

Chapter - V

Countering Ecofascism: Subversion and Survival in John Lanchester's *The Wall*

“The world in which we live today is a world of migrations- processes that happen across borders and in spite of the tendency of building new frontiers, new fences” (Oppermann 1).

The Wall by John Lanchester presents a dystopian portrayal of the future of humanity in a climatically changed world. The novel is anthropocentric both in the creation of the collapse as well as in the formulation of coping mechanisms for dealing with the crisis. It brings to light the question of ethics “concerning not only the extent of the human impact on the planet but also decisions about who or what is saved or left to die in a climatically changed future” (Mehnert 2-3). The dystopian representation extends to provide a “secondhand nonexperience” (4) to show how risk materialises and also how the interhuman conflicts are more chaotic than the planetary chaos. The chapter will discuss the environmental situation that has propelled the formation of ecofascist regime or as Lukas Meyer calls it a “threshold conception of harm” (qtd in Jafry 59) and how the characters resist ecofascism in order to bring about climate justice for climate migrants.

The novel depicts a dystopian world after undergoing a climatic catastrophe, wherein the world is broken into fragments and binaries which are designed to exercise power and control the mob. The world ‘After the Change’ can be distinguished glaringly from the world ‘Before the Change’ with respect to the Climate Regime or the Ecofascist Empire which has risen to power. The Wall acts not only as a physical representation of the outcome of heightened national security measures adopted but also as an expression of inhumane acts combined with xenophobic tendencies aimed at establishing totalitarianism. The rise in the number of climate refugees, and their consistent border defying

mechanisms are kept under control by the Wall which determines “the destinies of displaced peoples” (Oppermann 1).

The world “After the Change” is a world in which prolonged climate inaction has created havoc; politically, with the rise of the Ecofascist empire; economically, as wealth, power and the means to climb the social ladder are all drained into the hands of the elites; socially, as the divides not only oppress but also determine their survival, and lastly as an ethical standpoint, as justice has ceased to be free and accessible. The characters of the novel are unfairly doubly victimised both by the climate catastrophe, and by the unjust measures undertaken to cope with the same.

The Wall by John Lanchester, a dystopian portrayal of a world after a huge climate catastrophe revolves around the character Kavanagh and his fellow defenders who are forced to defend the wall. “The Wall” or the “National Coastal Defence Structure” (Lanchester 21) is built after the ‘Change’ with the intention of protecting the nation and its citizens from the overflow of refugees, labelled as the ‘Others’. The refugee influx after the major impact of climate change has given impetus to militant surveillance such as, citizens within the wall being micro chipped to monitor their activities, and naval and air forces always on guard to monitor the activities of the climate refugees.

The novel limns a world, where there is a lack in all aspects of life, and there is no element of wholesomeness. Literally, the characters live in extremities due to the unforgiving weather conditions, and metaphorically due to the vigilant totalitarianism. The choices and lifestyles of the citizens are predesigned, and a layman is left only with two choices: either to become a defender, and hope to rise above the ranks, or to become a breeder and be exempted from combat training or duty on the Wall. The latter choice though attractive is not opted easily as the present generation themselves are outbursts of anticipatory guilt, and refrain from the act of bringing more people into the world which is

spiralling towards doom. Like any other fascist regime, the elites and politicians have an upper hand and are living contradictions of the environmentalism that they preach.

The Wall depicts a climatically changed world, a society that is split into racial hierarchies and run by the elites, where citizens are given the choice to be either defenders or become breeders as the wall is not mighty enough to stand on its own. Migration is prohibited and Britain is barricaded with the aid of the “National Coastal Defence Structure” (Lanchester 21) to stop refugees’ border crossing and border defying mechanisms. The citizens are all micro chipped and for every ‘Other’ who gets in, a defender is stripped off the chip and is thrown into the sea. It anticipates the kind of future and governance that will inevitably spring in a ‘World after Change’. The novel presents a society that struggles to avoid death every day and relates to the readers as an extrapolation of present day fears revolving climate displacement and climate induced conflicts.

The ‘Change’ unanimously refers to climate change and its impacts felt across the globe. Though Britain seems to have escaped the threat of the same temporarily, there are countries where the change has not stopped. Under such vulnerable and victimising events, migration inevitably becomes contingent with survival. The climate refugees who defy the colossal structure of the wall and the political foundation that it is built on, subvert the climate regime in its entirety. The people within the Wall who are empathetic of the suffering of the desperate refugees, and who are also intensely dissatisfied with the principles the climate regime operates on, form the second group of people who try to subvert the authority. The characters fight for free mobility as the anthropogenic crisis has shifted the scale of impact into migrating just for a chance to life.

Britain chooses to self-isolate after the climatic catastrophe with the intention of keeping under control the flow of people and the decisions of who gets to benefit from the

habitability of the country. As the Change is not a single solitary event but a “process, a process that in some places, some unlucky places, has not stopped” (Lanchester 111). It has its ripples felt throughout the globe, thereby blurring the boundaries of the global and turning spaces into the earthly realm. This is heavily contested by the ecofascists as they combine xenophobic tendencies with the welfare of the environment, with the intent of protecting their race, their border, and thereby monitoring the flow of people in order to persistently display their supremacy. The supremacy is gained by immoral means as a developed country that has come out scot free despite leading to the climatic chaos, and also as ethically degrading governance amidst the numerous drowning refugees and victims of the rising tides.

The agricultural produce and dietary habits had changed after the ‘Change’, as the climatic wreck has forced the country to become self-reliant in all sectors. The dictum of self-reliance has played a vital role throughout dystopian imaginaries especially of post climate apocalypse depictions. For instance, in *The Butterfly Effect* by Rajat Chaudhuri, the four guiding principles of the darkland authority in the novel are fortitude, fellowship, flourish and fundamentals with the words “self-reliance” (23) written four times around the rim of the wheel. Like the dictum of most dystopian imaginaries of climate regimes, the ecofascist regime in the Wall also operates on the same principle of self-reliance which corrodes the foundation of justice. There are no traces of wildlife mentioned in the novel, and also no trace of meat in the dietary portion, which is an indicator of the extinction of animals and wildlife. As dietary portion is an indication of accessibility and they eat only what is grown in their land amidst the fluctuating weather events, their produce does not include meat. The produce they got before the change included almost everything as Kavanagh thinks it was like “science fiction, where they have a machine that just makes

stuff” (75), but produce after change has become minimal and monotonous just like life on the Wall as they had to eat only what survived the dwindling climatic conditions.

The world ‘After the Change’ has widened intergenerational gap caused due to the disparity, and is a world divided into factions where “there isn’t a single beach left, anywhere in the world.” (Lanchester 56) The system is further split into power hierarchies of the elites, politicians, defenders and breeders. The elites and the breeders enjoy a life of comparative ease as they are not thrown into the sea during the intrusion of the ‘Others’. Defenders form the majority of the population and are also on the lowest rung within the Wall, in spite of “more than three hundred thousand people involved in defending the Wall. That’s why everybody goes to the Wall, no exceptions. That's the rule” (Lanchester 34).

The failure of democracy arises from the collective assumption that the tenets of democracy cannot contribute to stability in the environment. The exploitation of freedom and decision making are considered to be the root causes of prolonged climate inaction, which the dictators, and the ecofascists have used to build their empire of totalitarianism “on the social irresponsibility of masses of people” (Reich 319). The democratic form of government in providing excess of freedom to act or indulge in prolonged inaction is said to have caused the climatic change, and the world ‘after the change’, had to resort to stricter measures to cope with the crisis. The ecofascist regime makes use of such a contradiction present in the human structure, “between an intense longing for freedom and fear of freedom” (322).

Opting for stricter alternatives to democracy is perceived as a turn from anthropocentric to ecocentric governance, but the ecofascist regime in *The Wall* is further biased as it functions merely as a totalitarian regime under the guise of protecting the environment. Like most radical environmentalists, ecofascists believe in overthrowing

democracy by replacing it with effective alternatives to protect the environment but on the darker side “they blame climate change on underdeveloped industrializing countries, multiculturalism, and overpopulation, with their solutions to these problems often being blatantly genocidal” (Hernandez).

The Wall employs similar destructive implementation of environmentalism that corrupts any trace of democracy, humanity and pollutes any institution of justice. Fascist politics lures its audiences with the temptation of freedom from democratic norms while masking the fact that the alternative proposed, is not a form of freedom that can sustain a stable nation state and can scarcely guarantee liberty. A state-based ethnic, religious, racial, or national conflict between “us” and “them” (Stanley) can hardly remain stable for long.

