

The Monkeywrench Downunder – Part 1 of 4

energy crises -- social war -- ecological-crises - capitalist crisis

monkeywrenchdownunder@gmail.com



Sabino Romero, cacique (traditional chief) of the Yukpa indigenous people in Venezuela's Sierra de Perijá, was assassinated on the night of March 3, when unknown gunmen ambushed his vehicle on a road in Machiques municipality, Zulia state, as he was traveling to a community meeting at the village of Chaktapa. Supporters immediately said he had been targeted for opposing extractive industries, particularly coal mining, in the Yukpa territory.

Claim of responsibility for graffiti attack on coal magnate's home

Thu 03 May 2012

In the early hours of April 9 some Wollongong ecovandals redecorated a \$5 million dollar mansion owned by Arun Jagatramka, executive chairman of Gujarat NRE Coking Coal, a mining company which has recently established itself in the Illawarra region.

The company has recently installed over \$90 million worth of long wall mining equipment for the massive expansion of Russelvale mine. The recently approved project will not only devastate the local ecosystem but will destroy aboriginal sacred sites and we refuse to sit idly by like 'good' lawful protesters, we will turn our outrage into action.

The slogans we sprayed across the millionaires walls read:

CLIMATE CRIMINAL -CLASS WAR NOT CLIMATE CHANGE - NO MINES NO MASTERS -
SHUT DOWN RUSSELVALE MINE - I SMELL A GUJARAT -CANT EAT COAL CANT DRINK
GAS

Arun is an international* capitalist who values his bank balance more than whatever land he chooses to live on. In attacking his property we wished to send him a signal that neither his money nor the police can protect him from those who love wild nature more than money. We also wished to call bullshit on his claims of total support, "from day one we have received support from all quarters, whether that is the federal government or the state government, the employees, and the community around us."

Despite government support Gujarat NRE is in a very precarious situation, suffering profit downgrades, project delays, a plummeting share price of more than 80 cents in the past year and contractors owed significant sums of money. With concerted community action targeting the company, there is a very real

chance to stop Russelvale mine, as well as the company's 20 other proposed sites in the Illawarra region.

As carbon emissions continue to soar, with institutions such as the annual COP summits failing to provide even an illusion of action against climate catastrophe, it is time those who care about the fate of the earth and the living beings that inhabit it to take a stand against the machinery and individuals which are polluting our common landbase.

Although we didn't take any photos of our slogans, local media covered the small action for 3 days running, even releasing CCTV footage of two individuals, with requests for potential snitches to aid police in the investigation.

Unsurprisingly the act was condemned by "Lock the Gate" a bourgeois farmers association defending their class interests against the cruder nouveaux riche of the mineral exploitation industry. Spokesman Drew Hutton described the nonviolent property damage as "completely inconsistent" with a commitment to non-violence. The Stalinist sect 'Socialist Alliance' even jumped on the reactionary bandwagon by condemning the action on public radio.

Australia is one of the world's largest coal exporters and the industry represents the nation's most powerful business lobby. As long as we remain trapped in a system ruled by police, political parties and corporate capital we will have no faith in any reforms toward an ecologically sustainable future. Those who consider themselves environmentalists must move beyond the ineffectual protests and lobbying campaigns of mainstream environmental groups to direct acts of sabotage against the industrial tools of devastation.

AGAINST COPS, CAPITALISTS AND COAL MINES

For industrial collapse and the creation of communes in harmony with nature

*as rightly critiqued elsewhere it is irrelevant whether he is a international capitalist or a local one. A capitalists a capitalist.

Environmentalism of the Poor

Theories of 'environmentalism of the poor' (Guha and Martinez-Alier, 1997; Guha, 2000; Martinez-Alier, 2002) and 'liberation ecology' (Peet and Watts, 2004) have much in common with the branch of the Green movement that contests the unequal distribution of ecological goods and evils resulting from economic growth. These perspectives are distinct from the mainstream current of environmentalism seeking ecological modernisation and eco-efficiency, and also from the older environmentalist current aimed at conserving a pristine nature without human interference.

The environmentalism of the poor manifests itself through conflicts that have an ecological element, including social justice claims, and involving impoverished populations struggling against the state or against private companies that threaten their livelihood, health, culture, autonomy. These movements are born from the resistance (expressed in many different languages) against the disproportionate use of environmental resources and services by the rich and powerful. Ordinary women and men strive to correct the wrongs that have been committed against the land, water and air around them. In so doing, they contradict the Brundtland report and its view that environmental damage is caused by poverty. Ecological anthropology, agro-ecology and political ecology are the main academic allies of the environmentalism of the poor. The Chipko movement in the Himalayas, India, in the 1970s, and the movement of the seringueiros, linked to Chico Mendes in Acre, Brazil, in the 1980s, represent two emblematic cases of environmentalism of the poor.

There are many well-known contemporary examples of this type of environmentalism: the Ogoni, the Ijaw and other groups protesting the damage from oil extraction by Shell in the Niger Delta; resistance against eucalyptus in Thailand and elsewhere on the grounds that 'plantations are not forests'; the movements of oustees due to dam construction as in the Narmada river in India and the atingidos por barragens in Brazil; and the new peasant movements such as Via Campesina, against agro-industries and biopiracy ('biopiracy' refers to the appropriation of knowledge of agricultural or medicinal plants without payment, essentially theft). There are also many historical instances of what could be termed the 'environmentalism of the poor', although the words 'ecology' and 'environment' were not used politically at the time and the actors of such conflicts rarely saw themselves as 'environmentalists', concerned mainly with livelihood. Two examples

related to copper mining come from Rio Tinto, Andalusia, in the 1880s against sulphur dioxide; and in the early 1900s against the pollution of the Watarase River by the Ashio copper mine in Japan with the peasant leader Tanaka Shozo.

As long as problems related to the unequal distribution of ecological costs and benefits remain unaddressed, efforts to pacify protagonists of this type of movement are unlikely to succeed. On the contrary, the publicity given to these struggles through traditional channels of communication and today's 'network society' is a source of inspiration to others opposing forces bent on destroying local and global environments. Ultimately, the sum of these conflicts in a global environmental justice movement may represent a powerful social force for greater sustainability.

References

Guha, R. (2000) Environmentalism: a global history. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guha, R. and Martínez-Alier, J. (1997) Varieties of environmentalism: essays North and South. London: Earthscan.

Martínez-Alier, J. (2002) The environmentalism of the poor: a study of ecological conflicts and valuation. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Peet, R. and Watts, M. (eds.) (2004) Liberation ecologies, New York: Routledge.

For further reading:

Davey, I. (2009) Environmentalism of the Poor and Sustainable Development: An Appraisal. JOAAG, 4 (1), 1-10.

A multiple crisis

The capitalist world-system has entered a **multiple crisis: (1) energy security, (2) climate stability, (3) food production, (4) profits (5) political legitimacy, and (6) a crises of work.** Even in the view of the mainstream it has become clear, that the financial crisis has turned into an economic crisis threatening political legitimacy in many countries. Yet at the same time, other aspects of the multiple crises are ignored. Many radicals are not fully aware that peak oil – the maximum of global oil production

– might already be reached or will be reached in the near future. It is argued that other resource peaks follow not far behind. Hardly anyone draws any conclusions from this.

This email list is a place to discuss responses from below, those of the exploited and those involved in struggles against capitalism, state and the multiple crises of our times. **Over a 130 radicals from around the world discuss these issues from anti-state and anti-capitalist perspectives and share analysis on this list over the last several years. Discussions have covered a range of topics**

- The struggle for land as a central focus of class struggle in an age of resource peaks.
- The limitations of 'clean' energy and the critique of technological fixes. I.e. Indigenous resistance to windfarms in Mexico to strikes in the German wind sector. Solar panel toxic-waste struggle in China.
- 'Green' capitalism's ability (or not) to adapt to climate crises and create new forms of accumulation.
- The scale of the climate crisis and how to respond as radicals.
- Class composition and just-transitions/eco-revolution? Discussion of the 'meta-industrial class' consisting of some indigenous, peasants, housewives, subsistence living especially women in this analysis ? Contrasting with a critique of reformist trade-unionism with green edges and shit green jobs.
- Critique of Geo-engineering experiments such as ocean fertilisation.
- Anarchist and leftist critiques of the 'authoritarian primitivism' of groups like Deep Green Resistance.
- Eco-insurrectionism, good and bad!
- De-growth and anarchism/radical-left.
- Anarchist, autonomist Marxist, left-communist views on ecological struggle.
- Anti-extractivist politics and movements against mining and other infrastructure development.
- Indigenous notions of 'living well', the critique of development and ecological class struggle.
- Climate struggle in times of austerity.

