ZAPOJTE SE DO DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE

O DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE

Pro■ Deep Green Resistance?

- Pr■myslová civilizace zabijí veškerý život na naší planet■, dohání k zániku 200 druh■ každý den, a to nebude ukon■eno dobrovoln■.

- Globální oteplování dnes postupuje s ohromující rychlostí. Jediným skute■ným ■ešením je zastavit pr■myslovou civilizaci p■ed spalováním fosilních paliv.

- V■tšina spot■eby je založena na násilí v■■i lidem (lidem a nelidským bytostem) a degeneruje krajinu na celé planet■.

- Život na Zemi je mnohem důležitější než toto šílenství, tato přechodná kultura, která je založena na hyper-vykořisťování omezených zdrojů. Tato kultura musí být zničena dříve, než zkonzumuje veškerý život na této planetě.
- Lidstvo není civilizací. Lidé se vyvinuli v mnohých zdravých a udržitelných kulturách, a sami čelí nebezpečí, které plyne z civilizace.
- Mnozí lidé jsou si vědomi, že tato kultura je šílená a potřebuje radikální změnu, ale nevidí žádný způsob, jak dosáhnout změny.
- Na rozdíl od většiny environmentálních organizací a organizací za sociální spravedlnost Deep Green Resistance zpochybňuje nezbytnost a života schopnost civilizace samotné. DGR se ptá: "Co kdybychom skoncovali s civilizací úplně?"
- Na rozdíl od většiny environmentálních organizací a za sociální spravedlnost se DGR ptá: "Co musíme udělat, aby to bylo efektivní?", ne na to: "Co ti u moci nám umožňují dělat?"
- DGR nabízí organizované, spolehlivé způsoby, jak prosadit zdravé způsoby žití a přežití probíhající krize.
- DGR má realistický plán, jak zastavit toto šílenství, viz Decisive Ecological Warfare (Rozhodující ekologický boj).

Poslechněte si členy Deep Green Resistance, proč se přidali.

Co je Deep Green Resistance?

Deep Green Resistance má analýzy, strategie, a je ojedinělou organizací svého druhu. Analýzy dokazují, že civilizace jako instituce je tím, co ničí život na Zemi. Jako strategii nabízí konkrétní plán, jak zastavit tuto zkázu. Jako organizace Deep Green Resistance realizuje tuto strategii.

Cílem DGR je zbavit bohaté jejich schopnosti okrádat chudé a jejich moci zničit planetu. Toto je obrovský závazek, ale je nutné říci: jde to provést. Průmyslová civilizace může být zastavena.

DGR je nadzemní organizace, která využívá přímé akce v boji za záchranu planety. Dále volá po potřebě podzemních akcí, které se mohou zaměřit na strategickou infrastrukturu industrializace. Ale tyto akce sami o sobě nejsou nikdy dostačující strategií pro dosažení spravedlivého výsledku. Každá strategie, která se zaměřuje na života schopnou budoucnost, musí zahrnovat výzvu pro vybudování přímé demokracie založené na lidských právech a udržitelné podstatě kultur.

To znamená, že různá ramena hnutí odporu musí pracovat v tandemu: nadzemní a podzemní, militantní a nenásilné, frontline aktivisté a kulturní pracovníci. Všichni se potřebujeme.

A my potřebujeme odvahu. Slovo "odvaha" pochází ze stejného kořene jako coeur, Francouzky srdce. Potřebujeme všechnu odvahu, které je schopné lidské srdce, použít zbraň a štít na obranu toho, co zbylo z této planety. A mízou odvahy je samozřejmě láska.

Takže zatímco DGR je o boji, cíl této organizace je o lásce. Zpěvní ptáci a lososi potřebují vaše srdce, bez ohledu na to, jak je unavené, protože i zlomené srdce je stále plné lásky. Potřebují vaše srdce, protože zanikají, padají do té nejdelší noci vyhynutí, a odpor je v nedohlednu. Budeme muset postavit tento odpor tomu, co vychází na světlo: šepot a modlitby, dějiny a sny z našich nejodvážnějších slov a akcí. Bude to těžké, vyžádá si to svou cenu, a při mnoha a mnoha neúprosných úsvitech, se to bude zdát nemožné. Ale budeme to muset udělat, tak jako tak. Takže jděte za tím, co vám říkají vaše srdce, a spojte se s každou živou bytostí. S láskou jako naším Hlavním impulsem, jak se nám to může podařit?

Nepopírám, že jsem plánoval sabotáž. Neplánoval jsem ji v duchu bezohlednosti ani proto, že bych miloval násilí. Plánoval jsem ji v důsledku klidného a střízlivého hodnocení politické situace, která vznikla po mnoha letech tyranie, vykořisťování a útlaku mého lidu ze strany bílých.

-Nelson Mandela

HLAVNÍ ZÁSADY DEEP GREEN REISTANCE

Základní principy

Půda, vzduch, voda, klima a potraviny, které jíme, jsou vytvářeny komplexními komunitami živých bytostí. Potřeba těchto živých komunit je primární: individuální a sociální morálka musí vycházet z pokorného vztahu se sítí života.

Civilizace, zejména průmyslová civilizace, je z podstaty destruktivní pro život na Zemi. Naším úkolem je vytvořit hnutí odporu zaměřeného na život, které odstraní průmyslovou civilizaci jakýmikoli potřebnými prostředky. Organizovaný politický odpor je jedinou nadějí pro naši planetu.

Deep Green Resistance pracuje na ukončení zneužívání na osobní, organizační a kulturní úrovni. Snažíme se také vymýtit dominanci a podřízenost z našich soukromých životů a sexuálních praktik. Deep Green Resistance se ztotožňuje s feministky a jinými, kteří se snaží vymýtit všechnu sociální nadvládu a podporují solidaritu mezi utlačovanými lidmi.

Když bude ukončena civilizace, živý svět se bude radovat. Musíme být biotičtí lidé, abychom přežili. Ti z nás, kteří zapomněli, se musí naučit, jak znovu žít s půdou a vzduchem a vodou a bytostmi kolem nás v komunitách postavených na úctě a díkuvzdání. Vítáme tuto budoucnost.

Deep Green Resistance je radikální feministická organizace. Muži jako třída vedou válku proti ženám. Znásilňování, incest, týrání, prostituce, pornografie, chudoba a gynocida jsou jak zbraní v této válce, tak podmínkami, které vytvářejí sexuální třídy žen. Gender není přirozený, není to volba a není to pocit: je to struktura útlaku žen. Pokusy vytvořit více „výběrů" v rámci sexuálního kastovního systému, slouží pouze k posílení brutální reality mužské moci. Jako radikálové chceme odstranit gender a celý systém patriarchátu, který ztělesňuje. Svobodu žen jako třídy nelze oddělit od odporu proti dominantní kultuře jako celku.

Listen to an audio version of the Statement of Principles

Kodex chování

Všechny společnosti – včetně nejklidnějších, zejména nejklidnější – musí pochopit nutnost kodexu chování, které nejsou nic víc, než normy chování.

Všechny seriózní organizace mají kodexy chování, kterým jsou lidé zavázáni. Dělali to španělští anarchisté. Stejně tak IRA (Irská republikánská armáda). Freedom Riders (Svobodní jezdci) měli kodex chování, stejně tak bojovníci Nat Turnera. Kodexy chování jsou ještě důležitější v militantním hnutí odporu, které se často chovaly nejhůře.

Odmítnutí konceptu sociálního dohody je odmítnutím veškeré odpovědnosti (která vychází z kořenu „dát na oplátku") a nakonec všech lidských vztahů. Moderním, západním, individualistickým, kapitalistickým kodexem

chování je, že zde nem■žeme být taková v■c jako jiný kodex chování než ten, který nejvíce prospívá jednotlivci. Naše hnutí nelze užívat jako m■■ítko osvobození nebo vzor pro naše organizace nebo komunity. Pokud máme být úsp■šní v takovém monumentálním úkolu, musíme investovat ■as a energii v našich vztazích.

Souhlasit s kodexem chování není omezující, je to osvobozující. To zajiš■uje, že se všechny zú■astn■né strany shodují na základních protokolech, které nás povedou v tomto boji.

Civilizace, zejména pr■myslová civilizace, je z podstaty destruktivní pro život na Zemi. Organizování politického odporu je jedinou nad■jí pro naši planetu. Naším úkolem je vytvo■it toto hnutí odporu.

S tímto v■domým cílem se shodujeme na dodržování následujícího kodexu chování v našich organiza■ních skupinách:

Politické akce: DGR skupiny se budou pohybovat pouze v nadzemních, nenásilných aktivitách. Ty mohou zahrnovat legální demonstrace, stejn■ jako ob■anskou neposlušnost.

Solidarita: Nedomorodí ■lenové DGR si uv■domují, že žijeme na ukradené p■d■ uprost■ed probíhající genocidy. Úkolem nedomorodých je vybudovat [solidaritu s domorodými lidmi](#) v obran■ zem■, zachovávat tradi■ní kultury a chránit posvátné ob■ady p■ed vyko■is■ováním.

Justice: Jsme obklopeni sítí systém■ sadistické moci vybudované na ukradeném bohatství, privilegiu bílých, misogynii a lidské nad■azenosti. Naší povinností je být si v■dom t■chto systém■, p■ekonat naše výsadby a úzce se spojit s vyvlast■ováním. Kolektivn■ je naším úkolem svrhnout takové systémy.

Volnost: Skupiny DGR zastávají nulovou politiku k zneužívání každého, ■lov■ka nebo nelidské bytosti. Fyzická integrita a emocionální bezpe■í jsou základní lidská práva, jejichž hájení se DGR zavázala. DGR vyhodí každého ■lena, který se bude podílet na znásil■ování, násilí nebo zneužívání jakékoliv bytosti. Mužství s jeho militarizovanou psychologií a jeho násilnickým imperativem musí být odstran■no na osobní a globální úrovni.

Charakteristika: DGR je vážným závazkem, který vyžaduje v■rnost, oddanost, poctivost a odvahu. Od ■len■ se o■ekává jednání se všemi s respektem.

Bezpe■nost: Všichni ■lenové DGR jsou povinní ■ídit se principy [bezpe■nosti a porušení](#) ihned ■ešit. Laxní bezpe■nost a paranoia jsou nebezpe■né pro naši organizaci. Veškerá nepolitická ilegální ■innost vystavuje všechny riziku a je nevhodná pro ■leny. Skupiny DGR jsou povinné ke vzd■lávání nových ■len■ v duchu bezpe■nosti.

[Listen to an audio version of the Code of Conduct](#)

DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE FEMINIST SOLIDARITY GUIDELINES

Developed by the Deep Green Resistance Feminist Solidarity group, with guidance from the [Women's Caucus](#).

Introduction

As a class, men have developed an entrenched system of power called patriarchy in order to naturalize exploitation of women's bodies, labor, time, children, and so on. Patriarchy consists of an interlocking system of social,

economic, political, legal, and cultural structures designed to oppress women for the benefit of men. This system provides men with privileges in every aspect of our lives; we are the direct beneficiaries. As men, we often mistake these privileges for natural rights.

It is not enough for us to be "good guys." It is not enough to personally refrain from exploiting women. It is not enough for us to be personally conscientious and respectful to women. It is not enough to maintain equality in our own relationships with women. While all of those things are important, abstaining personally from outright oppressive behavior doesn't challenge patriarchy as a system of power. Basic decency commands that we work alongside women to uproot and dismantle this entire patriarchal system– within ourselves, within our groups and communities, and within institutions and the culture at large.

The following guidelines are to encourage male activists in DGR to change their behavior and to better ally themselves with women. As male activists we have been socialized into a culture of domination, and are just as liable to carry, practice, and reproduce patriarchy. Remember: being an ally is an ongoing process rather than a title one earns; it must always be defined by women, who will determine by the daily actions and behaviors of a man how much of an ally he really is.

Guidelines

1. Learn to be silent, hold back, be humble, and to listen to women's voices. Be aware of subtle ways that you may devalue women or treat them unfairly.
2. Hear what individual women are saying. Acknowledge what they say and respond appropriately. Respect women enough to disagree with them, rather than pretending to go along with something you obviously disagree with; when you do agree, make this known.
3. We must follow the lead of women, and prioritize issues that are brought forth by women or concern women. The culture we want to move into will be women-centered: we should move in this direction ourselves. Make it a priority to have women in positions of power, and to foster new woman leaders. This includes recognizing how women leaders are objectified and silenced, and having zero tolerance for such behavior.
4. It is inappropriate for us to speak as authorities on subjects that women directly experience. As men we do not and cannot understand these experiences. If we are to speak at all on such subjects, it should only be after women or if women ask us to do so, and never from our own perspective.
5. We must challenge our own patriarchal behavior, such as patterns of silencing or devaluing women, and using patriarchal language (such as hate speech, jokes based on humiliation and degradation, and male-identified generalities e.g. "mankind", "manpower", "hey man").
6. Do not use pornography or prostitution. Free your sexuality from patriarchal capitalist structures that exploit women. Be vocal in challenging the sex-exploitation industry.
7. Challenge entitlement. Women do not owe men anything, including a smile, a conversation, a hug, a relationship, or intimacy of any kind. Men do not have the right to take up space at the expense of women's comfort or personal boundaries.
8. Challenge sexist behavior in your friends, family, associates, and political allies. End relationships with men who continue to encourage or practice sexism. We do not need permission to call out men on patriarchal behavior; it is our baseline responsibility. Calling out men in male-only spaces and groups, is a priority.
9. "Mansplaining" is not tolerated. By this we mean male speech that is arrogant, patronizing, condescending, or in some other way talks down to women or attempts to put the male speaker on a pedestal.
10. While patriarchy does hurt men in some ways, the intended target is women. Thus, while we may feel hurt by masculinity, we are not oppressed by it.

11. We must familiarize ourselves with issues affecting women, and with feminist theory and history. We should not expect to be spoon-fed a feminist understanding.

12. Within the dominant culture males are perpetrators of harassment and violence. Many women are survivors of this violence – studies estimate that nearly 1/3 of all women have been sexually assaulted or beaten by men, and many women say these numbers are low. It is not any woman's responsibility to assume that men are safe to be around.

13. We are not here to save or rescue women. We are not here to be heroes. We are not here to be protectors of women; women can protect themselves. Our job is not to protect women; it is to respect their wishes and work in solidarity with them to dismantle patriarchy. If we take on these roles against the wishes of the particular women involved in a situation, we are violating boundaries.

14. The guidelines established above represent a baseline for acceptable behavior. Following them is not exceptional, and does not merit reward. Conversely, choosing to ignore sexist behavior will be seen as an act of collaboration with the culture of male dominance.

DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE PEOPLE OF COLOR SOLIDARITY GUIDELINES

Developed by white Deep Green Resistance members, with guidance from the People of Color Caucus.

Introduction

White Supremacy is a system of power that is as active today as any time in this culture's history. As white activists, we have been socialized into a culture of domination and often carry, practice, and reproduce racism in our own work. Racism is a threat to the health and continuation of all communities, including political ones. We therefore ask all white activists to commit themselves in every aspect of their lives, political or otherwise, to dismantling racism, personally and culturally. Communities of color alone cannot change white communities from the outside, nor is it their responsibility.

As Stokely Carmichael said, "White people must start building those [anti-racist] institutions inside the white community, and that is the real question I think facing the white activists today: can they in fact begin to move into and tear down the institutions which have put us all in a trick-bag that we've been into for the last hundred years?" As allies to people and communities of color, this is our work. The following guidelines are to encourage white activists to eliminate racism from their behavior and language, and better ally themselves with people of color.

Guidelines

1. We understand that, as white people raised in a white supremacist society, we are racists. It is impossible to work to end racism without acknowledging the deep-seated racism that is taught to us from a very young age. White activists need not feel guilty about this, but rather we should feel obligated to dismantle racism, both inside ourselves and externally.

2. Among activists, racism doesn't always show itself in outbursts of anger or violence; more often it is found in everyday language, interactions, and assumptions that ultimately silence and devalue people of color. Work to respect and listen to the voices and choices of people of color.

3. Actively support, encourage, and respect the leadership of people of color.

4. Offer support and assistance to activists working in communities of color. Acknowledge and respect the primary emergencies of these communities.

5. Work to counter the efforts of white supremacist and fascist groups.

6. Have the humility and courage to challenge oneself and learn from others about issues relating to race and white supremacy.

7. Do not participate in or condone racist humor. Do not use derogatory labels based upon race. Do not speak in stereotyped racial dialects.

8. Challenge racist behavior in your friends, family, associates, and political allies. When appropriate, end relationships with people who continue to encourage or practice racism.

9. Discuss racism with young people in your life. Help them to identify and confront racism, become better allies to people of color, and engage in working towards the end of white supremacy.

10. Commit to ongoing self-education on the history and theory of racial oppression. Do not speak as an authority on subjects that people of color directly experience and you do not. If you are to speak at all on such subjects, it should only be after people of color or if people of color ask you to do so.

11. The power of white supremacy is maintained to a large degree by institutions (housing, education, criminal in-justice, banking, culture, media, extraction, and so on), rather than by individual racists. Our primary work to end racism goes beyond confronting particular racists; ultimately, it requires dismantling racist institutions and culture.

12. Understand that when you choose to fight racism and imperialism, you are joining a protracted, centuries-old struggle which indigenous people and people of color have always been on the front lines of. As white people, we must allow those who have experienced these histories first hand to inform our resistance.

13. The guidelines established above represent a baseline for acceptable behavior. Following them is not exceptional, and does not merit reward. Choosing to ignore racist behavior will be seen as an act of collaboration with the culture of white supremacy.

DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE INDIGENOUS SOLIDARITY GUIDELINES

Introduction

It's important that members of settler culture ally themselves with indigenous communities fighting for their rights and survival, but there are right and wrong ways to express solidarity. The following guidelines have been put together by Deep Green Resistance members with the help of indigenous activists. They aren't a complete how-to guide – every community and every situation is different – but they can hopefully point you in a good direction for acting effectively and with respect.

Guidelines

1. First and foremost we must recognize that non-indigenous people are occupying stolen land in an ongoing genocide that has lasted for centuries. We must affirm our responsibility to stand with indigenous communities who want support and give everything we can to protect their land and culture from further devastation; they have been on the frontlines of biocide and genocide for centuries, and as allies, we need to step up and join them.

2. You are doing Indigenous solidarity work not out of guilt, but out of a fierce desire to confront oppressive colonial systems of power.

3. You are not helping Indigenous people, you are there to: join with, struggle with, and fight with indigenous peoples against these systems of power. You must be willing to put your body on the line.

4. Recognize your privilege as a member of settler culture.

5. You are not here to engage in any type of cultural, spiritual or religious needs you think you might have, you are here to engage in political action. Also, remember your political message is secondary to the cause at hand.

6. Never use drugs or alcohol when engaging in Indigenous solidarity work. Never.

7. Do more listening than talking, you will be surprised what you can learn.

8. Recognize that there will be Indigenous people who will not want you to participate in ceremonies. Humbly refrain from participating in ceremonies.

9. Recognize that you and your Indigenous allies may be in the minority on a cause that is worth fighting for.

10. Work with integrity and respect, be trustworthy and do what you say you are going to do.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS OF DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE

Who speaks on behalf of Deep Green Resistance?

Deep Green Resistance is not monolithic. Those associated with it all have opinions which may differ from those of others within DGR. Thus anything said by a member of DGR should not be construed as official DGR policy unless these people are specifically speaking for DGR. DGR respects a diversity of opinion, expressed respectfully.

Is DGR a feminist organization?

Unconditionally yes. (See also: Radical Feminism FAQs)

In the words of Andrea Dworkin, "Feminism is the political practice of fighting male supremacy in behalf of women as a class."[1]

Let's start with the phrase "women as a class." From a radical perspective, society is made up of groups of people; some groups have power over other groups. The powerful use ideology to naturalize their dominance and the subordinate group's submission: if society is actually arranged by nature or god or the cosmos, then there's no point in fighting it. Ideology can be very effective at foreclosing resistance.

The model of racism we have inherited in the US was originally created by the English in their attempts to colonize Ireland. Before that, differences between peoples were seen as cultural. But by the 17th century, the English had solidified an ideology that made biological claims about the supposed inferiority of the Irish. The Irish weren't culturally deficient—they were by their nature "savage." The English image of the Irish was constructed around the concept that they were a separate "race" from the English, a race that was godless, immoral, lazy, "wicked, barbarous and uncivil." Underpinning this image was "the belief that many Irish were incapable of being civilized, that the 'wild' Irish, those who most vigorously resisted English hegemony, would remain untamed: and that the only way to bring them under some form of civilized control was to enslave them."[2] With this racial ideology, people around the world could be enslaved or simply wiped out with no ethical or moral reservations on the part of the colonizers. That's pretty much the last four hundred years in one sentence.

The point is that race is not biologically real. Politically, socially, economically, race is, of course, a brutal reality around the globe. But the concept of race is a creation of the powerful. If we want a just world, the material institutions that keep people of color subordinate need to be dismantled. And the concepts of "whiteness" and "blackness" themselves will ultimately be abandoned as they make no sense outside of the realities of white supremacy.

A lot of people get confused when asked to apply the same radical analysis to gender. But from a feminist perspective, the parallels are obvious. Are there differences in skin tone across the human species? Yes. Why do those differences mean anything? Because a corrupt and brutal arrangement of power needs an ideology called racism. Are there differences in the shapes of people's genitals? Yes. Why do those differences matter? Because a corrupt and brutal arrangement of power—patriarchy—needs an ideology called gender.

Patriarchy is a political system that takes biological males and females and turns them into the social categories called men and women, so that the class of men can dominate "people called women."[3] Gender is to women what race is to people of color: the ideological construct that underlies our subordination.

Men's socialization is the process that turns a child into a boy and then into a man. Being a man requires a psychology based on entitlement, emotional numbness, and a dichotomy of self and other. Masculinity is essential to any militarized culture, because those are the psychological traits necessary in soldiers. One can only kill on command if the human impulse to care for one another has been subdued or eradicated. The constant need to turn others into Others is one result: the rejected, "soft" parts of the self are projected outward so they can be destroyed.[4] This is a project that will likely never end as humans do have hearts and souls, and those can never be excised, try as men might. The Viet Nam vets who suffered the worst post-traumatic stress weren't the ones who survived atrocities, but those who committed atrocities.[5]

Masculinity requires what psychologists call a negative reference group, which is a group of people "that an individual … uses as a standard representing opinions, attitudes, or behaviour patterns to avoid." Boys in patriarchal cultures create negative reference groups as a matter of course. Boys' first despised Other is, of course, girls. No insult is worse than some version of "girl," usually a part of female anatomy warped into hate speech. But once the psychological process is in place, the category "female" can easily be filled in by any group that a hierarchical society needs dominated or eradicated.
A personality with an endless drive to prove itself against another, any other, combined with the entitlement that power brings, creates a violation imperative. Men become "real men" by breaking boundaries, whether it's the sexual boundaries of women, the cultural boundaries of other peoples, the political boundaries of other nations, the genetic boundaries of species, the biological boundaries of living communities, or the physical boundaries of the atom itself.

For the entitled psyche, the only reason "No" exists is because it's a sexual thrill to force past it. The real brilliance of patriarchy is right here: it doesn't just naturalize oppression, it sexualizes acts of oppression. It eroticizes domination and submission. Through the concepts—and lived reality—of masculinity and femininity—patriarchy institutionalizes domination and submission across the culture and deep into our psychologies.

And so men commit brutal and violating acts as a matter of course. Psychological profiles of rapists have found "that they are 'ordinary' and 'normal' men who sexually assault women in order to assert power and control over them."[6] Battering is the most common violent crime in the US, committed once every fifteen seconds. That's a man beating up a woman. It's one of the leading causes of injury and death to women in the US.[7] A Canadian survey found that four out of five female undergraduates had been victims of violence in a dating relationship.[8] The World Health Organization estimates that "one in four women will be raped, beaten, coerced into sex or otherwise abused in her lifetime, sometimes with fatal consequences."[9] Anything happening on this scale is clearly normal, a part of everyday life, the behavior into which a global culture of male dominance is socializing men as a matter of course.

Right now, patriarchy is the ruling religion of the planet. Women are just another resource for men to use in their endless quest to prove their toxic masculinity and breed soldiers for civilization's constant state of war. The masculinity and the war—against people, against the planet—together have created a perpetual motion machine of domination and destruction of the land and human rights. This is why militarism is a feminist issue, why rape is an environmental issue, why environmental destruction is a peace issue. We will never dismantle misogyny as long as domination is eroticized. We will also never stop racism. Nor will we mount an effective resistance to fascism, since, as Sheila Jeffreys points out, fascism's root is ultimately the eroticization of domination and subordination–fascism is in essence a cult of masculinity.[10] Those are all huge spin-outs from the same beginning. The result is torture, rape, genocide, and biocide.

