisis alone” there is, again, metonymy at work. He actually asks of the countries these leaders represent, and therefore all the people living across these countries, to unite in war against the virus. His third imperative is to “ignite” a “global movement to ensure this never happens again”. Even though the Director-General of the World Health Organization remains vague on how exactly this will be ensured, I read his third request as an imperative to work against deadly conditions created by anthropogenic climate change, as there is “growing evidence” of the interconnectedness of “infectious diseases, pandemics and climate hazards” as “many of the same human activities that are contributing to climate change are also contributing not only to the emergence of new diseases but also their spread.”<sup>18</sup> There might be many more pandemics in the future, as the global economies, which are based on the twin paradigms of growth and extraction, cause humans to move ever closer to new viruses, which increases the risks of “spillover events”.<sup>19</sup> The third request asks for the creation of conditions that will prevent future pandemics, as well as of conditions in which the world is no longer torn apart, as unity is needed to respond to the challenges, problems, emergencies, crises, and catastrophes that all concern the planet in its entirety. This third and last request actually moves away from the language of war to the language of movement, and hope for the possibility of working toward a different future.

More than twelve months into living with pandemic realities and pandemic death, the idea of war continued to define the response to the virus. “We are at war with the virus,” António Guterres stated in his opening address for the 74th World Health Assembly in May 2021.<sup>20</sup> The annual meeting of the World Health Assembly, which is the decision-making body of the World Health Organization and therefore the most important health policy body globally, normally takes place in Geneva, Switzerland, but, because of the pandemic conditions, it was again held remotely, as had already been the case in 2020. Addressing the health ministers of the 194 member states, who, through the World Health Assembly, govern the World Health Organization, adopt resolutions, and decide on future global policy, Guterres “called for the application of wartime logic in the international battle against COVID-19.”<sup>21</sup> By May 31, as the World Health Assembly closed, the delegations of the member states had agreed to come together again in a special session toward the end of the year, in November 2021, in order to work on a global agreement, on a new treaty on pandemic prepared-

ness and response in order to strengthen global health security, as “COVID-19 and other major disease outbreaks, as well as continuing humanitarian situations, highlight the need for a stronger collective and coordinated approach to preparedness and response to health emergencies.”<sup>22</sup>

The pandemic speeches by Guterres, Macron, and Tedros have been chosen as examples in order to draw attention to the global presence of political imaginaries of war since the outbreak of the global pandemic. Why do international leaders make war the basis of their political statements in public pandemic oratory? Why do they display such a strong political belief that war can be seen to provide the best framework for solutions in times of emergencies, crises, and catastrophes? Is there any political awareness of the constant spillover of political war oratory into everyday language? Is there political consideration being given to how this constant presence of war since the outbreak of the pandemic impacts on social and cultural imaginaries? Listening carefully, over and over again, to these pandemic war speeches and training my attention to the metaphorical and rhetorical use of language, what struck me most was the firm use of the indicative mood in this turn to war. “We must declare war on the virus.” “We are at war.” Cast no doubt: indicative mood, present tense. The indicative mood is used for facts, statements, and beliefs. Consequently, “We are at war” has to be understood as political statement, as a belief, and as a fact. War was not a doubt. What is even more depressing, a state of war was never doubted. Stating that they are at war against the virus seems to allow political leaders to demonstrate their resolve, their firm authority to resolve, that is, to find a solution to the crisis. They can show their utmost determination to end the pandemic. It is held by political analysts as well as in common everyday understanding that “war is largely about willpower”.<sup>23</sup> There is no doubt that the deadly realities of a pandemic require resolve. Earnest decisions, which will decide over life and death, have to be taken. Also, time is of the essence: decisions have to be taken immediately. Actions are required, without hesitation. “In a fast-moving pandemic, the cost of *inaction* is counted in the grim mortality figures announced daily [...]”<sup>24</sup> The application of wartime logic is thus understood to be a political manifestation of willpower, of fast decision-making, and of the ability to control the course of actions. War stands for political resolve. Words closely associated with resolve aid understanding of the political imaginaries which are invoked by war. These words include determination, firmness, self-command, self-control, steadfastness, and purpose. If war is held to be the expression of all the attributes connected to resolve, then belief in the political statement that we are at war can be understood to embody

the political will to command and the ability to decide on all the actions necessary. This leads to more questions that have to be raised here, asking about the relationship between this political invocation of war as demonstration of resolve and willpower and ‘us’, as ‘we’ are constantly being told that ‘we’ are at war. Why am I forced into war? Why do I have to be made to feel that I am following a war regime when caring about others, when following mask mandates, when respecting physical distancing rules, when testing for the virus, when getting vaccinated? Why do political leaders want people globally to share their belief, or rather their masculinist ideology, that war is the solution to emergency, crisis, and catastrophe? Why do political leaders present war in the indicative mood? Why do they speak of war as a fact? A fact is not a decision. A fact is not a choice. We cannot choose our facts. But decisions have to be taken, choices have to be made, because there are facts. Facts are resulting from decisions and choices. If it is assumed a fact that we are at war, then certain choices can be made, certain decisions can be taken, which, in other times, would not be possible. In times of war everything can and will be mobilized in order to defeat the enemy. If the notion of war allows political leaders to demonstrate their resolve and their will to control the situation, it also presents them with the political opportunity to ask of ‘us’ that we share this resolve and partake in their willpower so that all actions that are asked of us, that are required on our part so the war can be won, will be carried out by us. In pandemic political oratory, the invocation of war serves the forcible creation of a ‘we’. War as the utmost embodiment of political resolve is imagined to best serve the formation of unity in the collective will to fight together against a common enemy. The idea of war thus wills a ‘we’, which is based on the identification of a common enemy. Willpower, at once the will to use one’s power and to be in control of one’s power, is closely linked to the political idea of war.

Prussian general Carl von Clausewitz, in his book *On War*, a military theory of war published posthumously by his wife Marie von Brühl and a philosophical treatise and military strategy at once, offers the following definition of willpower: “[...] willpower, as we know, is always an element in and a product of strength.”<sup>25</sup> Following this logic, willpower is crucial to the collective strength on which wartime efforts rely, but this willpower is also generated through strength, meaning that those political leaders who display their resolve through the statement “we are at war” have such strength in them. The strength of political leadership, therefore, is the precondition for the mobilization of collective strength which is required for war. Will is central to the definition Clausewitz has given of war: “War is thus an act of force to compel our

enemy to do our will.”<sup>26</sup> In order for this collective force to come together, ‘our’ enemy has to be identified as the commonly agreed upon enemy and ‘our’ will has to be bent into a will so collective that it actually willingly conjoins with the act of force. Political pandemic resolve mobilizes collective willpower, which is the basis for the collective strength of a ‘we’ crucially needed in times of war. We can see here the politically as well as philosophically produced nexus between war, resolve, willpower, strength, and force, which were historically forged by the links among the ideology of patriarchy, the formation of the modern independent subject, and the general warification of life on the planet.