Sam Moore and Alex Roberts in *The Rise of Ecofascism: Climate Change and the Far Right*, delve into how climate change has the potential of producing other kinds of crises and how each crisis will be encountered by the governance in complex and multifaceted ways. They define Fascism as “a political form that seeks to revolutionize and reharmonize the nation state through expelling a radically separate ‘Other’ by paramilitary means” (11). The fascist authority establishes dictatorship and divides citizens into groups which determine the participatory or non-participatory role that they play in the nation’s decisions. Fascist propaganda tends to duplicate the hierarchical pattern in the natural order into the social and political order of a country to create a society that is divided, discriminated, and tortured. They bring out how the political order of hierarchy and division is a mere exaggeration of the natural laws of division: “lessons of scarcity, competition and dominance” (Moore and Roberts 11).

The chapter titled “Towards ecofascism proper?” of the book makes a reference to Geoff Eley’s ‘gatedness as the emergent social paradigm’ and expands on the idea with

Christina Parenti's statement of how "There is a real risk that strong states with developed economies will succumb to a politics of xenophobia, racism, police repression, surveillance, and militarism and thus transform themselves into...neofascist islands of relative stability in a sea of chaos." (102) The regime in the novel has also succumbed to corruptive policies that lead to ethical compromises on both sides of the Wall.

Paul-Martin Fearon-Hernandez in "Beware of Ecofascism" brings to focus how fascism and ecofascism are separated by a thin line of what they use to obtain power, the latter rests on climate change to exert authoritarianism. Ecofascists further shift the focus of environmentalists, leftists, and liberals who are desperate to find a solution by "effectively brainwashing them into an ideology of racism, colonialism, and genocide". They reproduce the discriminatory benchmarks against which people, animals, and the entire ecology have been creating hierarchy to prioritise the survival of one over the other: mobility, power, race, colour, and so on.

The regime in *The Wall* operates in a purely fascist manner with no undercurrent of ecological concerns and just interventions for climatic stability thus affirming that the "authoritarian regimes are equally- if not more- responsible for environmental degradation" (Protopapadakis 598). Linkola argues that ecofascism is built on the destructive belief that the worst environmental disasters exist in democracies and dictatorship is considered to be superior as in such a regime, "the individual is always chained, one way or other. When individual freedom reigns, human is both the killer and the victim" (qtd in Protopapadakis 593).

Ecofascism is put forth to be ethically wrong by Protopapadakis, as he argues that ethics have been founded by humans for humans, and any kind of totalitarian measure that "deprives humans of any moral value in favor of the ecosphere and subordinates

individual well-being to the flourishing of the whole, does not seem to me to be an ethics at all” (599).

The salient feature that distances the world before and after the change is the implementation of an eco-fascist regime. The turn towards ecofascism, though meant to signify movement towards an epoch of ecocentric approaches, has in reality no traces of ecological welfare or environmental protection as all measures undertaken recenter the focus towards the human.

The fascist regime chooses to discard the foundation of ecological thought about interconnectedness of the human and the natural world. The climate proofing or climate coping mechanisms undertaken in the novel are not sensible as they redirect to the root cause of the climate apocalypse, anthropocentrism. By continuing to prioritise the human over the ecology, the climate regime indulges in a negative feedback loop of worsening the catastrophe through the coping mechanisms undertaken.

Under the guise of eco preservation, climate regime does not undertake measures to combat the crisis but worsens it trifold by implementing totalitarian measures and strict security measures; “This is the true legacy of ecofascism in power: genocide developed into a necessity under the cloak of environment protection” (Biehl and Staudenmaier 19). The world after the change is a world of binaries. Totalitarianism is built on the principle of divide and rule: by dividing people into factions and placing the factions in a hierarchical fashion, it takes the power off the people and deposits it on the hierarchical structure thereby making the dictator mightier. Guarding from the intrusion of ‘Others’ and not letting laymen rise up to the ranks of power by living in heightened vigilance is not the solution that will stop climate change, as climate change will not seize through a process of walling in and walling out but will transcend all aspects that are anthropocentric.

The regime was built on the idea that if it had curbed the anthropocentric tendencies, then the anthropogenic crisis might slow down. But it is ironic that the world, after the major effect of climatic havoc under the guise of being ruled by a system of liability and accountability does not actually emphasize a restoration of eco systems, does not indulge in climate proofing vulnerable areas or climate hotspots, and resists globally interconnected climate movements. Such a governing system falls a prey or rather achieves its motto by establishing totalitarianism, and by treating its citizens as subjects. The citizens are stripped off their basic human rights: right to speech and even their right to life; as Greta Thunberg says, “freedom of speech and the right to a peaceful protest and assembly are non-negotiable human rights. These must be a fundamental part of any democracy”.

The World after the change, which lies under the scrutiny of the fascist regime is an indicator of “pseudo scientific racism” (Biehl and Staudenmaier 8) as the execution of power and measures adopted to cope with the climatic crisis are all centered on the human “and to the belief that through his unique rational faculties man could essentially recreate the world and bring about a universally more harmonious and ethically just social order” (8). The government fails to realize that “the survival of the species, in turn, is only trivial compared to the survival of life on earth in general” (Protopapadakis 592). Such extremist anthropocentric measures taken up during the ecocentric downfall propels further damage to both. Murray Bookchin’s response at a seminar sheds light on the crux of ecofascism and the barbaric futurity that it holds:

an ‘ecological’ dictatorship would not be ecological- it would finally finish off the planet altogether. It would be the glorification, the hypostatization, of social control, of manipulation, the objectification of human beings, the denial of human

freedom and selfconsciousness, in the name of ecological problems...an 'ecological' dictatorship is a contradiction in terms, an oxymoron. (Biehl and Staudenmaier 37)

The World after the change is ordered in the following manner, which also dictates their power and participatory role in the country: the generation before the change occupies the top most rung of the hierarchical structure as they had been the cause of the climate regime yet are unaffected by the same as they do not have to serve as defenders, elites occupy the next position as they are exempted from duty as defenders and are also not thrown out of the Wall under any circumstance, followed by politicians who are privileged enough to be exempted from service on the Wall and are sole decision makers of the country whose decisions are uncontested and un-negated. Captain of 'the Wall', flight and coast guards, 'Breeders', 'Defenders', 'Help' and 'Others', form the lower part of the power ladder. The flow of power is from the former: elites and politicians, to the latter: defenders, citizens, and 'Others', and is always monopolized. Such a division of its citizens prevents participatory democracy and enforces totalitarianism without concern either for the human race in general or for the ecology; "Fascist politics covers up structural inequality by attempting to invert, misrepresent, and subvert the long, hard effort to address it" (Stanley).

The hierarchical set up reinforces the flow of power from the authorities placed above in the hierarchical set up and seeks to "undermine public discourse by attacking and devaluing education, expertise, and language" (Stanley) , this attitude is glaringly evident in the novel as the elites fly across the globe to discuss global matters that provoke climate concerns, and are drained with the responsibility of taking decisions solely, whereas the civilians are not allowed to form groups, express their views, or even decide whether to stay in the Wall or not. Kavanagh talks about how the elites exhaust aviation fuel by getting on planes to talk to the other members of the elite about the change, but as the

civilians are restricted from transparency about any political meeting, he expresses his doubt by admitting “at least that's what they say they do” (28).

The exclusionist tendencies begin with the elites and politicians excluding the other members of the faction, the captains excluding the defenders, and in the bottom most rung, the ‘Others’: who face brutality and are victimised as beings of climate hotspots, third world countries, lack of resources and security, and are bereft of all rights that might put them on the radar of citizenship. Britain in the novel reinforces the ideology “that the nation is under siege, that aliens are a threat and danger both within and outside their borders” (Stanley).

Under such a fascist agenda, the refugee narrative is excluded and is overwritten by impositions of power driven from resources, climatic stability, development, man power, and hierarchy. The ‘Others’ being placed in the bottom most rung, literally on lifeboats with scarce resources, and pleading and resisting the border security measures demanding their right to life by simultaneously placing their lives at the mercy of the climate regime is a clear indication that “these populations struggle through unspeakable horrors to reach safer shores. That even such people could be painted as fundamental threats is a testament to the illusory power of fascist myth” (Stanley).