And the deep heart of this hell is the authoritarian personality structured around masculinity. Lundy Bancroft, writing about the mentality of abusive men, writes, "The roots [of abuse] are ownership, the trunk is entitlement, and the branches are control."[11] You could not find a clearer description of civilization's or patriarchy's reign of terror.

What of femininity? Femininity is a set of behaviors that are in essence ritualized submission. Female socialization is a process of psychologically constraining and breaking girls—otherwise known as "grooming"—to create a class of compliant victims. Across history this breaking has including so-called "beauty practices" like FGM (female genital mutilation) and footbinding as well as ubiquitous child sexual abuse. Femininity is really just the traumatized psyche displaying acquiescence.

It's become chic to embrace trendy notions from Post-modernism in some activist circles. This includes the idea that gender is a "binary." But gender is not a binary: it's a hierarchy, global in its reach, sadistic in its practice, murderous in its conclusion, just like race, just like class. Gender is the ideology that underlies the material conditions of women's lives: rape, battering, poverty, prostitution, and gynocide. Those conditions could not exist without the creation of social categories "men" and "women"—and those violent, violating practices are in turn are what create people called women. Those conditions, known in the aggregate as patriarchy, have to be resisted and dismantled, until the concept of gender no longer has meaning.

Noel Ignatiev, author of How the Irish Became White, has argued for abolishing the white race, defined as "white privilege and race identity."[12] DGR invites white people to undertake that very necessary project, both personally and politically. Likewise, DGR wants to dismantle the sex-class men, which is simply male privilege and gender identity. Men can be traitors to their class. Women can refuse to submit to the crushing constraints of gender, physically and psychologically. We can all fight.

The planet is in shreds; the indigenous displaced and disappeared; slavery a way of life only temporarily veiled by distance and fossil fuel; male supremacy is saturated with sexual sadism, women and girls rendered voiceless and violated. We say: enough. Liberty and a living planet will only be won when masculinity—its religion, its economics, its psychology, its sex—is resisted and defeated. DGR stands with women in this war. Join us!

[1]Dworkin, "Woman-Hating Right and Left", p. 30.
[2]Smedly, p. 63.
[3]Dworkin, Letters, p. 270.
[4]Griffin.
[5]Grossman.
[6]Lenskyj.
[7]Langford and Thompson, p. 7.
[8]DeKeseredy and Kelly.
[9]"UN calls for strong action to eliminate violence against women."
[10]Jeffreys, p. 65.
[11]Bancroft, p. 75.

[12]Ignatiev.

_____

Bibliography

Bancroft, Lundy. Why Does He Do That? Inside the Minds of Angry and Controlling Men. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 2002.

DeKeseredy, W. and K. Kelly. "The Incidence and Prevalence of Woman Abuse in Canadian University and College Dating Relationships: Results From a National Survey." Ottawa: Health Canada, 1993.

Dworkin, Andrea. Letters from a War Zone. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1988.

Dworkin, Andrea."Woman-Hating Right and Left," in Dorchen Leidholdt and Janice G. Raymond, eds. The Sexual Liberals and the Attack on Feminism. New York: Pergamon Press, 1990.

Griffin, Susan. Pornography and Silence: Culture's Revenge Against Nature. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1981.

Grossman, Lt. Col. Dave. On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1995.

Ignatiev, Noel. How the Irish Became White. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Langford, Rae and June D. Thompson. Mosby's Handbook of Diseases, 3rd Edition. St. Louis, MO: Elsevier Health Sciences, 2005.

Lenskyj, Helen. "An Analysis of Violence Against Women: A Manual for Educators and Administrators." Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1992.

Jeffreys, Sheila. "Sado-Masochism: The Erotic Cult of Fascism." Lesbian Ethics 2, No. 1, Spring 1986.

Smedley, Audrey. Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2007.

"UN calls for strong action to eliminate violence against women." UN News Centre. http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=16674&Cr=&Cr1=.

SUGGESTED READING

Andrea Dworkin. Life and Death. New York: The Free Press, 1997.

Cordelia Fine. Delusions of Gender. New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.

Sheila Jeffreys. Beauty and Misogyny. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Robert Jensen. Getting Off: Pornography and the End of Masculinity. Boston: South End Press, 2007.

Rebecca M. Jordan-Young. Brainstorm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

How do you define "civilization"?

Deep Green Resistance uses Derrick Jensen's definition of civilization that he laid out in *Endgame* vol. 1, p. 17, as follows:

> Civilization is a culture—that is, a complex of stories, institutions, and artifacts—that both leads to and emerges from the growth of cities (civilization, see civil: from civis, meaning citizen, from Latin civitatis, meaning city-state), with cities being defined—so as to distinguish them from camps, villages, and so on—as people living more or less permanently in one place in densities high enough to require the routine importation of food and other necessities of life.

See also Aric McBay's [description of civilization.](#)

What's wrong with civilization? Why would anyone want it to end?

Derrick Jensen's two volume *[Endgame](#)* fully explores this issue. He wrote 20 Premises as a distilled analysis:

Předpoklad první: Civilizace není a nikdy nemůže být udržitelná. To platí zejména pro průmyslovou civilizaci.

Předpoklad druhý: Tradiční komunity se ne často dobrovolně vzdávají zdrojů, na nichž jsou závislé, nebo zdroje ne dobrovolně prodávají; až do té doby, než jsou jejich komunity zničeny. Také ne dobrovolně dovolí, aby krajina, jíž obývají, byla ničena těžbou – zlata, ropy, atd. Z toho vyplývá, že ti, kteří chtějí dobývat zdroje, budou to dělat tak, aby mohli zničit tradiční komunity.

Předpoklad třetí: Náš způsob života – průmyslové civilizace – je založen na neustálém násilí a vyžaduje si jej. Bez neustálého násilí zkolabuje velmi rychle.

Předpoklad čtvrtý:Civilizace je založena na jasně definované a všeobecně přijímané, ale často neviditelné hierarchii. Násilí prováděné těmi výše z hierarchie na těch níže je téměř vždy neviditelné, to znamená, že prochází bez povšimnutí. Pokud je povšimnuto, je plně racionalizováno. Násilí prováděné těmi níže z hierarchie na těch výše je nemyslitelné, a když k němu dojde je považováno za šokující, horor a fetišizaci obětí.

Předpoklad pátý: Majetek těch výše v hierarchii je cennější než životy těch níže. Je přijatelné, aby ti na hoře navýšili množství majetku tím – lidově, vydělali peníze – že zničí životy těch níže nebo je dokonce zabijí. To je nazýváno *produkcí*. Pokud se ti níže pokouší poškodit majetek těch výše, mohou je ti na hoře za to zabít nebo jim nějakým způsobem zničit život. To je nazývané *spravedlnost*.

Předpoklad šestý: Tato kultura nepodstoupí nějaký druh dobrovolné transformace ke zdravému a udržitelnému způsobu života. Když toto neukončíme, civilizace nadále bude ožebračovat drtivou většinu lidí a drancovat planetu, dokud se nezhroutí (a pravděpodobně s ní bude zničena celá planeta). Vliv této degenerace bude utrpením pro lidi a nelidské bytosti po velmi dlouhou dobu.

Předpoklad sedmý: Čím déle budeme čekat, než se civilizace zhroutí – nebo čím déle budeme čekat, než ji k tomu sami přivedeme – tím bude její zhroucení pro lidi a nelidi, kteří zde jsou a pro ty, kteří přijdou po ní mnohem horší.

Předpoklad osmý: Potřeby přirozeného světa jsou mnohem důležitější než potřeby ekonomického světa.

Další způsob jak chápat osmý předpoklad: Každý ekonomický a sociální systém, z něhož nemá prospěch přírodní společenství, na němž je závislý, je neudržitelný, nemorální a hloupý. Udržitelnost, morálka a inteligence (stejně jako spravedlnost) vyžaduje demontáž takového ekonomického a sociálního systému, přinejmenším však musíme zabránit tomu, aby ničil krajinu.

P■edpoklad devátý: A■koliv je jasné, že p■ijde den, kdy bude mén■ lidí, než je dnes, existuje mnoho zp■sob■, jak by k tomuto snížení populace mohlo dojít (nebo má být dosaženo, v závislosti na tom, jak aktivn■ nebo pasivn■ se rozhodneme tuto transformaci p■iblížit). N■která z t■chto možností bude velmi násilná a strádající: jadernou katastrofou, nap■íklad, by se snížila jak populace, tak spot■eba, ale je to d■sivé; totéž platí o tom, když budeme nadále pokra■ovat v drancování zdroj■ a p■ijde následné zhroucení. Jiné zp■soby by mohly být mén■ násilné. S ohledem na sou■asnou úrove■ násilí této kultury proti lidem a p■írod■, snížení lidské populace a spot■eby se neobejde bez násilí a strádání, ne proto, že by snížení populace muselo nutn■ znamenat násilí, ale proto, že násilí a strádání se stalo normou naší kultury. Existují také n■které další zp■soby snížení populace a spot■eby. Zatímco by se stále jednalo o násilný, m■ly by být mén■ násilný než sou■asná úrove■ násilí – nutnost rovnom■rného p■erozd■lování zdroj■ od bohatých, bohatších (■asto nucen■) k chudým – a samoz■ejm■ snížení sou■asného násilí proti p■írod■. Individuáln■ a kolektivn■ se snad m■že poda■it snížit rozsah násilí, které by se odehrávalo v pr■b■hu potenciáln■ dlouhodobé zm■ny. Nebo nemusí. Ale jedno je jisté: pokud k tomuto problému nebudeme p■istupovat aktivn■ – pokud nebudeme mluvit o naší nesnázi, a nebudeme se ptát, co by jsme mohli ud■lat – pak násilí a utrpení bude nepochybn■ mnohem a mnohem závažn■jší a strádání extrémn■jší.

P■edpoklad desátý: Tato kultura jako celek je šílená a v■tšina její ■len■ jakbysmet. Kultura je pohán■na nutkáním smrti, nutkáním ni■ení života.

P■edpoklad jedenáctý: Od za■átku tato kultura – civilizace – byla kulturou okupa■ní.

P■edpoklad dvanáctý: Nejsou bohatí a chudí lidé na sv■t■. Jsou zde lidé. Bohatý m■že mít spoustu barevných papírk■, které p■edstírají, že mají takovou hodnotu – n■kdy bohatství t■chto lidí je ješt■ více abstraktní: ■ísla na pevných discích bank – zatímco chudí nemusí mít. Tito „bohatí“ si nárokují vlastn■ní p■dy, ale „chudým“ je ■asto toto právo upíráno. Hlavním úkolem policie je prosazovat iluze t■ch, kte■í mají spoustu barevných papírk■. Ti s barevnými papírky spolknou obecn■ tyto bludy stejn■ rychle, jako ti bez barevných papírk■. Tyto bludy s sebou p■ináší extrémní utrpení v reálném sv■t■.

P■edpoklad t■ináctý: Ti u moci vládnou silou, ■ím d■íve pochopíme, že tomu není jinak, tím d■íve budeme moci za■ít p■emýšlet a uskute■■ovat rozumná ■ešení, zda, jak i kdy se budeme bránit.

P■edpoklad ■trnáctý: Od narození – a pravd■podobn■ od po■etí, nejsem si jist, jak to ur■it – jsme individuáln■, tak kolektivn■ socializováni na to nenávid■t život, nenávid■t divo■inu, voln■ žijící zví■ata, nenávid■t ženy, nenávid■t d■ti, nenávid■t svá t■la, nenávid■t a bát se našich emocí a nenávid■t se navzájem. Pokud bychom nebyli u■eni nenávid■t sv■t, nemohli bychom dopustit toho, aby byl zni■en p■ed našima o■ima. Pokud bychom nebyli u■eni nenávid■t sami sebe, nep■ipustili bychom, aby naše domovy – a naše t■la – byly otráveny.

P■edpoklad patnáctý: Láska neznamená pacifismus.

P■edpoklad šestnáctý: Hmotný sv■t je primární. To neznamená, že duch neexistuje, ani to neznamená, že není nic jiného než hmotný sv■t. To znamená, že mysl a t■lo jsou spojeny, což také znamená, že skute■né akce mají skute■né d■sledky. To znamená, že se nem■že spoléhat na Ježíše, Santa Clause, Velkou matku nebo dokonce na velikono■ního zají■ka, abychom se dostali z této situace. To znamená, že tato situace je skute■ná, ne jen zamra■ení boží. To znamená, že musíme této situaci ■elit sami. To znamená, že v dob■ kdy jsme zde na Zemi – bez ohledu na to, kde bychom mohli skon■it po smrti, a zda jsme odsouzeni nebo jak jsme se rozhodli žít – musíme ■elit této situaci. Zem■ je hlavní. Je náš domov. Je vším. Je hloupé si myslet nebo jednat ■i žít tak, jako by tento sv■t nebyl skute■ný a primární. Je hloupé a ubohé, když nebudeme žít naše životy, jako by naše životy nebyly reálné.

P■edpoklad sedmnáctý: Je chybou, nebo spíš popíráním, d■lat naše rozhodnutí závislými na tom, ■i z nich vyplývající ■iny vystraší masy Ameri■an■ (Evropan■ aj.) nebo lidí, kte■í se cht■jí držet od všeho dále.

P■edpoklad osmnáctý: Naše sou■astné sebev■domí není udržiteln■jší než naše sou■asné využívání energií nebo technologie.

P■edpoklad devatenáctý: Problémem této kultury je p■edevším v p■esv■d■ení, že ovládání a zneužívání p■írody a jiných druh■ je opodstatn■no.

P■edpoklad dvacet: V rámci této kultury, není blaho komunit (lidé a jiné druhy), nejsou to morální zásady, není to etika, není to spravedlnost, není to samotný život sám, tou hnací silou, ale je to ekonomika sama.

Modifikace p■edpokladu dvacet: Sociální rozhodnutí jsou primárn■ ur■ována (a ■asto výhradn■) na základ■ toho, zda tato rozhodnutí zvýší finan■ní bohatství subjekt■ s rozhodovací pravomocí, t■m, kterým slouží.

Druhá modifikace p■edpokladu dvacet: Sociální rozhodnutí jsou primárn■ ur■ována (a ■asto výhradn■) na základ■ toho, zda tato rozhodnutí posílí sílu subjekt■ s rozhodovací pravomocí a jejich pán■m, t■m, kterým slouží.

T■etí modifikace p■edpokladu dvacet: Sociální rozhodnutí vycházejí p■edevším (a ■asto výhradn■) k tém■■ zcela nep■ezkoumaným p■esv■d■ením, že rozhodnutí t■ch, kte■í na to mají pravomoc nebo t■ch, kte■í z toho mají zisky, jsou oprávn■ni rozší■it svou sílu a/nebo finan■ní bohatství, na úkor t■ch níže.

Re-modification of Premise Twenty: If you dig to the heart of it—if there were any heart left—you would find that social decisions are determined primarily on the basis of how well these decisions serve the ends of controlling or destroying wild nature.

Why does civilization need to be dismantled? Aren't we approaching a tipping point in public opinion?

Derrick Jensen: In 2004, George Bush received more than 62 million votes in the United States. Admittedly, the Democrats are just the good cop in a good cop/bad cop scenario, but that doesn't alter the fact that 62 million people voted for George Bush. Now people are camping out overnight to get Sarah Palin's signature. In the small county where I live there are a few issues that will get enough people excited to storm the board of supervisor's office. One is that they want to maintain their ability to grow small amounts of marijuana. Another is that they want the right to drive ORVs anywhere they goddamn please.

People are not rioting over the unwillingness of this government to provide healthcare. People aren't rioting over the toxification of the total environment and their loved ones dying of cancer. They're not rioting over the United States spending billions of dollars-billions and billions of dollars-to kill people all over the world. And, in fact, one of the smartest political moves that any politician can make is to increase the military budget. That is tremendously popular.

This culture must be undone completely. That's an absolute necessity. Humanity lived without industrialism for most of its existence. And industrialism is killing the planet. Humans cannot exist without the planet. The planet (and sustainable human existence) is more important than industrialism.

Of course, we would all rather have a voluntary transformation, a tipping point. But if this tipping point does not occur, we need a back-up plan.

And, no, civilization will not transform itself into something sustainable. That's not physically possible. Civilization is functionally unsustainable. And the fact that ideas like the hundredth monkey are spoken of quite often in public discourse, lets us know the extreme distance that we have to go to make the sort of changes that are necessary. The fact that people are still talking about this level of detachment from real physical reality is evidence itself that there will not be a voluntary transformation.

No, the momentum is too fierce. What we need to do is stop this culture before it kills the planet. And I can't speak for you, but I'm not going to rely on a fictional hundredth monkey to do the work for me when I can do the work myself.

You can't force people to change. Won't a paradigm shift eventually occur that brings about a sustainable system?

Derrick Jensen: Proponents of a chiefly educational strategy often assert that persistent work at building public awareness will eventually result in a global "paradigm shift," which will dramatically change the actions and opinions of the majority. The term paradigm shift comes from Thomas Kuhn's 1962 book The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, but it's inapplicable to our situation for a number of reasons. Although the phrase gained usage in the 1990s as a marketing buzzword, Kuhn wrote explicitly that the idea only applied to those fields usually called the hard sciences (physics, biology, chemistry, and the like). A paradigm, he said, was a dominant system of explanation in one of these sciences, whereas "a student in the humanities has constantly before him [sic] a number of competing and incommensurable solutions to these problems, solutions that he must ultimately examine for himself." Scientists trying to use equations to explain, say, orbital mechanics, can come to agreement on which theory is best because they are trying to develop the most accurate predictive equations. Social sciences and other fields do not have this luxury, because there is no agreement on which problems are most important, how to evaluate their answers, what kind of answer is the most important and how precise it should be, and what to do when answers are arrived at.

Because of these differences, Kuhn argued that the true scientific paradigm shifts always lead to better paradigms-paradigms that do a better job of explaining part of the world. But in society at large this is not true at all-dominant worldviews can be displaced by worldviews which are considerably worse at explaining the world or which are damaging to humans and the living world, a phenomenon which is distressingly common in history.

Furthermore, Kuhn argued that even when a much better paradigm is supported by strong evidence, the scientific community doesn't necessarily switch quickly. Scientists who have been practicing the obsolete paradigm for their entire careers may not change their minds even in the presence of overwhelming evidence. Kuhn quotes Nobel laureate Max Planck, who said that "a new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."

Even worse for us, Kuhn and Planck are assuming the people in question are genuinely and deliberately trying to find the best possible paradigm. Doing this is literally a full-time job. Do we really believe that the majority of people are spending their free waking hours trying to gain a deeper understanding of the world, trying to sift through the huge amounts of available information, trying to grasp history and ecology and economics? The very idea of a paradigm shift assumes that the majority of people are actively trying to find large scale solutions to our current predicament, instead of being willfully ignorant and deeply invested in a convenient economic and social system that rewards people for destroying the planet.

Indeed, part of the problem with "education" is that it's not only leftists who do it, and it's rarely unbiased. Studies have shown that on the right wing, more educated people are less likely to admit the existence of global warming. This is probably because they have more sophisticated rationales for their delusions.

But let's pause for a moment and take the most optimistic (if somewhat mangled) interpretation of Kuhn's concept and assume that a beneficial paradigm shift is going to happen, rather than a worsening shift in dominant politics and worldviews. That shift would require abundant evidence that the dominant culture-civilization-is inherently destructive and doomed to destroy itself along with the living world. Since we can't do multiple experimental runthroughs of a global industrial civilization, for many people the only inescapable empirical demonstration of the

dominant system's fundamental unsustainability would be the collapse of that system. Only at that point would the majority of people be seriously and personally invested in learning how to live without destroying the planet. And even then, those people would likely continue to insist on their outdated worldview, until, as Max Planck observed, they die, resulting in a further decades-long delay beyond collapse before a beneficial paradigm was dominant. This means that even in the most optimistic and reasonable assessment, a "global paradigm shift" would be decades too late.

I'm a fan of Daniel Quinn. He says we should just walk away. What is wrong with this strategy?

Derrick Jensen: There are two problems with this. With civilization having metastasized across the globe and bombing the moon, where are you supposed to walk to? Are you supposed to walk to the melting arctic? Are you supposed to walk to the middle of the ocean, where there's forty-eight times as much plastic as there is phytoplankton? Where are you supposed to go? There is dioxin in every mother's breast milk, so you can't even drink breast milk without getting dioxin. There are carcinogens in every stream in the United States and, presumably, in the world.

Where are you supposed to go?

Some respond to this by saying, "Oh, no, it's supposed to be a mental state. We're supposed to walk away emotionally and withdraw." But the real physical world is the basis for all life and you cannot withdraw from that.

Withdrawal in the face of moral complexity is no answer. Withdrawal in the face of atrocity is no answer. Two hundred species went extinct today. When faced with those committing atrocities, it is incumbent upon you to stop those atrocities using any means necessary. If you were being tortured to death in some basement, and I knew this, would you want me to walk away? Would you accept it if I said, "Oh, here's an answer, I will walk away." What would you call me if I did that? I'm guessing that "coward" would be the kindest word you would use.

How do I know that civilization is irredeemable?

Derrick Jensen: Look around. Ninety percent of the large fish in the oceans are gone. Salmon are collapsing. Passenger pigeons are gone. Eskimo curlews are gone. Ninety-eight percent of native forests are gone, 99 percent of wetlands, 99 percent of native grasslands. What standards do you need?

What is the threshold at which you will finally acknowledge that it's not redeemable? In A Language Older Than Words I explained how we all are suffering from what Judith Herman would call "Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder." Judith Herman asks, "What happens if you are raised in captivity? What happens if you're long-term held in captivity, as in a political prisoner, as in a survivor of domestic violence?" You come to believe that all relationships are based on power, that might makes right, that there is no such thing as fully mutual relationships. That, of course, describes this culture's entire epistemology and this culture's entire way of relating. Indigenous peoples have said that the fundamental difference between western and indigenous ways of being is that even the most open-minded westerners view listening to the natural world as a metaphor as opposed to the way the world really works. So the world consists of resources to be exploited, as opposed to other beings to enter into relationship with. We have been so traumatized that we are incapable of perceiving that real relationships are possible. That is one reason that the culture is not redeemable.

Here is another answer. In Culture of Make Believe, I wrote about how this culture is irredeemable because the social reward systems of this culture lead inevitably to atrocity. This culture is based on competition as opposed to cooperation and, as such, will inevitably lead to wars over resources.

Ruth Benedict, the anthropologist, tried to figure out why some cultures are good (to use her word) and some cultures are not good. In a good culture, men treat women well, adults treat children well, people are generally

happy, and there's not a lot of competition. She found that the good cultures all have one thing in common. They figured out something very simple: they recognize that humans are both social creatures and selfish, and they merge selfishness and altruism by praising behaviors that benefit the group as a whole and disallowing behaviors that benefit the individual at the expense of the group. The bad cultures socially reward behavior that benefits the individual at the expense of the group. If you reward behavior that benefits the group, that's the sort of behavior you will get. If you reward behavior that is selfish, acquisitive, that's the behavior you will get. This is Behavior Mod. 101.

This culture rewards highly acquisitive, psychopathological behavior, and that is the behavior we see. It's inevitable.

Need another answer? In Endgame I explained that a culture that imports resources cannot be sustainable. In order to be sustainable a culture must help the landbase, but importing resources means denuding the land of that particular resource. As the city grows, an ever larger area is denuded. That culture's way of living can never be sustainable.

This way of life is always based on violence. If the culture requires the importation of resources, trade will never be sufficiently reliable. If the people next watershed over have a resource that culture needs, it will be taken. We could all become junior bodhisattvas and the US military would still have to be huge. Civilization is irredeemable on a functional level.

We can talk all we want about new technologies, but so long as they require copper wiring, they are going to require an industrial infrastructure, and they are going to require a mining infrastructure, and that is inherently unsustainable.

Right now the United States is spending 100 billion dollars a year to invade and occupy Afghanistan. That is $3,500.00 for every Afghan man, woman, and child, per year. At the same time, everybody from right wing pundits to the zombies on NPR ask the question, "Is it too expensive to stop global warming?" There is always money to kill people. There is never enough money for life-affirming ends.

I look around in every direction and I see no sign of redeemability in this culture. The real physical world is being murdered. The pattern is there. We need to recognize that pattern, and then we need to stop those who are killing the planet.