## Effects of War and the State of Exception

The politics of choosing words of war in pandemic political oratory was widely noticed.

Many, including political commentators, columnists, journalists, bloggers, critical theorists, and scholars, were quick to draw attention to the centrality of war in the global political response to the virus. Words can make us appear as “soldiers in a war”, as international relations scholar Constanza Musu has observed.<sup>27</sup> Alex de Waal has written that by “zoonosis from metaphor to policy, ‘fighting’ coronavirus may, in the worst case, bring troops onto our streets and security surveillance into our personal lives.”<sup>28</sup> The omnipresence of war rhetoric did, in fact, lead to very real new societal frictions and conflicts, as people questioned the pandemic measures imposed—and justified—in the name of war. Opposing camps formed around issues like the mask mandate or vaccination requirements. This gave rise to the formation of new fronts and confrontations, which could be understood as wars over Covid-19 measures resulting in deeply divided societies. In the following I will look at some examples of the effects of the use of war as metaphor.

On March 21, 2020, Simon Tisdall, writing for the Guardian, titled “Lay off those war metaphors, world leaders. You could be the next casualty.”<sup>29</sup> On April 11, 2020, Lawrence Freedman, a scholar of war studies, wrote a piece for the Statesman in which he made observations on the ubiquity of the war metaphors, with Xi Jinping speaking of a “people’s war” and Donald Trump presenting himself as “wartime president” and referring to the corona virus as “the Chinese virus.”<sup>30</sup> Writing for the *Conversation*, Constanza Musu titled that “War metaphors used for Covid-19 are compelling, but also dangerous”.<sup>31</sup> One of the indicated reasons for why war imaginary is at once compelling and

dangerous is that it suggests that there is a strategy in place, that people know what to do. At the same time, the war metaphor provides for identification not only of what has to be done, but also of who has to do it and who can be faulted in the event of failure.

The war-time imagery is compelling. It identifies an enemy (the virus), a strategy ('flatten the curve', but also 'save the economy'), the front-line warriors (health-care personnel), the home-front (people isolating at home), traitors and deserters (people breaking the social distancing rules).<sup>32</sup>

War not only offers the possibility to present political resolve and determination, but it also subordinates life in general to the war effort. Musu points out that, with all of us understood to be "soldiers" in a war, "politicians call for obedience rather than awareness and appeal to our patriotism, not to our solidarity."<sup>33</sup> This draws attention to the political as well as the ethical consequences of mobilizing societies in the name of war. The warification of Covid-19 effectively led to the justification of authoritarian rule and even to heightening ethno-nationalism, as nation states went about protecting and caring first and foremost for their own. It also led to violently pitting people against one another along new enemy lines formed through Covid belief systems. Enemy lines include coronavirus rule breakers, anti-lockdown marchers, Covid-deniers, anti-vaccine protesters as well as test or vaccine refuseniks. They also include people who, even though they are in general agreement with Covid-19 measures, are in opposition to what is portrayed as infringement or violation of freedom. These new causes of stark disagreement, conflict, and even violent confrontations mark daily life under pandemic conditions and also present a new cause of conflicts among family members, kin, and friends. These new lines of conflict create realities on the ground that heighten vulnerability to exposure to viral infections, with people refusing to get vaccinated, not covering nose or mouth with their masks in public transport, or with people staging so-called Covid parties or participating in Covid demonstrations that advertise their refusal to adhere to rules necessary for protecting one another from contagion.

The fact that measures for protection against viral infection and the social actions needed for keeping one another as safe as possible have been politically constructed through imaginaries of war used to legitimize the imposition of states of emergency, also known as states of exception or martial law, led to very justified critiques of the effects of such constant warification. Simultaneously, people on the right, including positions on the extreme right, began to invoke freedom to push against measures imposed by the state in order to mobilize against state politics, in general, as well as against specific governments. Ad-

vocating for freedom and fundamental rights was, therefore, coopted by those on the right, whose political ideologies are never liberating or emancipatory. At the same time, arguments made by them began to sound very much like arguments made by people at the opposing end of the political spectrum. Therefore, paradoxical new alignments and oppositions arose, as individuals and groups in societies were split over pandemic measures. Would the response to such measures, which restricted freedom of movement or freedom of assembly, have been different if international organizations and political leaders had advocated for global unity in the name of care? Would people have been less divided if measures imposed had been introduced as a pandemic state of caring solidarity rather than as a militarized state of exception? We will, of course, never know. Such questions are hypothetical, but they are not rhetorical. They tell us how limited global political imaginaries actually are when it comes to calling for mutuality in care and how humans have practiced habits and routines of trust in accepting restrictions to protect themselves and others.

One much-referenced example of the philosophical responses to pandemic politics, the arguments of which can be aligned with the arguments that drive Covid denialism and so-called Covid demonstrations held against measures imposed by states, are opinion pieces, essays, and interviews by Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben. Shortly after the outbreak of the novel coronavirus, Agamben began to publish his politico-philosophical comments on the political response to Covid-19 in Italy. These pieces can be found at *Una Voce di Agamben*, hosted on a website run by his Italian publisher Quodlibet. Agamben collected pandemic interventions that have been collated in the book titled *Where Are We Now? The Epidemic as Politics*.<sup>34</sup> The philosopher, known for his important work on the concept of bare life and his theorization of thanatocracy, sharply criticized the state of exception, the measures of surveillance, containment, physical distancing, and lockdown. Agamben's analysis of the state of exception is based on its theorization by political philosopher and jurist Carl Schmitt, a prominent member of Germany's Nazi party. In his 1922 *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, Schmitt writes: "Sovereign is he who decides on the exceptional case."<sup>35</sup> Such sovereignty is characterized by the power over taking decisions, even decisions that are outside the law. In a situation of "extreme peril" or emergency, states turn to the state of exception for their rule. According to Schmitt, the "exception reveals most clearly the essence of the state's authority. The decision parts here from the legal norm, and (to formulate it paradoxically) authority proves that to produce law it need not be based on law."<sup>36</sup> The German original is even more

ambiguous with the expression “nicht Recht zu haben braucht”, which has two different meanings. As in the translation quoted here, the meaning can be that for the state to act this “need not be based on law”, but at the same time this can also mean that the state “need not be right” to do so, can actually and factually be in the wrong. Therefore, the German original inseparably joins legal implications to epistemic, moral, and ethical dimensions. States can be wrong about there being a state of extreme threat or peril, yet, nonetheless, they still have the right to impose a state of exception. In the specific situation of the Covid-19 pandemic, this became relevant to the philosophical and political arguments against measures of prevention and protection. Covid-19 denialism and public protests against responses to the Covid-19 pandemic denied that the virus presented a deadly threat, and therefore called for the rejection of measures such as physical distancing and the wearing of masks, and later, when vaccines had been developed, called for a rejection of vaccination.