- The environmentalism of the poor, China cancer villages, Latin American indigenous resistance against 'eco-socialism'
- Fuel poverty – heat waves, cold snaps and housing.
- Resource grabs, neo-liberal crisis and emergent 'green' capitalism.
- climate hysteria and its use, critique of the greening of hate of the far right and other existing or emergent capitalist trends.



To join discussion email monkeywrenchdownunder@gmail.com

Indigenous communities asserting themselves across the Americas

Indigenous politics tend to be understood as local anecdotes, rather than political events of international significance. So it is of little surprise that the funeral of Bernardo Vásquez in San José del Progreso, Oaxaca, Mexico, generated little international attention. Vásquez was the second anti-mining activist shot dead in the past two months in the small Zapotec community, while many other opponents have been seriously injured in the Ocotlán Valley.

Mine-related violence is certainly distressing but far from rare, extending from Chile to the Arctic. What is less ordinary is the extent and intensification of anti-mining mobilisation across Latin America. The past month in particular has seen a swell in protests defending land and water resources. Between World Water Day, annually

celebrated on March 22, and the International Day of Peasant Struggles on April 17, this spring has seen resistance against mega-projects gain solid ground.

The incidents in Ocotlán, simultaneous with larger mobilisations in other locations, are indicative of a broader turn in which indigenous movements are leading coordinated efforts to defend natural resources. Indigenous movements may be locally rooted, yet as its contest reframes governmental agendas, it ineluctably impacts transnational politics as well.

'Conga won't go' in Peru

On World Water Day, thousands of people gathered around the Blue Lagoon in the Peruvian highlands of Cajamarca to protect their water resources from mining exploitation and contamination. The Conga Mine, a \$4.8bn project involving US-based Newmont Mining Corporation and Peruvian company Minas Buenaventura, would be the second largest gold mine in the world and affect five sources of drinking water.

Residents of Cajamarca have been insistently protesting the Conga Mine project, approved in 2010. Neither President Humala's 60-day state of emergency and increased military presence nor the external review of the environmental impact study were able to undermine the intensifying civil unrest. In fact, mobilisations gained momentum since Cajamarca's regional vice president, César Aliaga Díaz, issued regional ordinance 036, declaring the Conga project unviable, thereby lending official support to the mobilisations. The uncontroversial alliance between local protesters and Cajamarca's government against the Peruvian state and international mining interests suggests a multi-layered, and certainly transnational, political scenario.

Resilience in Ecuador

Ecuador's March for Life, Water, and the Dignity of Peoples was as extensive as it was enduring, gathering marchers for more than 400 miles from International Women's Day (March 8) to World Water Day. When CONAIE's[Esp] president Humberto Cholando led thousands of indigenous peoples into the capital on March 22, thousands of non-indigenous protesters had also joined in. The government, in turn,

organised pro-government countermarches, accusing the march of being fomented by prior coup participants, and to be supported by the country's right for electoral motives.

Despite obstacles and shortcomings, this national mobilisation symbolises the re-unification of all indigenous groups in Ecuador around one common political agenda, echoing the massive mobilisations of the 1990s. Using the same slogan as the anti-Conga movement: "Life is worth more than gold," the march emphasised protecting water and opposing mega-mining projects. The 19-point demand, however, was broader and included other issues, including opposing the expansion of oil frontiers and demanding labour rights as well as the respect of sexual rights.

This march did not achieve formal negotiations with the state. Yet it did achieve another important goal: to demand – and to practice – the de-criminalisation of social protest. In that sense, this mobilisation represents the resilience as well as the agility of an indigenous movement that has remained the leading force of opposition over the years, surviving political censorship and intimidation, as well its own internal fractures.

Thousands enter Guatemala City

Days after Ecuador's march, more than 10,000 people entered Guatemala City – an impressive crowd for a capital of about one million inhabitants. The march lasted nine days, covered much of the country, and involved a diverse array of social sectors. Called the "Indigenous, Campesino, and Popular March for the defence, dignity and of the Earth and Territories", this mobilisation was explicitly national and geared to address social concerns beyond indigenous concerns. The agenda encompassed land rights and territoriality as well as fundamental civil rights such as a Law for Community Media to legalise community radios. Just like in Ecuador, Guatemala's anti-mining march is relevant because it is embedded in politics at large.

Leaders issued a declaration of the march for resistance and dignity in defence of the earth and territory, in which they demand, among others things, the cancellation of

concessions for mining, petroleum and hydroelectric plants, and mono-culture agriculture – as well as the end to persecution and criminalisation of indigenous people fighting for their rights (eight indigenous women in San Miguel Ixtahuacán have arrest orders against them for speaking out against the Marlin Mine). Such forceful mobilisation convinced President Otto Perez Molina to negotiate the demands posited in the protesters official declaration.

TIPNIS redux

In Bolivia, indigenous mobilisation is also at a peak. The protests that brought international attention to the construction of a highway through the Indigenous Territory and National Park Isiboro Sécore (TIPNIS) are far from over. The 61-day march in the autumn of 2011 generated widespread support for ordinary peoples, pushing the government to abide by a law protecting the TIPNIS and interrupting the construction more than once. As conflict over the TIPNIS holds, political strategies grow increasingly complex, intricate, and transnational. The UN offered to mediate the stand-off, whereas the Brazilian National Bank for Social and Economic Development (which is financing most of the project) is demanding that the construction firm and the Bolivian government reframe the contract.

Despite political retaliation against protesters and harassment against leaders – such as against the president of the Bolivian Confederation of Indigenous Peoples (CIDOB), Adolfo Chávez, and the president of the TIPNIS, Fernando Vargas – coordination strengthened and even expanded to urban areas. In fact, Bolivia's IV Indigenous National Commission just ratified the start of the IX March in Defence of the TIPNIS for April 25, from Chaparina to La Paz. It will reiterate resistance against the road construction through protected territories, as well as to defend natural resources at large, respect for constitutional rights, and insist on the democratic practice of consultation.

The various marches in defence of the TIPNIS evolved beyond a mobilisation for and by indigenous interests. It made tangible a national political discontent beyond

protected territories, bringing international visibility to the internal fissures of the Morales government.

The smaller and larger indigenous mobilisations taking place simultaneously across Latin America are inevitably local, in that they contest projects in their communities, but they cannot be trivialised as isolated or anecdotal incidents. These mobilisations are of international relevance because they have successfully mobilised thousands of peoples, indigenous and non-indigenous, over long periods of time and across territories, crafting political demands, and often forcing governments to reframe policies. Most importantly, indigenous mobilisation has been able to bring environmental politics to the streets, turning natural resources, water, and consultation into public political issues. The growing constellation of mobilisations across the region points towards deeper societal changes in the making.

<http://cascadiasolidarity.wordpress.com/>

Of Energy Struggles, Energy Transitions and Energy Democracy (extract) by Tadzio Müller

A snapshot:[ii] The petroleum workers' union Pengassan threatens a complete shutdown of oil production in Nigeria, Africa's largest producer of crude oil which exports to countries like the USA, Brazil and India. They demand that the government re-introduce subsidies whose withdrawal had doubled the price of fuel over night. The workers' chances look good: only a few months before, popular pressure had forced the Bolivian government to withdraw a similar increase in fuel prices. Meanwhile, the conflict over Iran's nuclear programme is escalating: a nuclear physicist is killed by a car bomb in Teheran, and Japan threatens to reduce its oil imports from Iran. The Brazilian government increases subsidies for agrofuel from sugar cane – frequently mislabelled as 'biofuel' – only days after the USA scrapped import tariffs on it. In Germany, where the phased 'exit' from nuclear power allegedly reduces their profit margins, the country's four major energy companies (EON, RWE, Vattenfall and

EnBW) are expanding into international markets with even greater force in order to generate more of their electrical power in Brazil and Chile.