Though the Wall has been interpreted as a testament of climatic injustice, it signifies more. The Wall is considered to be “a leap of imagination way beyond the limits of engineering feasibility” (Munro) built to control the issue of overpopulation. In most dystopian depictions of climate collapse, the issues of resource scarcity, starvation and so on arise due to the rise in population. *The Butterfly Effect* by Rajat Chaudhuri revolves around the ‘Super Rice Project’ which involves genetically engineered crops to combat the climatic catastrophes as well as feeds the rising population. The results of the crop are

degrading and further complicate the livelihood of the people. Likewise, the climate regime in the Wall is determined to avoid the issue by practising 'lifeboat ethics' which can be considered not unfair if it were not for two contradictions: the negligence of the ecology and its other inhabitants, and its encouragement of breeding.

In a world of global warming, when sea levels rise turning former citizens into hapless climate refugees floating in lifeboats desperately awaiting entry into a ship to prolong their survival, it will be the wealthy nations that will dictate who gets to live and who gets to be left stranded, bereft of any scope of survival. In a climatically changing world, lifeboat ethics will not escape the political monologues passed down to the citizens. "Wealthy nations will take the lifeboats while the poorest will be stranded in the water. They will continue to hoard resources and use authoritarian measures to redistribute them to a select few groups of people, allowing the rest of the world to fall into crisis" (Hernandez).

The Global North is seen as a lifeboat for the climate refugees from the Global South, who are victimised, dispossessed and degraded by the environment, poverty, and racism. The "flotilla of others" (Lanchester 11), floating in lifeboats sans physical, and social equilibrium are left with no other choice but to knock at the gates of the imperialist leader, begging for a chance to be let inside the lands of habitability. The developed first world nations, fortunately saved from the short term effects of climate change, practise lifeboat ethics which appear to be a double edged sword that is not only aimed at the climate refugees but also at their own order of responsibility of defenders, as for every other who is let in, a defender is thrown out. The dictum of the climate regime can be concluded as: "Complete justice, complete catastrophe" (Hardin 37).

The first world countries also shirk from their responsibilities by ignoring the people from the third world countries though it was their neglect, and degrading

contributions that have moved the planet from the epoch of the Holocene to the Anthropocene. The nations should have developed a climate campaign that is inclusive, and does not further victimize the already victimized by demonstrating “how all these crises are interconnected, and how the solutions could be too” (Klein 3).

The stringent population control measure practised of “One in, one out: for every other who got over the Wall, one Defender would be put to sea” (Lanchester 37), is not a true measure of lifeboat ethics as the pull factor into habitability is submission to the totalitarian authority. The pull factor that retains Defenders is sheer obedience to the totalitarian authority, and for the ‘Others’, complete submission follows, after their performance of insubordinate border crossing. The country operates on ultra-nationalistic measures but falls short in its intensity by tilting towards fascism and being the ‘Big brother’ rather than safeguarding its citizens. The lifeboat ethics practised equates the lives of the defenders and the ‘Others’, wherein the citizens feel deserted by their own country for which they serve by risking their lives on the frontline; “a tiny bit of luck here and there dividing them; taking turns to live, taking turns to die; all in the same boat. All the same really. Others, Defenders- what's the difference?” (93) The climatic wreck and the population control measures adopted bear close resemblance to Garret Hardin’s “Living on a Lifeboat”:

The poor of the world are in other, much more crowded, lifeboats. Continuously, so to speak, the poor fall out of their lifeboats and swim for a while in the water outside, hoping to be admitted to a rich lifeboat, or in some other way to benefit from the “goodies” on board. What should the passengers on a rich lifeboat do? This is the central problem of “the ethics of a lifeboat”. (37)

Throughout the novel, the border is denaturalized, as defenders who are thrown out, come face to face with the realities of climate change that the Wall tries to shy away

from, under the refuge of climate denial. The Wall is a standing, unwavering, solidified, and inhumane testimony of denial: climate denial, denial of the first world nations' responsibility, denial of responsibility of belonging to the species that must act as a primary geological force by taking up action to prevent climatic and thereby worldly disintegration. Cary Wolfe puts forth the need to identify what the environmental crisis demands from the humans, and it is believed that it is a rejection of "received conceptions of the human's place in nature, the very structures of thought that have anchored the ontological hierarchy of human and animal in the philosophical tradition" (qtd in Bladow and Ladino 199).

The deep ecology movement that arose in the late 1970s and early 1980s is known for its "position of uncompromising "biocentrism," as opposed to the "anthropocentrism" that puts humans at the center of and above the rest of terrestrial life" (Reed 226). This ecological framework assigns more importance to the ecology and the biosphere, and also stresses on the commitment of the humans to protect the nonhuman. The recognition of humans as a geological force: action plush, must be accompanied with a reiteration on the responsibility it holds, and the commitment it must express to the preservation of animal communities, and all resident species of the planet. The climate regime in the novel governs sans responsibility and ethical guidelines. It expresses a sheer neglect of multispecies justice and promotes the well-being of the elite humans. The regime sheds the responsibility through a monarchical, hierarchical set up that builds up the colossal structure, a physical representation of their brooding measures of climate denial taken up.

It washes away the ideologies that form the concrete impermeable walls, the political structures and the societal hierarchies that monitor the inflow and outflow, and the alarming swan song of humankind that it lets out. The main purpose of military camouflage is said to deceive the enemy as to the presence, position and intentions of

military formations but the defenders on the Wall do not use military camouflage as there is a stark contrast in the distribution of power. The defenders try to dress up in bright green uniform which is the opposite of the camouflage, as their intention is not to hide from the enemy but to try to be as conspicuous as possible; “the idea is that it will scare them and reassure us.” (Lanchester 27) The country indulges in ruthless, barbaric warfare, wherein it exceeds the boundaries of ethics and ends up falling under the radar of barbaric hunting down of beings that are reduced from the human.

The Wall, through its exclusion, inclusion, and seclusion from the rest of the world reproduces exclusionist tendencies. It reproduces xenophobia with every change of the placement of the margin of vigilance; defenders, who fail are ‘othered’ the same way as ‘Others’ are. The suffocating atmosphere provides no breather for the commotion free existence of people as they view each other as objects of threat that can banish their existence from a place of temporal habitability. Wendy Brown in *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty* puts forth in the following lines the multiplicities of threat and crises that enclosed and militarized settings lead to:

Officially aimed at protecting putatively free, open, lawful, and secular societies from trespass, exploitation or attack, the walls are built of suspended law and inadvertently produce a collective ethos and subjectivity that is defensive, parochial, nationalistic, and militarized. They generate an increasingly closed and policed identity in place of the open society they would defend...they contribute new forms of xenophobia and parochialism to a post national era. (40)

The Wall is a concrete, undissolvable, and powerful entity that is a reminder of the developed countries hiding behind the huge walls of climate denial. The country raises the walls as high as possible to shield itself from the rising tides of water and refugees, which is but a “manipulation of climatic conditions within a military diagram for power”

(Baldwin and Bettini 69). Climate denial, especially when it is impossible to ignore, is a manifestation of the ecofascist eye wash aimed at ensuring racial purity and neglect of 'climate debt', wherein "either the wealthy or the entire population of the wealthy states will be entrenched behind militarized sea walls.

The capitalisation of the 'Wall' is the direct reflection of anthropocentrism and the preference of human lives, over the other species'. It extends to the multiplication of binaries, hierarchies, and identities under the scrutiny of the fascist authority; "before the Wall and after the Wall" (Lanchester 59). The Wall creates other binary opposites of people, who are placed above in the internal hierarchy and those who occupy the bottom rung. The identity production and identity alteration that happen in the wall may not be possible without the determination of "an external "they" without producing a reactionary "we""(Brown 42), hence for every act of exclusion there are counter acts of internal exclusion produced that further strengthens the fascist hierarchy. The internalised hierarchy also includes the division of an 'us' and a 'them' that distinguishes coastal and navy guards, captains, defenders, and breeders apart due to the distributive injustice of power.