Early on, Agamben viewed lockdown and the mask mandate as a form of new pandemic state despotism. His diagnoses thus lent philosophical legitimacy to the protests of those who called into question both the threat of the virus and governments’ imposition of measures, and to their refusal to follow the rules while they recklessly and carelessly denied that we are interdependent for protection against infection. Diagnosing a dictatorship of techno-medical-authoritarianism, he wrote:

We can use the term ‘biosecurity’ to describe the government apparatus that consists of this new religion of health, conjoined with the state power and its state of exception – an apparatus that is probably the most efficient of its kind that Western history has ever known. Experience has in fact shown that, once a threat to health is in place, people are willing to accept limitations on their freedom that they would never heretofore have considered enduring – not even during the two world wars, nor under totalitarian dictatorships.<sup>37</sup>

Unfolding the banner of freedom and the rhetorical philosophical claim to occupy the position of truth by calling medicine a new form of “religion”—that is, something one cannot be forced to believe—is a philosophy of carelessness.<sup>38</sup> While the argument is valid that the political goal of public health can be abused to legitimize governments’ turn to authoritarianism, turning against measures for mutual care and protection presents a very real threat to human life and has to be understood as a philosophy of warring carelessness.

Reactions to the restrictions on civil liberties took a very sinister turn in the formation of a new political movement against national responses to the

pandemic that united many different positions across the political spectrum who, before, would never have joined forces with one another. In Germany, for example, there arose an “anti-establishment movement” that draws together people of very different, even contradictory, political beliefs and thus leads to the unexpected alliance of followers of the far-right, conspiracy-theorists, people voting for the left, but also Green voters.<sup>39</sup> Observing these developments in Germany since their first culmination that even led to storming the Reichstag building in Berlin on August 29, 2020, the UK-based political website *openDemocracy* titled: “How Germany became ground zero for the COVID infodemic”.<sup>40</sup> According to the World Health Organization, an infodemic

is too much information including false or misleading information in digital and physical environments during a disease outbreak. It causes confusion and risk-taking behaviors that can harm health. It also leads to mistrust in health authorities and undermines the public health response.<sup>41</sup>

Viewed from the perspective of a declaration of war on the virus and the call for unity in a war effort, such an infodemic nourished by conspiracy theories and by freedom hyperbole has to be understood as a form of counter-attack or insurgency. Agamben’s philosophical critique of the state of exception in pandemic times, and popular protests against Covid-19 measures under the banner of reclaiming individual freedoms are trapped in a toxic, violent, and deadly cycle of warification. As philosophy scholar Carlo Salzani critically observed in his piece on “Covid-19 and State of Exception: Medicine, Politics and the Epidemic State”, Agamben’s critique of the epidemic as politics supplies no ideas either for “new forms of resistance”, which Agamben himself called for, or for a different model of the state in times of peril and in times of non-peril.<sup>42</sup> Salzani writes:

What this resistance will consist in cannot be defined or described a priori, but if there is one thing that the 2020 pandemic has taught us, it is that this new political strategy cannot be reduced to an all-too-common and essentially anarcho-libertarian focus on individual freedoms (to which also Agamben’s project ultimately amounts) but will have to be a positive collective project towards the common good.<sup>43</sup>

My assumption of a critical perspective on the imaginaries of war which, here, underpin the legal idea of the state of exception leads to my diagnosis that political analysis per Agamben and the rampant spread of misinformation through the emergent alignments among fascist supremacists, conspiracy

fundamentalists, but also critical minds along the left and the green political spectrum, along with other political beliefs based on hyper-individualism, are responses that fully embrace the logic of war. The physical realities aligned with this logic are large-scale protests in which people actively break lockdown rules by not respecting social distancing and by not wearing masks. Such an understanding of freedom becomes carelessness: freed from the responsibility to respect each other's vulnerability and the obligation to protect one another from infection.<sup>44</sup> Overarching characteristics of the anti-lockdown movement, as well as the anti-vax movement, are hyper-individualism and border-less freedom that disregard the realities of interdependency and vulnerability to one another. When freedom trumps vulnerability, individualism becomes warfare. Being care-free, that is, being free to not care, has to be understood as a view of the subject to be without obligations to others and to have the right to exercise, autonomously and independently, one's own freedom. Such a conception of a care-free subject is dangerously close to a care-less subject that disregards and willfully ignores interdependencies in vulnerability. Carelessness and warification make explicit the acute poverty of political imaginaries beyond war and the state of exception, and points to a much deeper and fundamental political crisis owed to the historical lack of having developed political imaginaries based on freedom in interdependency and mutuality of care.

At the same time, it is, of course, crucial to understand the very real danger of states turning authoritarian in pandemic times and abusing the state of exception. Critical political responses with that very aim included close monitoring and reporting on the use of the state of exception by different supra-national and intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, and bottom-up individual-based activism. Human rights organizations, such as Human Rights Watch, immediately criticized that the far-right ethno-nationalist Hungarian president Viktor Orbán “used the pandemic to seize unlimited power.”<sup>45</sup> A day after the report on Human Rights Watch, on March 24, 2020, the Council of Europe Secretary General Marija Pejčinović Burić wrote an official letter to Viktor Orbán to offer “expertise and assistance” to ensure that “democracy, rule of law and human rights” will be safeguarded in Hungary.<sup>46</sup> The Council of Europe Secretary General clearly differentiated between legitimately taking “drastic measures” to protect public health and restricting “a number of individual rights and liberties enshrined in constitutions and in the European Convention on Human Rights” and the situation in Hungary, which presented the threat of an “indefinite and uncontrolled state of emer-

gency” which “cannot guarantee that the basic principles of democracy will be observed and that the emergency measures restricting fundamental human rights are strictly proportionate to the threat which they are supposed to counter.”<sup>47</sup> International non-governmental and civic organizations closely monitoring and tracking the impact of Covid-19 measures on public political life, civic space, civil society, basic freedoms, and human rights include, among others: the *Covid-19 Civic Freedom Tracker* set up by the International Center for Not-For-Profit Law and the European Center for Not-For-Profit Law; the *Global Monitor of Covid-19’s impact on Democracy and Human Rights* by IDEA, the inter-governmental organization International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance; *Tracking the Global Response to Covid-19* by Privacy International, the UK-registered charity dedicated to promoting the human right to privacy; *#Tracker\_19* by Reporters Without Borders, a Paris-based non-profit and non-governmental organization that promotes and defends freedom of information.<sup>48</sup> Their work is crucial, and constructive, to understanding how civic life was impacted on by Covid-19 conditions. This work also invites reflection on the fact that governments did not immediately set up provision for new digital civic spaces or think of other possibilities for public political participation in times of a pandemic, when physical distancing makes it difficult to gather in public space. There has not been any news on states offering free broadband internet to all those living in their territories or on states envisioning the digital realm anew as public space together with their citizenry.