Energy struggles

For years now, the issue of energy has been moving to the forefront of the political agenda, whether at the geopolitical level – the ‘War on Terror’ as ‘War for Energy’ (Klare 2008) –, at the level of German national politics (‘energy transition’), or in everyday life, where parties that exhort people to switch their energy-suppliers have taken the place of Tupperware parties. From the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico to nuclear exit in Germany, from the climate summit in South Africa to uprisings in Central Asia: **energy struggles – that is, social struggles over the control of, the access to, and pricing of energy – have always been, and increasingly are, at the core of social conflicts around distribution and ecology, modes of production and modes of life.** The history of all hitherto existing society is also the history of energy struggles, because “every form of energy implies a particular organization of work” and a particular social division of labour (Abramsky 2010, 8). The centrality of energy struggles in the social balance of power is easily explained: energy is an extremely profitable good because all production and reproduction depend on it. Energy is a potential. In everyday life it means being able to move from A to B, to heat the apartment or make coffee. For capitalist businesses, it is the potential to make human labour more efficient or even replace it. For governments, it is the ability to deploy troops abroad, or to forge social compromise through the targeted reduction/increase of heating costs. Energy plays a central role in class struggles: because it can make human labour more efficient, it is indispensable for increasing relative surplus value (as opposed to increasing absolute surplus value by lengthening the working day). Control over energy therefore represents a crucial power resource in labour and class struggles. Industrial action by workers in the coal and oil industries can cause enormous social disruption, and it is for that reason that vast resources are mobilised globally to co-opt them – or to crush them if they revolt. Energy struggles come in various forms and are being waged by actors at all levels of society: from

government subsidies for renewable or fossil fuels, to hostile takeover bids between different energy companies.

Energy struggles and transformation

The current accumulation, intensification and coalescence of energy struggles marks the transition from a fossil fuel-based energy system to a post-fossil era, where renewable energy will play an increasing role. To be sure, traditional energy sources are not disappearing, they are instead being subsumed under the new energy system. The transformation of an energy system is closely connected to profound changes in the structure of global capitalism and the conditions of social struggle. Early mercantile capitalism, which, from the 16th century on, expanded from Europe to encompass the entire globe, was initially based on renewable energies, such as wind, water and biomass (Caffentzis 2009). By the mid-18th century, industrialisation in Britain seemed to reach the limits of this energy regime, as land was used for both agricultural and fuel production – a dual function which the rather small British Isles could not fulfil. From 1780 onwards, however, this problem was solved because coal mining now allowed energy to be extracted from under the soil. In other words, the rise of industrial capitalism, capitalist class relations and British hegemony coincided with the emergence of the first fossil energy system. Later, the system of globalised Fordist mass production under US hegemony coincided with the use of petroleum as primary source of energy. It was not by accident that Lenin defined communism as “soviets plus electrification”. Today we are once again faced with the question what kind of energy system will come to be combined with which type of social formation as a result of contemporary social struggles ...

LOGGING CAUSES BUSHFIRES – FUEL REDUCTION BURNS

Most people here and around the world think that Victoria just burns. That is simply not true. Before Europeans came to Australia a variety of rainforests existed across Victoria. These were subsequently logged, cleared and burnt for grazing, housing, firewood, gold mining and paper.

Those forests didn't promote fire to regenerate, and many of the flora species disappeared as a result. Fauna species also like leadbetter's possum that are used to these type of forests, have been decimated too. Fire-prone species began to dominate and this has led to numerous wildfires.

The current fixation on fuel-reduction burns shows no understanding of the nature of wildfires. These are either grass fires or fires in the forest crown. Because we removed all the huge ancient trees - read Cook's diaries, and the early explorers like Mitchell - mass amounts of young trees have popped up, creating a continual link of crowded eucalyptus leaves that love fire. No amount of fuel reduction burns in wet forests will change that. Fuel reduction burns in rainforest areas remove flora species which suppress fire, and promote species that make fires worse. Fuel reduction burns that are large, hot and intense have never been in our rainforest hills and valleys. Indigenous people used cool, small burns in their firestick culture but not in our rainforest hills and valleys. Hot burns dry-out our forest, and introduce invasive weeds which love fire too.

We have to move to a 200 to 500 year program of promoting the growth of old wet forests, as well as creating buffers for agriculture, housing, and timber harvesting that protect them from wildfire. Wet buffers protect nature from fire too. We need to develop a forest/land culture (already underway) that will promote economic, social and environmental benefits over the long-term, rather than short-term hip pocket and political gain. It would have taken generations for the first peoples of this land to come to terms with the different values of this, the most ancient and unique land in the world. We have been here many generations now, its time we understand these different values too.

Logging Causes Bushfires – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zCoqCO6YJg8>

<http://youtu.be/8hkqT-CZTDY>

By Fi Nelson and Alex Ginko Bowles fngproductions@gmail.com

NO MINES, NO MASTERS! ECO-CLASS WAR! RESOURCES

Environmental archives of Libertarian (anti-state) communists

<http://libcom.org/tags/environment> <http://www.delicious.com/dr.woooo>

<http://325.nostate.net/?cat=7>

<http://upsidedownworld.org> <http://ww4report.com>

<http://interactivist.autonomeia.org/taxonomy/term/31>

RTF – **European mass land squats network** <http://reclaimthefields.org/>

BC Blackout, anti-colonial and anti-capitalist opposition to pipelines.

Our self motivated practice and theory of insurrectional subsistence is relevant to weaving the currents between the eco war and the class war. ” <http://bcblackout.wordpress.com/>

<http://coalactionscotland.org.uk/>

Root Force: Promotes anti-infrastructure analysis and action, based on the recognition that infrastructure expansion is a weak point of the system...

<http://www.rootforce.org/> <http://en.contrainfo.espiv.net>

communisation, the struggle against work and class struggle beyond workers identity...

<http://endnotes.org.uk>

<http://news.infoshop.org/> <http://ainfos.ca/en/>

<http://disaccords.wordpress.com/tag/mining/>

Sabotage Against Shell's Pipeline in Erris, Ireland

50 Shell to Sea campaigners kicked off the Week of Action against Shell's experimental high pressure gas pipe in Erris by tearing up the bog road Shell has laid as part of its attempt to finish the pipeline. They also destroyed the sandbag dam that Shell were attempting to build across part of the estuary in order to be able to work on the pipeline route regardless of the tides. This was accomplished in full view of about 15 security from IRMS – the security company hired by Shell to repress protest

Tensions escalate in New Brunswick, anti-fracking protest

25-6-13 ELSIPOGTOG FIRST NATION — Unspecified “industrial equipment” was torched early Tuesday morning near the area of an ongoing anti-fracking protest in northern New Brunswick, says the RCMP, as tensions continue to rise as a result of ongoing police action against demonstrators there.

Report: Statement from the Black & Green Forum & 2nd Solidarity Eco-Camp in the Philippines (With international struggle reports)

Eco-Camp is an activity organized by Mobile Anarchist School with the help by Local Autonomous Network (LAN) both active in the Philippines. Last April 2012 was the first camping held in Tanay Rizal, Philippines. It was attended by various collectives and individuals totaling around 40 people who participated the various activities and discussions in the camp. The objective of the eco-camp was to discuss the different issues confronting our current society and to find solidarity actions that can help expose and popularize our issues.

After series of activities in 2012, the LAN decided to expand its activities on ecological issues due to concrete manifestation of the crisis impacting the archipelago.

The second eco-camp gathering was organized by LAN and the Mobile Anarchist School in March 2013 to heighten our education campaign and to strengthen the relationship with other affinity groups and build an international network better able to work towards intensifying our impact by making solidarity actions globally.

We invited anarchist from Indonesia, Germany, Greece, Japan, and U.S.A. to join us in the Philippines for six-day activities to share our experiences, ideas, and discuss the possibility of organizing future actions on these important issues detailed here.

The first event was the Black and Green Forum which provides education and popularization campaign of LAN, and its objectives to provide analysis on ecological issues based on the perspective of a non-hierarchical and anti-authoritarian framework and to share alternatives which already being done by anarchist and autonomous activists in the local and international level.