How can I be sure my actions won't hasten or cause the extinction of the very species I'm trying to save? How can I be sure my actions won't result in hungry people killing every last wild animal in the area for food or cutting down every last tree for fuel?

Derrick Jensen: We can't be absolutely certain of anything. The only thing we can be certain of is that if civilization continues, it will kill every last being on earth. But let's take a reasonable worst case scenario for a cataclysmic event. Chernobyl was a horrible disaster. Yet it has had a spectacularly positive ecological outcome: humans have been kept out of the area and wildlife is returning. Do you know what that means? The day-to-day workings of civilization are worse than a nuclear catastrophe. It would be hard to do worse than Chernobyl.

Yes, be smart and attend to those questions. But if we fail to act there will be nothing left. What the world needs is to be left alone. What the world needs is to have this culture-that is continuously cutting it, torturing it, murdering it-stopped.

If the strategy of Decisive Ecological Warfare were carried out and the electrical grid brought down, wouldn't it lead to nuclear meltdown?

The main problem in nuclear disasters is radioactive waste rather than the nuclear material in the reactor itself. Stored radioactive waste was the major issue with the Fukushima meltdown in 2011. Stored radioactive waste was

the largest concern during the fires near the Los Alamos nuclear waste storage area in both 2000 and 2011, and after the near-flooding of a nuclear reactor in Mississippi in 2011. The reactor contains only a small amount of active fuel compared to the spent fuel held within storage facilities.

More nuclear disasters will almost inevitably occur in the coming decades, whether or not the electrical grid is dismantled. Hazardous radioactive waste will accumulate as long as industrial civilization continues, and there are almost no safe long-term storage facilities anywhere in the world. So nuclear reactors will become more and more dangerous as larger and larger stockpiles of spent fuel are kept on site.

Nuclear reactors are most dangerous when ■ as at Fukushima ■ direct physical damage to the plant disables back-up generators and other safety equipment. Reactors are designed to cope with simple black-outs, so failure of the electrical grid is one of the least dangerous of possible disruptions to a nuclear plant. It is unlikely that a single dramatic blackout will collapse the industrial economy and cause widespread nuclear catastrophe. More likely, an increasing number of medium-scale power disruptions will encourage the decommission of nuclear power plants, or at least force closer attention to safety precautions. For example, several countries have started to shut down or put on hold their nuclear programs since the Fukushima disaster in Japan.

The current "exclusion" zone around Fukushima encompasses about 600 square kilometres of land. This temporary boundary will probably — like Chernobyl — ironically end up ecologically richer over the coming decades. (See previous FAQ.)

Most of the other large-scale energy sources are far more dangerous if they continue to operate. Mountain-top removal for coal in Appalachia will obliterate 5,700 square kilometres of land this year, and will do it again next year if not stopped. That land will need thousands of years to recover, assuming the burning of that coal doesn't trigger a runaway greenhouse effect. 85,000 square kilometres of land in Alberta has so far been leased for tar sands development.

Future nuclear disasters from shoddily-maintained plants will be very bad, but business as usual is far more destructive. And while nuclear radiation diminishes over time, unless something decisive is done, greenhouse gases levels will increase faster and faster as they pass tipping points.

If we dismantle civilization, won't that kill millions of people in cities? What about them?

Derrick Jensen: No matter what you do, your hands will be blood red. If you participate in the global economy, your hands are blood red because the global economy is murdering humans and non-humans the planet over. A half million children die every year as a direct result of so-called "debt repayment" from non-industrialized nations to industrialized nations. Sixty thousand people die every day from pollution. And what about all the people who are being forced off their land? There are a lot of people dying already. Failing to act in the face of atrocity is no answer.

The grim reality is that both energy descent and biotic collapse will be ever more severe the more the dominant culture continues to destroy the basis for life on this planet. And yet some people will say that those who propose dismantling civilization are, in fact, suggesting genocide on a mass scale.

Polar bears and coho salmon would disagree. Traditional indigenous peoples would disagree. The humans who inherit what is left of this world when the dominant culture finally comes down would disagree.

I disagree.

My definition of dismantling civilization is depriving the rich of their ability to steal from the poor and depriving the powerful of their ability to destroy the planet. Nobody but a capitalist or a sociopath (insofar as there is a difference) could disagree with that.

Years ago I asked Anuradha Mittal, former director of Food First, "Would the people of India be better off if the global economy disappeared tomorrow?" And she said, "Of course." She said the poor the world over would be better off if the global economy collapsed. There are former granaries of India that now export dog food and tulips to Europe. The rural poor the world over are being exploited by this system. Would they be better off? What about the farmers in India who are being forced off their land so that Coca Cola can have their water? What about those who are committing suicide because of Monsanto? A significant portion of people in the world do not have access to electricity. Would they be worse off with grid crash? No, they'd be better off immediately. What about the indigenous peoples of Peru who are fighting to stop oil exploration by Hunt Oil on their land, allowed because of United States-Peruvian trade agreements?

When someone says, "A lot of people are going to die," we've got to talk about which people. People all over the world are already enduring famines, but for the most part they are not dying of starvation; they're dying of colonialism, because their land and their economies have been stolen. We hear all the time that the world is running out of water. There is still as much water as there ever was, but 90 percent of the water used by humans is being used for agriculture and industry. People are dying of thirst because the water is being stolen.

When I asked a member of the Peruvian rebel group MRTA, the Tupacameristas, "What do you want for the people of Peru?" his response was, "What we want is to be able to grow and distribute our own food. We already know how to do that. We merely need to be allowed to do so." That's the entire struggle right there.

I used to think it's true that the urban poor would be worse off at first, because the dominant culture, like any good abusive system, has made its victims dependent upon it for their lives. That's what abusers do, whether they are domestic violence abusers, or whether they are larger scale perpetrators. That's how slavers work: they make enslaved people dependent upon them for their lives. One of the brilliant things this culture has done has been to insert itself between us and our self-sufficiency, us and the source of all life. So we come to believe that the system provides our sustenance, not that the real world does.

But I recently asked Vandana Shiva if the people of Mumbai, for example, would be better off quickly if the global economy collapsed. She said yes, for the same reasons Mittal did: most of the poor in major cities in India are there because they've been driven off their land, with their land stolen by transnational corporations. With the global economy gone, they would return to the country and reclaim the land. Given the option between getting their land back and staying in the city, nearly all would want to move back to the country.

This is a huge number of people we are talking about. Most of the urban poor are people who live in third-world slums. That's more than a billion people, and, if trends continue, that will double in two decades. Many of these are people who have been forced off their traditional land. The poor will be able to take back this land if the governments of the world are no longer capable of propping up colonial arrangements of exploitation.

I have another answer, too. As this culture collapses, much of the misery will be caused by the wealthy attempting to maintain their lifestyles. As this culture continues to collapse, those who are doing the exploiting will continue to do the exploiting. Don't blame those who want to stop that exploitation. Instead, help to stop the exploitation that is killing people in the first place.

The authors of this book are not blithely asking who will die. In at least one of our cases, the answer is "I will." I have Crohn's disease, and I am reliant for my life on high tech medicines. Without these medicines, I will die. But my individual life is not what matters. The survival of the planet is more important than the life of any single human being, including my own.

Since industrial civilization is systematically dismantling the ecological infrastructure of the planet, the sooner civilization comes down, the more life will remain afterwards to support both humans and nonhumans. We can

provide for the well-being of those humans who will be alive during and immediately after energy and ecological descent by preparing people for a localized future. We can rip up asphalt in vacant parking lots to convert them to neighborhood gardens, go teach people how to identify local edible plants, so that people won't starve when they can no longer head off to the store for groceries. We can start setting up neighborhood councils to make decisions, settle conflicts, and provide mutual aid.

How can I do something to help bring down civilization and not just throw away my life in a useless act?

Derrick Jensen: There are three answers. The philosophical answer is that we can't know the future. We can never know whether some action will be useful. We should pick what we think are the most effective actions, but that still doesn't guarantee any given act will succeed. What we can know is that if this culture continues in the direction it's headed, it will get where it's headed, which is the murder of the planet. There are already casualties, and they're called the salmon. They're called the sharks. They're called the black terns. They're called migratory songbirds. They're called oceans, rivers. They're called indigenous people. They're called the poor. They're called subsistence farmers. They're called women.

The second, historical answer is about the way resistance movements work. You lose and you lose and you lose until you win. You get your head cracked, get your head cracked, get your head cracked, and then you win. You can't know when you start how many times you have to get your head cracked before you win. But the struggle builds on struggle. It has to start somewhere and it has to gain momentum. That happens through organizing, it happens through actions. And it happens through victories. One of the best recruiting tools is some sort of victory. And you can't have a victory unless you try.

And now the pragmatic: we are horribly outnumbered and we do not have the luxury to throw away our lives. How we can be most effective? We have to be smart. Choose targets carefully, both for strategic value and safety. And we have to organize. A lone person's chance of sparking a larger movement is much lower than that of a group of organized people.

Whatever actions a person takes (and this is true in all areas of life) need to count. Many of the actions being taken right now are essentially acts of vandalism, as opposed to acts of active sabotage that will slow the movement of the machine. So choose. How can you make your actions (and your life) have the most significance in terms of stopping the perpetration of atrocity?

All those who begin to act against the powers of any repressive state need to recognize that their lives will change. They need to take that decision very seriously. Some of the people captured under the Green Scare knew what they were getting into, and some of them made the decision more lightly. The latter were the people who turned very quickly when they were arrested. One person turned within five seconds of getting into the police car. That person probably didn't seriously consider the ramifications of his actions before he began. The Black Panthers knew when they started the struggle that they would either end up dead or in prison.

Finally, we have to always keep what we're fighting for in sight. We are fighting for life on the planet. And the truth is, the planet's life is worth more than you. It's worth more than me. It is the source of all life. That doesn't alter the fact that we should be smart. We need to be very strategic. We need to be tactical. And we need to act.

Did John Brown throw away his life? On one hand, you could say yes. His project ultimately failed. But, on the other hand, you could say that it set up much greater things. Did Nat Turner throw away his life? Did members of the revolt at Sobibor throw away their lives? On one hand, you could say yes. On the other hand, you could say that they did what was absolutely right and necessary. And something we must always remember is that those who participated in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising had a higher rate of survival than those who went along. When the whole planet is being destroyed, your inaction will not save you. We must choose the larger life. We must choose to

do what is right to protect the planet. It is our only home.

What is meant by "aboveground" and "underground" or "belowground"?

In DGR we use these terms to distinguish between different parts of a movement. "Aboveground" refers to those parts of a resistance movement which work in the open and operate more-or-less within the boundaries of the laws of the state. This means that aboveground activism and resistance is usually limited to nonviolence. DGR is an aboveground organization; we are public and don't try to hide who we are or what we desire, because openness and broad membership is what makes aboveground organizations effective.

"Underground" or "belowground" refers to those parts of a resistance movement which operate in secret. Generally, these groups use more militant or violent tactics like property destruction and sabotage to achieve their goals. The use of these tactics makes them an open enemy of the state, which makes security and secrecy very important for underground groups. Historically, these groups have a stringent membership process to make sure new recruits are prepared for the psychological and/or physical demands of underground work and are trained in combat and other necessary operations as well as in proper security culture.

Aboveground security culture is also important in maintaining the effectiveness of aboveground groups.

DGR is strictly an aboveground organization. We will not answer questions regarding anyone's personal desire to be in or form an underground. We do not want to be involved in or aware of any underground organizing. We do this for the security of everyone involved with Deep Green Resistance.

What is a "Culture of Resistance"?

A culture of resistance exists to encourage and promote organized political resistance, nurturing the will to fight. It helps people break their psychological identification with the oppressive system and create a new identity based on self-respect and solidarity. It offers the emotional support of a functioning community that believes in resistance as well as an intellectually vibrant atmosphere that encourages analysis, discussion, and the development of political consciousness. It produces cultural products like poems, songs, and art organized around the theme of resistance. It builds the new institutions that will take over as the corrupt ones come down. And it provides loyalty and material support to the aboveground frontline resisters and political prisoners.

Why should I take large-scale direct action against the system when almost nobody else, especially in the first world, is?

Derrick Jensen: Because the world is being murdered. And because members of the so-called "first world" are the primary beneficiaries. It is not up to the poor to be on the frontlines yet again. It is not up to the indigenous to be on the frontlines. It is not up to the non-humans to be on the frontlines. It is our responsibility as beneficiaries of this system to bring a halt to the system.

MEND (the Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta) have been able to reduce oil industry output by up to 30 percent in Nigeria. They have done so because they love the land they live in and that land is being destroyed. We have much greater resources at our disposal. It's our responsibility to use those resources and to use the privilege that we have to stop this culture from killing the planet.

What might distinguish an anti-civilization resistance from other popular movements that those in power have successfully overpowered COINTELPRO-style? Do people have new strategies and tactics that can stand up to these new systems and technologies?

Derrick Jensen: Frankly, no. People now have a tremendous disadvantage over people in the past in that people now live inside a panopticon. The ability to surveil and to kill at a distance has greatly increased over what it was in times past. Contrast the powers of the state at present with those, say, in Nazi Germany. For the Nazis, fingerprint technology was still very new. They had nothing like the capacity to surveil that modern states have. They had only rudimentary computers. They didn't have the ability to do voice-recognition software. They didn't have any software. So those in power have a tremendous advantage over historical popular movements.

Indigenous and traditional resistance movements had villages where they could be safe. They had wild places where they could be safe. They had their own territory. People now don't have that. They do, however, have a significant advantage over the indigenous resistance movements of the last 500 years in that they mix in. Tecumseh could not have walked into Philadelphia and not been recognized. People today have that advantage.

But the biggest advantage that people today have over people in times previous is that the age of exuberance is over. The age of cheap oil is over. The empires of today are on their way to collapse. It used to seem that as civilization dissolved, anyone who even remotely opposed it would be put up against a wall. But now it looks as though as civilization falls apart, its emperors may not even be able to deliver the mail, much less maintain the level of oppression that they have historically perpetrated on those who oppose empire. Think of the collapse of the Soviet Union; it just sort of fell apart instead of instigating purges or gulags. The Soviet Union didn't have the resources.

Even the United States is falling apart. The US government can't even maintain the water systems in this country and it can't maintain the roads. State and federal governments can't pay for colleges anymore. Those in power don't have the money, and they don't have the resources, and those resources will never come back.

If someone would have taken out some important piece of infrastructure in years past, those in power would have been able to replace it. But now the governments of the world don't have the money. The more they spend on rebuilding, the less primary damage they can do.

A resistance movement will be demonized and portrayed as eco-terrorists by the mainstream media. Is there an alternative media in place with a strategy to counter this?

Derrick Jensen: There is an alternative media in place, but will it counter this demonization? No. The alternative media is tepid and full of horizontal hostility. The larger question is, "Is there a media forum that is supporting serious resistance against this culture's murder of the planet?" And the answer, sadly, is no. Even so-called nature magazines have tremendous resistance to promoting anything other than composting or riding bicycles. Or rather, I should say, a lot of the readers do. One purpose of [Deep Green Resistance] is to help create that literature of resistance-an absolutely necessary literature of resistance-that will help to put in place a larger media of resistance. It takes all forms, from comics to films to books to graffiti to people having conversations on their back porches. We need to be discussing this and we need to be discussing it openly. One of the absolutely necessary precursors to a resistance is to talk about it. This has been true of every resistance movement in the past and it will be true as long as there are resistance movements. We must put all the options on the table and discuss them openly, honestly, earnestly.

Is there a solidarity/support network in place to support someone who goes to prison for activism? Is there a support system in place to support someone's family if an activist goes to prison and is the breadwinner?

Derrick Jensen: For the former, there is. For example, Anarchist Black Cross does political prisoner support and there are other organizations that do political prisoner support. But the truth is we need to build a much broader base of that. Prisoner support is actually pretty lacking. And it's pretty easy to do the basic stuff. My mother, every year, writes to many political prisoners on their birthdays and around winter solstice. Many of these people have

been in prison for thirty and forty years, and her letters may be one of two or three that they receive throughout the year. So there are organizations in place, but those organizations have to be much more robust. And so far as support for families, no, there isn't. But there should be. These are things that can and should be done by those who are entirely aboveground. We have emphasized throughout this book that not everyone needs to take up serious illegal action. But we need a culture of resistance, and part of a culture of resistance is a robust prisoner support network for those who are on the front lines. We need a system where we support the troops, those who are actually fighting for the planet. That needs to be in place and so far it's not.

Do you have lawyers willing to help us/advise us as we act?

We are currently building legal support for this purpose. We need volunteers for this and other tasks.

How can I accept the risks of being caught when that could mean never being able to see or help my family/lover/children in these difficult times?

Derrick Jensen: Nothing in this book is meant to exhort people to do things they don't want to do. In fact, nothing in this book is meant to exhort people to do anything illegal (recognizing that innocence of actual criminal activity is no guarantee that one will not be punished by those in power). We've said numerous times that there are plenty of ways that a culture of resistance can manifest, any number of activities that you can participate in that are not as immediately risky as below-ground actions. If your primary concern is the risk of being caught, there are plenty of other things you can do.

But remember that when state repression gets really bad, being aboveground does not mean that the state won't come for you. It's often the public intellectuals, the organizers, and the writers who are thrown in jail. The people underground, without a public profile, are sometimes safer.

Perhaps, though, we should turn the question around. "Are you willing to risk not having fish in the oceans?" If things continue the way they are, by 2050 there will be no fish in the oceans. Amphibians are already dying. Migratory songbirds are already dying. The planet is dying. Are you willing to risk that?

None of this is theoretical. When the industrial system starts to collapse, I will be dead. I am reliant upon high-technology medicine for my life. But there is something larger and more important than my life.

If we act effectively against those in power, won't those in power just come down on us harder?

Derrick Jensen: They will, but that's not a reason to submit. This is how authoritarian regimes and abusers work: they make their victims afraid to act. They reinforce the mentality, "If I try to leave him, my abusive husband, my pimp, may kill me." And that is a very good reason to not resist.

This question explicitly articulates what we all know to be true: the foundation of this culture is force. And the primary reason we don't resist is because we are afraid of that force. We know if we act decisively to protect the places and creatures we love or if we act decisively to stop corporate exploitation of the poor, that those in power will come down on us with the full power of the state. We can talk all we want about how we supposedly live in a democracy. And we can talk all we want about the consent of the governed. But what it really comes down to is if you effectively oppose the will of those in power, they will try to kill you. We need to make that explicit so we can face the situation that we're in. And the situation that we're in is those in power are killing the planet and they are exploiting the poor, they are murdering the poor, and we are not stopping them because we are afraid.

But there have to be some of us who are willing to act anyway. We should never underestimate the seriousness of attempting to stop those in power. And we also need to be very clear about the seriousness of what is happening to the world. If you're reading this book, you probably understand how desperate things are.

What is the legacy that we want to leave for those who come after? How do you want to be seen by the generations that follow? Do you want to be seen as someone who knew what the right thing was and didn't do it because you were afraid? Or do you want to be remembered as someone who was afraid and did the right things anyway? It's okay to be afraid. Almost everyone I know is afraid at some time or another. But there is tremendous joy and exhilaration that comes, too, from doing what is right. The fact that those in power will use their power against resisters is not a reason to give up the fight before we even begin. It is a reason to be really, really smart.

What has happened to those who have tried to use violence? Fred Hampton, Laura Whitehorn , and Susan Rosenberg are just a few of the many who have tried to use force and have ended up dead, framed, or in jail. You say we all have a role; how do you feel about proposing that others do what you will not do?

Derrick Jensen: It's not a question of taking more or less risks by going aboveground or belowground. As repression becomes more open, it is the people who are aboveground who are often first targeted by those in power. Erich Mühsam was aboveground. So was Ken Saro-wiwa. Many writers have been. That is our role. Our role is to put big bull's-eye targets on our chests so that we can help to form a culture of resistance. Our role is to be public. And, of course, if you are public, you cannot also be underground; there must be an absolute firewall between aboveground and belowground activities and organizations. This is basic security culture.

We are not asking anyone else to do things we aren't willing to do. In fact, we aren't asking anyone to do anything in specific. We all need to find our own roles, based on our personal assessment of what risks we can take and what our gifts are.

Those in power will come down on us if we resist. It doesn't matter if that resistance is violent or nonviolent. It's resistance that brings the risk and retaliation, and it's resistance that our planet needs.

Civilization is the only thing keeping violent criminals from raping/killing people like in those horrible places far away. Who will protect my family if we dismantle civilization?

Derrick Jensen: A couple of years ago, I got an email from a policeman in Chicago. He was reading Endgame and liking it except that he thought I came down too hard on cops. He said, "Our job is to protect people from sociopaths and that's what I do every day. I protect people from sociopaths." I wrote back, "I think that's really great that you protect us from sociopaths. When my mom's house got burgled, the first thing we did was call the cops. When my house got burgled, I turned it over to the cops. It's great that you protect us from sociopaths. My problem is that you really only protect us from poor sociopaths, not the rich sociopaths."

After Bhopal, Warren Anderson was tried and found guilty in absentia for the atrocities of running Union Carbide. He was sentenced to hang. And the United States refuses to extradite him. If it were up to me, all the people associated with the Gulf oil spill, which is murdering the Gulf, would be executed. That would be part of the function of a state. Instead, one of the primary functions of government is to protect the rich sociopaths from the outrage of the rest of us. Who is protecting the farmers in India from Monsanto? Who is protecting the farmers in the United States from Cargill and ADM?

I did a benefit for a group of Mexican-Americans who were attempting to stop yet another toxic waste dump from being placed in their neighborhood. The toxic waste was, of course, from somewhere far away. The conversation turned to what it would be like if police and prosecutors were not enforcing the dictates of distant corporations instead of the wishes of the local communities. What if they were enforcing cancer-free zones? Or clearcut-free zones? Or rape-free zones, for that matter? And then everyone laughed, because everyone knows it's not going to happen. But what if we in our communities started to form community-defense groups [and militias] and said, "This is going to be a cancer-free zone. This will be a clearcut-free zone. This will be a rape-free zone. This will be a dam-free zone." What would happen if we did that?

That's exactly what we're talking about in this book. We want to have our communities be cancer-free. We want them to be clearcut-free. We want them to be dam-free. We want them to be rape-free. And we need to stop the sociopaths who are hurting us.

As civic society collapses in a patriarchy, things can become much worse. Look at the Democratic Republic of Congo, where there are organized mass rapes. What do we do about that? One of the things we need to do is to prepare now. That's why we've emphasized in this book so often that the revolutionaries need to be of good character. A friend of mine says that he does the environmental work he does because as things become increasingly chaotic, he wants to make sure that some doors remain open. If the grizzly bears are gone in twenty years, they'll be gone forever. But if they are there in twenty years, they may be able to be there forever. It's the same for the bull trout, the same with the redwoods-if you cut this forest, it's gone. But if it's standing, who knows what will happen in the future? And it's the same for people's social attitudes; as things become increasingly chaotic, events become increasingly uncontrollable. We must make sure that certain ideas are in place before that happens. That's why we have emphasized zero-tolerance for horizontal hostility, zero-tolerance for violence against women, zero-tolerance for racism. Because as civic society collapses-no matter the cause of this collapse-men will rape more, and the time to defend against that is not then, but now.

There are two approaches to the problem of men assaulting women. One of them is in a line by Andrea Dworkin, "My prayer for women of the twenty-first century: harden your hearts and learn to kill." Women need to learn self-defense, and they need to form self-defense organizations, and they need to be feminists. And men must make their allegiance to women absolute. They must have a zero-tolerance policy for the abuse of women.

The same is true for race-based hate crimes. As the economic system collapses, those whose entitlement has put them at the top of the heap are going to start blaming everyone else (witness the Tea Party, for example). As Nietzsche wrote, "One does not hate what one can despise." And so long as your entitlement is in place and so long as your entitlement isn't threatened, you can despise those whom you're exploiting. But as soon as that entitlement is threatened, that contempt turns over into outright hatred and violence. As civilization collapses, we will see an increase in male-pattern violence. We will see an increase in violence against those who resist. We will see an increase in violence against people of color. We are already seeing this.

My answer for people of color is, learn to defend yourself and form self-defense organizations. And the job of white allies is to make our allegiance to the victims of white oppression absolute.

There have been many resistance movements who have formed self-defense organizations and their own police forces. The IRA acted as neighborhood police, the Spanish Anarchists organized their own police force in some of the bigger cities, and the Gulabi Gang organizes women to protect themselves and their communities from police and male violence. We need something similar. We need to form self-defense organizations to defend those humans and non-humans who are assaulted and violated. Those assaults will continue to happen until we stop them.