The state of exception re-defines the ways in which people are able to act as political beings. What we do not see in philosophical responses like those provided by Agamben and in public protests against governments and their response to the pandemic are caring ways forward. Such philosophy and such protests are warring and violent and offer no alternative political ideas as to how states, governments, or municipalities can better ensure civil liberties in pandemic times. Calling for unlimited rights to freedom fails the fundamental right to care for oneself and others, which has to be understood as mutually inseparable. Such philosophical opinion-making does not provide constructive thought on how to enact differently a new pandemic “space of appearance”, which, in the sense of political philosopher Hannah Arendt, is understood as “the reality of the world [...] guaranteed by the presence of others”.<sup>49</sup> When our close presence can become a threat to others, when their close presence can become a threat to us—in short, when we are a threat to one another, co-presence is not an expression of freedom but an expression of threat, danger, and risk. This requires novel pandemic approaches to thinking of presence and ap-

pearance through forms of distance as caring in the name of mutual protection. What is needed are new forms of civic space and public thought outside of frames of warification and violence, supported by a new political philosophy in favor of public imaginaries, and articulations, of care. Politics has not been built on public imaginaries of care. Historically, political oratory has not supported the development of such public imaginaries of care. The pandemic proclamation of the state of exception tied to the political metaphor of war led, as we have seen, to continued and even deepening warification of the mind.

### War and Illness: Political Metaphors in Crisis

War and illness have a shared history of serving as metaphors. While all metaphors have political implications, which can be studied by turning to the critical framework of the politics of metaphors, war and illness-based metaphors have a special role in political rhetoric. Used to influence public opinion and to shape political imaginaries, metaphors in political oratory are used as powerful rhetorical means to compel global publics or national electorates to view social, economic, environmental, or historical realities as well as the political response to them in a very specific way. Metaphors in political oratory appeal both to reason and to emotion. Periods of crises, in particular, lead to the increased use of political metaphors. “Punitive notions of disease have a long history,” as Susan Sontag remarked in *Illness as Metaphor*.<sup>50</sup> Equally, curative notions of war or combat have a long history. And both disease and war, as they are deeply connected to notions of threats posed by invaders or enemies, have been central in the arsenal of metaphors used in the political rhetoric of warfare. US American presidents have mobilized war as political metaphor, presenting war as a political solution to societal crises or problems. In his First State of the Union Address US President Lyndon B. Johnson proclaimed that “this administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America.”<sup>51</sup> Since then, the militaristic rhetoric of declarations of war against crises and disease has played an important role in public political speech. One may think, here, of the prominent example of the ‘fight’ or the ‘crusade’ against cancer.<sup>52</sup> Yet the metaphorical political traffic between war and disease at the intersections of governance, policy, public health, and science are much older. When physician Robert Koch, government advisor at the Imperial Health Office in Germany, worked on measures to contain the cholera outbreak in Hamburg, he “characterized the cholera vibrio as an

‘invader’”.<sup>53</sup> At the same time, articulations of the connections between diseases, politics, and the military extend beyond figures of speech. In particular, with the beginnings of a broader notion of security during the last decade of the twentieth century, as for example in the 1994 Human Development Report, disease was understood to form part of security.<sup>54</sup> Within this changing political understanding of epidemics and this expanded understanding of threats to security that began to “regard microbes as threats to the security of states and to the international order”, war metaphors remain the dominant historical narrative. Frank M. Snowden, for example, stated that the World Health Organization took major steps in the 1990s to prepare “for the ongoing siege by microbial pathogens”.<sup>55</sup>

In a 1989 essay published in the journal *History and Memory*, historian Omer Bartov states the following on the “reality and the heroic image in war”:

War is essentially a military confrontation between two armed groups or organizations of men; yet at the same time, war seems to present an image of heroic individuals upon whose supreme qualities its outcome depends. Whereas the former image denotes an impersonal mass, the latter implies the centrality of personal valor.<sup>56</sup>

The political rhetoric for a common war against the virus strongly mobilizes around individuals upon whom the outcome depends. Following this logic, winning the war and defeating the virus depends on the frontline. War provides the frame through which the common good of pandemic care is viewed, and the pandemic imperative is articulated as an ethics of unity against the common enemy. The global frontline of care, which is the focus of the next chapter, is cast as a heroic effort in the pandemic war. Disregarding completely the historical and contemporary gender realities of war, war casts a heroic image of the exploited, exhausted, and feminized care workforce, speaking to the supreme qualities expected of the workforce and its personal valor on which others depend for their life and survival. Care workers are viewed as pandemic war heroes. The metaphor of war makes care work a national and global war duty and subjugates care to war. Fighting the virus renders it evident that some have to fight harder in this war than others, and that those in need of essential care are in fact fully dependent upon those who are seen as the ones who will fight the fight with them, who will fight the fight for them. The realities of war speak of interdependency, reliability, and the extreme vulnerability of life to death. At the same time, the use of war as metaphor overwrites vulnerability with necessary sacrifice and the myth of heroism. The cunning of the politi-

cal use of the metaphor of war for the pandemic situation is the mobilization of the term's heroic imaginaries, while simultaneously it renders the realities of the state of exception, also known as martial law, inevitable, as humans are faced with a war waged against them by deadly pathogenic microbes.

## Feminist Worry: War and Care

As a feminist, as a pacifist, as a realist who still tells herself every morning that it is possible to believe in the potentiality of hope, and as a mother of two sons who were found unfit for the army and celebrated the day this was determined during the obligatory military draft process for men in Austria, where we live, I was worried to the extreme about this general turn to war in pandemic times. War is based on the logics of annihilation and extinction. War causes trauma, grief, and pain. War realities are death-making realities. As a feminist theorist and an educator, I propose feminist worry as a lens through which to view humans in relation to their response to the world. *Feminist worry is personal and political*. It is an activity of relating to knowing and understanding. Worry has a specific relation to temporality, we worry about what might happen. Worry has a specific relation to others, as we worry for them. What interests me in proposing feminist worry as a method useful to critical cultural analysis are the close etymological and semantic connections with care, curiosity, and cure. Historian, artist, and theorist of visual cultures Jill H. Casid writes that “care derives, according to the OED [*Oxford English Dictionary*], from the common Germanic and Old English *caru* for trouble and grief.”<sup>57</sup> Drawing on Casid, art historian and educator Carla Macchiavello writes that such “deep concern and sorrow” can “be manifested as providing aid to someone and sometimes even a cure [...] and an emphatic response to others’ troubles leading to action.”<sup>58</sup> Understanding that the etymological roots of curiosity are closely linked to *caru*, worry, I read the following by Donna Haraway as an invitation for feminist worry: “Caring means becoming subject to the unsettling obligation of curiosity, which requires knowing more at the end of the day than at the beginning.”<sup>59</sup> Worrying about something and worrying about others also means knowing more and differently at the end of the day. At once epistemological and ethical, feminist worry thus leads to wanting to know and to care, otherwise and differently. Cultural theorist and political philosopher Erin Manning observed that “care carries a weight, a responsibility. It is both worry and attunement to. It is *caru* – anxiety, sorrow, grief. It is *karo* – lament – and *kara*