The Black and Green Forum was carried out in collaboration with Third World Studies Center-University of the Philippines (TWSC – UP) and entitled “Anarchism: Ecological Crises, Climate Change and Direct Action”.

In recognition that Food not Bombs is one of among effective methods of anti-authoritarian actions an activity was organized after the Black and Green Forum to spread information with regards to history, experience and insights of the Food Not Bombs global movement.

After the two events in Quezon City, activists witnessed the industrial wastewater discharge into creeks and tributaries of Laguna Lake. The next day, activists once again meet for four days at the Second Solidarity Eco-camp in Tanay, Rizal. These activities culminated to adoption of this common statement where the specific context of most localities detailed below was critically discussed.

Mining surfaced as one of the major issues being addressed by the network in their respective localities due to its various social and environmental impacts. But generally, autonomous and anarchist activists are responding to multiple and interconnected social and ecological issues.

PHILIPPINES

The massive destruction of the ecology of the archipelago is directly attributed to investments of corporations who are up to extract natural resources to gain more profit.

The marginalized communities in the global south such as the majority of urban and rural poor communities in the Philippines constantly experience the negative impacts of environmental destructions; the changing weather pattern already claimed 300,000 of lives on the annual basis, it destroyed billions of assets and it caused massive losses in various sectors such agriculture. Floods and landslide have become common and the government has shown that it will not provide concrete and long term solutions.

Despite of very destructive and hazardous impact of mining, the government allowed it to operate and even give more incentives to corporations, the corrupt government is assisting the destructive enterprise of these profit-hungry institutions through legislations and coercive processes.

Mining corporations in the Philippines such as Sagittarius Mines/Xtrata, Philex and among others should be held liable to the destruction of the environment, murdering people and displacing communities. The said corporations and the likes should be kick-out of the archipelago and made them pay for the damages and violence they incurred.

In general, lakes, rivers, bays, forests (upland and mangroves) and other ecosystems are being used and exploited in favor of the capitalists to the demise of marginalized communities. We encourage people and community to directly take action in defending and reclaiming their lives by protecting their own habitat.

JUSTICE FOR THE VICTIMS OF STATE VIOLENCE

Like any government in the world, the Philippine Republic is guilty of executing people both political and innocents. The Philippine government is harboring criminals that terrorize and rob people. The Philippine National police (PNP) and the military (Armed Forces of the Philippines) are supposed to protect the people; but we are all aware that these institutions violate people's dignity and life and getting away with it.

CONTACT Email: [aschool \(at\) riseup.net](mailto:aschool@riseup.net)

onsiteinfoshopphilippines.wordpress.com ebinfoshop.surestepintegral.com

unitedmedianetwork.wordpress.com mindsetbreakerpress.blogspot.com

INDONESIA

The history of Indonesia is a history of agrarian conflict which has endured since colonial times, and continues to the present day. Conflicts which remain unresolved or which are even deliberately cultivated to reinforce structures that benefit political and business elites. And then, as part of these conflicts, acts of violence emerge, by state security forces against the people, legitimized in the name of the law. When peasants and those defending the people's rights are prosecuted, terrorized, intimidated, arrested or shot, it is a clear example that the state prefers to solve its problems with violence.

Meanwhile, the people who are standing in the way of capital's expansion are themselves labeled as violent, under the pretext that state security forces are merely maintaining security and stability (for capital). Another source of violence comes from those elements of society whose discourse supports that of the state and corporations, with their slogans about resistance, saying that resistance should be non-violent, meaning that the people do nothing in the face of the state's treachery. The actions which the people take in defending or reclaiming what is rightfully theirs is not violence. It is their struggle, just as in the colonial era people took up arms to fight for independence.

The Forum for Communication between Agrarian Communities (FKMA) was conceived, formulated and formed by peasant farmers and other communities that have been victims of the collusion between the state and corporations to seize agrarian resources (living space).

JAPAN

ECOLOGICAL DESTRUCTION BY CORPORATION AND STATE (MINING PROJECT & RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION)

The Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant accident is the second largest nuclear disaster after Chernobyl. Approximately 30,000 people died of its accident, and currently, around 150,000 people still live in evacuation under government order or by their own choice and certain number of those people cannot go back to their home town forever because of high level of radioactive contamination.

Although it was triggered by a large earthquake and tsunami, this accident was definitely a human disaster. It means that an electric company and the national government are responsible due to a series of underestimations sustained by a “myth of safety”, such as that of the height of a possible tsunami, the possibility of a “station blackout,” and duration of power failures. In addition, confusing and misleading information, and also a deliberate concealment of information occurred.

In the background of this, there is the “Atomic Village” or “Atomic Circle,” a very closed relationship among politicians, government offices, academics, industrial leaders, and the media. Japan, has had no true independent regulator of nuclear issues. This disaster revealed out that Japan is the society simply determined by the economic growth led by the state policy.

In response to all these incidents, unprecedented enormous protests against nuclear society have been happening in Japan to get our destiny back to our own hands. The struggles are work in progress.

Genpatsu Yamero Demo: <http://911shinjuku.tumblr.com/>

Metropolitan Coalition Against Nukes: <http://coalitionagainstnukes.jp/>

GERMANY

The German state as one of the powerful leaders in Europe and also in the world has to defend its capitalist interests by any means necessary. In the ongoing economical crisis in Europe, Germany is on the one side mainly responsible for the tragic situation in countries like Greece,

Spain or Portugal where poverty and social exclusion is growing every day. On the other side the state and some of the big corporations make profit from this economical situation.

But concerning to one of the main topics (mining) at the Eco Camp, the German business is actively participating in the overexploitation of natural resources around the world and of course also in the Philippines. Since over 10 years the "Commerzbank" gave credits to the mining company Lepanto to support gold digging in the Cordillera region.

This area and their people are strongly affected through the environmental pollution. In the Tampakan area in Mindanao a Gold and Copper project was developed by the big Swiss mining company "Xstrata", one of the shareholders is the „Deutsche Bank“. This bank also gave loans to "Atlas Consolidated" to finance their copper mine in Toledo City, Cebu. But also other big companies, like for example "DHL" try to make substantial profits out of this dirty economical practice. They provide everything what is needed to take care of the mining sector needs. These short examples show how German companies are involved in international mining.

Some additional short notices should highlight that Germany tries to consolidate their leading position as good as possible. Germany and their military forces intervene in different international conflicts, for example in Afghanistan, Syria or since some weeks in Mali.

Furthermore Germany takes part in developing new strategies of modern warfare to control social uprisings. In the middle of the country is the most advanced training center in Europe for practicing war and counterinsurgency. But beside this practice of prevention they do everything to fight possible enemies. Surveillance, repression and police brutality are only some ways to secure their power.

The struggle against capitalism is global. For international solidarity. Let's light up the fire of revolt. For social revolution!

USA

The U.S. is in the last days of empire and is forcing a crisis on the population. The 2010 census shows that one in two Americans are struggling to survive. Several million people are homeless and half of all prisoners on Earth are locked up in U.S. jails. While the two political parties pretend to argue over policy they really share the same goals of supporting transnational corporate power.

Since Americans are in a period of what may be the final transfer of capital from the taxpayers to the elite the authorities are taking every measure to protect their interests from civil unrest. Federal and State governments are implementing policies to aid in a rapid increase in mining, oil extraction, timber harvesting and many other ecologically damaging activities which are also inspiring resistance. New legal policies give the president the power to kill or detain anyone including Americans without trial. For the first time since the civil war the military is empowered to wage war against the American people. Local police have been militarized with new equipment, training and powers.

The current economic crisis has inspired a new wave of anti-homeless laws and other forms of criminalization of the poor. The technology for surveillance is so sophisticated the authorities are able to monitor nearly all electronic communications and monitor nearly every movement of anyone considered a threat.