The Wall also contributes to the external hierarchy that decides who gets to live, and who deserves to be washed down into the sea: the people within the Wall and the 'Others'. The Wall is also a glaring reminder of the basis of postcolonial racism, due to the disparity between the first world countries and the third world countries. The first world countries are privileged enough to escape the gruesome impact of climate change in the short term and are also rich enough to shield from the flotilla of climate refugees, and the human- centric climate change adaptive measures. Such exclusionist tendencies indicate that the burden of bearing the manifestations of slow onset and sudden onset events of climate change in the short term will fall on the shoulders of the needy; "It is entirely

plausible to argue that the effects of climate change will be racialized, born disproportionately by people of colour. This claim is one of the pillars of climate justice. It is also correct to argue that climate change is a manifestation of racist political economy” (Baldwin and Bettini 14).

The rest of the population badly wanted to be one of the elites as Kavanagh expresses his yearning: “To go up above people, to be away from ordinariness, to live in the pure inhuman element of height and air...to be one of them and not one of us” (Lanchester 74). It is also doubted by the people that elites were exempted from service on the Wall as defenders because the “rich people rigged ID chips so that Help went to the Wall instead of them...we all suspected that there were rich and powerful people who got out of it” (109). The Wall is heavily bound by unethical measures and principles that are in stark contrast to the idea of participatory democracy, that there is no space for transparency. The ethically compromised, corrupt, and illegal measures practised had no way of meeting the day light or put through any test of punishment. Unjust measures became a way of life on the Wall. James, the politician though he too gets thrown out of the Wall in the end of the novel due to the breach, had been exempted from service on the Wall as he is one of the elites.

The Wall also does not offer any margin for interaction with the hope of reconciliation, forgiveness, acceptance or justice. It seals up all human margins capable of humaneness, closes away rooms for interaction, and forgiveness. It paves way for a life of “nothing but black and white, the rulebook or anarchy, nothing but the Wall and the Others and the always waiting, always expectant, entirely unforgiving sea” (Lanchester 48).

The Wall has emerged from the destruction of the sense of home, and the sense of security and warmth that are associated with home as Kavanagh says, “once you had spent

time on the Wall, you stop believing in the idea that anybody, ever, has no choice but to take you in. Nobody has to take you in. They can choose to, or not” (Lanchester 54). The Wall is a testament of their insecurity, and monotonous lifestyle reflected through the defenders’ chant that is melancholic, and nihilistic: “We’re on the Wall because...” (52). The Wall does not only contribute climate imaginaries but also spectacularises power structures by negating certain political imaginaries like democracy and has “contributed to the political subjectivity of those they encompass and those they exclude” (Brown 39).

The Wall maps the territory of Britain, where the sun has not set even amidst the rising sea levels, vanishing populations, extinct wildlife, and produce. Though the developed countries or first world countries, like Britain, are responsible for more than half of the climatic wreck, capitalism has further given them the upper hand as the burden is borne by the third world countries. The disproportionate impact, and unfair ways of letting the third world countries bear the brunt of the expense of decomposing the residue of the development trajectory of the already developed nations; paves way for ethical compromise.

The dilemma, faced by developing and under developed nations, of either embarking on the same development trajectory by staying indifferent to the toxic planetary residue, or to stay poor, and remain in the bottom rung of the power ladder, is the unresolvable question posed by imperialism. The unjust distribution of climate change events, along with unfair concentration of wealth and power reduces the stand of the political and the power of the human. Zimmerman’s thoughts resonate with the refugee crises reverberating political, postcolonial and other forms of discrimination

As hordes of desperate people from ecologically devastated and politically disintegrating Third World countries continue to pour into First World countries, some politicians will call for harsh measures to exclude immigrants, so as to

prevent them from reproducing the same ecological and political crises that they (allegedly) created in their abandoned homelands. (211)

The British heroic efforts of heightening national security is paired with maintaining the racial purity by keeping out the ‘Others’ and at the same time promoting breeding of “their race” to defend the Wall as the ‘Others’ cannot rise to become defenders but stay as slaves. Such systematic climate racism or climate apartheid allows “the powerful to discount the lives of the less powerful” (Klein 5). The reason behind the irony of encouraging breeding by giving exemptions and allowances to the civilians while practising ‘lifeboat ethics’ and stringent population policies, is the insistence on racial purity. The children of the ‘Others’ are separated from their parents as the children in extended exposure to their parenting are feared to be polluted. In an attempt to save the children, the figure of the ‘white saviour’ steps in to rescue the children by introducing them to the language, culture, and ways of life of the people within the Wall. The stringent population control measures fail its purpose when on one side, the regime encourages breeding of the same race and on the other side refuses to take in the climate refugees. All the tenets of the Ecofascist Empire are purely totalitarian with no trace of ecocentrism.

Rohan Chakravarty’s *Green Humour for a Greying Planet* brings out the same contradiction of how the issue of overpopulation resides only with respect to the third world countries and not the first world countries. Employing a comic figure of a first world politician as his mouthpiece, Chakravarty says “there are children and there are white children” (197) as a reply to the question posed on overpopulation being an issue only in developing or under developed countries.

The attitude of the white saviour complex, under the ramifications of climate change has functioned under the appearance of “Green god saviour complex” (Hernandez). Though there is a difference in the colour, the ideology executed remains the

same. It focusses on how white people especially those in influential ranks preach climate ethics and ecofriendly industries. Bill Gates in *How to Avoid a Climate Disaster* preaches about ecofriendly use of technology and less carbon emitting measures. He offers alternate ways of treading the development trajectory without leaving behind degrading residues like how the first world countries have done but he forgets to be mindful of how most of his polluting industries are all based in the Global South.

Edward Said in *Orientalism*, a work celebrated for its contribution to postcolonial studies has also delved into the construction and the transactions between the Orient and the Occident. ‘Othering’- what is described in *Orientalism* as “disregarding, essentialising, denuding the humanity of another culture, people or geographical region” (Said 108) can also be traced in the novel. The refugees who await seeking entry into the country are ‘othered’ in postcolonial terms as most of them are from the Global South, which echoes the division between the occident and the orient. The establishment of who constitute the ‘Others’ in the novel gradually leads to transgressions like “violent expulsion, land theft, occupation, invasion. Because the whole point of othering is that the other doesn't have the same rights, the same humanity, as those making the distinction” (Klein 4).

The sea acts as a metaphor that like its fluid nature dilutes and erodes the identity of people, fluctuates the power relations, flickers the signs of life and death, and becomes the common fluid ground wherein identities dissolve, power deforms only to take up the shape of something new. The sea operates “in the imaginary as surface on which personal, nation state and indeed imperial interests got to be imposed” (Baldwin and Bettini 105). The unmarked waves, demark the territories made by the ‘man’ to accommodate all not by inclusionist measures but by isolationist tendencies. The fluid entity of the sea, slowly eroding aspects of justice, brings to the upfront the “question of race through a focus on

the sea: the sea as a cultural reference point, the sea as bearer of racial meaning and the sea as material force” (Baldwin and Bettini 14).

The binary of the people within the Wall and people outside the Wall has been intensified through the comparison of the sea and the coast and what they represent. Interpretation of the Wall and the coast as signifiers of greater meaning of identity is brought out through the concrete wall that blocks out the sea and its components, and also controls the mobility of the people within the Wall. Jimmy Packham in “Boundaries-belonging and coastal community in contemporary British fiction” has analysed the coast and how the coast has been represented as a “space that illuminates Britain’s relation to the wider world- as a potent site to explore anxieties of belonging, nationhood and national identity” (1). He proceeds to interpret the coast as an “ecotone” (2) as it is the overlapping of two distinct ecological zones. Such overlapping is said to produce life and death, literally and culturally. Coastal studies further analyses the coast with the discriminatory practices that are done “as if its peripheral relationship to the land has reinforced its peripheral treatment culturally” (qtd in 2).

The changing world has brought in the modern form of slavery, wherein voluntarily submitting oneself to the role of the help has become the only alternative to dying. Surveillance capitalism further chains them down as a chip is inserted to monitor their activity. The intention of the climate regime in reproducing the power relationships between the slave and the slave holder bears a close resemblance in turning the entered refugees into helpers in the novel. *Life Adrift: Climate Change, Migration, Critique* brings to light “another related aspect of racial power: the way that enslaved and racially subjugated bodies always represent the possible dissolution of white supremacy.” (Baldwin and Bettini 15)

The journey taken up by the climate refugees, fleeing their residence seeking habitability, is horrific and miserable. Kavanagh tries to empathise with the refugees by shifting places mentally to understand “what it would be like to be an Other, floating in the dark, in some makeshift boat or raft or an inflatable, staring at the shoreline, looking at the Wall... You would hardly be able to remember the last time you were warm or dry or safe” (Lanchester 65).