– trouble.”<sup>60</sup> Ethics, the desire to know, and epistemology, curing and healing and the labors of care all converge in feminist worry. Approaching the political metaphor of war with feminist worry requires not only the grief caused by engagement with “hegemonic thought”, in which “the metaphor of war has acquired a solid place”, but also opening up painful and troubling questions that have to do with how being human is understood in terms of political oratory and the realities of politics.<sup>61</sup>

Over the period of writing this book, there were continuous updates on the counts of Covid-19 cases and deaths worldwide. In August 2021, close to 4.5 million people had lost their lives to the virus. About a year later, in July 2022, “Nearly 15 million people around the world have died from the impact of COVID directly or indirectly during the first two years of the pandemic. That is the estimate from a new report by the World Health Organization. It is also nearly three times higher than governments have reported publicly so far.”<sup>62</sup> How can war, which always means killing and mass death, provide the best possible political answer when life is in peril and millions of people are dying because of the pandemic? How can anyone think of war as a cure when faced with pandemic mass death? How can it be that war is seen as a solution to disease and helpful for the prevention of death? What about the gendered and racialized dimensions of this political mobilization for war? What does the use of the war metaphor tell us about the long-spanning legacies of the warring mind and warification as a way of relating to ourselves, to others, and to the world?

War has, of course, long been a feminist concern, or a feminist worry, as I have proposed to call it. Large parts of historical as well as of contemporary feminist and women’s movements can be understood as peace movements. Feminist aims in these struggles have, of course, not been unified. While some strands of feminist and women’s movements are dedicated to permanent peace seeking to end all wars by “addressing the root causes of violence with a feminist lens”, others have been fighting for the inclusion of women in the army, from which women had been historically excluded.<sup>63</sup> Historically, war has been gendered masculine. The war/masculinity bind has shaped the historical stages of patriarchy as patriarchy transformed by and through the paradigms and realities of coloniality based on the violent domination and exploitation of humans and nature as resources in the name of profit. War renders masculinity toxic. As licensed therapist and clinical psychologist Andrew Smiler explains in the book *Is Masculinity Toxic?* that men have been defined through the exercising of social dominance, which has given rise to what the author defines as “masculinity ideology”.<sup>64</sup> This masculinity ideology

is firmly tied to the ideas around the military and the belief system of war. Even today, masculinity is widely imagined through “the military model”.<sup>65</sup> Every historical reality and every philosophical theory of politics can be understood to contain a perspective of war and, at the same time, to be characterized by the deep meaning of the idea of war. The military is seen to be a service of and to the nation state, and military service, which is obligatory for the male population in many countries around the world, forms part of the modern institution of citizenship. In his theory of citizenship developed after World War II, sociologist T. H. Marshall elaborates in his social philosophy of citizenship how citizenship structures the social relations and rights and obligations between individuals and the state. These obligations include “paying taxes, insurance contributions and military service”.<sup>66</sup> Joan Tronto remarks in her observations on Marshall’s theorization of welfare that, in the second half of the twentieth century, the ideal of citizenship was no longer based on the model of the “soldier” but on the model of the “worker”.<sup>67</sup> Neither the soldier nor the worker stays at home. The soldier goes to war and the worker goes to work. All others are homemakers, who stay behind at home, where their task is to take care of all those who depend upon it.

In the formation of Western genealogies of ideas and political consciousness, this divide between the so-called public, concerned with the interests and purposes of community and state, and the so-called private, focused on the basic physical needs and routines of everyday care in the life of individuals, can be traced back to Aristotle’s philosophy of politics and of the state. Hannah Arendt’s *The Human Condition* is at once an elaboration on and extension of Aristotelian lines of thought. Everything to do with basic human needs, all matters of physical survival, were considered not to be of the state, not to be of public importance, but left to be organized privately. Historically, all those whose laboring bodies were responsible for providing life and sustenance, who, in the Greek polis, included “women”, but also “slaves, servants and others”, were “considered a threat to public life”.<sup>68</sup> The legacies of this division, which is central to Western thought, of course long predate modernity but have gained ultra-prominence with the separate spheres model since the beginning of the industrialized period. The care/dependence bind is the social and material expression of the separate spheres model with its private-public divide, through which, quite paradoxically, all those upon whose labor others were fully dependent for their bodily existence were cast as dependents, whereas those whom they sustained through their care were considered independent. Independence guaranteed access to public life. Dependence, on the

other hand, meant exclusion from active participation in the dimensions of public life, of which one of the most prominent legal expressions is the status of citizenship, which is characterized by the entanglements and conflicts that run through the provision of essential care and sustenance, dependence, power, and independence. These phenomena resulted in social realities in which those marked by their gender, their sexuality, their ethnicity, their race, their social status, class, or caste were essentialized as necessarily having to perform this work, whereas those who were free to choose not to perform this work were seen as more powerful and superior. Those who were made to perform the essential work of sustenance and care were largely excluded from public office, from the vote, from military service, and from access to paid labor. The knowledge of those who had to worry about everyday human needs and physical and emotional concerns—those who were, therefore, closest to care, curiosity and cure—were excluded from the public realm of politics. Conversely, this means that politics has profoundly suffered from this lack of worry that only comes with the deep knowledge of care, sustenance, and everything to do with everyday life and survival.

In historical terms, “war” has been understood as central to the “birth [sic!] of the nation state”.<sup>69</sup> The death system of war is a key metaphor in the political imaginaries of the formation of the nation state. Politically, war is understood as an act of birth. The political imaginaries of war shaped the political realities of how nation states were formed. Wars need militaries and armies. War is fully entrenched in the making of the modern institutions of the nation state, their tax systems, their bureaucracies, and their exclusionary notions of citizenship. War is also connected to modern public health as the “military model of public health became hegemonic”.<sup>70</sup> These systems of state hierarchies and state dependencies, states as dependent upon militaries, tax payers, and public bureaucracies are marked by the notion of separate spheres. Those who contribute to protecting the state and keeping it running were considered to visibly contribute to the purpose of the nation state’s public interest, whereas those who take care of all the things which are not part of this public machinery remained invisible in the private territories of care. Yet in times of war it becomes more apparent than ever that care is essential and that those who perform the labors of keeping life alive are of utmost importance to those who serve the nation state’s public interest. Those going to war fully and entirely depend upon all those who take care of the military’s care needs, who take care of the wounded, sick, and tired soldiers, who take care of the hin-

terland with civilians under attack and suffering physical, mental, emotional exhaustion and massive pain.