Protests in the U.S. against the policies of the state and corporations have been frequent but Occupy Wall Street surprised both the activist community and the security forces. Many people who had never considered participating in a protest were moved to join because of their personal conditions. Many of the new protesters had voted for Obama believing he would bring change but he continued the policies that caused them to lose their jobs and homes. Occupy Wall Street also frightened the elite inspiring bans or limitations on the sharing of food in public spaces. This has in some cases caused the local community to support groups like Food Not Bombs. In late December 2012 a public interest law firm received nearly 200 pages of F.B.I. documents showing that the Obama administration was worried and started to monitor activists months before the occupations started. These documents show that the F.B.I. organized with private security to implement a wide range of disruptive tactics including organizing bombing plots in the name of occupy and a suggestion that the people considered to be the leaders be killed using suppressed sniper rifles. Since the disruption of occupy resistance in the United States has been in disarray. Efforts to regroup have been derailed by covert means within the movement.

After the evictions and disruption of the occupy movement many activists refocused their attention to stopping the XL Keystone Pipeline, the rapid increase in coal mining and the associated rail lines and super ports. There is also an increase in protests and direct actions against the rapid increase in hydraulic fracturing or fracking though no wide spread campaign of sabotage by the public has occurred yet. Fracking is a process of pumping toxic chemicals into the earth to force carbon to the surface. The contamination to fresh water and the surrounding

ecosystem is already driving many into poverty as their land and homes have become worthless. This crisis is likely to grow dire when the tens of thousands of wells already in operation run dry during the decade and the small amount of profit shared with local land owners also evaporates.

It is very important that the Anarchists and other opponents of corporate and government domination start to work together and consider new strategies of resistance while at the same time organizing systems of mutual aid as the economy continues to collapse and the repression increases.

Millions more will become homeless and hunger is sure to increase in the United States. The new police state policies like the deployment of the military in local communities, advanced methods of surveillance and the promised use of over 30,000 drones patrolling American skies will make resistance challenging. Reaching the public with counter information and working with them to implement some effective strategies of resistance while building an alternative to the failing system will require reflection and critical thinking in the anarchist community.

Recent events like Katrina and Sandy, the occupations, increase in projects like community gardening show that the best hope for Americans can be found in the ideas of the anarchist community.

Greece . Mining struggles

Soil, water and air are priceless, and belong to all of us. Gold, on the other hand, is an abstract concept that, especially today, acquires value when it functions as 'money', when it is used as an effort to counterbalance the 'over-the-top money', money invented out of thin air, that came into being three decades ago through bank lending and the 'stoke exchanges' system of speculation and gambling. We have to point out the fact that only the 10% of the world's extracted gold deposits is actually put in some tangible use. At the same time, the quantity of gold that is being used as 'money' in stoke exchanges and in the international monetary system is seven times more than the real quantity of gold which can be found in the planet.

'Development and progress' is the echo following the announcements concerning the goldmines, as well as the wind turbines on Lesbos and Limnos islands, and elsewhere, the waste incineration factories; all these plus innumerable other such crimes are presented as the antidote to the crisis, the same crisis that the development itself created. The case of the goldmines is the most extreme one, out of all these 'developing crimes in the name of

progress', due to the fact that no one even dares to oppose the destruction that they are about to cause, but also because—as we all know by now—the multinationals will draw all the profit, apart from a short-term small portion that will go to a few hundred workers. Furthermore, it is not coincidental that this scandalous transaction scam of the northern-eastern Halkidiki mines took place during a period of affluence, at a time when no one paid any attention, while the realization of the mega-project, the actual construction of the mines, is pushed forward now, amidst the crisis. Here, we are faced with blunt blackmail: we have to either accept such a plainly and straightforward destructive proposition, or else we will not manage to survive.

The whole problem with the capitalistic growth is not simply that there are some businesspeople and politicians who are squeezing exorbitant profits out of everybody else, and in order to do so—always in the name of the profit—they will destroy the environment, but the plain fact that our lives are being governed by an international money mafia that kills humans, animals and the Earth. The true face of progress is one of a vicious circle that will constantly dictate even harsher terms in order to exploit more each time. Development manages to achieve this through the breaking up of communities and the weakening of individuals, bonding them tighter and tighter to the chariot of this mechanism of death and destruction called capitalism. Consequently, this ongoing collapse gives birth to certain types of people who fall prey to the blackmail—because they are so desperately looking for single-handed solutions that seem to be in their own self-interest—and eventually believe that their interests are the same ones with those of multinational corporations. They do not care about the impact that their choices have on the whole of society, the consequences of which will soon knock also on their door.

The system wishes to incapacitate us so that we are in no position to decide for ourselves. Its whole existence depends on whether we choose to bind ourselves to the dynamic engine of capitalism, in order to survive or even enjoy a share of the profits of the capitalistic growth. If we want to stand against this dictatorship of money, if we want to build another world, we cannot succumb to this blackmail of crisis that is offering further disasters and is driving us towards the desperate pursuit of a personal bailout while threatening entire communities with mass destruction. We can neither hand over our future to any sort of saviors. On the contrary, we must fight to defend common goods and resources. We must fight to put an end to the activities of these mega-companies and of all the politicians who are in their payroll. We must struggle to prevent the destruction of people's communities.

Social solidarity, collective consciousness and human values are our weaponry.

We must meet and discuss:

Which goods are necessary?

Which are the values that we should fight for?

How do we take decisions? How can we, ourselves, organize and take charge of our lives?

Whoever is silent is an accomplice to the crime...

OPEN COORDINATIVE OF THESSALONIKI AGAINST THE GOLDMINES

<http://nogoldthess.espivblogs.net/>

Revolutionary Ecology

Biocentrism & Deep Ecology

by Judi Bari

I was a social justice activist for many years before I ever heard of Earth First!. So it came as a surprise to me, when I joined Earth First! in the 1980s, to find that the radical environmental movement paid little attention to the social causes of ecological destruction. Similarly, the urban-based social justice movement seems to have a hard time admitting the importance of biological issues, often dismissing all but "environmental racism" as trivial. Yet in order to effectively respond to the crises of today, I believe we must merge these two issues.

Starting from the very reasonable, but unfortunately revolutionary concept that social practices which threaten the continuation of life on Earth must be changed, we need a theory of revolutionary ecology that will encompass social and biological issues, class struggle, and a recognition of the role of global corporate capitalism in the oppression of peoples and the destruction of nature.

I believe we already have such a theory. It's called deep ecology, and it is the core belief of the radical environmental movement. The problem is that, in the early stages of this debate, deep ecology was falsely associated with such right wing notions as sealing the borders, applauding AIDS as a population control mechanism, and encouraging Ethiopians to starve. This sent the social ecologists justifiably scurrying to disassociate. And I believe it has

muddied the waters of our movement's attempt to define itself behind a common philosophy.

So in this article, I will try to explain, from my perspective as an unabashed leftist, why I think deep ecology is a revolutionary world view. I am not trying to proclaim that my ideas are Absolute Truth, or even that they represent a finished thought process in my own mind. These are just some ideas I have on the subject, and I hope that by airing them, it will spark more debate and advance the discussion.

Biocentrism

Deep ecology, or biocentrism, is the belief that nature does not exist to serve humans. Rather, humans are part of nature, one species among many. All species have a right to exist for their own sake, regardless of their usefulness to humans. And biodiversity is a value in itself, essential for the flourishing of both human and nonhuman life.

These principles, I believe, are not just another political theory. Biocentrism is a law of nature, that exists independently of whether humans recognize it or not. It doesn't matter whether we view the world in a human centered way. Nature still operates in a biocentric way. And the failure of modern society to acknowledge this - as we attempt to subordinate all of nature to human use - has led us to the brink of collapse of the earth's life support systems.

Biocentrism is not a new theory, and it wasn't invented by Dave Foreman or Arnie Naas. It is ancient native wisdom, expressed in such sayings as "The earth does not belong to us. We belong to the earth." But in the context of today's industrial society, biocentrism is profoundly revolutionary, challenging the system to its core.

Biocentrism Contradicts Capitalism

The capitalist system is in direct conflict with the natural laws of biocentrism. Capitalism, first of all, is based on the principle of private property - of certain humans owning the earth for the purpose of exploiting it for profit. At an earlier stage, capitalists even believed they could own other humans. But just as slavery has been discredited in the mores of today's dominant

world view, so do the principles of biocentrism discredit the concept that humans can own the earth.