To be clear, civilization is not the same as society. Civilization is a specific, hierarchical organization based on "power over." Dismantling civilization, taking down that power structure, does not mean the end of all social order. It should ultimately mean more justice, more local control, more democracy, and more human rights, not less.

Will civilization just reassemble itself?

Derrick Jensen: I have several answers to that. The first is that, no, this is a one-time blowout. The easily accessible reserves of oil are gone. There will never be another oil age. There will never be another natural gas age. There will never be another Iron Age or Bronze Age. Further, there will never be-or not for a very, very long time-an age of tall ships, for example, because the forests are gone. This culture has destroyed so much that there

will not be the foundation upon which a similar civilization could be built. Topsoil is gone. No, there will never be another rise of a civilization like this. There might be-presuming humans survive-some small-scale civilizations, but there will never be another one like this.

Second, I don't really think that's the right question. It's like waking up in the middle of the night and hearing the screams of your family as they're tortured, and then you look up and you see an ax murderer standing over your bed. You turn to the person sleeping next to you and you say, "Darling, honeybunch, how can we make sure that ax murderers don't break into our home tomorrow?" Right now, we have a crisis and we need to deal with that crisis. I wish we had the luxury to worry about whether civilization will rise again in the future, but we don't have that luxury. Right now, we need to stop this culture from killing the planet and let the people who come after worry about whether it's going to rise again.

This question reminds me of another I was once asked: "How much time do you think we have left?" I gestured toward the person next to her. "Pretend she is being tortured in that room over there. We can hear her screaming. How much time do you think she has left before we need to act? How much time should we allow the torturers to continue before we stop them?" There are injustices happening right now. Two hundred species went extinct today. And how much time did they have? None. The question for them is not, will civilization rise again? The question is what can we do to protect them right now. If we see these injustices, we need to stop them.

What should I say if someone says: "I want to form an underground, join an underground, start a safehouse, etc."

Say: "We are an aboveground organization. We do not want to be involved. We do not answer anyone's questions about personal desire to be in or form an underground."

Immediately cut off conversation if there are breaches of security. Sometimes, you have to end the conversation.

Do not say, "the underground" – this could imply we are in contact with an already existent underground organization. Instead, use, "an underground (which may or may not exist)."

Why hasn't DGR taken a stance on vaccines, 9/11, or any conspiracy theories?

Radical social movements tend to attract people who hold fringe beliefs. While we would never dictate what a person chooses to believe personally, DGR is strategic in what controversies and beliefs we hold positions on and in how we spend our time and energy. These beliefs do nothing to further DGR in achieving our goals and could alienate comrades and potential allies. Members who hold such views are expected to refrain from presenting or debating them while representing or engaging in DGR.

Global warming is a reality, and is referred to in the foundational texts of the DGR organization.

Some fringe beliefs, such as Holocaust denial, are in violation of DGR Principles and Code of Conduct and disqualify believers from membership.

For more questions and answers, see Deep Green Resistance: An interview with Derrick Jensen and Rachel Ivey.

RADICAL FEMINISM FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

What is radical feminism?

There are many branches of feminism. Radical feminism takes aim at the root cause of the crisis facing women: the system of violence that keeps people divided by sex with a dominant class (men) and an oppressed class (women).

This system of violence is called patriarchy, and over the past two thousand years it has come to rule most of the world. Patriarchal civilization is based on exploiting and consuming women, living communities, and the earth itself.

Radical feminists seek to liberate all women from oppression. We side with women resisting male violence in all its forms, including rape, porn, prostitution, female infanticide, and forced birth. We are dismantling misogyny (hatred of women), biophobia (fear and hatred of nature), and lesbophobia (fear and hatred of lesbians).

Radical feminists in DGR are committed to overturning this brutal patriarchal culture in defense of the earth, the source of life; and our sisters, women around the world.

Why are some people accusing Deep Green Resistance of transphobia?

Deep Green Resistance has been accused of transphobia because we have a difference of opinion about the definition of gender.

DGR does not condone dehumanization or violence against anyone, including people who describe themselves as trans. Universal human rights are universal. DGR has a strong code of conduct against violence and abuse. Anyone who violates that code is no longer a member of DGR.

Disagreeing with someone, however, is not a form of violence. And we have a big disagreement.

Radical feminists are critical of gender itself. We are not gender reformists–we are gender abolitionists. Without the socially constructed gender roles that form the basis of patriarchy, all people would be free to dress, behave, and love others in whatever way they wished, no matter what kind of body they had.

Patriarchy is a caste system which takes humans who are born biologically male or female and turns them into the social classes called men and women. Male people are made into men by socialization into masculinity, which is defined by a psychology based on emotional numbness and a dichotomy of self and other. This is also the psychology required by soldiers, which is why we don't think you can be a peace activist without being a feminist.

Female socialization in patriarchy is a process of psychologically constraining and breaking girls—otherwise known as "grooming"—to create a class of compliant victims. Femininity is a set of behaviors that are, in essence, ritualized submission.

We see nothing in the creation of gender to celebrate or embrace. Patriarchy is a corrupt and brutal arrangement of power, and we want to see it dismantled so that the category of gender no longer exists. This is also our position on race and class. The categories are not natural: they only exist because hierarchical systems of power create them (see, for instance, Audrey Smedley's book *Race in North America*). We want a world of justice and equality, where the material conditions that currently create race, class, and gender have been forever overcome.

Patriarchy facilitates the mining of female bodies for the benefit of men – for male sexual gratification, for cheap labor, and for reproduction. To take but one example, there are entire villages in India where all the women only have one kidney. Why? Because their husbands have sold the other one. Gender is not a feeling—it's a human rights abuse against an entire class of people, "people called women."[1]

We are not "transphobic." We do, however, have a disagreement about what gender is. Genderists think that gender is natural, a product of biology. Radical feminists think gender is social, a product of male supremacy. Genderists think gender is an identity, an internal set of feelings people might have. Radical feminists think gender

is a caste system, a set of material conditions into which one is born. Genderists think gender is a binary. Radical feminists think gender is a hierarchy, with men on top. Some genderists claim that gender is "fluid." Radical feminists point out that there is nothing fluid about having your husband sell your kidney. So, yes, we have some big disagreements.

Radical feminists also believe that women have the right to define their boundaries and decide who is allowed in their space. We believe all oppressed groups have that right. We have been called transphobic because the women of DGR do not want men—people born male and socialized into masculinity—in women-only spaces. DGR stands with women in that decision.

When Radical Feminists use the term "gender," what do they mean?

1. "The End of Gender" talk from the 2013 DGR Conference

2. Talking About Gender

3. Who Owns Gender?

Is Radical Feminism essentialist?

No, most definitely not. Essentialism is the idea that gender is biological, not social. So boys are naturally aggressive and adventurous, while girls are nurturing and emotional. Gendered behavior is attributed to brain structure, hormones, or both.

Feminists have fought essentialism since the beginning. Biological essentialism has been used to excuse everything from women's exclusion from education to men's sexual violence. Those in power need to naturalize their dominance and the subordinate group's submission: if society is actually arranged by nature or god or the cosmos, then there's no point in fighting it. The ideology of essentialism can be very effective at foreclosing resistance.

Think about race. Race is not biologically real. Politically, socially, economically, race is, of course, a brutal reality around the globe. The concept of race, however, is a creation of the powerful. If we want a just world, the material institutions that keep people of color subordinate need to be dismantled. And the concepts of "whiteness" and "blackness" themselves will ultimately be abandoned as they make no sense outside of the realities of white supremacy.

Many people are confused when asked to apply the same radical analysis to gender. But from a feminist perspective, the parallels are obvious. Are there differences in skin tone across the human species? Yes. Why do those differences mean anything? Because a corrupt and brutal arrangement of power needs an ideology called racism. Are there differences in the shapes of people's genitals? Yes. Why do those differences matter? Because a corrupt and brutal arrangement of power—patriarchy—needs an ideology called gender.

Patriarchy is a political system that takes biological males and females and turns them into the social categories called men and women, so that the class of men can dominate people called women. Gender is to women what race is to people of color: the ideological construct that underlies our subordination.

So we are firmly against the notion that gender is biological. In fact, it's the genderists who make essentialist claims for gender. In their view, men and women display domination and submission, respectively, not because of social conditions, but because we have different brains. Gendered behavior is natural, they say, a function of our biology. The claim is often that prenatal hormones create these propensities, and that the "wrong" hormones can produce the "wrong" brain. Hence it is possible to have a man's body with a woman's brain.

We find it very strange that we are accused of essentialism when we believe the exact opposite. Gender is socially constructed to the root, and those roots are soaked in women's blood. We aim to dismantle it. If gender was a product of our biology, that wouldn't be possible. We reject the idea of a female brain as firmly as we reject the idea of a "Negro brain."[2] And we will never accept that femininity is natural to women. It is the ritualized displays of submission created by trauma and demanded of all oppressed groups in a social hierarchy. We refuse to submit and we encourage women everywhere to resist.

For further reading:

Delusions of Gender: How Our Minds, Society, and Neurosexism Create Difference by Cordelia Fine

Brainstorm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences by Rebecca Jordan-Young.

[The Emperor's New Penis](http://deepgreenresistance.org) by Lierre Keith and Derrick Jensen

Aren't you just reaffirming gender when you create women-only spaces?

No, we are acknowledging gender and its terrible harms when we create women-only space. We are fighting gender, with its demands for feminine submission and its assertion that women exist to take care of men.

Gender is socially and politically very real and very deadly. It is the structure of women's oppression. Individually feigning "gender blindness" does not make gender go away: only radical action on a broad political scale can accomplish this. Gender is not just any social construction, but a social construction specifically designed to privilege one class (males) at the expense of another class (females).

Acting as if gender does not exist cannot counter it: on the contrary, that only helps to mask a system of oppressive power. No one would suggest that the working class could fight capitalism by abandoning their class consciousness. Likewise, people of color have long been adamant that "racial colorblindness" only serves the project of white supremacy by hiding the existence of oppressive race relations. By being conscious of their group condition, women and men can remain aware of their own relative oppression or privilege, which is necessary when combating systems of oppressive power.

The creation of women-only spaces ensures that women in our organization have a liberatory space to work, organize, and bond, free from the negative impact of men. All oppressed peoples need their own space to feel some moments of freedom, create community, and overcome submissive and self-hating behavior. All oppressed peoples have a right to draw a boundary, including women. DGR is committed to defending the right of women to define our own space.

How does radical feminism intersect with race and class struggles?

Alice Walker, Audre Lorde, and Barbara Smith, among others, were integral to the Second Wave of radical feminist theory. Many women of color and poor/working class women made sure that race and class issues were grappled with in a way that previously had not been addressed across the Left. This was essential, since some Second Wave feminist individuals and groups who made contributions to radical feminist theory and practice were unaware of their race and class privilege, which alienated women of color and working class women in the movement. The women mentioned above made sure that these overlapping systems of oppression were recognized and highlighted.

The sadistic systems of racism and classism intersect with patriarchy. All women are oppressed for being female, but this oppression takes different forms and degrees of severity along the lines of race and class. The sex-caste status of females as a class does not cancel out the differences of experience between women of differing racial

and economic classes. White, middle/upper class, and otherwise privileged women have a responsibility to prove themselves as allies to women of color. Only after this trust and solidarity is established will women be able to organize collectively to overthrow male power.

If radical feminism asserts that male trans people still retain male privilege, how does it account for the violence directed at them?

All biological males benefit from patriarchy. No internal identity or emotional state can change the material reality of those benefits. Only changing the material conditions—ending patriarchy—can end those benefits.

Having said that, people who don't conform to gender stereotypes face risks. They are hated because they are proof that gender is not natural. All systems of power have to naturalize their hierarchies, for obvious reasons. It is much harder to fight a social order that was created by God, or nature, or evolution. Male supremacy has to claim that masculinity and femininity are biologically or even cosmically real. Women who resist femininity and men who refuse masculinity are living proof that patriarchy is not inevitable. They might even serve as an inspiration to the rest of us to go on a wildcat strike in the gender factory. Such people will, of course, be punished with ridicule, censure, and even violence.

But *all* women are subjected to men's ridicule, censure, and violence. Women who conform to femininity are punished and women who resist it are also punished. Global statistics on male violence show exactly how viciously men punish women for the sin of simply being female. Either path–resistance or conformity–leads to potential rape, torture, and murder. Andrea Dworkin called that "the barricade of sexual terrorism."[3] All women live inside it, whether we resist or do our best to conform. Nothing we do individually will free us. There is no way out except to destroy the barricade, brick by brick.

Gender exists because the people on top—men—need to know who counts as human and who is an object, a thing to be used. That has to be made very clear, both ideologically and visually. That's why Jews were forced to wear yellow stars—they had to be visually demarcated as subhuman. That's why women's and men's clothing is so different. Until very recently in western societies, it was illegal for women to wear men's clothes.[4] The visual demarcation is crucial to the ideological demarcation of human and non-human, subject and object, person and thing. Women's clothing both advertises us as sexually available and constrains our movement: we exist to be used and, just in case we get other ideas, we can't get away.

At the center of all of this is rape. As Catharine MacKinnon put it so succinctly, "Man fucks woman; subject verb object."[5] Men need to know who is in the fuck-object category. They need that category to be absolute because they need to know that they will never be in it. They know too well the sadism that they've built into their sexuality. This is the deal they make with each other: don't do it to me, do it to her instead.

People who don't conform to gender throw a wrench into the works. If men can't tell who is a man and who is a woman, how will they know who is human and whom to use, whom to fuck? This is why homophobia springs from misogyny. The divide between human-subject and fuck-object has to be absolute to keep men—real men—safe from each other, physically and ideologically.

This is why people who don't conform to the visual demands of gender are punished so viciously by men. Men invested in masculinity are terrified of the possible confusion. They can't have the smallest hint of "gayness" attached to themselves, and the idea that some men might end up in the fuck-object category is horrifying. Their fear is based on a very real assessment of men's sexual sadism and the endless punishments meted out to those fuck-objects. So men who don't conform have to be punished until they do, to keep all men safe.

The only way to stop this is to dismantle male supremacy. No one belongs in the fuck-object category: not women, not gay men, not people who don't conform for whatever reason. The socialization that creates gender—the

violence and violation that men and boys do to girls and women—has to end, and the power that demands gender's existence conquered. When that happens, patriarchy will be over and the concept of gender will have no meaning.

What about two-spirits or other indigenous third/other gender roles?

Non-indigenous people have no right to an opinion on this issue.

What about children who identify with the other sex or with the gender they weren't assigned from a young age?

These children are simply acting like themselves. If patriarchy and its gender-straitjacket didn't exist, neither would this question. It's unbelievably frustrating that in this day and age we still have to argue that it's okay for girls to play rough and tumble and for boys to play dress-up, as kids and for the rest of their lives if they want.

It's gender that is the problem, not the children, and definitely not the children's bodies. Right now there is a frightening push to medicalize non-conforming children, including "treatment" with dangerous and experimental drugs. It is profoundly regressive to chemically and surgically alter children to get them to conform to gender caricatures. And some of the children on whom these experiments were done have already come forward with regrets. (See links below.)

In fact, research shows that the majority of children who have symptoms of "gender dysphoria", when not "treated" with some form of medical intervention, will grow up to be happy, healthy, non-gender dysphoric adults, most of whom are gay or lesbian.[6] What's happening is the medical erasure of gay and lesbian youth. We should be very concerned about this social trend as the latest version of eugenics.

Some further reading:

1. Ria Cooper: Britain's youngest sex change patient reverses treatment

2. Detransition: A young transman's story back to womanhood

3. I'm questioning my gender again

4. Leave the Kids Alone

Isn't the act of denying someone's self-proclaimed identity an act of violence?

No, it is an act of disagreement. That is what it means to live in a pluralistic democracy. We are going to disagree, sometimes vigorously, sometimes painfully.

Over the course of peoples' lives, our identities change many times. Indeed, as radicals, we actively question and abandon many of the identities to which we have been socialized. This is both healthy and necessary work.

Our point is that identity is not sacrosanct. Identities can be oppressive to ourselves and to other people. An example would be white people's racialized identity as white people. Breaking the identification with the category "white" does not relieve white people of their privilege—they're still white in a racist world—but it is an important stepping stone to fighting racism. So we don't think there is anything wrong with questioning identity as such.

To assert that questioning the legitimacy of gender can be equated with denying the existence of a person is implying that humans cannot exist without gender. We do not accept this. We do not accept that gender, or any oppression, is inevitable or natural. We can do better than the caste-system called gender.

What about the emotional well being of men who can't/don't do masculinity well enough for society to leave them alone?

First, it's not "society' that won't leave them alone. It is men. Men are the ones committing violent crimes to enforce masculine norms in other men.

Second, you will not be left alone when you challenge male power or any power. The powerful will try to subdue any signs of resistance to their order. We all have to come to terms with that in the best way we can. Some of us make our personal lives as safe as possible and hope for the best. Others of us make our lives a battle cry and intend to fight the power until the end. But that's each person's decision.

Third, we encourage all men to fail at masculinity! That's the only hope this planet has. As for men's emotional well-being, they are much better off refusing to play the Real Man game.

But if the implication is that it's women's job to take care of men, we reject that. Men need to take care of themselves and each other. We want to point out that this question of men's emotional well-being is a central one to way too many people. No one has ever—not once—asked us about women's emotional well-being, or implied that it's men's job to take care of women, even though it's men who are committing the violence.

Men commit 95 percent of the violent crime and 98 percent of the sexual crime in the US. Men need to confront other men. They need to stop each other from committing violence, both against men—in their endless wars, for instance—and against women.

What lies are anti-feminists spreading about Lierre Keith and Deep Green Resistance?

The following is a partial list of the lies told in this recent letter smearing Lierre Keith, Deep Green Resistance, and radical feminists more broadly.

Lie #1: "outspoken transphobe Lierre Keith"

Truth: Lierre has made exactly two statements about the theory and practice of transgenderism. One was not even public – it was a private email "leaked" by someone writing under false pretenses. Her other public statement on this issue was published on the website Counterpunch following an assault on DGR members in Portland, OR. Lierre is anything but outspoken about her views on this issue, and her views are anything but transphobic. Disagreement is not hatred, nor it is violence.

Lie #2: "DGR bans trans people from their organization."

Truth: This is false. DGR welcomes anyone who agrees with our Statement of Principles and Code of Conduct. We have had people who have identified as trans in the organization, who have been members in good standing. DGR does not discriminate against anyone based on their mannerisms, choice of clothing, physical appearance, choice of name, etc. Many, possibly even most DGR members fail to conform to gender stereotypes in either appearance or behavior. However, given our understanding of gender as a hierarchy, we recognize that being put into the class of called women is not something you choose, it is something you are born into. Therefore, we have a strict policy in defense of female only spaces, meaning that anyone born male is not allowed admittance. This is an important boundary that our female members, many of whom are survivors of male violence including rape, battering, and human trafficking (listen to those women), have set, and in DGR, women's boundaries are respected absolutely.

As articulated in our [Statement of Principles](), here is our position on gender:

Deep Green Resistance is a radical feminist organization. Men as a class are waging a war against women. Rape, battering, incest, prostitution, pornography, poverty, and gynocide are both the main weapons in this war and the conditions that create the sex-class women. Gender is not natural, not a choice, and not a feeling: it is the structure of women's oppression. Attempts to create more "choices" within the sex-caste system only serve to reinforce the brutal realities of male power. As radicals, we intend to dismantle gender and the entire system of patriarchy which it embodies. The freedom of women as a class cannot be separated from the resistance to the dominant culture as a whole."

Lie #3: "DGR does little else beside attacking people in the environmental movement who do not fit her identity politics." "While it is difficult to find, in the last year, one single action that DGR has taken in defense of the Earth."

Truth: DGR has members in countries around the world who are engaged in [various kinds of work.]() Ironically, a DGR Great Basin member is depicted on the [cover]() of the new Earth First! Direct Action Manual taking part in a lockdown to stop the Utah Tar Sands project. While other organizations, namely the Earth First! Journal, have expended their energy writing and publishing no less than four articles condemning DGR, DGR has not put out a single article condemning any other organization. Every statement DGR has released on this issue, including the list you are reading, has been defensive.

Lie #4: "Lierre Keith has a history of tearing apart alliances in the environmental movement."

Truth: Lierre Keith has torn apart no alliances. It is an extreme twisting of reality to say that having a disagreement is the same as deliberately tearing apart movements. This claim is once again unfounded, and the author makes no attempt to back up their claim with evidence, because it simply cannot be done.

.

Lie #5: "These quotes are from RadFem/DGR activist Lisa Compton, and roughly typify the position of these groups as experienced in public forums and personal conversations."

Truth: Lisa Compton is not a DGR member, and is not affiliated with DGR. No one speaks for DGR except DGR members. The characterization of Lisa Compton as a DGR activist is once again typical of the complete contempt the author or authors of the original article have for even basic truth, and by extension for the readers of the article.

 Lie #6: "Keith's larger community are known for… insisting that all trannies will be eradicated by radical feminism".

Truth: This is an absolute and absurd lie. Neither Keith or anyone else in DGR ever uses the term 'tranny' and we condemn violence against anyone, including people who describe themselves as trans. Universal human rights are universal. DGR has a strong [Code of Conduct]() against violence and abuse. The only thing DGR wishes to eradicate is civilization. As feminists, we also want to dismantle patriarchy and its gender caste system. Then the classes of people called men and women would no longer exist, and we would all be free. The idea that radical feminists want to "exterminate" trans people is like the idea that Marxists want to "exterminate" wage-laborers; a desire to dismantle a constructed arrangement of power does not imply a desire to eliminate those people inside that system.

For more: "DGR does not condone dehumanization or violence against anyone, including people who describe themselves as trans. Universal human rights are universal. DGR has a strong code of conduct against violence and abuse. Anyone who violates that code is no longer a member of DGR." (Radical Feminism FAQ)

Lie #7: "McBay left DGR after Keith, Saba Malik, and Derrick Jensen spurned his and others' support for trans* inclusive policies."

Truth: McBay originally agreed on the implementation of a female-only spaces policy. He then left (taking with him a large sum of money that didn't belong to him) without commenting to anyone in DGR on his reasons for doing so. Only in retrospect has he attempted to claim a glorious and self-righteous departure.

Lie #8: "Saba Malik, Lierre Keith and Derrick [Jensen] all sent emails to my chapter and one other chapter that supported trans folks with the usual rad fem attacks. The head organizer Premadasi Amada was asked to leave as a part of this process."

Truth: Lierre and Derrick had already left DGR when Premadasi Amada was asked to leave. It was DGR members who recognized her abusive and manipulative behavior and asked her to leave. With Premadasi gone, the staff then asked for Lierre and Derrick to come back. The DGR staff was unanimous in their experience of her and in their action to remove her. These details are sordid, petty, and ultimately pointless. Why does anyone care about people they will never meet in an organization they will never join? DGR had no interest in making any of this public but the constant trashing from outsiders has left us with no recourse but to tell the truth.

Lie #9: "Keith… attacked the Lakota as patriarchal."

Truth: Listen to women.

Lie #10: "It is easy to find episodes of divisive antagonism littered by Keith and her "radical feminist" group throughout both the feminist and environmental movements."

Truth: Every single instance of public uproar around the issue of gender and DGR has been instigated by others. DGR is not and has never been the aggressor here. Here's one example, and here's another.

Lie #11: "PIELC must not become a venue for trans* exclusionary hate that breeds an environment of hostility and violence."

Truth: How many lies can fit in one sentence? See lie #2 for a response to "trans exclusionary". To claim that Lierre hates trans people is a complete lie and has no basis in fact. A political disagreement is not hatred. To claim that Lierre incites violence is absurd. She regularly receives threats of violence, has been assaulted before, and can only speak safely with the presence of allies and security; her response to violence against trans people? "Universal human rights are universal." That is a direct quote.

Footnotes

[1] Dworkin. "Against the Male Flood: Censorship, Pornography, and Equality," p. 270.

[2]http://neurophilosophy.wordpress.com/2007/03/14/on-the-peculiarities-of-the-negro-brain/

[3] Dworkin, *Right-Wing Women*, p. 122.

[4] Clothing has also been legislated by class. Such laws are called "sumptuary laws." A brief history is here.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sumptuary_law

[5] Mackinnon, p. 124.

[6] Zucker.

Bibliography

Dworkin, Andrea. "Against the Male Flood: Censorship, Pornography, and Equality," in *Letters from a War Zone*, (New York, E.P. Dutton), 1988.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Right-Wing Women*. New York: Perigee Books, 1978.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Zucker, KJ. Gender identity development and issues. *Child Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics North America* 2004, 13: 551-568.