Historically, powerful states expressed their hegemony to the world through military superiority and strength. It was never part of public and political imaginaries that powerful states can express such hegemony to the world through care superiority, through strength produced by better care. For the military power they needed in order to ensure territorial independence, self-determination, protection, and security, nation states relied on those who worked toward those ends in unity, obedience, and discipline. The realities and atrocities of war make it abundantly clear that the bodies of soldiers are at extreme risk and exposed to their own vulnerability, to the very real war threats of injury, disease, and death. Therefore, the physical, material, and ecological dimensions of war are linked to the physical, material, and ecological dimensions of care provided under the conditions of war. The most depressing and most revealing term cannon fodder makes it very clear that the lives of soldiers are at risk in times of war, that they are expected to sacrifice their lives, to fight, get injured, or even die for their nations. At the same time, nations are tasked to take care of their soldiers in times of war. Those who are at war are in extreme need of care. The history of war has been written as the public history of nation states. But the provision of care, including the very specific expectations concerning how care is thought of, produced, and maintained under the conditions of war, has largely been wiped from historical record. With much feminist attention focused on the gendered, sexualized, and racialized dimensions of the hegemony of the separate spheres model and on analyzing the implications of this model on men's and women's lives, and also on the theoretical understanding of masculinities and femininities in philosophical, political, and social concepts of subject formation, the equally crucial dichotomy—namely, the military-civilian dichotomy—has remained largely overlooked in its importance to the economies, politics, and ethics of care. We have to extend the notions of the separate spheres and the public-private dichotomy to dimensions of the military-civilian dichotomy if we are to gain a more complex perspective on the gendered entanglements of the politics of war and care as they intersect the public, the private, the military, and the civilian dimensions of social life.

This deep-running, yet not fully grasped, interconnectedness between war and care is central to why the idea of war and militarist rhetoric are used in public appeals to the global community of nations around the world in times of global emergency. That said, there has been much feminist scholarly work

to recover the histories of war as part of women's history, and as central to women's lives globally. Feminist scholars across many disciplines including history, anthropology, sociology, political philosophy, political economy or international relations studies have examined the gendered dimensions of war and the different impact war has on defining masculinities and femininities, on men's lives and women's lives. Yet the feminist focus on war has not fully located war in the historical formation of social expectations, norms, obligations, duties, and responsibility that concern the provision of care. The ideas that inform the ethos of war have not informed the study of the ideas and the ethos of care.

Even though it is well understood that, for example, "one of the jobs most transformed by war was that of the nurse", feminist perspectives have not viewed the realities and the imaginaries of war as most influential to the understanding of care in historical and theoretical terms.<sup>71</sup> War produces care in very specific ways. The warification of care, the obligations for sacrifice as well as the endurance of violence, have to be much better understood as part of the long-spanning expectations of, and pressures on, care. Theories of care have to take care out of the home and follow care into the war, into the battlefield, into what is called the home front. Overcoming the effects of the structure of public/private and military/civilian dichotomies on the ways in which realities are studied and theorized has to be continuously recast as central feminist worry in scholarship. Again, language and the deep meaning transported through words and metaphors as a specific form of public philosophy under the umbrella of historical semantics offer excellent starting points for taking feminist worry into the field of study. The term home front captures and expresses the deep connection between war and care. This coinage originated during World War I and, according to the Merriam Webster dictionary, refers to "the people who stay in a country and work while the country's soldiers are fighting in a war in a foreign country." Women's contributions to the home front during World War I did not go unrecognized. The Wikipedia entry on the "home front during World War I" even goes so far as to state that women's "sacrifices" were recognized "with the vote during or shortly after the war, including the United States, Britain, Canada (except Quebec), Denmark, Austria, the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden and Ireland."<sup>72</sup> This is fully in line with the state logic that all those who, like soldiers, leave their homes and wage war for their countries are included in full citizenship and all aspects of public life. If women's suffrage is understood as the recognition by their states of women's central importance to the home front and their sacrifices

during World War I, then granting women the vote is incorporated into an androcentric and state-centric historical narrative and viewed as an outcome of women having received a reward for their contribution to men's history of waging war, rather than as an outcome of the women's movement fighting for the vote. Following the realities of care beyond the domestic realm to which perspectives on care are often confined and expanding the understanding of care as having been shaped by the histories of war is helpful to understanding that care was not only the reason for exclusion from politics proper and subjected to economic exploitation, but is also a component part of the public interests and the public purpose of the state. Locating the realities of care in war, which is always an attack on life and nature, expands the philosophical understanding and theoretical perspectives of care.

The violence of war gives rise to extreme needs of care, both in times of war as well as in the aftermath of war. Violence heightens the risk of being made vulnerable and wounded. Violence increases the need for care. Violence is bound to vulnerability, and the use of "violence against the enemy is part and parcel of every militarist system."<sup>73</sup> The perpetration of violence exploits the existential human condition of vulnerability and "injurability".<sup>74</sup> Judith Butler has written widely on vulnerability and injurability as they matter to existential precariousness. Butler argues that humans are "all subject to one another, vulnerable to destruction by the other, and in need of protection through multilateral and global agreements based on a recognition of shared precariousness."<sup>75</sup> What we all need protection from, being exposed to the vulnerabilization of life and its mortality through the violence wrought by war, is, paradoxically, what war and the logic of militarization rest on. Also, the realities of the violence committed in the name of war increase tremendously the need for care. This is the "common human vulnerability"<sup>76</sup> which, for Butler, presents the ontological condition for a politics in common, and in my view for an ethics of care. Politics needs to be based on an acceptance of shared human vulnerability, and out of this, the political structures and material infrastructures necessary to caring for and protecting livability as a common good must be built. Butler's insight into the ontological condition of vulnerability and injurability is in fact exploited through the politics and realities of war, which are based on the possibility of the injurability of the enemy and even the complete annihilation of the enemy. As we are vulnerable to one another we are at risk of being injured by the other and of injuring the other. Butler writes that "we each have the power to destroy and to be destroyed."<sup>77</sup> Therefore, there is need for protection from this power of destruction.

Joan Tronto has written about dimensions of the state and of the institution of citizenship, which is legally enshrined through the nation state, in relation to protection and to care. Her argument is that protection has historically been gendered as a male obligation and care as a female duty. From this it follows that protection was understood on many, but not on all, levels as a public obligation, while care, on the other hand, was understood on many, but not all levels as a private duty. "Protection of the body politic from its enemies, external and internal, has always been part of the responsibility of citizenship."<sup>78</sup> The premise of citizenship is the promise of protection. The promise of protection rests on the realities of the militarization of this protection delivered through the army and the police. The nation state has created these historical institutions of the army and the police for the protection of its citizenry against external and internal enemies. Protection and care are understood by Tronto to shape two central dimensions of the public and private dichotomy, which, as I argued earlier, has to be understood as the dichotomy between the military and the civilian.