How can corporate raider Charles Hurwitz claim to "own" the 2,000-year-old redwoods of Headwaters Forest, just because he signed a few papers to trade them for a junk bond debt? This concept is absurd. Hurwitz is a mere blip in the life of these ancient trees. Although he may have the power to destroy them, he does not have the right.

One of the best weapons of U.S. environmentalists in our battle to save places like Headwaters Forest is the (now itself endangered) Endangered Species Act. This law and other laws that recognize public trust values such as clean air, clean water, and protection of threatened species, are essentially an admission that the laws of private property do not correspond to the laws of nature. You cannot do whatever you want on your own property without affecting surrounding areas, because the earth is interconnected, and nature does not recognize human boundaries.

Even beyond private property, though, capitalism conflicts with biocentrism around the very concept of profit. Profit consists of taking out more than you put in. This is certainly contrary to the fertility cycles of nature, which depend on a balance of give and take. But more important is the question of where this profit is taken from.

According to Marxist theory, profit is stolen from the workers when the capitalists pay them less than the value of what they produce. The portion of the value of the product that the capitalist keeps, rather than pays to the workers, is called surplus value. The amount of surplus value that the capitalist can keep varies with the level of organization of the workers, and with their level of privilege within the world labor pool. But the working class can never be paid the full value of their labor under capitalism, because the capitalist class exists by extracting surplus value from the products of their labor.

Although I basically agree with this analysis, I think there is one big thing missing. I believe that part of the value of a product comes not just from the labor put into it, but also from the natural resources used to make the product. And I believe that surplus value (i.e., profit) is not just stolen from the workers, but also from the earth itself. A clearcut is the perfect example of a part of the earth from which surplus value has been extracted. If human production and consumption is done within the natural limits of the earth's fertility, then the

supply is indeed endless. But this cannot happen under capitalism, because the capitalist class exists by extracting profit not only from the workers, but also from the earth.

(Author's note: At this point, Marxist scholars always object, citing Critique of the Gotha Program to say that Marx did recognize nature, as well as labor, as a source of value. But Marx makes the distinction between use value, which he says comes from nature and labor, and exchange value, which he says comes from labor alone. It is this point with which I am disagreeing. It seems obvious to me that use value, supplied by nature, helps determine exchange value. For example, redwood and fir trees grow side by side in the same forest, and at a similar rate. Yet the same amount of labor applied to cutting and mining a 600-year-old, 6-foot diameter redwood tree will produce more exchange value than if it were applied to cutting a 600-year-old, 6-foot diameter fir tree. The reason redwood is worth more is that it has certain qualities the fir lacks i.e., it is so rot resistant that it can be used for exposed siding or as foundation wood in direct contact with the soil, while the fir cannot. This quality of rot resistance does not come from anything added by human labor. It is a quality supplied by nature. So when I say that value comes from both labor and nature, I am referring to exchange value, not just use value.)

Modern day corporations are the very worst manifestation of this sickness. A small business may survive on profits, but at least its basic purpose is to provide sustenance for the owners, who are human beings with a sense of place in their communities. But a corporation has no purpose for its existence, nor any moral guide to its behavior, other than to make profits. And today's global corporations are beyond the control of any nation or government. In fact, the government is in the service of the corporations, its armies poised to defend their profits around the world and its secret police ready to infiltrate and disrupt any serious resistance at home.

In other words, this system cannot be reformed. It is based on the destruction of the earth and the exploitation of the people. There is no such thing as green capitalism, and marketing cutesy rainforest products will not bring back the ecosystems that capitalism must destroy to make its profits. This is why I believe that serious ecologists must be revolutionaries.

Biocentrism Contradicts Communism

As you can probably tell, my background in revolutionary theory comes from Marxism, which I consider to be a brilliant critique of capitalism. But as to what should be implemented in

capitalism's place, I don't think Marxism has shown us the answer. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is that communism, socialism, and all other left ideologies that I know of speak only about redistributing the spoils of raping the earth more evenly among classes of humans. They do not even address the relationship of the society to the earth, Or rather, they assume that it will stay the same as it is under capitalism - that of a gluttonous consumer. And that the purpose of the revolution is to find a more efficient and egalitarian way to produce and distribute consumer goods.

This total disregard of nature as a life force, rather than just a source of raw materials, allowed Marxist states to rush to industrialize without even the most meager environmental safeguards. This has resulted in such noted disasters as the meltdown of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, the oil spill in the Arctic Ocean, and the ongoing liquidation of the fragile forests of Siberia. It has left parts of Russia and Eastern Europe with such a toxic legacy that vast areas are now uninhabitable. Marx stated that the primary contradiction in industrial society is the contradiction between capital and labor. I believe these disasters show that there is an equally important contradiction between industrial society and the earth.

But even though socialism has so far failed to take ecology into account, I do not think it is beyond reform, as is capitalism. One of the principles of socialism is "production for use, not for profit." Therefore, the imbalance is not as built in under socialism as it is under capitalism, and I could envision a form of socialism that would not destroy the earth. But it would be unlike Marx's industrial model .

Ecological socialism, among other things, would have to deal with the issue of centralism. The Marxist idea of a huge body politic relating to some central planning authority presupposes (1) authoritarianism of some sort; and (2) the use of mass production technologies that are inherently destructive to the earth and corrosive to the human spirit. Ecological socialism would mean organizing human societies in a manner that is compatible with the way that nature is organized. And I believe the natural order of the earth is bioregionalism, not statism.

Modern industrial society robs us of community with each other and community with the earth. This creates a great longing inside us, which we are taught to fill with consumer goods. But consumer goods, beyond those needed for basic comfort and survival, are not really what we crave. So our appetite is insatiable, and we turn to more and more efficient and

dehumanizing methods of production to make more and more goods that do not satisfy us. If workers really had control of the factories (and I say this as a former factory worker), they would start by smashing the machines and finding a more humane way to decide what we need and how to produce it. So to the credo "production for use, not for profit," ecological socialism would add, "production for need, not for greed."

Biocentrism Contradicts Patriarchy

Patriarchy is the oldest and, I think, deepest form of oppression on Earth. In fact, it's so old and it's so deep that we're discouraged from even naming it. If you're a white person, you can talk about apartheid; you can say, "I'm against apartheid" without all the white people getting huffy and offended and thinking you're talking about them. But if you even mention patriarchy, you are met with howls of ridicule and protest from otherwise progressive men who take it as a personal insult that you're even mentioning the word. But I think that the issue of patriarchy needs to be addressed by any serious revolutionary movement. In fact, I think that the failure to address the patriarchy is one of the great short comings of Marxism. (One of my favorite examples is the book "The Women Question", which was written by four Marxist men!) The other deficiency in Marxism, in my estimation, is the failure to address ecology. I think both of these are equally serious shortcomings.

So I would like to address eco-feminism, and its relevance to biocentrism or deep ecology. Eco-feminism is a holistic view of the earth that is totally consistent with the idea that humans are not separate from nature. I would describe eco-feminism in two separate terms. The first is that there is a parallel between the way this society treats women and the way that it treats the earth. And this is shown in expressions like "virgin redwoods" and "rape of the earth", for example.

The second thing, which I think is even more important, is the reason for the destruction of nature by this society. Obviously part of the reason is capitalism. But beyond that, destruction of nature in this society stems from the suppression of the feminine.

Let me clarify that I believe men and women have both masculine and feminine traits. I'm not saying "all men are bad - all women are good." I define "masculine traits" as conquering and dominance, and "feminine traits" as nurturing and life-giving. And I think that the masculine traits of conquering and dominance are valued no matter who exhibits them. As a macho woman, I can tell you, I've gotten all kinds of strokes in my lifetime because I can get out

there head to head and be just as aggressive as any man. Conversely, the feminine traits of nurturing and life-giving are devalued and suppressed in this society, whether a man or a woman exhibits them. The devaluing and suppression of feminine traits is a major reason for the destruction of the earth. So that's my personal view of eco-feminism. I know the academics have a lot more complicated definition and description, some of which I don't even understand, but I'm going to use my personal, easy to understand definition.