Further Reading

http://www.troubleandstrife.org/new-articles/brain-wars/

Fine, Cordelia. *Delusions of Gender: How Our Minds, Society, and Neurosexism Create Difference.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2010.

Jeffreys, Sheila. *Beauty and Misogyny: Harmful Cultural Practices in the West.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Jeffreys, Sheila. *Unpacking Queer Politics.* Camrbridge, UK: Polity Press, 2003.

Jordan-Young, Rebecca M. *Brainstorm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010

Smedley, Audrey. *Race in North America.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2007.

GREEN TECHNOLOGY & RENEWABLE ENERGY

FAQs

Zachrání planetu zelené technologie?

Magnety pro větrné turbíny

Bringhamský důlní kaňon

Ne. Větrné turbíny, solární fotovoltaické panely a síť samotná jsou vyráběny pomocí levné energie z fosilních paliv. Když náklady fosilních paliv začnou stoupat, tyto složité vyráběné položky přestanou být jednoduše uskutečnitelné.

Solární panely a větrné turbíny nejsou vyráběny z ničeho. Jsou vyráběny z kovů, plastů a chemikálií. Tyto produkty byly vytěženy ze země, přepraveny, zpracovány, vyrobeny. Každá část za sebou zanechává stopu zkázy: zničené biotopy, znečištěné vodní toky, kolonizaci, toxický odpad, otrockou práci, skleníkové plyny, války a podnikatelské zisky.

Základními surovinami pro obnovitelné zdroje jsou stejné materiály, které jsou všudypřítomné v průmyslových výrobcích, jako je cement a hliník. Nikdo nevyrobí cement v jakémkoliv množství bez použití energie z fosilních paliv. A hliník? Těžba sama je destruktivní a toxickou noční můrou, z níž se lidé při povodí jen tak nezotaví, ale bude to trvat geologickou dobu.

Od počátku až do konce tzv. "obnovitelné zdroje energie" a další "zelené technologie" vedou k zničení planety. Tyto technologie mají své základy ve stejné průmyslové těžbě a procesech výroby, které ničí celý svět posledních 150 let.

Nezabýváme se mírným snížením škod způsobených průmyslovou civilizací; máme v úmyslu kompletně zastavit tyto škody. Toto si bude vyžadovat odstranění globální průmyslové ekonomiky, které bude znemožňovat vytváření těchto technologií.

Solární, větrná nebo geotermální energie není dobrá pro životní prostředí?

Ne. Většina elektřiny, která je vyráběna obnovitelnými zdroji se používá ve výrobě, těžbě a dalších průmyslových odvětvích, které ničí planetu. Dokonce i v případě, že by výroba elektřiny byla neškodná, spotřeba rozhodně není. Každá elektrická věc při procesu výroby zanechává stejnou stopu zkázy. Žijící společenství - lesy, řeky, oceány - se stávají mrtvými komoditami.

Snížení emisí, kterých je v úmyslu dosáhnout fosilními palivy, může být dosaženo zlepšením účinnosti stávajících úhelných elektráren, podniků a domácností za mnohem menší cenu. V rámci průmyslové civilizace toto dává větší smysl, a to jak ekonomicky a environmentálně.

Tento přístup nebere v potaz, že celý průmysl s obnovitelnými zdroji není nic jiného než hrozný byznys. Neprospívá nikomu jinému než investorům.

"Obnovitelné" zdroje energie znamená, že vydrží věčně?

Ne. Solární a větrné turbíny vydrží kolem 20 až 30 let, pak je potřebné je vyměnit. Výrobní procesy těžby, znečištění a využívání nejsou něčím, co se stane jednou, ale je to kontinuální - a rozšiřuje se velmi rychle. Obnovitelné zdroje energie nikdy nemohou nahradit infrastrukturu fosilních paliv, protože jsou zcela na fosilních palivech závislé.

Zachrání obnovitelné zdroje ekonomiku?

Technologie obnovitelných zdrojů energie do značné míry závisí na vládních dotacích získávaných od daňových poplatníků, a také přímo získávaných od velkých energetických a jiných společností jako jsou ČEZ, BP, Samsung a Mitsubishi. Zatímco toto schéma naplňuje jejich představy, nám to nepomůže.

Nicmén■ je to špatná otázka. Pr■myslová kapitalistická ekonomika vyvlast■uje a ochuzuje miliardy lidí a zabíjí živý sv■t. Obnovitelné zdroje energie závisí na centralizovaném kapitalismu a energetické nerovnováze. Nechceme profitovat ze zahra■ování tohoto systému.

Namísto obhajoby další pr■myslové technologie se pot■ebujeme p■esunout k lokální ekonomice založené na komunitním rozhodování a tom, co m■že poskytovat místní krajina udržitelnou cestou. A pot■ebujeme zastavit globální ekonomiku, na níž závisí obnovitelné zdroje energie.

Dob■e, získávání kov■ je škodlivé. A co recyklace t■chto materiál■?

Recyklace

Recyklace m■že být "efektivn■jší" než t■žba, ale není ■ešením problém■m se životním prost■edím. Ve skute■nosti jim p■ispívá.

Recyklace hliníku, oceli, k■emíku, m■di, kov■ vzácných zemin a jiných surovin používaných pro "zelené technologie" m■že být provedena jen za velkou cenu na planet■. Recyklace t■chto látek je velice energeticky náro■ná, uvol■uje velké množství skleníkových plyn■ a p■ispívá k zamo■ení podzemních vod a intoxikaci planety.

Recyklace kov■ vyžaduje globální obchod, protože recyklace v■tšinou probíhá v chudých zemích s laxními environmentální a hygienickými p■edpisy. Je velmi nebezpe■ná pro d■lníky. Mnoho ■ástí technologií obnovitelných zdroj■ energie nelze recyklovat.

Dob■e, obnovitelné technologie mají n■jaké dopady, ale jsou stále lepší než fosilní paliva, je to tak?

P■íznaky šílenosti

Dolování neobnovitelných kov■

P■elo■ování jich p■es celý sv■t

Jejich obráb■ní

Nazýváme je udržetlnými a zelenými

Technologie obnovitelných zdroj■ energie jsou lepší než fosilní paliva ve stejném slova smyslu, že zran■ní jednou kulkou je "lepší" než dv■ma. Obojí je tragickým zran■ním.

Chcete sest■elit planetu jednou nebo dvakrát?

Jediný zp■sob, jak se dostat z této patové situace, je ji rozbít: odmítnout ob■ volby a jít úpln■ jinou cestou. Nepodporovat ani fosilní paliva nebo obnovitelné technologie.

Nicmén■ ani analogie se st■elou není zcela p■esná, protože obnovitelné technologie mají v n■kterých p■ípadech horší dopad na životní prost■edí než fosilní paliva.

Více obnovitelné energie není synonymem mén■ energie z fosilních paliv. Množství energie vyráb■né obnovitelnými zdroji nar■stá, ale sou■asné nar■stá množství vyráb■né energie fosilními palivy. Žádná uhelná

nebo plynová elektrárna nebude vypnuta kv■li obnovitelné zdroji energie.

Jen asi 25% globální spot■ebovávané energie je ve form■ elekt■iny, která proudí dráty a bateriemi. Ropa, zemní plyn a další deriváty fosilních paliv p■edstavují zbylou spot■ebovávanou energii. Dokonce i kdyby mohla být elekt■ina po celém sv■t■ vyráb■na bez emisí skleníkových plyn■, znamenalo by to snížení jen o 25%. A dokonce by to m■lo malý význam, když v■tšina spot■ebovávané energie rapidn■ nar■stá.

Je diskutabilní zda n■jaký "obnovitelný zdroj" skute■n■ vyrábí ■istou energii. V■tšina energie spot■ebovávaná p■i t■žb■, výrob■, výzkumu a vývoji, transportu, instalaci, údržb■, p■ipojení k síti a likvidaci v■trných turbín a solárních panel■ m■že být v■tší, než dokáží vyráb■t; oponentská tvrzení ■asto neberou v úvahu všechny energetické vstupy. Obnovitelné zdroje energie byly popsány jako praní špinavých pen■z: špinavá energie p■ichází, ■istá energie vychází.

U biopaliv, pro další p■íklad "zelených technologií", bylo prokázáno, že se ■istá energie vytrácí v tém■■ každém p■ípad■. Tato biopaliva, která mají produkovat ■istou energii, produkují velice malé množství energie. Tyto paliva jsou ■asto vyráb■na skrze zni■ený p■irozených ekosystém■ takových jako jsou tropické lesy nebo prérie pro zem■d■lskou výrobu, což je proces, který uvol■uje ješt■ více skleníkových plyn■, ni■í biodiverzitu a ni■í lokální dostupnost potravin. Výroba biopaliv je považována za hlavní faktor r■stu cen potravin po celém sv■t■ v posledních letech. Tyto vzr■stající ceny potravin vedou k ší■ení hladov■ní, nepokoj■m a násilí.

N■kte■í lidé rádi podporují hydroelektrárny jako zdroj "zelené energie". Toto je falešné. P■ehrady mají obrovské dopady na životní prost■edí na ■ekách, plážích a ústí ■ek. V■etn■ t■chto dopad■ mnoho p■ehrad je velkým zdrojem metanu v d■sledku rozkladu organické hmoty v dolní ■ásti zásob. Metan z vodních p■ehrad m■že být zodpov■dný 4% nebo více procenty na globálním oteplování.

Jaké jsou základní rozdíly mezi fosilními palivy a zelenými technologiemi?

	Fosilní paliva	Zelené technologie
T■žba	Vyžadují si neudržitelnou t■žbu kov■ a jiných zdroj■ ve velkém m■■ítku.	Vyžadují si neudržitelnou t■žbu kov■ a jiných zdroj■ ve velkém m■■ítku.
Produkce	Globalizovaná pr■myslová produkce vyžaduje energeticky náro■né technologie.	Globalizovaná pr■myslová produkce vyžaduje energeticky náro■né technologie.
Zne■išt■ní	Extrémní zne■išt■ní prostupuje od po■áte■ního pr■zkumu p■es t■žbu a spot■ebu. Zne■išt■ní je ■asto *viditelné* na míst■ spot■eby.	Extrémní zne■išt■ní prostupuje od po■áte■ního pr■zkumu p■es t■žbu a spot■ebu. Zne■išt■ní je ■asto *neviditelné* na míst■ spot■eby.
Lidská práva	Technologie z velké ■ásti ovládají nadnárodní spole■nosti. Vyžadují si masivní kapitál. Vytvá■ení komunit není do zna■né míry možné.	Technologie z velké ■ásti ovládají nadnárodní spole■nosti. Vyžadují si masivní kapitál. Vytvá■ení komunit není do zna■né míry možné.
Demokracie	Technologie z velké ■ásti ovládají nadnárodní spole■nosti. Vyžadují si masivní kapitál. Vytvá■ení komunit není do zna■né míry možné.	Technologie z velké ■ásti ovládají nadnárodní spole■nosti. Vyžadují si masivní kapitál. Vytvá■ení komunit není do zna■né míry možné.

Co je špatného na solární energii?

Výroba solárních panel■

Výroba solárních panelů patří dnes mezi nejběžnější zdroje hexachlorethanu, fluoridu dusitého a fluoridu sýrového. Tří extrémně silných skleníkové plyny, které jsou používané pro čištění plasmy při výrobě. Jako skleníkový plyn je hexachloroethan 12 000 krát silnější než oxidu uhličitý. Je 100 procentně produkovaný lidmi, a přežije 10 000 let po dostání se do atmosféry. Fluorid dusitý je 17 000 krát silnější než oxid uhličitý, a fluorid sýrový je 25 000 krát silnější. Je to nejsilnější známý skleníkový plyn. Jen pro příklad, atmosférické koncentrace fluoridu sýrového stoupají o 11 procent každý rok.

Ze zprávy Silicon Valley Toxics coalition:

> Jak se solární průmysl rozšiřuje je malá pozornost věnována potenciálním environmentálním a zdravotním dopadům této rychlé expanze. Rozšiřující se solární fotovoltaické panely mají potenciál vytvořit obrovský nový zdroj elektronického odpadu na konci jejich životnosti, která je odhadována na 20 až 25 let. Nové solární fotovoltaické technologie mají vzrůstající výkon a snižují náklady, ale u mnoha z nich se používají extrémně toxické materiály nebo materiály s neznámými zdravotními a environmentálními riziky (včetně nových nanomateriálů a procesů).

Co je špatného na větrných turbínách?

Montáž větrných turbín

Jednou z nejběžnějších větrných turbín na světě je 1,5 megawattová turbína, která je vyráběna General Electric. Gondola váží 56 tun, věž váží na 71 tun a lopatky 36 tun. Jedna taková turbína vyžaduje více než 36 tun oceli.

Tento model je menšího designu moderních standardů. Jsou tu turbíny, které mohou být třikrát vyšší a používat osmkrát tolik materiálů (oceli, hliníku a mědi).

Tyto materiály pocházejí odněkud, a tam je vždy někdo doma, je to to něčí posvátné místo, něčím zdrojem potravy a vody a vzduchu. My neslýcháme o nich, protože pokud jsou to lidé, jsou obvykle chudí a barevní. Toto je část, kde se rasismus, kolonialismus, environmentalismus a těžební ekonomika schází.

Největší výrobce větrných turbín na světě je Vestas, společnost s obratem 15 miliard dolarů. Největší americký výrobce turbín je General Electric, která vlastní 700 miliard dolarů a je čtvrtým největším producentem znečištění ovzduší. Může si někdo opravdu myslet, že - po Fukušimě, Hanfordu, Bhópálu - budou mít tyto společnosti obavy o spravedlnost nebo udržitelnost? Zisky jsou přední a život vždy pro ně zůstane druhotný.

Co elektrická auta?

Výroba elektrických aut vyžaduje energii z fosilních paliv v mnoha částech jejich výroby a distribuce. Tento požadavek je pravděpodobně ještě extrémnější u elektrických aut, když je potřebné, aby byly vyráběny pro, co největší lehkost jak je to možné kvůli hmotnosti baterií. Mnoho odlehčujících materiálů jsou extrémně energeticky náročné na výrobu, takové jako je hliník a uhlíkové kompozity. Toto je také důvod, proč jsme nikdy neviděli elektrický nákladák - jsou příliš těžké. A samozřejmě nákladní auta jsou potřebná pro těžbu a pohon fosilních paliv všech nákladních vozidel. Elektrická/hybridní auta jsou také nabývána touto energií, která z velké části pochází z plynových, uhelných a jaderných elektráren.

Nedávná studie Národní akademie, která analyzovala dopady výroby vozidel, těžbu, rafinaci, emise a jiné faktory, prokázala, že zdravotní a environmentální dopady elektrických vozidel jsou ve skutečnosti vyšší než u benzínových automobilů.

Měli bychom se zaměřit na hustou urbanizaci a městskou dopravu?

V n■kterých p■ípadech je hustý m■stský rozvoj výhodn■jší než rozlehlá p■edm■stí. M■že výrazn■ snížit dopady na místní divoká území. Nicmén■, soust■edit se na hust■ osídlené m■stské komunity a ve■ejnou dopravu, což se nachází v moderním environmentálním hnutí, je v n■kolika ohledech problematické.

Hlavním problémem tohoto p■ístupu je, že je tím brána v úvahu existence m■st. M■sta jsou neudržitelná, protože vyžadují rutinní dovoz zdroj■ - jídlo, d■evo, minerály a palivo - z okolních krajin a nic nevrací. Krajina na níž je vybudováno m■sto, nem■že poskytnout svým ob■an■m dostatek potravy, p■íst■eší, paliva a další materiální statky.

M■sto je v rozporu s vesnicemi, tábory a jinými malými osadami, které nap■í■ d■jinami sloužily jako udržitelný model pro lidská spole■enství.

M■sta vždy ■erpají zdroje z okolních region■ a v moderním sv■t■ z celého sv■ta. Hust■ osídlená m■sta mohou snížit dopady tzv. "vývoje" na nejbližší území, ale ne■eší základní dopady m■st nebo moderní globalizované m■sto.

Nap■íklad, zatímco jsou n■které ■tvrti v New Yorku extrémn■ hust■ osídleny a využívají pom■rn■ malé množství energie, je to zúžený úhel pohledu. Deštné pralesy jsou káceny a hory vyt■ženy, aby byly poskytnuty zdroje t■mto hustým m■st■m. Každý vážný pokus o environmentalismus musí brát v potaz dopad výroby a p■epravy materiál■ do m■sta, a musí ■ešit základní problémy t■žby zdroj■ a expanze globální pr■myslové civilizace.

Pokud chcete více v■d■t o m■stech, jak fungují, a pro■ jsou neudržitelná jako formy sociální organizace, p■e■t■te si naši definici civilizace na konci stránky.

Pokud chcete více v■d■t o m■stech, jak fungují, a pro■ jsou neudržitelná jako formy sociální organizace, p■e■t■te si [naši definici civilizace](#) a [zdroje](#) na konci stránky.

Ale my pot■ebujeme elekt■inu, nebo ne?

Solární elektrárna Ivanpah

Lidé, stejn■ jako jiná zví■ata, získávají svou energii p■edevším z konzumace rostlin a zví■at. Rostliny získávají energii ze slunce. Žádný druh nepot■ebuje elekt■inu pro p■ežití. Pr■myslový systém pot■ebuje elekt■inu, aby p■ežil.

Potraviny a stanovišt■ pro živé bytosti jsou ob■továny pro uživení elekt■iny. Infrastruktura, doly, zpracování a odpad nutný pro výrobu elekt■iny ni■í lesy a jiná p■irozená místa po celém sv■t■. Zajišt■ní energetické bezpe■nosti pro pr■mysl vyžaduje ni■ení bezpe■í života pro živé bytosti (to jsme my).

Jaké je vaše alternativa?

Elekt■ina se b■žn■ používá jen od roku 1920 (nebo pozd■ji ve vyšších ■ástech sv■ta). Mnoho lidí ve v■tšin■ sv■ta nemá doma elekt■inu dokonce dnes. Existuje mnoho zp■sob■, jak splnit naše požadavky, které jsou závislé na elekt■in■.

Výroba elekt■ina je neudržitelná, pokud "udržitelným" chápeme n■co, co m■žeme d■lat udržiteln■ v■■n■ bez toho, aby došlo k trvalému ■i významnému poškození planety. Lokální elektrické systémy generující energii malého m■■ítka mohou pokra■ovat ješt■ [po pádu](#) centralizovaných energetických sítí, ale globální pr■myslová výroba "zelených" produkt■ bude zabíjet planetu stejn■ tak jako status quo.

Jsme skeptičtí i ve využívání průmyslové "zelené" technologie pro usnadnění přechodu k zcela neprůmyslovým způsobům života. Závislost na průmyslové technologii se může stát snadno kultem pokroku, a může snadno odvádět lidi od tradičních, udržitelných způsobů života.

Lokální stravování

Jediné opravdové "zelené" zdroje energie přicházejí ze země a nevyžadují si destrukci. Mluvíme zde o fotosyntéze a síle svalů. Permakultura, stejně jako jiné tradiční způsoby života takové jako jsou lov, rybolov a sběr, musí být základy každé budoucí udržitelné kultury; jinak je jakékoliv tvrzení o "zeleném" žití lež. Trvalé polykultury, jak kultivované a divoké, mohou také dodávat další základy potřebné k životu: čistá voda, čistý vzduch, materiály pro oblečení a přístřeší a duchovní rozvoj.

Deep Green Resistance stojí v opozici k průmyslovým technologiím, které jsou označovány jako "zelené" nebo "obnovitelné". Stojíme v solidaritě se živým světem a komunitami, které čelí dopadům průmyslové těžby po celém světě.

Více k přečtení/Vidění

- [Falešná řešení zelené energie](#) (jednohodinové video s českými titulkami)
- [Ozzie Zehner – Zelená iluze](#) (jednohodinové video v angličtině)
- [Mýty biopaliva](#) (jednohodinové video v angličtině)
- [Resistance Radio rozhovor s Annette Smith](#) (čtyřiceti minutové audio)

Reference

- ["Problém s větrnými turbínami"](#), Eric Rosenbloom. (EN)
- ["Energetická bilance globálního fotovoltaického (PC) průmyslu– Je tento průmysl sítí elektrické výroby?"](#), Michael Date a Sally M. Benson. (EN)
- *Green Illusions: The Dirty Secrets of Clean Energy and the Future of Environmentalism* (*Zelené iluze: Špinavá tajemství čisté energie a budoucnost environmentalismu*) Ozzie Zehner. University of Nebraska Press, 2012.
- [*Deep Green Resistance: Strategie pro záchranu planety*](#), Lierre Keith, Derricka Jensena, a Arica McBaya. Seven Stories Press, 2011.
- *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power and Earthly Ruin* (*Imperiální San Francisco: Síla města a pozemská zřícenina*), Gray Brechin. University of California Press, 2006.
- ["Reservoár emisí"](#), International Rivers. (EN) Accessed October 31st, 2014.
- ["Solární průmysl se potýká s nebezpečnými odpady"](#), Jason Dearen, Associated Press. February 10th, 2013. (EN)
- ["Deset důvodů, proč jsou přerušované obnovitelné zdroje (větrné a solární) energie problém"](#), Gail Tverbeg. January 2014. (EN)

BEZPEČNOSTÍ KULTURA

Holou pravdou je, že žijeme pod dohledem státu, který je nevyzpytatelný. Mnoho lidí se oprávněně bojí nebo obává represe ze strany státu. Ale tento strach se může stát paranoidní a paralyzujícím. Výsledkem je, že se někteří nebudou zapojovat do radikálního aktivismu. Jiní zůstanou zapojeni, ale jejich paranoia vytvoří dusnou

atmosféru a lidi odradí. Výsledek bude, že naše hnutí zem■e.

Bezpe■ností kultura je jednoduchý soubor pravidel, které n■kdo m■že následovat. Snižuje paranoiu a strach, a poskytuje nám bezpe■nost, takže svou práci m■žeme d■lat efektivn■ji. Tato stránka je úvodem do bezpe■ností kultury, a nem■la by být považována za vy■erpávající. Bu■te chyt■í a p■izp■sobte se vaší konkrétní situaci.

Co je bezpe■ností kultura?

Bezpe■ností kultura je soubor postup■ a postoj■, jejichž cílem je zvýšit bezpe■nost v politických komunitách. Tyto pokyny jsou vytvá■eny na základ■ nedávné a d■jinné státní represe, a p■ispívají snížit paranoiu a zvýšit efektivitu.

Pravidla bezpe■ností kultury

Nemluvit o ...

- Zapojení se nebo n■koho do podzemní skupiny.
- Vaší nebo touze jiného se zapojit do takové skupiny.
- Vaší nebo touze jiného se zapojit do takových ilegálních praktik.
- Prosazování takových opat■ení n■kým jiným.
- Vašich nebo jiného plánech d■lat v budoucnu takové akce.
- Neptejte se ostatních zda jsou ■leny podzemních skupin.
- Nemluvte o ilegálních aktivitách, co se tý■e doby, lidí, míst, atd.

Nenásilná ob■anská poslušnost je nezákonná, ale n■kdy m■že být projednávána otev■en■. Obecn■ platí, že konkrétní nenásilné ob■anské neposlušnosti by m■ly projednávány pouze s lidmi, kte■í se na akci podílejí, nebo t■mi, kte■í pracují na jejich podp■rné práci.

Stále p■ijatelné je (dokonce podporováno) mluvit o podpo■e odporu, pokud se nezmi■ujete o konkrétních místech, lidech, ■asu, atd., ale pouze tehdy, pokud je to legální ve vaší jurisdikci. I když je odpor legální ve vašem kraji, bu■te si v■domi možných represí nebo následk■, takže m■žete ud■lat informované rozhodnutí o tom, jakou úrove■ rizika byste byli ochotni snést.

Nikdy nemluvte s policií, kriminalisty, agenty FBI, atd.