The negligence of the climate refugees by the climatically stable countries is a stark evidence of the negligence of climate debt and responsibility. The question of ethics in a postcolonial world witnessing the impact of climate change events is the attitude of the first world countries believing that they do not need to pay the ‘climate debt’ as the burden has fallen on the third world countries. The first world nations are morally lost as they seclude themselves from both the responsibility of saving the planet as well as from that of helping the fleeing climate refugees. Kavanagh expresses how the defenders viewed the ‘Others’, “I remember thinking: we don’t owe them anything” (Lanchester 66).

Life Adrift: Climate Change, Migration, Critique unravels histories and narratives of oppression and genocide to lay emphasis on the role that the oceans played as “a veritable graveyard of human disposability. They speak to the untraceable histories of those violently uprooted from their homes...or today's migrants putting themselves in a truly perilous position since at least it appears more secure than what was being fled.” (Baldwin and Bettini 66)

Through such histories of genocide and oppression, migrants who bear the mark of threat and are discriminated “bear the mark of the ‘other’ . They are racialized, sexualized and dehumanized” (Baldwin and Bettini 1); the ‘Others’ in the novel are victimised to xenophobic tendencies, wherein they are not granted the right to life, sexualized as they

are either forced to become breeders or separated from their children, and dehumanized as they serve as helps, and are not given the chance to climb the social ladder.

Evidences of postcolonial racism occur from the excessive pride, the leaders or rather the dictators have of the nation's position and power. The politician James' speech in the novel is the direct testimony of the fascist testament that has been implemented throughout the novel. He begins the speech by expressing his bloated pride on the essential climate injustice of how the third world countries, who have contributed very little to the disintegration of climatic stability, are one of the firsts to experience its wrath. He glorifies the habitability of the nation; "This country is the best in the world. We have prevailed, we do prevail, we will prevail" (Lanchester 112), for which they had made no contribution to, as no sustainable measures were implemented.

The country exhausts fuel usage for the purpose of defending the country from the 'Others', no conservation of animals or ecology has been mentioned and the sheer practice of 'lifeboat ethics' that revolve around the "supposed connection between environmental purity and 'racial' purity" (Biehl and Staudenmaier 8). Such falsehood in the politician's speech serves as a technique of manipulating the mob; "Regular and repeated obvious lying is part of the process by which fascist politics destroys the information space. A fascist leader can replace truth with power, ultimately lying without consequence" (Stanley).

Kavanagh tries to reason out why the captain was being very strict and tries to justify it by equating him with a tribal person by saying "No wonder his bite was worse than his bark. His scars were tribal scars, and yet he had left behind his tribe and was now a Defender, one of us" (Lanchester 47). Kavanagh through these lines, brings out the binary of the barbarian and the supremacist, a segregation between an 'us' and a 'them' that dictates their destinies. But the climatic wreck has also shifted the roles of the white

supremist and the barbarian, as the white supremacist has now ethically become the barbarian by resorting to ecological barbarism.

The change, called “Kuishia” (Lanchester 82), means the ending is a signifier of humankind’s retracing of the beginning, of how survival and the basic right to live in an animal like manner becomes more important than acting like a civilised human. They shrug off their responsibilities; seclude themselves by raising the Wall high, and are ethically lost in all their actions. The obsession over racial purity and soil purity exerts control over the abyss that determines the futures of those who trespass the borders for mere survival.

In the novel, the mention of ‘Others’ is clouded with the intention of blurring out their identities that might suggest any humanly qualities so that the people within the Wall view the ‘Others’ as enemies, who should be hunted down. The government brainwashes the people into making blurry judgments that the land cannot accommodate more people in, while at the same time promoting breeding. Though breeding is for the purpose of the continuance of human communities, the regime ends up losing its focus on the need of the hour to take in as much of people as it is possible, to promote the conservation or balance of animals and wildlife, ecological preservation, and other sustainable measures.

The nation is mindless in exhausting fuel with the purpose of defending the Wall, thereby continuing to pollute the environment. Kavanagh also talks about how energy is plentifully available but aviation fuel is not and yet the country is willing to exhaust it to feed the paranoid national security measures. James, the politician sneaking a bomb in, when he is being thrown out of the Wall, is an indication of the raked up ammunition, weapons and armory. Amidst the climatic wreck, the strong ones wage war with mighty weaponry whereas the desperate seek desperate measures just to live as slaves. The survival of the

fittest and racially purest, determines the decisions and destinies of the refugees: a clear reflection of one's ethically compromised stature that tilts towards barbarism.

Gruhl's social Darwinist ecology reduces human beings to their biological attributes, and people are expected to accept the social order including the domination, hierarchy and exploitation. Those who deviate from the set social order and existing norms, are equated to the plight of an animal who breaks the unwritten law set by the herd, and has to "pay for its independence with its life." (qtd in Biehl and Staudenmaier 41) The monarchical hierarchy in the novel operates in the same pattern and those who break away from the patterns pay for their independence with their lives as they are thrown out. Gruhl calls this kind of attitude as a "social Darwinist struggle for existence" (qtd in Biehl and Peter Staudenmaier 41) wherein, due to the climatic instability; people around the globe will begin to fight for survival rather than other means of life. He also believes that the only nations that can continue to survive would be those that "succeed in bringing their military preparedness to the highest level, while keeping their standard of living low" (41).

The Wall reduces the climate warfare's global credibility by associating it with its short term impacts and conflicts between nations, which have even in the short term, become a Darwinist struggle for existence. The unfit in this postcolonial context: people of the third world nations doubly punished by their residence in climate hotspots and the exclusionist tendencies, are erased from the planet first.

There is not enough information about the 'Others' except that they are poor, and desperate. The country tries to reduce the 'Others' as objects of threat who need to be taken care of, if not, they have the potential to reproduce the same distress that they had created in their homelands. There is a mention of a particular group of 'Others' in the novel that "they were from sub-Saharan Africa" (Lanchester 130). This is a reference to

how the Change has not stopped in the third world, poor countries of the Global South, especially located close to the equator.

The call “The Others are coming” (Lanchester 111), signifies the “language that undermines the democratic process of reasonable decision making, replacing it with fear” (Stanley). Such employment of language was intensified with the kind of binaries that the Wall created. Ivan March in “The Dark Side of Environmentalism” reflects how “fascist movement or group will use racist or xenophobic language alongside messages of “‘going back to the land’, ‘purifying the country’ while calling to renationalize society”. The ‘Others’ are addressed with a sense of alarm, and panic broods over the defenders at the sight of them floating in lifeboats not because they are more powerful but because their entry is viewed equivalent to death itself to the defenders, and as equivalent to pollution of land of the elites. The fear, infused language that has wired their minds to perceive the ‘Others’ from the lens of polluting agents, changes when Kavangh is let out of the Wall, to become an ‘other’ himself: “now that I was one of them, they weren’t Others any more? If I was an Other and they were Others perhaps none of us were Others but instead we were a new Us. It was confusing” (Lanchester 203).

The language used by James, the politician, manipulatively calling them as “unfortunates” (Lanchester 111) victimized only due to the distributive injustice of climate events and by refusing to own up responsibility of the developed countries’ contribution to the climatic wreck, makes the civilians view the climate refugees as objects of threat. The politician’s speech “was influential in mobilising an idea of the environmental migrant as a racialised other: a bringer of disease, disorder and incompatible cultural differences which might lead to conflict and political breakdown” (Mayer and Crepeau 74). Such feeding frenzies by the politician with the wrong perceptions of the mob aggravate the

othering process and segregates segments of population based on who mattered and who did not.

It is also predicted that the disproportionate impacts of climate change: distributive injustice and intergenerational injustice, will lead to injustice for all species of the planet. Racism in the time of major climatic changes is also described as “climate apartheid” (qtd in Lennard) by Philip Alston, who believes that climate apartheid will lead to impoverishment, widespread displacement, and hunger. Such measures of climate apartheid have led to the implementation of militant measures that dehumanise the ‘Others’. Warfare has been justified by rather weighing down intentions and purposes than lives that would be lost. The conclusions reached by mass death and banishment have been proven worthier than the numerous lives lost on warfare throughout history.