According to Tronto, to be part of delivering protection offered a pass from care, not only effectively separating protection and care from each other along the lines of class, gender, race, sexuality, and status of protection, but also, in a strange way, obliterating the fact that those who are obliged to protect are much more in need of care than others, in need of urgent and intensive care as they are exposed to their injurability and the capability of being destroyed by those seen as external or internal enemies. In reading together Butler's thought on ethics, which proceeds from ontological vulnerability, and Tronto's thought on care, which is based on the ontological dependence upon care, we can begin to expand further ethical thought. Finding themselves open to vulnerability and therefore at risk of being injured, those who are there to fulfil the public service of protecting the state and its citizenry are, in fact, very often being made vulnerable and are consequently in need of extreme care. We therefore have to study the relations between those who protect and those who care as relations that were shaped in such a way that they were perceived to be of uneven dependence, with those tasked with protection held to be more important and more powerful than those tasked with care. Yet, as has become most abundantly clear, they cannot be without each other, as all humans are reliant upon care in even more fundamental ways than upon protection. Care is tied to the realities of the body. Our bodies cannot live and survive without care for sustenance and basic needs. Without air, water, food, or sleep, bodies die. The need for care is part of the human condition. Without care, no human life.

Protection from external or internal enemies is needed by our bodies, but it is not a need that originates from our bodies, but a need produced by political and social conditions imposed upon our bodies. As political decisions and social processes continue to define realities through ideas based on the paradigm of enmity, histories, and of nations, the lives of their citizenry and the landscapes in their territories are being defined through structures that create internal and external enemies. Protection and violence have to be understood as most closely related. Acts of protection are often closely bound up with acts of violence committed by the police or by the military in the name of protection. Thus, protection, paradoxically, results in the normalization of violence and the militarization and securitization of everyday life. Therefore, amid our exposure to the risks of deadly violence and infection because of the climate catastrophe and the pandemic catastrophe, new political imaginaries are very much needed for organizing ways of taking care of protection, to be better protected against the old kinds of protection that have made us more vulnerable to our vulnerability and have exposed us to intrinsic and endemic violence.

As a *feminist worrier* I raise the following questions in order to prompt reflection on the problems posed by the normalization of violence through militarized imaginaries and realities in protection. What if those who are there to protect turn their violence against those upon whose care they are dependent? What if those who provide much-needed care to those who protect are being forced to do so? What if those who care cannot protect themselves while they care? What if those who care cannot care for themselves, because they are burdened with and completely exhausted by the care for others? What if the relations between protection and care are rendered vulnerable and violent?

The understandings of both the philosophical ideas and the historical realities of what is understood as protection and what is understood as care have to be located within these structures of enmity as they underpin war and the process of general warification. Political philosopher and public intellectual Achille Mbembe published extensively on enmity. Following his thought, we can see how protection from internal and external enemies, which I have shown not to be a primary bodily need but a socially produced need, has taken on ontological dimensions in what I propose to call today's world disorder. Mbembe writes:

In this depressive period within the psychic life of nations, the need, or rather the drive, for an enemy is no longer purely a social need. It corresponds to a quasi-anal need for ontology. In the context of the mimetic rivalry exacer-

bated by the 'war on terror', having an enemy at one's disposal (preferably in a spectacular fashion) has become an obligatory stage in the constitution of the subject and its entry into the symbolic order of our times.<sup>79</sup>

The need for protection, then, results from this entirely Man-produced ontology of enmity that gives rise to external or internal enemies. Care is now even more ontologically needed precisely because of this Man-produced ontology of enmity that structures societies. Therefore, dependence upon bodily care results from the conditions of bodies under the societal regime of general warification. Today, under climate change realities, the relation between care and protection has become much more complicated, with the air polluted, water poisoned, food pumped with hormones and chemicals, and sleep eroded because of 24/7 efficiency, environmental degradation or homelessness.<sup>80</sup> We also have to raise the question of who the enemy we are declaring war on actually is when we refer to the virus as the enemy. War, enmity, independence, and dependence are inextricably bound up with one another. Nestled inside of them are protection and care as they are defined in philosophical terms as well as shaped by real world conditions precisely through the ways in which their relation to violence and vulnerability is imagined and, ultimately, cared for.

## **Warification of the Modern Mind: Man-Made Planetary Death**

How, then, have we arrived at this warification of the modern mind, which today confronts us with the omnipresence of war as a key political metaphor for the production of care, upon which life essentially depends? "Enlightenment Man", to use feminist multi-species anthropologist Anna Tsing's coinage, who served as the universal model of the modern subject, fully relied on joining together the two central notions of independence and domination.<sup>81</sup> In political terms, this was achieved, or maintained, by the political mobilization of the threat of war and violence. The history of this subject has come to dominate the history of our infected planet. As we have seen, care is absolutely necessary to life and survival. This dependency upon care of course gets in the way of being and feeling truly independent. One can never be independent from one's own care needs. In order to create independence, care had to be thought through structures and organized through real world conditions in such a way that "living" and "nonliving" beings who were not considered to hold the universal subject position corporeally embodied by Enlightenment Man were made to care

for His independence.<sup>82</sup> Feminist anthropologist Elizabeth Povinelli has raised awareness of the enduring legacies of Western thought built on “how Aristotle distinguished between living and nonliving things”.<sup>83</sup> This distinction was crucial to the scale of hierarchies that came to define politics and economies governing independence in relation to care. While the focus of feminist and race-critical scholarship was largely on the sexist and racist dimensions of care hierarchies, including both the exploitation of those who had to care and their lack of access to care or the exploitation of their bodies for medical and health care experimentation, the environmental dimensions of this scale of hierarchies as they are most intricately connected to social dimensions are only more recently being examined in the context of feminist and race critical climate scholarship, Anthropocene studies, and political ecology. Recognition of the notion that care is provided by living and nonliving beings is crucial to an expanded understanding of the formation of modern violence against care.<sup>84</sup> This violence includes extraction and exploitation and has political, economic, and epistemic dimensions.