The relationship between the suppression of feminine values, and the destruction of the earth is actually much clearer in third world nations than it is in this society. Where colonial powers take over, when nature is to be destroyed by imperialistic corporations coming into third world countries, one of the ways that the colonial powers take over is by forcibly removing the women from their traditional roles as the keepers of the forest and the farmlands. The women's methods of interacting with the fertility cycles of the earth, is replaced by men and machines. Rather than nurturing the fertility of the earth, these machines rip off the fertility of the earth. For this reason, many of the third world environmental movements are actually women's movements; the Chipko in India, and the tree-planters in Kenya, Brazil, to mention two. In each of these situations, the way that the feminine is suppressed is very parallel to the way that nature is suppressed.

It's less obvious, I think, in this society, but it's still here. Anyone who has ever dealt with the Forest Service, California Department of Forestry, the Endangered Species Act, or anything like that knows that science is used as the authority for the kind of relentless assault on nature in this society. And science is presented to us as neutral, as an objective path to knowledge, as something that's value-free.

But science is not value-free. The scientific methods (there's not just one method, despite what we were taught in science class) of western science are not value-free at all. In fact science was openly described by its founders as a masculine system that presupposes the separation of people from nature and presupposes our dominance over nature. I want to give you some quotes to let you know why this is so, going back to the origin of the scientific method in the 1600's and the Renaissance period. First of all, the initiation of the scientific method, the elevation of this as absolute truth and the only path to truth, began in 1664. For example, there was something that was called the "Royal Society" and it was composed of scientific men who were developing these theories. They described their goal as, and this is a quote, "to raise a masculine philosophy, whereby the mind of men may be enabled with the

knowledge of solid truths." So the idea is that this masculine philosophy will provide us with truth, as opposed to the more "superstitious" feminine kind of knowledge.

I'll give you another example. This is from the aptly-named Sir Francis Bacon. He was one of the worst and actually pretty shocking. He said that the scientific method is a method of aggression. And here is his quote: "The nature of things betrays itself more readily under vexation than in its natural freedom. Science is not merely a gentle guidance over nature's course. We have the power to conquer and subdue her, to shake her to her foundations." And that the purpose of doing this is, "to create a blessed race of heroes who would dominate both nature and society."

So these are the roots of the scientific method upon which CDF justifies clearcuts.

Another of the really worst was Descartes' "Cogito Ergo Sum," "I think therefore I am." He arrived at that by trying to prove that he existed without referring to anything around him. The very concept of that shows a separation between self and nature. But he did a pretty good job of it, and I thought it was pretty interesting. But he went beyond that. He also said, "Well I can doubt this room exists. I can doubt that you exist. I can doubt that I exist. The only thing I can't doubt is that I am doubting. AHA! I think, therefore, I am!" So that was pretty smart, but it was still very narrow and very self-centered. I always said that only an oldest child could have come up with this kind of solipsistic view of the world. Descartes also named the scientific method that we learned in science class "scientific reductionism." The idea is that in order to understand a complex problem, reduce it to its simpler form to know it, in order to "render ourselves the masters and possessors of nature." So the very concept of "scientific reductionism" is really the problem with science and illustrative of why it's not a neutral objective path to knowledge. This is the methodology that we're going to look at a little piece at a time, in order to understand something complex.

One more example is a statement from Bacon to James I, who was involved in the inquisition at the time. The rise of the scientific method, of this masculine method of knowledge, emerged during the same time period as the very violent suppression of the women's knowledge of the earth, herbal ways etc. So this wasn't just, "Oh, we have a better way, you women stand aside." It was "we're going to burn you at the stake," so it was certainly not neutral. It was a very aggressive and violent imposition of a masculine system of knowledge. In this context Bacon said to James I, "Neither ought a man to make scruple of entering and penetrating into those holes and corners when the inquisition of truth is his whole object - as

your majesty has shown in your own example." The only way they can perpetuate the myth that the scientific method is objective is to remove it from the context of the social conditions from which it arose. It's not objective at all. It's not the only method of knowledge. It's not the only path to truth. And it's not value-free. It's openly masculine and it openly presupposes the separation of humans from the earth, and it presupposes that the purpose of science is to dominate nature.

What did the more feminine methods of knowledge that were being suppressed at the time involve? The "feminine" methods were based on observation and interaction with the earth in order to increase the fertility cycles in a way that's beneficial to all. For example, we learn that if we bury a fish with the corn, the corn grows better - those kind of things. The women's knowledge of the earth was passed down generation to generation - and was dismissed as mere superstition by the rising scientists with their reductionist methods.

However, reductionist science has indeed had a lot of success. It's created nuclear bombs, plastic shrink-wrap, Twinkies, Highway 101, all kinds of wonders of the earth! But it has not led us to a true understanding of nature or the earth, because nature's parts are not separate, they are interdependent. You can't look at one part without looking at the rest, it is all inextricably interconnected. The way that reductionist science has looked at the world has brought us antibiotics that create super bacteria, and flood control methods that create huger floods than ever existed before and fertilizers that leave us with barren soil. These are all examples of the defects of a reductionist kind of science.

Contrary to this masculine system of separation and dominance, eco-feminism seeks a science of nature. And this science of nature is a holistic and interdependent one, where you look at the whole thing and the way that everything interacts, not just the way that it can be when you separate it. And also it presupposes that humans are part of nature, and that our fates are inseparable; that we have to live within the earth's fertility cycles and we can enhance those fertility cycles by our informed interaction.

In India, where Chipko began, the women were the keepers of the forest and the keepers of agriculture, as well. So when the women brought the cows up to the trees (probably savannas rather than forests), the cows fertilized the trees, and nibbled at the limbs and branches, helping to trim them so they would produce more nuts or fruit. This kind of interaction enhanced the fertility cycle of nature. So rather than trying to conquer it, or

subvert it, or disrupt it, the feminine method is based on interacting and enhancing the fertility cycle. And this is exactly what is supplanted when the colonial powers come in.

The holistic and interdependent eco-feminist view in which humans are inseparable from nature, is not any different than deep ecology or biocentrism. This is simply another way of saying the same thing. And so, to embrace biocentrism or deep ecology, is to challenge the masculine system of knowledge that underlies the destruction of the earth, and that underlies the justification for the way our society is structured.

Eco-feminism, however, does not seek to dominate men as women have been dominated under patriarchy. Instead, it seeks to find a balance. We need both the masculine and the feminine forces. It's not that we need to get rid of the masculine force. Both of them exist in the world but must exist in balance. We need the conquering and the dominance as well as we need the nurturing. Eco-feminism seeks find that balance.

Because this society is hugely out of balance, we need a huge rise of the feminine. We need a rise of individual women, and also a rise of feminist ideology among both women and men. Fortunately, I have seen quite a few changes in that direction. I think I'm more impressed with the teenage boys than I am with the teenage girls. It's really neat to see them being able to hug each other and want to grow gardens and things like that. That wouldn't have happened in my generation.

Without this balance between the masculine and the feminine, I don't believe we can make the changes that we need to come back into balance with the earth. For those reasons, I think that deep ecology/biocentrism contradicts patriarchy, and to embrace deep ecology/biocentrism is to challenge the core belief of this masculine, scientific system.

What This Means For The Movement

The fact that deep ecology is a revolutionary philosophy is one of the reasons Earth First! was targeted for disruption and annihilation by the FBI. The fact that we did not recognize it as revolutionary is one of the reasons we were so unprepared for the magnitude of the attack. If we are to continue, Earth First! and the entire ecology movement must adjust their tactics to the profound changes that are needed to bring society into balance with nature.

One way that we can do this is to broaden our focus. Of course, sacred places must be preserved, and it is entirely appropriate for an ecology movement to center on protecting

irreplaceable wilderness areas But to define our movement as being concerned with "wilderness only," as Earth First! did in the 1980s, is self defeating. You cannot seriously address the destruction of wilderness without addressing the society that is destroying it. It's about time for the ecology movement (and I'm not just talking about Earth First! here) to stop considering itself as separate from the social justice movement. The same power that manifests itself as resource extraction in the countryside manifests itself as racism, classism, and human exploitation in the city. The ecology movement must recognize that we are just one front in a long, proud, history of resistance.