Climate warfare is not a conflict between the climate and life forms on earth, or climatic catastrophes and humankind but is an unfortunate outcome of conflicts between groups of humankind under the wrapped up manifestations of climatic outcomes. The conflict does not propel or even aim for climatic resolution as it revolves around the establishment of power and supremacy under the guise of protecting a few from climatic events. This climatic conflict has led to the dehumanisation of refugees and has ended up justifying killing them because they are mere threats to the social conditioning and political functioning of the country. Klein brings out this undercurrent of militant othering: “the same capacity for dehumanising the other that justified the bombs and drones is now being trained on these migrants, casting their need for security as a threat to ours, their desperate flight as some sort of invading army” (Klein 9).

The gulf that separates the first world and the third world nations are aided doubly by the international scale of the climate justice claims that exclude the diverse experiences of vulnerable communities, and thereby contribute to inequality in the kind of policies

implemented or actions undertaken. Climate change in the postcolonial context must not only be perceived through the lens of race, power, or colonialism but also as collaborative and globally interconnected climate action for the sake of restoring climate justice.

Climate justice must address the planetary boundaries of permissible emissions, technological advancements and even sustainable measures by enforcing stringent norms that all the countries share equitable responsibility to climate action.

The climate emergency poses the question of implementing measures that can address the urgency without compromising on inclusion or ethics. The various manifestations of climate catastrophes are not only a reflection of the ongoing conflict between the human and the entire planet, but also the looming, and impending conflict of the various sects of the human species.

Climate coping mechanisms require a clear comprehension of the differing traditions and disparities: historic, geographical and economic, to “deepen our capacity to imagine better solutions to environmental problems and the social problems with which they are inextricably intertwined” (Reed 228). The novel is filled with resonating “White Noise” (Reed 231) that drowns out all the other presences of the other identities and races. Amidst the “White Noise” (231), even the sounds of nature, and its representation are buried as all that prevails in a strong authoritarian voice till the end is the voice of a white male supremacist.

The ‘White Noise’ also possesses the potential to destruct the environment as it is inclusive of “a racially coded distortion of environmental reality” (Reed 232). The represented whiteness of the novel, whitewashes the coloured history, the tinge of climate debt, and practises climate apartheid from the lens of the white, thereby attempting “to bury consciousness of toxicity along with all other signs of human vulnerability” (Reed 232). It cashes in on the disadvantage of the disadvantaged, who are fleeing death, and are

also restricted even from accessing the true environmental history or the uncorrupted climate reality of the planet. The acts of resistance expressed in the novel are also aimed at demolishing the acts of climate racism with undercurrents of post colonialism induced xenophobia and exclusion.

Affect and emotions are considered to be major drivers of climate change action. Climate change, when approached from an emotional lens, by letting it be personalised rather than looking at it from the international claims, and statistics, reassures the people that their individualized and small scale efforts can be made significant. Instead of merely accepting the climate emergency, the impending doom, and the reverberating climate alarm, the characters formulate intervention strategies that aim at free mobility for climate refugees, try to subvert the ecofascist regime, and promote sustainable living that is inclusive, unbound by politically disruptive policies, and aim at the restoration of justice in a climatically unjust world.

Ecological grief though not healthy is realistic and an indication of ecological awareness. It is the awareness and recognition of the degrading and changing state of the environment that no longer resemble one's idea of belonging or home. This as Glenn Albrecht puts it, contributes to "solastalgia"- "pain or distress caused by the loss of, or inability to derive, solace connected to the negatively perceived state of one's home environment. Solastalgia exists when there is the lived experience of the physical desolation of home" (qtd in Cunsolo xviii) the kind of loss that pervades human existence after recognition of losses of human and nonhuman lives.

The characters in the novel express feelings of strange displacement, wherein though they have not been physically displaced from their place of residence, their 'home' has been eroded and destroyed. This recognition evokes severe grief of the loss of home, lives, and futures. David Gray in "Globalgia and the loss of planetary home in Cormac

McCarthy's *The Road* and John Lanchester's *The Wall* has put forth the term 'globalgia' as an "attempt to theorise and categorise psychological-affective responses to fictional scenarios where the entire planetary system is recognized in the pain causing loss-of-home" (77). He believes that 'globalgia' would be a more apt term to verbalise the fictional representations that portray the irregularities of climate change discourse through rational possibility. The characters in the novel are grief stricken about the severe losses, and are also guilt ridden as they do not indulge in a process of mourning with the intention of climatic action. The parental generation in the novel is numbed due to their inability to comprehend the profound crisis and has resorted to climate denialism instead of climate adaptation.

Jo Confino has raised the question of the possibility "to hold all the grief in the world and not get crushed by it?" (Cunsolo xx), because he believes that "our failure to deal with the collective and individual pain generated as a result of our destructive economic system is blocking us from reaching out for the solutions that can help us find another direction" (qtd in xx). It is the ability of the characters to channelise their ecological grief into a process of mourning that enables a person to take meaningful action. Climate action is believed to stem from the process of recognition, awareness, and mourning for what is lost. The characters in the novel, start undertaking meaningful action after the awareness of climate change, and also question the distributive injustice of the same. The role of intergenerational disparity and intergenerational guilt leads to the idea of corruptive justice.

The submission of the parental generation to the ecofascist regime surfaces from traces of survivor guilt that forces them to submit themselves and the futures of the upcoming generations so that they get a chance to survive. Though the responses of the parental generation can be justified as a manifestation of survivors' guilt, the current

generation of defenders does not accept the same because they bear the burden of the brutal choices made by their parents, who had submitted the lives of the entire human species to the fascist authority.

The intergenerational misunderstanding is due to the blame put on the parental generation for their crime of inaction, which has caused the cascading shifts in the climate patterns, and the hoarded guilt in the parents, for passing down the world in a decaying state to their children; “there was our parents' world, and now there is our world” (Lanchester 110). The present generation, being in the receiving end of the aftermaths of climate change, expresses traces of anticipatory guilt as they refrain from becoming parents. Breeding is detestable to them as they do not want to bring more people into a world moving towards doom.

The present generation has been fed with the brewing thoughts that solidify as blame on the parents as it was their prolonged inaction that has contributed to the climatic alarm that resounds through every aspect of their lives; “Who broke the world? They wouldn't say that they did yet it broke on their watch” (Lanchester 151). It resonates through their personal, social, and political lives as they are monitored, controlled, and dehumanized constantly. The new normalcy, poles apart from the normalcy enjoyed by their parents, has propelled the characters to believe in the power of collaborative rebellion and individualized actions aimed at institutional and socially disruptive climate policies. The anticipatory guilt and shame of being passive in a world that demands active participation through resistance, and contribution have propelled the characters to express resistance. “The acts of border-defying mechanisms and intense discontentment with the state of the country arise from the sense of anticipatory guilt in the children.” (Janane 574)

Activism and resistance are propelled by psychological responses to sociological and political issues. The psychological reactions to global warming, climate change,

species extinction, resource scarcity, and the ambiguity of futurity of life on earth, push the people to take action. The role of guilt, pretraumatic stress syndrome, climate trauma, and so on has been major reasons behind the expressions of resistance by the characters in the novel.

Intergenerational disparity is caused due to the disproportionate impact of climate change signifying distributive injustice not only with regard to location but also with respect to the timelines. The children develop animosity towards their parents for having spent their lives in climatic ease, and for snoozing out the climate alarm, for which their children pay for, at the price of their health, security, survival, and any hope of the future.

Activism or resistance under a fascist regime has layers of implications. It does not battle with denial because unlike certain democracies that operate on the principle of climate denialism, ecofascism emerges out of recognition of the climate apocalypse. The characters instead, are voicing out for mobility, climate justice for human migrants of all nationalities, and against the regime that exploits the disaster as a means to control the masses.

The characters revolt against the empire through acts of subversion because they are discontent with the climatic action that is taken so far and would like to take control of their own destinies instead of allowing to be dictated by the elites. Like how Chandra in Kim Stanley Robinson's *The Ministry for the Future* states, "yes, you know. Everyone knows, but no one acts. So we are taking matters into our own hands" (47). The characters are tired of waiting for the execution of just plans from the empire and have set out to reclaim the narratives and the destinies of the displaced.