- Nezáleží na tom, zda jste vinní nebo nevinní. Nezáleží na tom, jak jste chyt■í. *Nikdy* nemluvte s policisty, kriminalisty, agenty FBI, atd. Nezáleží na tom, zda si myslíte, že ■íkáte policist■m, co již znají. Nezáleží na tom, že pouze konverzujete s policisty. Každý rozhovor s policií, kriminalisty nebo FBI atd. vám nebo jiným s nejv■tší pravd■podobností p■inese potíže.
- Pokud budete mluvit s policisty, mu nebo ji m■žete dát p■íležitost, aby sv■d■ili proti vám na základ■ toho, co jste ■ekli, nebo to, co ■íkají, že jste ■ekli.
- Jednoduše a stru■n■ ■e■eno ■ekn■te, že chcete ml■et. Ptejte se, pokud jste zat■eni nebo zadržováni. Pokud ne odejd■te. Pokud jste zat■eni nebo zadržováni, opakujte každému, kdo se vás zeptá, že chcete ml■et a že chcete mluvit s právníkem. Ne■íkejte nic jiného, než své jméno, adresu a datum narození.
- V■tšina usv■d■ení, zda lidé jsou vinní nebo nikoliv, pocházejí od lidí, kte■í mluví, ne z investigativní práce.
- Nestýkejte se s donaše■i. Donaše■ je n■kdo, kdo poskytuje informace policii nebo kriminalist■m nebo federální policii s cílem získat mírn■jší trest pro sebe. ■asto donaše■i poskytují policii informace po delší dobu.

N■kdy k tomu dochází poté, co byli zat■eni a nuceni pracovat pro policii jako informáto■i. Na oplátku mohou dostávat peníze, nebo je jejich ilegální chování ignorováno policií. [■t■te více o intrikách a nebezpe■í.](#)

- Learn about interrogation tricks and threats.
- Watch [Don't Talk to Cops – Part I](#) and [Don't Talk to Cops – Part II](#) on YouTube.

Nikdy nedovolte, aby do vašeho domu vstupoval policista, kriminalista nebo agent FBI, atd., pokud nemají povolení k prohlídce.

- Pokud pustíte do vašeho domu policistu, musí mít povolení pro prohledání vašeho domova.
- Pokud p■ijdou k vašemu domu, kla■te otázky, nenechte je vstoupit. I když vstoupí nebo zav■ou dve■e za vámi, laskav■ ■ekn■te: „Chci ml■et." Zeptejte se jich, zda jste zat■eni nebo p■ípadn■, zda mají povolení k prohlídce. Pokud ■eknou, že ne, jd■te zp■t do svého domu, zdvo■ile zav■ete dve■e. Pokud vstoupí, nebra■te se v každém p■ípad■ zat■ení. ■ekn■te: „Nesouhlasím s pohledáváním." Dívejte se, kde jsou a co d■lají.

Bu■te chyt■í

- Nau■te se zákony ve vaší zemi/státu/jurisdikci: zjist■te si, co si m■žete dovolit a co ne. Zjist■te si jaké akty jsou legální a jaké ilegální, zjist■te si, co vyzkoušeli p■edchozí aktivisté a co je zákonem povoleno.
- Najd■te si podrobnosti o právnících, kte■í ve vaší oblasti hájí aktivisty: pokud se chystáte ud■lat akci, napište své telefonií ■íslo fixem na své t■lo.
- Spojte se se zkušenými aktivisty: budou mít bohaté zkušenosti a znalosti o aktivismu v zemi, kde jste, a mohou vás nau■it místní logistice a strategie, jak z■stat v bezpe■í.

Mýty bezpe■ností kultury

Mýtus # 1

"Má skrytá identita m■ drží v bezpe■í."

"Když jsem si p■e■etl stránky DGR, budu na vládním seznamu."

"Nechci, aby bylo mé jméno na registra■ním seznamu workshopu DGR, takže neví, kdo jsem."

- Všechny akce zahrnují riziko. Nic nem■že zaru■it bezpe■nost. Každé ú■inné nadzemní akce mohou vést k útlaku. Bezpe■ností kultura je pro nás efektivn■jší.
- Nadzemní hnutí je chrán■no tém■■ výhradn■ po■tem ■len■ a ve■ejnou solidaritou.
- Neexistuje žádný zp■sob, jak d■lat efektivn■ nadzemní práci a udržovat svou identitu skrytou. Naopak není to také prosp■šn■ nebo nezbytné skrývat svou totožnost p■i nadzemní práci.
- Po■et ■len■ a ve■ejná solidarita nadzemního hnutí m■že nar■stat p■edevším tím, že vystupuje ve■ejn■ a otev■en■ s cílem oslovit další.
- Pracujeme za p■edpokladu, že jsou všechny internetové a telefonní komunikace monitorovány. Vzhledem k tomu, že nadzemní hnutí mají, co skrývat, vyjma nenásilné ob■anské neposlušnosti, musíme používat internet a telefony, abychom se byli schopni efektivn■ organizovat.
- Jednou z hlavních rolí nadzemního odporu má být ve■ejný obraz hnutí. Vystupovat ve■ejn■ a nap■íklad ■íkat: „Podporuji tuto strategii a jsem zastáncem DGR." Tuto d■ležitou práci, nelze d■lat, pokud se neustále snažíme skrývat svou identitu.

- Jsou zde zcela pochopitelné důvody proto, proč si chtít udržet odstup, ale skrývat svou identitu úplně při zapojení se do jakéhokoliv hnutí je prakticky nemožné. Pokud máte důvod pro to, aby se vám nedostalo pozornosti od vlády (například pokud nejste občanem), pak nejlepší způsob, jak být v bezpečí, je, nepouštět se do jakéhokoliv hnutí.

Mýtus # 2

"Musíme identifikovat federálního agenta, kriminalistu, policistu, atd. ve skupině."„Musíme identifikovat federálního agenta, policistu, kriminalistu, atd. ve skupině"

- Obecně to není dobrý nápad spekulovat o lidech nebo je obviňovat z toho, že jsou špehové. Toto je typická taktika, kterou špehové používají ke zlomení hnutí.
- Paranoia může vyvolat ničemné chování.
- Nepravdivé/nejisté obviňování je nebezpečné.

Mýtus # 3

"Policisté se sami identifikují. Policisté nemohou lhát."

- Utajení špehové nemohou dělat svou práci, pokud by se měli identifikovat.
- Policisté mají podle zákona povoleno lhát lidem – a to stále – to jak na ulici, a zejména při výslechu. Policisté a další činitelé stejně tak předkládají falešné doklady, včetně fotografií, videa a audia ve snaze přimět lidi, aby mluvili o jiných lidech nebo věcech.
- Vládní agenti všeho druhu vás mohou ohrozit, vaši rodinu a vaše přátele. Nejlepší obranou je nemluvit, nevěřit jim, nespolupracovat a požádat ostatní o pomoc.

Mýtus # 4

"Bezpečností kultura my zaručuje bezpečnost."

- Bezpečností kultura vás zabezpečuje, ale každá efektivní akce může vést k represím.
- Nic nemůže zaručit bezpečnost, ale bezpečností kultura nás dělá efektivnějšími.
- Striktní oddělení mezi nadzemním a každým podzemním hnutím, které existuje nebo může vzniknout, pomáhá chránit lidi.

Narušení bezpečností kultury

Chování nikoliv lidé je problém

- Existuje mnoho případů chování, které může narušit skupiny nebo je vystavit nebezpečí. Na tom, zda je někdo policista nebo ne, nezáleží. Zaměřte se na řešení chování.
- Mezi některá chování, na která si dávat pozor, je sexismus, urážlivé chování, drby a vytváření konfliktů mezi jednotlivci nebo skupinami.

Co dělat, pokud jsou porušeny bezpečností kultury

- Vzdělávat se (taktně a soukromě) a poukazujte na lidi, kteří narušují bezpečností kulturu.
- Nenechávejte porušování procházet, jinak se stanou zvykem.

- Chronické porušování má stejný negativní dopad jako špehové. Je d■ležité a nezbytné stanovit hranice. Pokud ■len soustavn■ porušuje bezpe■nosti kulturu, a to i poté, co byla opravena, m■l by být ze skupiny vylou■en pro bezpe■í každého.

Zdroje

- [Deep Green Resistance videa o bezpe■ností kultu■e](#) prezentované Aricem McBayem
- [Civil Liberties Defense Center (Obranné centrum ob■anské svobody)](#) webové stránky
- The Mysterious Rabbit Puppet Army presents: "Donny, Don't!", a security culture training skit ([text transcript](#) or [3.7 MB MP3](#))

  Následující dokumenty jsou nutností pro všechny aktivisty.

  - [Agent At The Door](#): one-page guide to handling visits from government officials in the US. You may want to print this out and post it by your door.
  - [You Have the Right to Remain Silent](#)
  - [Operation Backfire](#)
  - [Security Culture: A Handbook for Activists](#)
- Zabezpe■ení po■íta■e
  - Read our guide to [encrypting email with PGP](#)
  - [Encryption Works: How to Protect Your Privacy in the Age of NSA Surveillance](#) by the Freedom of the Press Foundation
  - [PRISM BREAK](#) – detailed list of software options.
- The [Grand Jury Resistance Project](#) provides useful information, including PDFs on [A Few Facts About Grand Juries](#) (1 page), [Grand Juries Are An Abuse Of Power!](#) (2 page brochure), and [What You Should Know About Grand Juries](#) (2 pages, plus example subpoena.)

■asto kladené otázky

Otázka: Máte právníky, kte■í by nám pomohli/poradili, jak máme jednat?

Odpov■■: V sou■asné dob■ budujeme právní podporu za tímto ú■elem. Pot■ebujeme [dobrovolníky](#) pro tento ú■el a jiné.

Otázka: Co má ■íci, když se m■ n■kdo zeptá: „Chci se napojit na podzemní odpor, za■ít, zachra■ovat, atd."

Odpov■■: ■ekn■te: "Jsme nadzemní organizace. Nechceme se zapojit. Nechceme odpovídat na otázky týkající se n■■í osobní touhy vytvá■et podzemní hnutí."

Ihned p■erušit konverzaci, pokud existuje narušení bezpe■nosti. N■kdy budete muset ukon■it rozhovor.

Ne■íkejte „podzemní organizace" - to by mohlo znamenat, že jsme v kontaktu s již existující podzemní organizací. Místo toho použijte „podzemní".

Máte-li více bezpe■nostních otázek nebo obav? Kontaktujte nás:

STRATEGICKÝ ODPOR

Výňatek ze šesté kapitoly knihy [Deep Green Resistance: Strategy to Save The Planet (Strategie pro záchranu planety)](#)

Dnes, když jsem mluvil o organizovaném odporu, mluvil jsem o organizovaném politickém odporu. Nemluvil jsem jen o něčem, co přichází a něčem, co se děje. Nemluvil jsem o mých pocitech nebo dobrých, slušných a skvělých vírách ve vašich srdcích. Mluvil jsem o tom, jak oddáváte své tělo a svou mysl pro letitý boj za změnu společnosti, v níž žijete. To není jen o změně člověka, kterého znáte, aby jeho chování bylo lepší, nebylo špatné... Politický odpor je o něčem jiném. Politický odpor pokračuje ve dne v noci, otevřeně nebo utajeně v dohledu nebo tajnosti. Předává se z generace na generaci. Dědí se. Podporuje se. Oslavuje se. Je to závazek. Je to chytré. A jednoho dne se to stane vítězstvím. Zvítězí.
—Andrea Dworkin

Strategie a taktiky, k nimž se uchylujeme, musí být součástí propracovanější strategie. To není totéž, jako budování hnutí: svrhnout civilizaci si nevyžaduje většinu nebo jednotné ucelené hnutí. Propracovaná strategie musí být nezbytně různorodá a decentralizovaná, a bude zahrnovat mnohé druhy aktivismu. Pokud ti u moci usilují o Full-Spectrum Dominance (Dominance nad celým spektrem), pak potřebujeme *Full-Spectrum Resistance (Odpor k celému spektru)..*[1]

Efektivní akce si často vyžadují vysokou míru rizika nebo jednotlivé oběti, takže absence věrohodné propracované strategie odrazuje mnoho skutečně radikálních lidí, aby jednali. Proč bych měl riskovat svou vlastní bezpečnost kvůli symbolickým nebo zbytečným činům? Jedním z cílů této knihy je určit věrohodné strategie vítězství.

Pokud chceme zvítězit, je potřebné se ponaučit z historie. Pojďme blíže nahlédnout na to, co dělalo efektivním minulá hnutí odporu. Existují obecná kritéria pro posuzování účinnosti? Existuje všeobecný model - druh nebo taxonomie akce - z něhož by si mohla vybrat skupina odporu?

Odpověď na tyto otázky je ano.

Pro ponaučení se z historických hnutí, potřebujeme znát čtyři specifické druhy informací: jejich cíle, strategie, taktiky a organizování se.

Cíle nám mohou říci, čeho se přesně snažili dosáhnout jednotlivá hnutí, a posoudit, zda to bylo skutečně úspěšné ve svých vlastních podmínkách. Dělali to, co si řekli, že chtějí dělat?

Strategie a taktiky jsou dvě různé věci. *Strategie* jsou dlouhodobé a rozsáhlé plány pro dosažení cílů. Historik Liddell Hart nazval vojenskou strategii "uměním rozdělit a použít vojenské prostředky pro dosažení cílů politiky."[2] Spojenecké bombardování německé infrastruktury v průběhu první světové války, je příkladem jedné úspěšné strategie. Jiné zahrnují občanské právní bojkoty pro-segregačních podniků a petiční strategie a přímý nátlak na politické kandidáty a nepřímý prostřednictvím činů sufražetek, které zahrnovaly ničení majetku a žhářství. Na druhé straně jsou

taktiky krátkodobého, menšího rozsahu: jsou to konkrétní činy, které strategiím přidávají na efektivnosti. Pokud je strategií systematické bombardování, taktikou může být spojenecký nálet, který je zaměřen na konkrétní podniky. Strategie občanských právních bojkotů zahrnují takové taktiky, jako jsou hlídky a protesty před určitými obchody.

Sufražetky dosahovaly svých strategických cílů plánovaným žhářstvím určitých budov. Úspěšné taktiky jsou na míru šité konkrétní situaci, a odpovídají lidem a zdrojům, které jsou k dispozici.

Organizování se je způsob, jakým se skupina ubírá, aby naplnila činy odporu. Hnutí odporu se může lišit ve velikosti od atomizovaných jednotlivců po velké, centrálně řízené byrokracie, a podle toho, jakou organizaci si skupina sama určí, jaké strategie a taktiky je schopna přijmout. Je skupina centralizována nebo decentralizována? Je hierarchická, nebo je výslovně přirozeně anarchistická? Je skupina silně organizována kodexy chování a politikou, nebo je improvizační "adhorakracií"? Kdo je členem, a jak jsou členové přijímáni? A tak dále.

TAXONOMIE AKCE

Všichni jsme viděli biologické taxonomie, které kategorizují živé organismy podle říše a kmene po rod a druh. Byť existují miliony žijících druhů mnohých různých druhů tvarů, velikostí a stanovišť, můžeme použít taxonomii pro rychlé zaměření se na malé skupiny.

Když vyhledáváme účinné strategie a taktiky, musíme roztřídit miliony minulostí a možných akcí, z nichž většina jsou buď historickým selháním nebo slepou uličkou. Můžeme zachránit sami sebe před četným trápením a ušetřit si mnoho času rychlou a špinavou taxonomií odporu. Při pohledu na celé odvětví akcí můžeme najednou rychle posoudit, která taktika je skutečně vhodná a účinná pro záchranu planety (a pro mnoho specifických typů environmentálního aktivismu a za sociální spravedlnost). Taxonomie akce může rovněž přinést taktiku, kterou bychom mohli jinak přehlédnout.

Obecně řečeno, můžeme rozdělit všechny naše taktiky a projekty, a to buď do aktů opomenutí nebo aktů provize.

Samozřejmostí je, že se někdy tyto kategorie překrývají. Protest může být prostředkem pro lobby u vlády, způsobem, jak zvýšit podvědomí u veřejnosti, cílenou taktikou pro narušení ekonomiky, nebo vše vzájemně v závislosti na záměru a organizaci. A někdy jedna taktika může podporovat další: je mnohem pravděpodobnější, že akt opomenutí jako stávka bude účinný ve spojení s propagandismem a protestem.

Za chvíli provedeme rychlou prohlídku našich taxonomiích možností odporu. Ale nejprve varování: poučení se z historie nám poskytne mnoho cenných informací, ale tyto informace nejsou zadarmo. Přicházejí s břemenem. Ano, příběhy těch, kteří bojují jsou plné odvahy, brilance a dramatu. A ano, můžeme najít postřehy a inspirace, jak v jejich triumfech a jejich tragediích. Nicméně historické břemeno je toto: neexistuje žádný jednoduchý způsob, jak ven.

Ve filmu *Star Trek* může být každý problém vyřešen v závěrečné scéně obrácením polarity deflektoru. Ale to není realita, a není to naše budoucnost. Vítězství každého hnutí odporu bylo dosaženo skrze slzy a krev, úzkost a oběti. Naše břemeno je uvědomování si, že existuje tolik způsobů odporu, že tyto způsoby již byly vynalezeny, a všichni se zapojili do hlubokého a nebezpečného boje. Když povstalci vítězí, je to proto, že bojovali usilovněji, než předpokládali, že je to možné.

A toto je druhá část našeho břemena. Poté, co jsme viděli příběhy těch, kteří bojují - jednou jsme se *skutečně* s nimi seznámili, plakali jsme nad nimi, uchovali je do svých srdcí, začali je nosit jako válečné veterány ve svých myslím, což přineslo bolavé střepiny - nemáme jinou možnost, než bojovat sami. Lidé bojovali za nejnepříznivějších a strašných podmínek, které si lze představit: tito lidé jsou našim příkladem v boji za spravedlnost a pro udržitelnou budoucnost. A dohledáme tyto lidi nejen v minulosti, ale také v moderní době. Najdeme je nejen mezi lidmi, ale všemi, kteří bojovali.

Musíme bojovat, protože pokud to neuděláme, zemřeme. Toto je jistě pravda ve fyzickém slova smyslu, ale je to také pravda na jiné úrovni. Jakmile *skutečně* uvidíte statečnost, sebeobětování a neúnavnost, kterou náš druh ukázal v temných dobách, musíte buď jednat nebo zemřít jako člověk. Musíme bojovat nejen pro vítězství, ale abychom viděli, že jsme, jak naživu, tak hodní tohoto života.

Další zdroje

- Přečtěte si strategii [Deep Green Resistance Decisive Ecological Warfare (Rozhodující ekologický boj)](#)
- Zjistěte si více nebo si kupte knihu [Deep Green Resistance](#)
- Read of militant attacks on infrastructure at the [DGR News Service Underground Action Calendar](#)
- Read the [DGR News Service "Time Is Short"](#) article series on strategic resistance
- Zdroje pro [naučení se strategií a taktik](#) (17MB zip, English)

Poznámky

[1] A není třeba říkat "pokud". Full-Spectrum Dominance (Dominance nad celým spektrem) je děsivá. Ještě neočekávaným státním cílem vlády USA, a to prostřednictvím vojenských a jiných prostředků.

[2] Hart, *Strategy*, 2nd ed, p. 335.

ROZHODUJÍCÍ EKOLOGICKÝ BOJ

Rozhodující ekologický boj (Decisive Ecological Warfare - DEW) je ojedinělá strategie hnutí Deep Green Resistance. Je to válečný pokřik lidí, kteří odmítají ztratit další bitvy, poslední východisko izolovaného hnutí kooptovaného a unaveného z nikdy nekončících legálních bojů a blokád.

Informace v DEW jsou vyvozeny z vojenských strategií a taktik a manuálů, analýz historických hnutí odporu, vzpour a národně osvobozeneckých hnutí. Principy uvedené na těchto stránkách jsou přijímány po celém světě jako principy asymetrických bitev, kde je jedna strana silnější než ostatní. Pokud byl boj vždy asymetrický, pak tato je.

Strategie a taktiky uvedené v DEW se učí vojenští důstojníci na místech jako je Vojenská akademie ve West Pointu z prostého důvodu: jsou velmi efektivní.

Když byl [Nelson Mandela](#) souzen v Jižní Africe v roce 1964 za své zločiny proti režimu apartheidu, řekl: Nepopírám, že jsem plánoval sabotáž. Neplánoval jsem ji v duchu bezohlednosti ani proto, že bych miloval násilí. Plánoval jsem ji v důsledku klidného a střízlivého hodnocení politické situace, která vznikla po mnoha letech tyranie, vykořisťování a útlaku mého lidu ze strany bílých.

Zveme vás k pročtení si této strategie, a bedlivému a střízlivému posouzení situace, jíž čelíme. Času je málo.

COLLAPSE SCENARIOS

[Listen to an audio version of Collapse Scenarios](#)

There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop! —Mario Savio, Berkeley Free

To gain what is worth having, it may be necessary to lose everything else. —Bernadette Devlin, Irish activist and politician

At this point in history, there are no good short-term outcomes for global human society. Some are better and some are worse, and in the long term some are very good, but in the short term we're in a bind. I'm not going to lie to you—the hour is too late for cheermongering. The only way to find the best outcome is to confront our dire situation head on, and not to be diverted by false hopes.

Human society—because of civilization, specifically—has painted itself into a corner. As a species we're dependent on the draw down of finite supplies of oil, soil, and water. Industrial agriculture (and annual grain agriculture before that) has put us into a vicious pattern of population growth and overshoot. We long ago exceeded carrying capacity, and the workings of civilization are destroying that carrying capacity by the second. This is largely the fault of those in power, the wealthiest, the states and corporations. But the consequences—and the responsibility for dealing with it—fall to the rest of us, including nonhumans.

Physically, it's not too late for a crash program to limit births to reduce the population, cut fossil fuel consumption to nil, replace agricultural monocrops with perennial polycultures, end overfishing, and cease industrial encroachment on (or destruction of) remaining wild areas. There's no physical reason we couldn't start all of these things tomorrow, stop global warming in its tracks, reverse overshoot, reverse erosion, reverse aquifer drawdown, and bring back all the species and biomes currently on the brink. There's no physical reason we couldn't get together and act like adults and fix these problems, in the sense that it isn't against the laws of physics.

But socially and politically, we know this is a pipe dream. There are material systems of power that make this impossible as long as those systems are still intact. Those in power get too much money and privilege from destroying the planet. We aren't going to save the planet—or our own future as a species—without a fight.

What's realistic? What options are actually available to us, and what are the consequences? What follows are three broad and illustrative scenarios: one in which there is no substantive or decisive resistance, one in which there is limited resistance and a relatively prolonged collapse, and one in which all-out resistance leads to the immediate collapse of civilization and global industrial infrastructure.

No Resistance

If there is no substantive resistance, likely there will be a few more years of business as usual, though with increasing economic disruption and upset. According to the best available data, the impacts of peak oil start to hit somewhere between 2011 and 2015, resulting in a rapid decline in global energy availability.[1] It's possible that this may happen slightly later if all-out attempts are made to extract remaining fossil fuels, but that would only prolong the inevitable, worsen global warming, and make the eventual decline that much steeper and more severe. Once peak oil sets in, the increasing cost and decreasing supply of energy undermines manufacturing and transportation, especially on a global scale.

The energy slide will cause economic turmoil, and a self-perpetuating cycle of economic contraction will take place. Businesses will be unable to pay their workers, workers will be unable to buy things, and more companies will shrink or go out of business (and will be unable to pay their workers). Unable to pay their debts and mortgages, homeowners, companies, and even states will go bankrupt. (It's possible that this process has already begun.) International trade will nosedive because of a global depression and increasing transportation and manufacturing costs. Though it's likely that the price of oil will increase over time, there will be times when the contracting

economy causes falling demand for oil, thus suppressing the price. The lower cost of oil may, ironically but beneficially, limit investment in new oil infrastructure.

At first the collapse will resemble a traditional recession or depression, with the poor being hit especially hard by the increasing costs of basic goods, particularly of electricity and heating in cold areas. After a few years, the financial limits will become physical ones; large-scale energy-intensive manufacturing will become not only uneconomical, but impossible.

A direct result of this will be the collapse of industrial agriculture. Dependent on vast amounts of energy for tractor fuel, synthesized pesticides and fertilizers, irrigation, greenhouse heating, packaging, and transportation, global industrial agriculture will run up against hard limits to production (driven at first by intense competition for energy from other sectors). This will be worsened by the depletion of groundwater and aquifers, a long history of soil erosion, and the early stages of climate change. At first this will cause a food and economic crisis mostly felt by the poor. Over time, the situation will worsen and industrial food production will fall below that required to sustain the population.

There will be three main responses to this global food shortage. In some areas people will return to growing their own food and build sustainable local food initiatives. This will be a positive sign, but public involvement will be belated and inadequate, as most people still won't have caught on to the permanency of collapse and won't want to have to grow their own food. It will also be made far more difficult by the massive urbanization that has occurred in the last century, by the destruction of the land, and by climate change. Furthermore, most subsistence cultures will have been destroyed or uprooted from their land—land inequalities will hamper people from growing their own food (just as they do now in the majority of the world). Without well-organized resisters, land reform will not happen, and displaced people will not be able to access land. As a result, widespread hunger and starvation (worsening to famine in bad agricultural years) will become endemic in many parts of the world. The lack of energy for industrial agriculture will cause a resurgence in the institutions of slavery and serfdom.