A revolutionary ecology movement must also organize among poor and working people. With the exception of the toxics movement and the native land rights movement most U.S. environmentalists are white and privileged. This group is too invested in the system to pose it much of a threat. A revolutionary ideology in the hands of privileged people can indeed bring about some disruption and change in the system. But a revolutionary ideology in the hands of working people can bring that system to a halt. For it is the working people who have their hands on the machinery. And only by stopping the machinery of destruction can we ever hope to stop this madness.

How can it be that we have neighborhood movements focused on the disposal of toxic wastes, for example, but we don't have a worker's movement to stop the production of toxics? It is only when the factory workers refuse to make the stuff, it is only when the loggers refuse to cut the ancient trees, that we can ever hope for real and lasting change. This system cannot be stopped by force. It is violent and ruthless beyond the capacity of any people's resistance movement. The only way I can even imagine stopping it is through massive non-cooperation.

So let's keep blocking those bulldozers and hugging those trees. And let's focus our campaigns on the global corporations that are really at fault. But we have to begin placing our actions in a larger context - the context of revolutionary ecology.

[Note: This article was written in early 1995. It first appeared in the Groundhog Day 1995 edition of Alarm, a journal of revolutionary ecology, Box 57, Burlington, VT 05402. The section on patriarchy differs slightly from the version in Alarm, as it was updated and revised by Judi, and given as a talk at the Willits Environmental Center in June, 1996. This edition was published in the Mendocino Environmental Center Newsletter issue dated September 1997.]

Catastrophism: The truth won't set you free

Catastrophism, by Sasha Lilley, David McNally, Eddie Yuen and James Davis, reviewed by Nic Beuret

At its heart *Catastrophism* is about the loss of faith that haunts radical left-wing politics. Through a series of short essays by prominent US writers and activists it maps out the consequences of an end in the belief that radical change can come from mass politics – that is, from organising. In place of organising *Catastrophism* outlines two ways of doing politics.

The first mode of politics is a kind of determinism: the very nature of capitalism will bring about its demise. Sasha Lilley's essay gives a good overview of the history of this idea among the left. In its various guises it proposes that there is no need to organise, only wait. The end – through economic crisis or environmental collapse – is coming no matter what we do.

The second is in many ways the very opposite – the truth of the impending crisis and the very fact of its imminent arrival will awaken the sleeping masses and provoke them to action. This idea – that it is the left's role to bring the truth of the world to the masses, and that this will move them to revolt – is at the heart of much of the radical left and broader environmental movement.

But as *Catastrophism* points out, this is often far from the case. Truth does not necessarily lead to action. Actually, when it comes to catastrophe and disaster, the truth can play a demobilising as well as mobilising role.

The book doesn't make a neat connection between the two modes of politics and catastrophe. The history of each as outlined in the book rather speaks to the idea that the radical left has moved between these two positions throughout its history. Determinism and volunteerism would seem to be the two dominant reference points of radical left politics.

Where Catastrophism comes into its own is in identifying both that these points of reference are part of the general problem of left-wing politics at the moment, and that it is in times of crisis that they become even stronger tendencies. The author's call for an environmental and left-wing politics animated by a faith in people's ability to change the world is all the more timely.

----- For a detailed critique of the book see

<http://scurvytunes.blogspot.com.au/2012/11/lilley-et-al-on-catastrophism.html>

In Latin America strategies are still being advanced focused on mining, hydrocarbons and monoculture, despite the fact that this means repeating the role of suppliers of raw materials and of civic resistance.

This extractive mode of being is expressed both in conservative and progressive governments. But as the latter hope for another type of development this emphasis has become a political knot of enormous complexity.

Extractivism is appealing to new political justifications. One of the most striking is to invoke the old thinkers of socialism, arguing that they would not oppose extractivism in the 21st century, and would indeed promote it.

Surely the most notable example has been the Ecuadorian President Rafael Correa, who to defend extractivism launched two challenging questions: "where does the Communist Manifesto say no to mining? What socialist theory said no to mining?" (interview in May 2012).

Correa redoubled his bet, since in addition to quoting Marx and Engels, he told his own assembly that it cannot go unnoticed that "traditionally the socialist countries were miners". The message that is displayed is that the theoretical basis of socialism is functional extractivism, and that in practice, the countries of actually existing socialism implemented it successfully. If his position is correct, today, and in Latin America, Marx and Engels would be encouraging mining, oil holdings or monoculture plantations for export.

Dreaming of an extractivist Marx

Let's start by weighing the validity of Correa's question. One can't expect that the Communist Manifesto, written in the mid-19th century, would contain the answers to all the problems of the 21st century.

As noted by two of the most renowned Marxists of the twentieth century, Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, both Marx and Engels considered that the principles of the manifesto were still correct, but that the text had aged. "In particular, they acknowledged implicitly that the means by which capitalism would be extended and introduce new countries and regions into the mainstream of modern history, would necessarily lead to the emergence of problems and forms of development that are not considered by the Manifesto", they say [1]. Without a doubt this is the situation of the Latin American nations, where it would be necessary to contextualize both the questions and the answers.

It is then necessary to verify if the socialist countries were really miners. That is not entirely true, and in those sites where mining increased in importance, we now know that the environmental, social and economic balance sheet was very negative. One of the most striking examples occurred in the mining and steel areas of Poland under the Soviet shadow. Today equally terrible situations with regard to mining exist in China.

We cannot forget that many of those enterprises, given their high social and environmental cost, only become viable when there are no adequate environmental controls or civic demands are muted by authoritarian means. It cannot go unnoticed that extractivism, Soviet-style, was unable to generate the economic and productive leap that was predicted by those same plans.

Currently, progressivism defends extractivism, aiming to take advantage of its economic income to finance various social plans and changes in the productive base to create another economy.

The problem is that, in this way, a dependency develops between extractivism and social plans. Without taxes on exports of raw materials possibilities would be reduced to fund, for example, monthly monetary aid to the poorest. This means the state itself becomes extractive, becoming a partner in various projects, courting investors of all kinds, and providing various facilities. Without doubt there are changes under progressivism, but the problem is that the social and environmental impacts are repeated and reinforce the role of national economies as subordinate suppliers of raw materials.

The claim that emergence from dependency is possible through more extractivism has no chance of being realized. It creates a situation where the promised transition becomes impossible, through the consequences of extractivism at various levels, through economic policies (such as the displacement of local industry or the overvaluation of national currencies, and a tendency to combat civic resistance). The use of instruments of economic redistribution has limited scope, as demonstrated by the repetition of social mobilizations. But it is also expensive, and ends up with governments needing still more new extractivist projects. It is precisely all these perverse relationships which should be analysed by looking to Marx. Correa's message, although challenging, is in fact not applying those principles of Marx that still remain for the 21st century.

Listening to the warning of Marx

Marx did not reject mining. Most of the social movements do not reject it, and if their claims are heard carefully it will be found that they are focused on a particular type of enterprise: large scale, with huge volumes removed, intensive and open-pit. In other words, don't confuse mining with extractivism.

Marx did not reject mining, but was very clear where there should be changes. From that perspective there are answers to Correa's question: Marx distinguished "vulgar socialism" from a substantive socialism, and that differentiation should be considered attentively today.

In his "Critique of the Gotha Programme" Marx recalls that the distribution of the means of consumption is, actually, a consequence of the mode of production. Intervening in

consumption does not transform modes of production, but it is at this last level where the real changes must occur. Marx adds: “vulgar socialism (...) has learned from the bourgeois economists to consider and treat distribution as something independent of the mode of production, and, therefore, to consider socialism as a doctrine that revolves mainly around distribution” [2].

Here is the answer to Correa’s question: Marx, in Latin America today, would not be an extractivist, because that would mean abandoning the goal of transforming the modes of production, becoming a bourgeois economist. On the contrary, he would be promoting alternatives to production, and that means, in our present context, moving toward post-extractivism.

For sure the vision of Marx is not enough to organize the end of extractivism, since he was a man immersed in the ideas of the progress of modernity, but it identifies the sense that there must be alternatives. Indeed, it becomes clear that instrumental adjustments or redistributive improvements may represent progress, but it is still imperative to transcend the dependence on extractivism as a key element of the current mode of production. This issue is so clear that Marx himself concludes “once the true relation of things is clarified, why go backwards”? So, why continue to insist with extractivism? --- MORE SIMILAR AT <http://ww4report.com/node/12050>