Environmental justice movement stems from the bottomless pit of discrimination and adversity that spiral the lives of people, offering no escape. It is in such acts of resistance and "fights against this kind of 'environmental racism' that the climate justice

movement was born” (Klein 5). Climate change brings with it major imbalances in power and management that it leads to distributive injustice. As Tagg and Jafry put forth “The face of this climate injustice have often been those who are in the frontline of climate-related impacts-the poorest and most marginalized in both the Global North and the Global South” (qtd in Jafry 2). Climate justice movements through ecological awareness, campaigns, climate adaptation, security measures, conservation or free mobility are all expressions of the voice of the downtrodden in the face of climate change. *The Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice* sums up climate justice as a threefold attempt to rectify the historical wrongdoings and anthropocentric configurations by establishing distributive and corrective justice, egalitarianism, and global justice. The resistance expressed by the characters in the novel will be interpreted along the lines as a call for ensuring climatic justice for climate refugees.

The cascading transitions in the climate cause unpredictable social and political impacts that affect the existence of the characters, which grow passive and less humane with every passing day, as life to them is about survival rather than striving towards higher purposes. The world after the change is ethically compromised with biased judicial system that neither protects nor punishes, especially lenient to the defenders: “We get in fights, we bust places up, and nothing much happens” (Lanchester 59). The novel, being narrated from the point of view of a defender, does not bring to light what it is to be someone who resides on the bottom most rung as a civilian, under the mercy of the authorities.

Climate movements that include activism, resistance, protests, and other measures of battling climate denialism and climate inaction can be viewed as a measure to ensure climate justice. The characters in the novel “oppose any attempt to use the climate crisis to justify racist, reactionary and authoritarian policies.” (Knights) The characters resist or attempt to subvert the fascist authority for the sake of the futurity of the species. Like how

Sam Knights had put forth, the futurity of the human species will inevitably be influenced by climatic crises and the rise of the authoritarian far right. The defenders, the captain and the anonymous group put up acts of resistance not only to combat the ecofascist regime but also to ensure climate justice amidst the cascading climatic ramifications.

The kinds of resistance put forth by the characters in the novel are border crossing and migration, refusal to reproduce, and the defiance from the order of duty of letting in the highest number of climate refugees into Britain. The first kind of resistance: border defiance is expressed by ‘Others’ as well as by the captain and the anonymous group who defy the border by smuggling climate refugees. The second kind of resistance is the most collective defiance of fascist authority that can be traced in the novel as the citizens refuse to breed. They refrain from the act of breeding thereby letting the climate refugees a chance to life or at least combat overpopulation in the present. Lastly, the defiance by the order of duty involving the captain, James, Kavanagh, Hifa and so on form the major act of revolt as it indicates that the plan of the activists are being materialised. It can also be viewed as a martyr like act as the characters put their life at risk to give the climate refugees a chance to life.

The first kind of resistance that consistently contributes to the plot has been acts of border defiance and the refugee crisis. Mobility presents itself as one of the prominent ways to escape the impact of a disaster or to even survive. But in most cases, climate refugees are not welcome as the hosts feel threatened about resource scarcity and overpopulation, the impacts of which are exacerbated in a climatically changing world. For instance, during Hurricane Dorian, visa-less Bahamian refugees were not permitted in the ferry during the face of a disaster though there was no visa required for transportation (qtd in Howard). This sense of threat, and heightened vigilance over sealing up the borders and preventing border crossing to prolong the habitability of their own lands have caused

refugees to assert their mobility. The assertion of one's mobility can also be interpreted as the assertion of one's right to life.

The act of border crossing and other kinds of border defying or authority defying mechanisms itself paves way for call against the erosions of justice. "The popular, yet deeply fraught figure of the 'climate refugee' here becomes a touchstone for planetary fate, humanity adjudicated on the ethical stance adopted in relation to it" (Baldwin and Bettini 1-2). The resistance puts forth by the 'Others', though not criticised bitterly by the politician James, is compensated through his ruthless critique of the acts of resistance put forth by people within the Wall, seeking to bridge the gap of climate justice. He calls them out for betraying the defenders and the regime, whose intention has been to ensure security of the residents; "They would rather be on the side of the Others than on the side of their own people. It is hard to imagine such wickedness. Hard to imagine being so wrong, so morally lost, so ethically destitute... I will instead call them what they are, traitors" (Lanchester 113).

One of the major concerns of climate change adaptation is addressing the varied duties and vulnerabilities with respect to the climate events. Collaborative climate action extends unrestrained space for survival, and a space wherein livelihood and human rights are not a luxury. Every act of border crossing, border defying mechanisms, and call for free climate mobility of human migrants is a clarion call for that space for freedom, survival, and livelihood. The anonymous group that tries to let in the 'Others' by inserting a different chip, is an attempt to encourage free mobility for climate migrants as migration has become contingent with survival, and seeks to restore justice for the already disadvantaged 'Others'.

The act of transgressing the border assigns power to the powerless refugee floating on the sea passively waiting to be let in, because they subvert the former image of the

climate refugee by becoming active participants of their destiny. The defenders have become accustomed to the lifestyle of becoming completely passive, and let the days pass through them devoid of any active participation but the 'Others' decide their fate and put up a rebellion at least knowing what they want. They disintegrate the prejudicial and judicial authority that the border takes up and in turn become active agents who trespass the passive border to claim what they deserve.

Through such acts of border crossing, the border's role as an impermeable colossal structure is compromised and the ethically compromised situations express hope for restoration. 'The Wall' becomes a passage through which identities are exchanged, perspectives of the world are changed, and paves way for endless set of border transgressions of the 'inside and outside', 'us and them' and so on, created through a carefully crafted set of societal and institutional hierarchies.

The border defiance of the characters can be viewed as a fight against systemic racism, hierarchy, and discrimination. The 'Others' express their resistance and try to subvert the ideology of power reverberating through the concrete entity of the Wall, symbolic of the solidifying ecofascist authority, the Captain and the anonymous group he works with, express their resistance and work for the subversion of totalitarianism by promoting free mobility as they plan to secretly let the 'Others' in, and help them get away from the hands of the dehumanizing fascists, the civilians express their subversion by refraining from the act of breeding, which is a significant act of resistance considering the mapped out and monitored way of life they are forced to lead.

The second kind of resistance expressed through the refusal to belong to the faction of Breeders can be observed as a collective act. Though most acts of resistance is passive, independent or only pertinent to one group of people, but the refusal to breed has been a decision shared by most of the citizens. People's abstinence from breeding is a reflection

of their intense disappointment with the state of the world and exposes one part of their lives that is under their control that they can employ to subvert the regime's ideologies and thereby also have a positive impact on the planetary future. They believe that they have broken the world "and have no right to keep populating it" especially when most of the people here "are starving and drowning, dying and desperate; so how dare we make more of them?" (Lanchester 35)

The shift in the perspective from the narrative segmentation of 'The Wall', 'The Others' and 'The Sea' shifts to the perspective of the hardships faced by the people and further dissolves the binaries. In the first section of the novel, identity, internal hierarchy, and external binaries are solidified into as concrete a structure as the Wall, by shedding light only on those within the Wall. The second section, delves into the plight of the climate refugees, addresses their issues, and how they are perceived as a threat to the order established by the fascist regime.

The final section revolves around the major act of resistance expressed by the characters to attempt the subversion of the dictatorship. The final section of the novel revolves around the expression of a major act of revolt planned by the captain and the anonymous group by letting in the highest number of climate refugees and also traces the brutal punishment that the entire order of duty receives for the same. The captain, being the executor of the plan is ready to give up his title, comfort, and risk even his chance to life by indulging in the act of rebellion.

The captain, being an 'Other' himself does not try to assimilate entirely with the intention of forgetting his past, but assimilates with the intention of taking revenge on the power drunk institution and its inhumaneness. He tries to restore justice by reiterating his stand by prioritising justice over his temporary state of security. The act of surrendering his position as the captain, and placing his life on the frontline expresses his prioritising of

the standpoint of justice over prolonged survival. The defenders look up at the captain as he was one of the few people who had risen from the bottom to become members of the elite after three supplementary tours of duty with each one that earned perks for his family too, such as better housing, better food, and also better schools for his children. But the Captain goes to the extent of renouncing it all and subverts the entire ideology of the system. This delimits and debunks the kind of promise, security, and survival promised by Britain; because he is ready to shrug it all off by equating life within as life outside as an 'Other'.