Slavery does not occur in a political vacuum. Threatened by economic and energy collapse, some governments will fall entirely, turning into failed states. With no one to stop them, warlords will set up shop in the rubble. Others, desperate to maintain power against emboldened secessionists and civil unrest, will turn to authoritarian forms of government. In a world of diminishing but critical resources, governments will get leaner and meaner. We will see a resurgence of authoritarianism in modern forms: technofascism and corporation feudalism. The rich will increasingly move to private and well-defended enclaves. Their country estates will not look apocalyptic—they will look like eco-Edens, with well-tended organic gardens, clean private lakes, and wildlife refuges. In some cases these enclaves will be tiny, and in others they could fill entire countries.

Meanwhile, the poor will see their own condition worsen. The millions of refugees created by economic and energy collapse will be on the move, but no one will want them. In some brittle areas the influx of refugees will overwhelm basic services and cause a local collapse, resulting in cascading waves of refugees radiating from collapse and disaster epicenters. In some areas refugees will be turned back by force of arms. In other areas, racism and discrimination will come to the fore as an excuse for authoritarians to put marginalized people and dissidents in "special settlements," leaving more resources for the privileged.[2] Desperate people will be the only candidates for the dangerous and dirty manual labor required to keep industrial manufacturing going once the energy supply dwindles. Hence, those in power will consider autonomous and self-sustaining communities a threat to their labor supply, and suppress or destroy them.

Despite all of this, technological "progress" will not yet stop. For a time it will continue in fits and starts, although humanity will be split into increasingly divergent groups. Those on the bottom will be unable to meet their basic subsistence needs, while those on the top will attempt to live lives of privilege as they had in the past, even seeing some technological advancements, many of which will be intended to cement the superiority of those in power in an

increasingly crowded and hostile world.

Technofascists will develop and perfect social control technologies (already currently in their early stages): autonomous drones for surveillance and assassination; microwave crowd-control devices; MRI-assisted brain scans that will allow for infallible lie detection, even mind reading and torture. There will be no substantive organized resistance in this scenario, but in each year that passes the technofascists will make themselves more and more able to destroy resistance even in its smallest expression. As time slips by, the window of opportunity for resistance will swiftly close. Technofascists of the early to mid-twenty-first century will have technology for coercion and surveillance that will make the most practiced of the Stasi or the SS look like rank amateurs. Their ability to debase humanity will make their predecessors appear saintly by comparison.

Not all governments will take this turn, of course. But the authoritarian governments—those that will continue ruthlessly exploiting people and resources regardless of the consequences—will have more sway and more muscle, and will take resources from their neighbors and failed states as they please. There will be no one to stop them. It won't matter if you are the most sustainable eco-village on the planet if you live next door to an eternally resource-hungry fascist state.

Meanwhile, with industrial powers increasingly desperate for energy, the tenuous remaining environmental and social regulations will be cast aside. The worst of the worst, practices like drilling offshore and in wildlife refuges, and mountaintop removal for coal will become commonplace. These will be merely the dregs of prehistoric energy reserves. The drilling will only prolong the endurance of industrial civilization for a matter of months or years, but ecological damage will be long-term or permanent (as is happening in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge). Because in our scenario there is no substantive resistance, this will all proceed unobstructed.

Investment in renewable industrial energy will also take place, although it will be belated and hampered by economic challenges, government bankruptcies, and budget cuts.[3] Furthermore, long-distance power transmission lines will be insufficient and crumbling from age. Replacing and upgrading them will prove difficult and expensive. As a result, even once in place, electric renewables will only produce a tiny fraction of the energy produced by petroleum. That electric energy will not be suitable to run the vast majority of tractors, trucks, and other vehicles or similar infrastructure.

As a consequence, renewable energy will have only a minimal moderating affect on the energy cliff. In fact, the energy invested in the new infrastructure will take years to pay itself back with electricity generated. Massive infrastructure upgrades will actually steepen the energy cliff by decreasing the amount of energy available for daily activities. There will be a constant struggle to allocate limited supplies of energy under successive crises. There will be some rationing to prevent riots, but most energy (regardless of the source) will go to governments, the military, corporations, and the rich.

Energy constraints will make it impossible to even attempt any full-scale infrastructure overhauls like hydrogen economies (which wouldn't solve the problem anyway). Biofuels will take off in many areas, despite the fact that they mostly have a poor ratio of energy returned on energy invested (EROEI). The EROEI will be better in tropical countries, so remaining tropical forests will be massively logged to clear land for biofuel production. (Often, forests will be logged en masse simply to burn for fuel.) Heavy machinery will be too expensive for most plantations, so their labor will come from slavery and serfdom under authoritarian governments and corporate feudalism. (Slavery is currently used in Brazil to log forests and produce charcoal by hand for the steel industry, after all.)[4] The global effects of biofuel production will be increases in the cost of food, increases in water and irrigation drawdown for agriculture, and worsening soil erosion. Regardless, its production will amount to only a small fraction of the liquid hydrocarbons available at the peak of civilization.

All of this will have immediate ecological consequences. The oceans, wracked by increased fishing (to compensate for food shortages) and warming-induced acidity and coral die-offs, will be mostly dead. The expansion of biofuels will destroy many remaining wild areas and global biodiversity will plummet. Tropical forests like the Amazon produce the moist climate they require through their own vast transpiration, but expanded logging and agriculture will cut transpiration and tip the balance toward permanent drought. Even where the forest is not actually cut, the drying local climate will be enough to kill it. The Amazon will turn into a desert, and other tropical forests will follow suit.

Projections vary, but it's almost certain that if the majority of the remaining fossil fuels are extracted and burned, global warming would become self-perpetuating and catastrophic. However, the worst effects will not be felt until decades into the future, once most fossil fuels have already been exhausted. By then, there will be very little energy or industrial capacity left for humans to try to compensate for the effects of global warming.

Furthermore, as intense climate change takes over, ecological remediation through perennial polycultures and forest replanting will become impossible. The heat and drought will turn forests into net carbon emitters, as northern forests die from heat, pests, and disease, and then burn in continent-wide fires that will make early twenty-first century conflagrations look minor.[5] Even intact pastures won't survive the temperature extremes as carbon is literally baked out of remaining agricultural soils.

Resource wars between nuclear states will break out. War between the US and Russia is less likely than it was in the Cold War, but ascending superpowers like China will want their piece of the global resource pie. Nuclear powers such as India and Pakistan will be densely populated and ecologically precarious; climate change will dry up major rivers previously fed by melting glaciers, and hundreds of millions of people in South Asia will live bare meters above sea level. With few resources to equip and field a mechanized army or air force, nuclear strikes will seem an increasingly effective action for desperate states.

If resource wars escalate to nuclear wars, the effects will be severe, even in the case of a "minor" nuclear war between countries like India and Pakistan. Even if each country uses only fifty Hiroshima-sized bombs as air bursts above urban centers, a nuclear winter will result.[6] Although lethal levels of fallout last only a matter of weeks, the ecological effects will be far more severe. The five megatons of smoke produced will darken the sky around the world. Stratospheric heating will destroy most of what remains of the ozone layer.[7] In contrast to the overall warming trend, a "little ice age" will begin immediately and last for several years. During that period, temperatures in major agricultural regions will routinely drop below freezing in summer. Massive and immediate starvation will occur around the world.

That's in the case of a small war. The explosive power of one hundred Hiroshima-sized bombs accounts for only 0.03 percent of the global arsenal. If a larger number of more powerful bombs are used—or if cobalt bombs are used to produce long-term irradiation and wipe out surface life—the effects will be even worse.[8] There will be few human survivors. The nuclear winter effect will be temporary, but the bombing and subsequent fires will put large amounts of carbon into the atmosphere, kill plants, and impair photosynthesis. As a result, after the ash settles, global warming will be even more rapid and worse than before.

Nuclear war or not, the long-term prospects are dim. Global warming will continue to worsen long after fossil fuels are exhausted. For the planet, the time to ecological recovery is measured in tens of millions of years, if ever.[9] As James Lovelock has pointed out, a major warming event could push the planet into a different equilibrium, one much warmer than the current one.[10] It's possible that large plants and animals might only be able to survive near the poles.[11] It's also possible that the entire planet could become essentially uninhabitable to large plants and animals, with a climate more like Venus than Earth.

All that is required for this to occur is for current trends to continue without substantive and effective resistance. All that is required for evil to succeed is for good people to do nothing. But this future is not inevitable.

Limited Resistance

What if some forms of limited resistance were undertaken? What if there was a serious aboveground resistance movement combined with a small group of underground networks working in tandem? (This still would not be a majority movement—this is extrapolation, not fantasy.) What if those movements combined their grand strategy? The abovegrounders would work to build sustainable and just communities wherever they were, and would use both direct and indirect action to try to curb the worst excesses of those in power, to reduce the burning of fossil fuels, to struggle for social and ecological justice. Meanwhile, the undergrounders would engage in limited attacks on infrastructure (often in tandem with aboveground struggles), especially energy infrastructure, to try to reduce fossil fuel consumption and overall industrial activity. The overall thrust of this plan would be to use selective attacks to accelerate collapse in a deliberate way, like shoving a rickety building.

If this scenario occurred, the first years would play out similarly. It would take time to build up resistance and to ally existing resistance groups into a larger strategy. Furthermore, civilization at the peak of its power would be too strong to bring down with only partial resistance. The years around 2011 to 2015 would still see the impact of peak oil and the beginning of an economic tailspin, but in this case there would be surgical attacks on energy infrastructure that limited new fossil fuel extraction (with a focus on the nastier practices like mountain-top removal and tar sands). Some of these attacks would be conducted by existing resistance groups (like MEND) and some by newer groups, including groups in the minority world of the rich and powerful. The increasing shortage of oil would make pipeline and infrastructure attacks more popular with militant groups of all stripes. During this period, militant groups would organize, practice, and learn.

These attacks would not be symbolic attacks. They would be serious attacks designed to be effective but timed and targeted to minimize the amount of "collateral damage" on humans. They would mostly constitute forms of sabotage. They would be intended to cut fossil fuel consumption by some 30 percent within the first few years, and more after that. There would be similar attacks on energy infrastructure like power transmission lines. Because these attacks would cause a significant but incomplete reduction in the availability of energy in many places, a massive investment in local renewable energy (and other measures like passive solar heating or better insulation in some areas) would be provoked. This would set in motion a process of political and infrastructural decentralization. It would also result in political repression and real violence targeting those resisters.

Meanwhile, aboveground groups would be making the most of the economic turmoil. There would be a growth in class-consciousness and organization. Labor and poverty activists would increasingly turn to community sufficiency. Local food and self-sufficiency activists would reach out to people who have been pushed out of capitalism. The unemployed and underemployed—rapidly growing in number—would start to organize a subsistence and trade economy outside of capitalism. Mutual aid and skill sharing would be promoted. In the previous scenario, the development of these skills was hampered in part by a lack of access to land. In this scenario, however, aboveground organizers would learn from groups like the Landless Workers Movement in Latin America. Mass organization and occupation of lands would force governments to cede unused land for "victory garden"–style allotments, massive community gardens, and cooperative subsistence farms.

The situation in many third world countries could actually improve because of the global economic collapse. Minority world countries would no longer enforce crushing debt repayment and structural adjustment programs, nor would CIA goons be able to prop up "friendly" dictatorships. The decline of export-based economies would have serious consequences, yes, but it would also allow land now used for cash crops to return to subsistence farms.

Industrial agriculture would falter and begin to collapse. Synthetic fertilizers would become increasingly expensive and would be carefully conserved where they are used, limiting nutrient runoff and allowing oceanic dead zones to recover. Hunger would be reduced by subsistence farming and by the shift of small farms toward more traditional work by hand and by draft horse, but food would be more valuable and in shorter supply.

Even a 50 percent cut in fossil fuel consumption wouldn't stave off widespread hunger and die-off. As we have discussed, the vast majority of all energy used goes to nonessentials. In the US, the agricultural sector accounts for less than 2 percent of all energy use, including both direct consumption (like tractor fuel and electricity for barns and pumps) and indirect consumption (like synthetic fertilizers and pesticides).[12] That's true even though industrial agriculture is incredibly inefficient and spends something like ten calories of fossil fuel energy for every food calorie produced. Residential energy consumption accounts for only 20 percent of US total usage, with industrial, commercial, and transportation consumption making up the majority of all consumption.[13] And most of that residential energy goes into household appliances like dryers, air conditioning, and water heating for inefficiently used water. The energy used for lighting and space heating could be itself drastically reduced through trivial measures like lowering thermostats and heating the spaces people actually live in. (Most don't bother to do these now, but in a collapse situation they will do that and more.)

Only a small fraction of fossil fuel energy actually goes into basic subsistence, and even that is used inefficiently. A 50 percent decline in fossil fuel energy could be readily adapted to from a subsistence perspective (if not a financial one). Remember that in North America, 40 percent of all food is simply wasted. Of course, poverty and hunger have much more to do with power over people than with the kind of power measured in watts. Even now at the peak of energy consumption, a billion people go hungry. So if people are hungry or cold because of selective militant attacks on infrastructure, that will be a direct result of the actions of those in power, not of the resisters.

In fact, even if you want humans to be able to use factories to build windmills and use tractors to help grow food over the next fifty years, forcing an immediate cut in fossil fuel consumption should be at the top of your to-do list. Right now most of the energy is being wasted on plastic junk, too-big houses for rich people, bunker buster bombs, and predator drones. The only way to ensure there is some oil left for basic survival transitions in twenty years is to ensure that it isn't being squandered now. The US military is the single biggest oil user in the world. Do you want to have to tell kids twenty years from now that they don't have enough to eat because all the energy was spent on pointless neocolonial wars?

Back to the scenario. In some areas, increasingly abandoned suburbs (unlivable without cheap gas) would be taken over, as empty houses would become farmhouses, community centers, and clinics, or would be simply dismantled and salvaged for material. Garages would be turned into barns—most people couldn't afford gasoline anyway—and goats would be grazed in parks. Many roads would be torn up and returned to pasture or forest. These reclaimed settlements would not be high-tech. The wealthy enclaves may have their solar panels and electric windmills, but most unemployed people wouldn't be able to afford such things. In some cases these communities would become relatively autonomous. Their social practices and equality would vary based on the presence of people willing to assert human rights and social justice. People would have to resist vigorously whenever racism and xenophobia are used as excuses for injustice and authoritarianism.

Attacks on energy infrastructure would become more common as oil supplies diminish. In some cases, these attacks would be politically motivated, and in others they would be intended to tap electricity or pipelines for poor people. These attacks would steepen the energy slide initially. This would have significant economic impacts, but it would also turn the tide on population growth. The world population would peak sooner, and peak population would be smaller (by perhaps a billion) than it was in the "no resistance" scenario. Because a sharp collapse would happen earlier than it otherwise would have, there would be more intact land in the world per person, and more people who still know how to do subsistence farming.

The presence of an organized militant resistance movement would provoke a reaction from those in power. Some of them would use resistance as an excuse to seize more power to institute martial law or overt fascism. Some of them would make use of the economic and social crises rippling across the globe. Others wouldn't need an excuse.

Authoritarians would seize power where they could, and try to in almost every country. However, they would be hampered by aboveground and underground resistance, and by decentralization and the emergence of autonomous communities. In some countries, mass mobilizations would stop potential dictators. In others, the upsurge in resistance would dissolve centralized state rule, resulting in the emergence of regional confederations in some places and in warlords in others. In unlucky countries, authoritarianism would take power. The good news is that people would have resistance infrastructure in place to fight and limit the spread of authoritarians, and authoritarians would have not developed as much technology of control as they did in the "no resistance" scenario.

There would still be refugees flooding out of many areas (including urban areas). The reduction in greenhouse gas emissions caused by attacks on industrial infrastructures would reduce or delay climate catastrophe. Networks of autonomous subsistence communities would be able to accept and integrate some of these people. In the same way that rooted plants can prevent a landslide on a steep slope, the cascades of refugees would be reduced in some areas by willing communities. In other areas, the numbers of refugees would be too much to cope with effectively.[14]

The development of biofuels (and the fate of tropical forests) is uncertain. Remaining centralized states—though they may be smaller and less powerful—would still want to squeeze out energy from wherever they could. Serious militant resistance—in many cases insurgency and guerilla warfare—would be required to stop industrialists from turning tropical forests into plantations or extracting coal at any cost. In this scenario, resistance would still be limited, and it is questionable whether that level of militancy would be effectively mustered.

This means that the long-term impacts of the greenhouse effect would be uncertain. Fossil fuel burning would have to be kept to an absolute minimum to avoid a runaway greenhouse effect. That could prove very difficult.

But if a runaway greenhouse effect could be avoided, many areas could be able to recover rapidly. A return to perennial polycultures, implemented by autonomous communities, could help reverse the greenhouse effect. The oceans would look better quickly, aided by a reduction in industrial fishing and the end of the synthetic fertilizer runoff that creates so many dead zones now.

The likelihood of nuclear war would be much lower than in the "no resistance" scenario. Refugee cascades in South Asia would be diminished. Overall resource consumption would be lower, so resource wars would be less likely to occur. And militaristic states would be weaker and fewer in number. Nuclear war wouldn't be impossible, but if it did happen, it could be less severe.

There are many ways in which this scenario is appealing. But it has problems as well, both in implementation and in plausibility. One problem is with the integration of aboveground and underground action. Most aboveground environmental organizations are currently opposed to any kind of militancy. This could hamper the possibility of strategic cooperation between underground militants and aboveground groups that could mobilize greater numbers. (It would also doom our aboveground groups to failure as their record so far demonstrates.)

It's also questionable whether the cut in fossil fuel consumption described here would be sufficient to avoid runaway global warming. If runaway global warming does take place, all of the beneficial work of the abovegrounders would be wiped out. The converse problem is that a steeper decline in fossil fuel consumption would very possibly result in significant human casualties and deprivation. It's also possible that the mobilization of large numbers of people to subsistence farming in a short time is unrealistic. By the time most people are willing to take that step, it could be too late.

So while in some ways this scenario represents an ideal compromise—a win-win situation for humans and the planet—it could just as easily be a lose-lose situation without serious and timely action. That brings us to our last scenario, one of all-out resistance and attacks on infrastructure intended to guarantee the survival of a livable planet.

All-Out Attacks on Infrastructure

In this final scenario, militant resistance would have one primary goal: to reduce fossil fuel consumption (and hence, all ecological damage) as immediately and rapidly as possible. A 90 percent reduction would be the ballpark target. For militants in this scenario, impacts on civilized humans would be secondary.

Here's their rationale in a nutshell: Humans aren't going to do anything in time to prevent the planet from being destroyed wholesale. Poor people are too preoccupied by primary emergencies, rich people benefit from the status quo, and the middle class (rich people by global standards) are too obsessed with their own entitlement and the technological spectacle to do anything. The risk of runaway global warming is immediate. A drop in the human population is inevitable, and fewer people will die if collapse happens sooner.

Think of it like this. We know we are in overshoot as a species. That means that a significant portion of the people now alive may have to die before we are back under carrying capacity. And that disparity is growing by the day. Every day carrying capacity is driven down by hundreds of thousands of humans, and every day the human population increases by more than 200,000.[15] The people added to the overshoot each day are needless, pointless deaths. Delaying collapse, they argue, is itself a form of mass murder.

Furthermore, they would argue, humans are only one species of millions. To kill millions of species for the benefit of one is insane, just as killing millions of people for the benefit of one person would be insane. And since unimpeded ecological collapse would kill off humans anyway, those species will ultimately have died for nothing, and the planet will take millions of years to recover. Therefore, those of us who care about the future of the planet have to dismantle the industrial energy infrastructure as rapidly as possible. We'll all have to deal with the social consequences as best we can. Besides, rapid collapse is ultimately good for humans—even if there is a partial die-off—because at least some people survive. And remember, the people who need the system to come down the most are the rural poor in the majority of the world: the faster the actionists can bring down industrial civilization, the better the prospects for those people and their landbases. Regardless, without immediate action, everyone dies.

In this scenario, well-organized underground militants would make coordinated attacks on energy infrastructure around the world. These would take whatever tactical form militants could muster—actions against pipelines, power lines, tankers, and refineries, perhaps using electromagnetic pulses (EMPs) to do damage. Unlike in the previous scenario, no attempt would be made to keep pace with aboveground activists. The attacks would be as persistent as the militants could manage. Fossil fuel energy availability would decline by 90 percent. Greenhouse gas emissions would plummet.

The industrial economy would come apart. Manufacturing and transportation would halt because of frequent blackouts and tremendously high prices for fossil fuels. Some, perhaps most, governments would institute martial law and rationing. Governments that took an authoritarian route would be especially targeted by militant resisters. Other states would simply fail and fall apart.

In theory, with a 90 percent reduction in fossil fuel availability, there would still be enough to aid basic survival activities like growing food, heating, and cooking. Governments and civil institutions could still attempt a rapid shift to subsistence activities for their populations, but instead, militaries and the very wealthy would attempt to suck up virtually all remaining supplies of energy. In some places, they would succeed in doing so and widespread hunger

would result. In others, people would refuse the authority of those in power. Most existing large-scale institutions would simply collapse, and it would be up to local people to either make a stand for human rights and a better way of life or give in to authoritarian power. The death rate would increase, but as we have seen in examples from Cuba and Russia, civic order can still hold despite the hardships.

What happens next would depend on a number of factors. If the attacks could persist and oil extraction were kept minimal for a prolonged period, industrial civilization would be unlikely to reorganize itself.

Well-guarded industrial enclaves would remain, escorting fuel and resources under arms. If martial law succeeded in stopping attacks after the first few waves (something it has been unable to do in, for example, Nigeria), the effects would be uncertain. In the twentieth century, industrial societies have recovered from disasters, as Europe did after World War II. But this would be a different situation. For most areas, there would be no outside aid. Populations would no longer be able to outrun the overshoot currently concealed by fossil fuels. That does not mean the effects would be the same everywhere; rural and traditional populations would be better placed to cope.

In most areas, reorganizing an energy-intense industrial civilization would be impossible. Even where existing political organizations persist, consumption would drop. Those in power would be unable to project force over long distances, and would have to mostly limit their activities to nearby areas. This means that, for example, tropical biofuel plantations would not be feasible. The same goes for tar sands and mountain-top removal coal mining. The construction of new large-scale infrastructure would simply not be possible.

Though the human population would decline, things would look good for virtually every other species. The oceans would begin to recover rapidly. The same goes for damaged wilderness areas. Because greenhouse emissions would have been reduced to a tiny fraction of their previous levels, runaway global warming would likely be averted. In fact, returning forests and grasslands would sequester carbon, helping to maintain a livable climate.

Nuclear war would be unlikely. Diminished populations and industrial activities would reduce competition between remaining states. Resource limitations would be largely logistical in nature, so escalating resource wars over supplies and resource-rich areas would be pointless.

This scenario, too, has its implementation and plausibility caveats. It guarantees a future for both the planet and the human species. This scenario would save trillions upon trillions upon trillions of living creatures. Yes, it would create hardship for the urban wealthy and poor, though most others would be better off immediately. It would be an understatement to call such a concept unpopular (although the militants in this scenario would argue that fewer people will die than in the case of runaway global warming or business as usual).

There is also the question of plausibility. Could enough ecologically motivated militants mobilize to enact this scenario? No doubt for many people the second, more moderate scenario seems both more appealing and more likely.

There is of course an infinitude of possible futures we could describe. We will describe one more possible future, a combination of the previous two, in which a resistance movement embarks on a strategy of Decisive Ecological Warfare.

Decisive Ecological Warfare Strategy

Goals

The ultimate goal of the primary resistance movement in this scenario is simply a living planet—a planet not just living, but in recovery, growing more alive and more diverse year after year. A planet on which humans live in

equitable and sustainable communities without exploiting the planet or each other.

Given our current state of emergency, this translates into a more immediate goal, which is at the heart of this movement's grand strategy:

Goal 1

To disrupt and dismantle industrial civilization; to thereby remove the ability of the powerful to exploit the marginalized and destroy the planet.

This movement's second goal both depends on and assists the first:

Goal 2

To defend and rebuild just, sustainable, and autonomous human communities, and, as part of that, to assist in the recovery of the land.

Strategies

To accomplish these goals requires several broad strategies involving large numbers of people in many different organizations, both aboveground and underground. The primary strategies needed in this theoretical scenario include the following:

Strategy A

Engage in direct militant actions against industrial infrastructure, especially energy infrastructure.