Silencing dependency on care was a precondition for independence. All those living and nonliving beings indispensable or considered necessary for Enlightenment Man's care were historically subjugated to the idea of their own incapacity for independence and of their natural capacity to care. At the same time, if all those living and nonliving beings tasked with providing the care indispensable to independence had resisted, revolted, or gone on strike, then this independence would have been made impossible. Thus, through its very dependence upon care, independence is open to being wounded. Enlightenment Man's independence relied on naturalizing and essentializing those who perform the labors of care and on holding them to be inferior. He also engaged in inventing political forms of permanent warfare to continue this subjugation and oppression and to affirm His own dominance. Exclusion from politics, governance, and access to the economy and education are the expressions of this politics of dominance and subjugation. This ultimately results in a deep structure of enmity. Independence and domination can thus be viewed as constitutive to Enlightenment Man's permanent war on those who (have to) care. Independence is potentially under threat, as indispensable care might not be made available; and all those living and nonliving beings providing this care can be understood as potential enemies to independence. Therefore, this structure of power, which is always already imbalanced and completely and utterly unequal, relies on the fact that those who are independent present the threat of violence to those are taking care of their needs which make them de-

pendent. Independence, then, can only be upheld through permanent domination over those who could always become enemies. The course of history was largely defined by the violent consequences of the human exceptionalism of Enlightenment Man, which made Man independent from care and from nature as both care and nature were transformed to serve the needs of Man. White supremacy, coloniality, and patriarchy resulted in the domination over all those humans who were not Enlightenment Man and were thus considered not to have progressed far beyond the status of nature.

Warification is entrenched in the deep structure of the philosophical ideas and political processes which made Enlightenment Man the universal model of what it means to be a fully human subject. Two very different feminist thinkers, the anthropologist Anna Tsing and the philosopher and environmental historian Carolyn Merchant, have provided important analyses and insights helpful to understanding the profound structural and material impacts of the ideas connected to Enlightenment Man's quest for domination and supremacy as a form of permanent war. They both introduce notions deeply connected to violence and destruction, with Anna Tsing introducing the notion of Enlightenment Man stalking the Earth and Carolyn Merchant titling her 1980 book *The Death of Nature*.<sup>85</sup> The pursuit of prey, as captured in the notion of stalking, and killing and murder, as associated with violent death, are closely associated with war and contributed to my understanding of colonial patriarchal modernity as a process of ongoing warification. In her 2015 lecture "A Feminist Approach to the Anthropocene: Earth Stalked by Man", Anna Tsing explains how Man took the place of God. "Man, the Enlightenment figure, arose in dialogue with God. He inherited God's universalism."<sup>86</sup> Enlightenment Man took the place that had been occupied by God as creator or God sending wars to punish humans. During the period of the Enlightenment, the planet began to be more fully understood to exist on the terms created by Enlightenment Man and seen to be there to serve the interests and, ultimately, the care needs of Men. Carolyn Merchant traces relations to the planet of nurturing and of domination. In her groundbreaking book *Death of Nature. Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*, one of the first studies in Western philosophy to trace the political, social, and economic structures that led to seeing nature and women as sources for extraction and exploitation, she uncovers nurturing and domination as the two fundamentally different and opposing perspectives through which humans have conceived of their relationship with planet Earth. Throughout, I use the word care to speak of life-making and life sustaining activities that not only sustain and maintain human life, but living and nonliv-

ing beings on the planet in general. I understand Merchant's use and understanding of the term nurture to be very close to my understanding of what care is and what care enables. Metaphors are, as stated earlier, conveyors of deep meaning. Merchant uses the word metaphor to describe the centrality of the two paradigms of nurturing and domination that have profoundly shaped the ways in which humans relate to the earth until the beginnings of the formation of the modern mind and the modern subject with the scientific revolution and the Enlightenment era. Merchant writes:

Both the nurturing and domination metaphors had existed in philosophy, religion and literature. The idea of dominion over the earth existed in Greek philosophy and Christian religion; that of the nurturing earth, in Greek philosophy and other pagan philosophies. But, as the economy became modernized and the Scientific Revolution proceeded, the dominion metaphor spread beyond the religious sphere and assumed ascendancy in the social and political spheres as well.<sup>87</sup>

Metaphors are articulations of human cosmologies, ontologies, spiritualities, philosophies, and systems of value. Therefore, the meaning of metaphors allows us to trace in historical terms how meaning evolves over very long time-spans. We may want to think of metaphors as tools of memory, as they constantly remind us how we make sense of the world. In historical hindsight, we come to understand today's pandemic, climate change, and the destruction of the environment to have been caused by the birth of modern Enlightenment Man and the beginnings of the long and violent "death of nature".<sup>88</sup> Domination and carelessness have resulted in a war on nature, the consequences of which we are living through now on our infected planet marked by the long-term ecological, material, and social destruction caused by the fact that Man's domination transformed humanity into a geological force that is causing ruination and mass death. The term Anthropocene was first proposed by atmospheric chemist Paul J. Crutzen and biologist Eugene F. Stoermer in the year 2000. They suggested the term "Anthropocene" as a designation for a new Earth age, to express the fact that Man has become a planetary force and that Man-made changes have taken on geophysical proportions which are disastrously affecting the future existence of the entire planet.<sup>89</sup>

In 2016, the interdisciplinary Anthropocene Working Group, which is part of the International Commission on Stratigraphy and was established in 2009 by their Subcommission on Quaternary Stratigraphy, voted that the Anthropocene is a new geological epoch. Over the last twenty years since the intro-

duction of the term Anthropocene, the ways in which humans view themselves in relation to the planet they inhabit have profoundly changed. Humans have come to understand themselves as a geological force, and, at the same time, as a cause of planetary catastrophe, mass extinction, and ecocide. The warification of modern consciousness based on structures of domination and extraction led to a war against planet Earth, which has not ended yet. Extinctions, loss of biodiversity, and deforestation, the brutal and deadly effects of the Man-made world on the planet are leading to the increased spread of diseases from animals to humans on this “frontier of human expansion”.<sup>90</sup> War leads to death.

There is currently no peaceful modern way of living with and in nature. If living with the planet Earth is to be understood as defined by the total sum of the conditions of possibilities for living, then why are we at war with these conditions, why are we at war with the very possibilities for living? If, as political scientist and theorist of ethics Ella Myers has stated, “political life is inevitably inhabited by an ethos”, then it is crucial to think about the reasons why so much of political life, which is to be understood as inextricably interconnected and interdependent with the total sum of eco-material, eco-social, geo-biological, and bio-material conditions of possibilities for living, is hinged on what I propose to call an ethos of war.<sup>91</sup> The larger questions that have driven this chapter are concerned with the political and social dimensions of a pervasive ethos of war that bears heavily on the ways in which humans imagine, and value, their being-in-relation with one another and with the planet. War generates and legitimizes death. War is an ideology of death. Asking how to understand better how we have arrived at an ideology of death as the best possible response to millions of lives at risk, this chapter has linked the response to the current pandemic to fundamental questions of the making of the modern subject, Enlightenment Man, which has given birth to the slow and painful process called death of nature with its anthropogenic climate catastrophe, the ongoing sixth mass extinction, and now pandemicide. Now, with the planet infected with Man-made war, new imaginaries for planetary care and cure are most urgently needed. The emergence of new forms of care feminism in response to the pandemic and the planetary need for care is the focus of this book’s third and last chapter.