The captain's renunciation of his position within the internal hierarchy signifies his turn in perspective of the corruptive binaries, and manipulative hierarchies that exist for the sake of glorifying the ruler. The captain lives under the facade of an obedient submissive defender who advises Kavanagh to "do everything we tell you to without questioning why" (Lanchester 47) and ends up doing the exact opposite by placing not just his life but the lives of the entire order of responsibility on line. The willingness of the Captain to sacrifice his position is of tremendous significance in the novel, as the 'Others' who manage to trespass aren't allowed the chance to rise up and become members of the elite and they "have to choose between being euthanised, becoming Help or being put back to sea" (Lanchester 47).

The anonymous group, the "secret sympathisers" (Lanchester 158), who worked with the captain to let in the "Others" are suspected to have secret networks with the 'Others', to let them in by inserting a chip, to hide them away from the government, subverts the climate regime by not just fighting for the survival of the 'Others' but also offering them better quality of life than being slaves. The anonymous group's sympathy in voicing out for justice is misinterpreted by the elites as betrayal, and as "being so wrong, so morally lost, so ethically destitute" (113).

This response of the elites who continue to manipulate the masses is an evidence of how the “political and economic elites either do not understand the ramifications of their actions, which will leave driven the climate crises, or simply do not care enough to stop it” (Knights). The continuance of the masses to fight for justice by turning against the elites is a sign of revolt by toppling the hierarchy of dictatorship to ensure just survival of human species unrestricted by power, wealth, race or any other privilege. The group does not only fight for the survival of the ‘Others’ but also try to prevent them from becoming slaves. The defenders are objects of pity in this measure of restoration of justice taken up by the anonymous group as they take the downfall, as the entire order of responsibility is thrown into the sea. The regime is so ethically blind and morally wavering that any measure to restore justice robs justice from another set of people. The anonymous group still strives for free mobility at the cost of the lives of defenders as subversion of the climate regime holds more significance than momentary survival.

The captain reveals his experience of border crossing, and he was the only one who got over the Wall amongst their group of seven. The captain had patiently waited for years to execute a plan to let in ‘Others’ and the aid of the anonymous group came in handy as he says,

By now we had got in touch with a wider network. Some of your countrymen don't agree with the Wall. They think you need the Wall to keep out the water but not to keep out human beings. Some of them don't agree with turning people into Help. They think it's slavery. It's a big network, much bigger than you realise. I don't know much about who is in it and I don't know who they're helping but I do know that my people are not the only ones who are coming. (Lanchester 191)

Such careful execution of a plan to let in climate refugees and extend the platform of humane justice, when climate justice is sliding over, reflects the Captain's pretention to

earn the trust of the defenders and the regime to strike when the time is right. This also proves that throughout his stay in the Wall, he felt excluded, and not at home as the awareness of flotillas of climate refugees drowning and dying of starvation, ate his conscience. The ‘defenders’, rightly observe the Captain’s expression of guilt after killing ‘Others’, “People who maybe were not so unlike he once was.” (Lanchester 162), but the regime expresses no guilt, or shame in renouncing and rejecting its defenders by throwing them into the open sea. The regime is webbed in ethical chaos that it is clueless about the distribution of justice through the shifting process of ‘walling in and walling out’ that it refrains from granting justice to anybody at all, including the elites who are unjustly celebrated.

The anonymous group aided with the contribution of the captain had managed to let in the highest number of climate refugees in the history of the Wall, which makes Kavanagh fear for the safety of defenders as he says “An extraordinary event would demand an extraordinary response” (Lanchester 172). The final section aptly titled, ‘The Sea’ signifies the fluidification of identities, and is an indicator of the characters living on the margins of establishment, and on the verge of death. They are dehumanised as they are in their nomadic search for the resources that would provide habitability, and sustain life, the shift in their ways of life after the clear ostracisation has paved way for their slow loss of mental equilibrium along with their swinging physical equilibrium.

The injustice of throwing the defenders who had spent all their time and energy guarding the Wall, when ‘the Others’ got in, evokes pity and reiterates that the intention of the fascist empire is unquestioned adherence to its rules. If defenders were retained, the insecure empire felt threatened of losing its imperialistic nature. Kavanagh mourns over their victimisation: “I felt sick with the injustice of it. Physically sick. I knew for certain that I, that we, had done nothing wrong” (Lanchester 181).

The margin for any human reconciliation and compromise is withheld and the defenders are robbed off their already transient identity of citizenship, as their id chips are taken off, and they would be lost “with the same complete lack of agency” (Lanchester 183) that they had during the attack and also through their entire period of stay in the Wall. The internal hierarchy of the Wall is shredded as soon as it comes into contact with the open sea, as the entire order of responsibility: James, captain, Hifa, Hughes, and Kavanagh are all climate refugees placed on the same shifting waves. The overthrow of the ‘baby politician’ fills the defenders with relief as the hierarchy had been collapsed and “he felt the injustice of what had been done to him as much as we felt the injustice of what had been done to us.” (192)

The injustice in the world after the change trespasses all man made identities and narrative environmental imaginaries as all the characters were in grief over all that had happened; “Loss, loss, there was just so much loss, in what had happened to us, in what the Captain had one, in what we had done to the world, in what we had done to each other and in what was happening to us” (Lanchester 192). The sea adds on to the mounting injustice as the group of pirates captures their boat, kill the captain and Sarge, and attempt to abduct their women. The worsening security of lives on the sea coupled with life threatening events created by environmental and man-made distress, adds on to the misery of the flotilla of ‘Others’.

The resistance expressed through border crossing is a demand for their right to survive in an ecologically and ethically crumbling world that bans the weakest out of the lands of habitability. People refrain from becoming breeders as they do not want to bring more people into the vanishing world, people involve in border defying mechanisms as the only means to survive, and people inside the Wall go to the extent of risking their lives for the sake of restoring ethics by letting in ‘the Others’ into a land that fulfills their basic

needs without major compromise on their human rights. Though the kinds of resistance expressed do not abolish the ecofascist empire in its entirety, succeed in letting in the highest number of 'Others', which is the beginning of major acts of subversion and counter reactions to the restricting and corruptive measures taken.

The resistance is also an indicator of a globally interconnected movement or a form of collaborative rebellion in its threshold, as the anonymous group has its ties not only with the people inside the Wall but also with the groups of climate refugees belonging to various parts of the world. Such an effort to restore ethics even amidst the world moving towards destruction is the declaration of attempts that steer towards judicial reformation and activism that find a cause that transcends any human made boundary.

The intention of the activist measures do not include preservationism or conservationism, as the world presented is the world after the Change, and they find it too late to begin with such measures, hence addresses the short term significance of free mobility and security of climate migrants. Their resistance signifies rewriting climate history and the injustice of climate warfare, amidst the context of "white flight" (224) as put forth by Reed in *The Art of Protest*, wherein he talks about how people of colour and poor whites are victimised during any potential situation of conflict or destruction.

The activist measures aim to counter "the invasive, pervasive effects of corporate capitalism in this process, and the racial-class dynamic that has permitted that process to continue" (Reed 233), and tries to counter react to the process of systemic racism, discrimination, and injustice with the hope of ensuring the futurity of human communities, especially climate refugees, those that are 'othered'.

The characters' resistance in the novel cannot be measured in the scales of its impact in overthrowing the regime as the fascist empire is autonomic and does not extend spaces for democratic participation or egalitarian interaction. But the resistance showcased

can be analysed only through acts of counteracting the power imbalances in the autocratic society and through the efforts taken to establish one's survival. At the end of the novel, after the exclusion of the battalion from the Wall after the failed attack, the characters face the world sans the unethical security of the 'Wall'.

The characters settle in an island with the help of a few people who have learnt to survive using primitive methods of fishing, and survival with the bare minimum that was available to them. Kavanagh and Hifa navigate through the strife in the open sea in the form of attack from pirates, the unforgiving weather fluctuations, and lack of food and water. The novel ends with a bleak note of hope as Kavanagh and Hifa manage to enter a ship which has fuel and the other resources necessary for survival. Though it does not assure a future of prolonged survival, it puts forth the fruition of their acts of resistance as it hints survival and the plausibility of a future.

Though climate activism, and widespread climate movements hold no space for in the fascist regime, the acts of resistance expressed by the people hold significance as it is a manifestation of collaborative rebellion that aims at ensuring justice for the people who are constantly thrown off to the margins, and if located in the center, is usually for persecution rather than for existence. The acts of resistance expressed by the characters hope to extend justice to the people who are situated in the margins: geographically, politically, economically and socially; "because home isn't just the UK, home is everywhere on this planet" (Klein 12).