Strategy B

Aid and participate in ongoing social and ecological justice struggles; promote equality and undermine exploitation by those in power.

Strategy C

Defend the land and prevent the expansion of industrial logging, mining, construction, and so on, such that more intact land and species will remain when civilization does collapse.

Strategy D

Build and mobilize resistance organizations that will support the above activities, including decentralized training, recruitment, logistical support, and so on.

Strategy E

Rebuild a sustainable subsistence base for human societies (including perennial polycultures for food) and localized, democratic communities that uphold human rights.

In describing this alternate future scenario, we should be clear about some shorthand phrases like "actions against industrial infrastructure." Not all infrastructure is created equal, and not all actions against infrastructure are of equal priority, efficacy, or moral acceptability to the resistance movements in this scenario. As Derrick wrote in Endgame, you can't make a moral argument for blowing up a children's hospital. On the other hand, you can't make a moral argument against taking out cell phone towers. Some infrastructure is easy, some is hard, and some is harder.

On the same theme, there are many different mechanisms driving collapse, and they are not all equal or equally desirable. In the Decisive Ecological Warfare scenario, some of the mechanisms are intentionally accelerated and encouraged, while others are slowed or reduced. For example, energy decline by decreasing consumption of fossil fuels is a mechanism of collapse highly beneficial to the planet and (especially in the medium to long term) humans, and that mechanism is encouraged. On the other hand, ecological collapse through habitat destruction and biodiversity crash is also a mechanism of collapse (albeit one that takes longer to affect humans), and that kind of collapse is slowed or stopped whenever and wherever possible.

Collapse, in the most general terms, is a rapid loss of complexity.[16] It is a shift toward smaller and more decentralized structures—social, political, economic—with less social stratification, regulation, behavioral control and regimentation, and so on.[17] Major mechanisms of collapse include (in no particular order):

- Energy decline as fossil fuel extraction peaks, and a growing, industrializing population drives down per capita availability.
- Industrial collapse as global economies of scale are ruined by increasing transport and manufacturing costs, and by economic decline.
- Economic collapse as global corporate capitalism is unable to maintain growth and basic operations.
- Climate change causing ecological collapse, agricultural failure, hunger, refugees, disease, and so on.
- Ecological collapse of many different kinds driven by resource extraction, destruction of habitat, crashing biodiversity, and climate change.
- Disease, including epidemics and pandemics, caused by crowded living conditions and poverty, along with bacteria diseases increasingly resistant to antibiotics.
- Food crises caused by the displacement of subsistence farmers and destruction of local food systems, competition for grains by factory farms and biofuels, poverty, and physical limits to food production because of drawdown.
- Drawdown as the accelerating consumption of finite supplies of water, soil, and oil leads to rapid exhaustion of accessible supplies.
- Political collapse as large political entities break into smaller groups, secessionists break away from larger states, and some states go bankrupt or simply fail.
- Social collapse as resource shortages and political upheaval break large, artificial group identities into smaller ones (sometimes based along class, ethnic, or regional affinities), often with competition between those groups.
- War and armed conflict, especially resource wars over remaining supplies of finite resources and internal conflicts between warlords and rival factions.
- Crime and exploitation caused by poverty and inequality, especially in crowded urban areas.
- Refugee displacement resulting from spontaneous disasters like earthquakes and hurricanes, but worsened by climate change, food shortages, and so on.

In this scenario, each negative aspect of the collapse of civilization has a reciprocal trend that the resistance movement encourages. The collapse of large authoritarian political structures has a countertrend of emerging small-scale participatory political structures. The collapse of global industrial capitalism has a countertrend of local systems of exchange, cooperation, and mutual aid. And so on. Generally speaking, in this alternate future, a small number of underground people bring down the big bad structures, and a large number of aboveground people cultivate the little good structures.

In his book The Collapse of Complex Societies, Joseph Tainter argues that a major mechanism for collapse has to do with societal complexity. Complexity is a general term that includes the number of different jobs or roles in society (e.g., not just healers but epidemiologists, trauma surgeons, gerontologists, etc.), the size and complexity of political structures (e.g., not just popular assemblies but vast sprawling bureaucracies), the number and complexity

of manufactured items and technology (e.g., not just spears, but many different calibers and types of bullets), and so on. Civilizations tend to try to use complexity to address problems, and as a result their complexity increases over time.

But complexity has a cost. The decline of a civilization begins when the costs of complexity begin to exceed the benefits—in other words, when increased complexity begins to offer declining returns. At that point, individual people, families, communities, and political and social subunits have a disincentive to participate in that civilization. The complexity keeps increasing, yes, but it keeps getting more expensive. Eventually the ballooning costs force that civilization to collapse, and people fall back on smaller and more local political organizations and social groups.

Part of the job of the resistance movement is to increase the cost and decrease the returns of empire-scale complexity. This doesn't require instantaneous collapse or global dramatic actions. Even small actions can increase the cost of complexity and accelerate the good parts of collapse while tempering the bad.

Part of Tainter's argument is that modern society won't collapse in the same way as old societies, because complexity (through, for example, large-scale agriculture and fossil fuel extraction) has become the physical underpinning of human life rather than a side benefit. Many historical societies collapsed when people returned to villages and less complex traditional life. They chose to do this. Modern people won't do that, at least not on a large scale, in part because the villages are gone, and traditional ways of life are no longer directly accessible to them. This means that people in modern civilization are in a bind, and many will continue to struggle for industrial civilization even when continuing it is obviously counterproductive. Under a Decisive Ecological Warfare scenario, aboveground activists facilitate this aspect of collapse by developing alternatives that will ease the pressure and encourage people to leave industrial capitalism by choice.

<div align="center">***</div>

There's something admirable about the concept of protracted popular warfare that was used in China and Vietnam. It's an elegant idea, if war can ever be described in such terms; the core idea is adaptable and applicable even in the face of major setbacks and twists of fate.

But protracted popular warfare as such doesn't apply to the particular future we are discussing. The people in that scenario will never have the numbers that protracted popular warfare requires. But they will also face a different kind of adversary, for which different tactics are applicable. So they will take the essential idea of protracted popular warfare and apply it to their own situation—that of needing to save their planet, to bring down industrial civilization and keep it down. And they will devise a new grand strategy based on a simple continuum of steps that flow logically one after the other.

In this alternate future scenario, Decisive Ecological Warfare has four phases that progress from the near future through the fall of industrial civilization. The first phase is **Networking & Mobilization**. The second phase is **Sabotage & Asymmetric Action**. The third phase is **Systems Disruption**. And the fourth and final phase is **Decisive Dismantling of Infrastructure**.

Each phase has its own objectives, operational approaches, and organizational requirements. There's no distinct dividing line between the phases, and different regions progress through the phases at different times. These phases emphasize the role of militant resistance networks. The aboveground building of alternatives and revitalization of human communities happen at the same time. But this does not require the same strategic rigor; rebuilding healthy human communities with a subsistence base must simply happen as fast as possible, everywhere, with timetables and methods suited to the region. This scenario's militant resisters, on the other hand, need to share some grand strategy to succeed.

THE FOUR PHASES OF DECISIVE ECOLOGICAL WARFARE

Phase I – Networking and Mobilization

Preamble

In phase one, resisters focus on organizing themselves into networks and building cultures of resistance to sustain those networks. Many sympathizers or potential recruits are unfamiliar with serious resistance strategy and action, so efforts are taken to spread that information. But key in this phase is actually forming the above- and underground organizations (or at least nuclei) that will carry out organizational recruitment and decisive action. Security culture and resistance culture are not very well developed at this point, so extra efforts are made to avoid sloppy mistakes that would lead to arrests, and to dissuade informers from gathering or passing on information.

Training of activists is key in this phase, especially through low risk (but effective) actions. New recruits will become the combatants, cadres, and leaders of later phases. New activists are enculturated into the resistance ethos, and existing activists drop bad or counterproductive habits. This is a time when the resistance movement gets organized and gets serious. People are putting their individual needs and conflicts aside in order to form a movement that can fight to win.

In this phase, isolated people come together to form a vision and strategy for the future, and to establish the nuclei of future organizations. Of course, networking occurs with resistance-oriented organizations that already exist, but most mainstream organizations are not willing to adopt positions of militancy or intransigence with regard to those in power or the crises these people face. If possible, they should be encouraged to take positions more in line with the scale of the problems at hand.

This phase is already underway, but a great deal of work remains to be done.

Objectives

- To build a culture of resistance, with all that entails.
- To build aboveground and underground resistance networks, and to ensure the survival of those networks.

Operations

- Operations are generally lower risk actions, so that people can be trained and screened, and support networks put in place. These will fall primarily into the sustaining and shaping categories.
- Maximal recruitment and training is very important at this point. The earlier people are recruited, the more likely they are to be trustworthy and the longer time is available to screen them for their competency for more serious action.
- Communications and propaganda operations are also required for outreach and to spread information about useful tactics and strategies, and on the necessity for organized action.

Organization

- Most resistance organizations in this scenario are still diffuse networks, but they begin to extend and coalesce. This phase aims to build organization.

Phase II – Sabotage and Asymmetric Action

Preamble

In this phase, the resisters might attempt to disrupt or disable particular targets on an opportunistic basis. For the most part, the required underground networks and skills do not yet exist to take on multiple larger targets. Resisters may go after particularly egregious targets—coal-fired power plants or exploitative banks. At this phase, the resistance focus is on practice, probing enemy networks and security, and increasing support while building organizational networks. In this possible future, Underground cells do not attempt to provoke overwhelming repression beyond the ability of their nascent networks to cope. Furthermore, when serious repression and setbacks do occur, they retreat towards the earlier phase with its emphasis on organization and survival. Indeed, major setbacks probably do happen at this phase, indicating a lack of basic rules and structure and signaling the need to fall back on some of the priorities of the first phase.

The resistance movement in this scenario understands the importance of decisive action. Their emphasis in the first two phases has not been on direct action, but not because they are holding back. It's because they are working as well as they damned well can, but doing so while putting one foot in front of the other. They know that the planet (and the future) need their action, but understand that it won't benefit from foolish and hasty action, or from creating problems for which they are not yet prepared. That only leads to a morale whiplash and disappointment. So their movement acts as seriously and swiftly and decisively as it can, but makes sure that it lays the foundation it needs to be truly effective.

The more people join that movement, the harder they work, and the more driven they are, the faster they can progress from one phase to the next.

In this alternate future, aboveground activists in particular take on several important tasks. They push for acceptance and normalization of more militant and radical tactics where appropriate. They vocally support sabotage when it occurs. More moderate advocacy groups use the occurrence of sabotage to criticize those in power for failing to take action on critical issues like climate change (rather than criticizing the saboteurs). They argue that sabotage would not be necessary if civil society would make a reasonable response to social and ecological problems, and use the opportunity and publicity to push solutions to the problems. They do not side with those in power against the saboteurs, but argue that the situation is serious enough to make such action legitimate, even though they have personally chosen a different course.

At this point in the scenario, more radical and grassroots groups continue to establish a community of resistance, but also establish discrete organizations and parallel institutions. These institutions establish themselves and their legitimacy, make community connections, and particularly take steps to found relationships outside of the traditional "activist bubble." These institutions also focus on emergency, disaster preparedness, and helping people cope with impending collapse.

Simultaneously, aboveground activists organize people for civil disobedience, mass confrontation, and other forms of direct action where appropriate.

Something else begins to happen: aboveground organizations establish coalitions, confederations, and regional networks, knowing that there will be greater obstacles to these later on. These confederations maximize the potential of aboveground organizing by sharing materials, knowledge, skills, learning curricula, and so on. They als target=o plan strategically themselves, engaging in persistent planned campaigns instead of reactive or crisis-to-crisis organizing.

Objectives

- Identify and engage high-priority individual targets. These targets are chosen by these resisters because they are especially attainable or for other reasons of target selection.
- Give training and real-world experience to cadres necessary to take on bigger targets and systems. Even decisive actions are limited in scope and impact at this phase, although good target selection and timing allows for significant gains.
- These operations also expose weak points in the system, demonstrate the feasibility of material resistance, and inspire other resisters.
- Publicly establish the rationale for material resistance and confrontation with power.
- Establish concrete aboveground organizations and parallel institutions.

Operations

- Limited but increasing decisive operations, combined with growing sustaining operations (to support larger and more logistically demanding organizations) and continued shaping operations.
- In decisive and supporting operations, these hypothetical resisters are cautious and smart. New and unseasoned cadres have a tendency to be overconfident, so to compensate they pick only operations with certain outcomes; they know that in this stage they are still building toward the bigger actions that are yet to come.

Organization

- Requires underground cells, but benefits from larger underground networks. There is still an emphasis on recruitment at this point.
- Aboveground networks and movements are proliferating as much as they can, especially since the work to come requires significant lead time for developing skills, communities, and so on.

Phase III – Systems Disruption

Preamble

In this phase resisters step up from individual targets to address entire industrial, political, and economic systems. Industrial systems disruption requires underground networks organized in a hierarchical or paramilitary fashion. These larger networks emerge out of the previous phases with the ability to carry out multiple simultaneous actions.

Systems disruption is aimed at identifying key points and bottlenecks in the adversary's systems (electrical, transport, financial, and so on) and engaging them to collapse those systems or reduce their functionality. This is not a one-shot deal. Industrial systems are big and can be fragile, but they are sprawling rather than monolithic. Repairs are attempted. The resistance members understand that. Effective systems disruption requires planning for continued and coordinated actions over time.

In this scenario, the aboveground doesn't truly gain traction as long as there is business-as-usual. On the other hand, as global industrial and economic systems are increasingly disrupted (because of capitalist-induced economic collapse, global climate disasters, peak oil, peak soil, peak water, or for other reasons) support for resilient local communities increases. Failures in the delivery of electricity and manufactured goods increases interest in local food, energy, and the like. These disruptions also make it easier for people to cope with full collapse in the long term—short-term loss, long term gain, even where humans are concerned.

Dimitry Orlov, a major analyst of the Soviet collapse, explains that the dysfunctional nature of the Soviet system prepared people for its eventual disintegration. In contrast, a smoothly functioning industrial economy causes a false sense of security so that people are unprepared, worsening the impact. "After collapse, you regret not having an unreliable retail segment, with shortages and long bread lines, because then people would have been forced to learn to shift for themselves instead of standing around waiting for somebody to come and feed them." [18] Aboveground organizations and institutions are well-established by this phase of this alternate scenario. They continue to push for reforms, focusing on the urgent need for justice, relocalization, and resilient communities, given that the dominant system is unfair, unreliable, and unstable.

Of course, in this scenario the militant actions that impact daily life provoke a backlash, sometimes from parts of the public, but especially from authoritarians on every level. The aboveground activists are the frontline fighters against authoritarianism. They are the only ones who can mobilize the popular groundswell needed to prevent fascism.

Furthermore, aboveground activists use the disrupted systems as an opportunity to strengthen local communities and parallel institutions. Mainstream people are encouraged to swing their support to participatory local alternatives in the economic, political, and social spheres. When economic turmoil causes unemployment and hyperinflation, people are employed locally for the benefit of their community and the land. In this scenario, as national governments around the world increasingly struggle with crises (like peak oil, food shortages, climate chaos, and so on) and increasingly fail to provide for people, local and directly democratic councils begin to take over administration of basic and emergency services, and people redirect their taxes to those local entities (perhaps as part of a campaign of general noncooperation against those in power). This happens in conjunction with the community emergency response and disaster preparedness measures already undertaken.

In this scenario, whenever those in power try to increase exploitation or authoritarianism, aboveground resisters call for people to withdraw support from those in power, and divert it to local, democratic political bodies. Those parallel institutions can do a better job than those in power. The cross-demographic relationships established in previous phases help to keep those local political structures accountable, and to rally support from many communities.

Throughout this phase, strategic efforts are made to augment existing stresses on economic and industrial systems caused by peak oil, financial instability, and related factors. The resisters think of themselves as pushing on a rickety building that's already starting to lean. Indeed, in this scenario many systems disruptions come from within the system itself, rather than from resisters.

This phase accomplishes significant and decisive gains. Even if the main industrial and economic systems have not completely collapsed, prolonged disruption means a reduction in ecological impact; great news for the planet, and for humanity's future survival. Even a 50 percent decrease in industrial consumption or greenhouse gas emissions is a massive victory (especially considering that emissions have continued to rise in the face of all environmental activism so far), and that buys resisters—and everyone else—some time.

In the most optimistic parts of this hypothetical scenario, effective resistance induces those in power to negotiate or offer concessions. Once the resistance movement demonstrated the ability to use real strategy and force, it couldn't be ignored. Those in power begin to knock down the doors of mainstream activists, begging to negotiate changes that would coopt the resistance movements' cause and reduce further actions.

In this version of the future, however, resistance groups truly begin to take the initiative. They understand that for most of the history of civilization, those in power have retained the initiative, forcing resistance groups or colonized people to stay on the defensive, to respond to attacks, to be constantly kept off balance. However, peak oil and systems disruption has caused a series of emergencies for those in power; some caused by organized resistance groups, some caused by civil unrest and shortages, and some caused by the social and ecological consequences of centuries—millennia—of exploitation. For perhaps the first time in history, those in power are globally off balance

and occupied by worsening crisis after crisis. This provides a key opportunity for resistance groups, and autonomous cultures and communities, to seize and retain the initiative.

Objectives

- Target key points of specific industrial and economic systems to disrupt and disable them.
- Effect a measurable decrease in industrial activity and industrial consumption.
- Enable concessions, negotiations, or social changes if applicable.
- Induce the collapse of particular companies, industries, or economic systems.

Operations

- Mostly decisive and sustaining, but shaping where necessary for systems disruption. Cadres and combatants should be increasingly seasoned at this point, but the onset of decisive and serious action will mean a high attrition rate for resisters. There's no point in being vague; the members of the resistance in this alternate future who are committed to militant resistance go in expecting that they will either end up dead or in jail. They know that anything better than that was a gift to be won through skill and luck.

Organization

- Heavy use of underground networks required; operational coordination is a prerequisite for effective systems disruption.
- Recruitment is ongoing at this point; especially to recruit auxiliaries and to cope with losses to attrition. However, during this phase there are multiple serious attempts at infiltration. The infiltrations are not as successful as they might have been, because underground networks have recruited heavily in previous stages (before large-scale action) to ensure the presence of a trusted group of leaders and cadres who form the backbone of the networks.
- Aboveground organizations are able to mobilize extensively because of various social, political, and material crises.
- At this point, militant resisters become concerned about backlash from people who should be on their side, such as many liberals, especially as those in power put pressure on aboveground activists.

Phase IV - Decisive Dismantling of Infrastructure

Preamble

Decisive dismantling of infrastructure goes a step beyond systems disruption. The intent is to permanently dismantle as much of the fossil fuel-based industrial infrastructure as possible. This phase is the last resort; in the most optimistic projection, it would not be necessary. In the optimistic projection of this scenario, converging crises and infrastructure disruption would combine with vigorous aboveground movements to force those in power to accept social, political, and economic change; reductions in consumption would combine with a genuine and sincere attempt to transition to a sustainable culture.

But this optimistic projection is not probable. It is more likely that those in power (and many everyday people) will cling more to civilization even as it collapses. And likely, they will support authoritarianism if they think it will maintain their privilege and their entitlement.

The key issue—which we've come back to again and again—is time. We will soon reach, (if we haven't already reached) the trigger point of irreversible runaway global warming. The systems disruption phase of this hypothetical

scenario offers selectivity. Disruptions in this scenario are engineered in a way that shifts the impact toward industry and attempts to minimize impacts on civilians. But industrial systems are heavily integrated with civilian infrastructure. If selective disruption doesn't work soon enough, some resisters may conclude that all-out disruption is required to stop the planet from burning to a cinder.

The difference between phases III and IV of this scenario may appear subtle, since they both involve, on an operational level, coordinated actions to disrupt industrial systems on a large scale. But phase III requires some time to work—to weaken the system, to mobilize people and organizations, to build on a series of disruptive actions. Phase III also gives "fair warning" for regular people to prepare. Further, phase III gives time for the resistance to develop itself logistically and organizationally, which is required to proceed to phase IV. The difference between the two phases is capacity and restraint. For resisters in this scenario to proceed from phase III to phase IV, they need two things: the organizational capacity to take on the scope of action required under phase IV, and the certainty that there is no longer any point in waiting for societal reforms to succeed on their own timetable.

In this scenario, both of those phases save lives, human and nonhuman alike. But if large-scale aboveground mobilization does not happen once collapse is underway, phase IV becomes the most effective way to save lives.

Imagine that you are riding in a streetcar through a city crowded with pedestrians. Inside the streetcar are the civilized humans, and outside is all the non-human life on the planet, and the humans who are not civilized, or who do not benefit from civilization, or who have yet to be born. Needless to say, those outside far outnumber the few of you inside the streetcar. But the driver of the streetcar is in a hurry, and is accelerating as fast as he can, plowing through the crowds, maiming and killing pedestrians en masse. Most of your fellow passengers don't seem to particularly care; they've got somewhere to go, and they're glad to be making progress regardless of the cost.

Some of the passengers seem upset by the situation. If the driver keeps accelerating, they observe, it's possible that the streetcar will crash and the passengers will be injured. Not to worry, one man tells them. His calculations show that the bodies piling up in front of the streetcar will eventually slow the vehicle and cause it to safely come to a halt. Any intervention by the passengers would be reckless, and would surely provoke a reprimand from the driver. Worse, a troublesome passenger might be kicked off the streetcar and later run over by it.

You, unlike most passengers, are more concerned by the constant carnage outside than by the future safety of the streetcar passengers. And you know you have to do something. You could try to jump out the window and escape, but then the streetcar would plow on through the crowd, and you would lose any chance to intervene. So you decide to try to sabotage the streetcar from the inside, to cut the electrical wires, or pull up the flooring and activate the brakes by hand, or derail it, or do whatever you can.

As soon as the other passengers realize what you are doing, they'll try stop you, and maybe kill you. You have to decide whether you are going to stop the streetcar slowly or speedily. The streetcar is racing along so quickly now that if you stop it suddenly, it may fling the passengers against the seats in front of them or down the aisle. It may kill some of them. But if you stop it slowly, who knows how many innocent people will be struck by the streetcar while it is decelerating? And if you just slow it down, the driver may be able to repair the damage and get the streetcar going again.

So what do you do? If you choose to stop the streetcar as quickly as possible, then you have made the same choice as those who would implement phase IV. You've made the decision that stopping the destruction as rapidly as possible is more important than any particular program of reform. Of course, even in stopping the destruction as rapidly as possible, you can still take measures to reduce casualties on board the street car. You can tell people to sit down or buckle up or brace themselves for impact. Whether they will listen to you is another story, but that's their responsibility, not yours.

It's important to not misinterpret the point of Phase IV of this alternate future scenario. The point is not to cause human casualties. The point is to stop the destruction of the planet. The enemy is not the civilian population—or any population at all—but a sociopathological sociopolitical-economic system. Ecological destruction on this planet is primarily caused by industry and capitalism; the issue of population is tertiary at best. The point of collapsing industrial infrastructure in this scenario is not to harm humans any more than the point of braking the streetcar is to harm the passengers. The point is the reduce the damage as quickly as possible, and in doing so to account for the harm the dominant culture is doing to all living creatures, past and future.

This is not an easy phase for the above-grounders. Part of their job in this scenario is also to help demolish infrastructure, but they are mostly demolishing exploitative political and economic infrastructure, not physical infrastructure. In general, they continue to do what they did in the previous phase, but on a larger scale and for the long term. Public support is directed to local, democratic, and just political and economic systems. Efforts are undertaken to deal with emergencies and cope with the nastier parts of collapse.

Objectives

- Dismantle the critical physical infrastructure required for industrial civilization to function.
- Induce widespread industrial collapse, beyond any economic or political systems.
- Use continuing and coordinated actions to hamper repairs and replacement.

Operations

- Focus almost exclusively on decisive and sustaining operations.

Organization

- Requires well-developed militant underground networks.

IMPLEMENTING DECISIVE ECOLOGICAL WARFARE

Listen to an audio version of Implementing Decisive Ecological Warfare

It's important to note that, as in the case of protracted popular warfare, Decisive Ecological Warfare is not necessarily a linear progression. In this scenario resisters fall back on previous phases as necessary. After major setbacks, resistance organizations focus on survival and networking as they regroup and prepare for more serious action. Also, resistance movements progress through each of the phases, and then recede in reverse order. That is, if global industrial infrastructure has been successfully disrupted or fragmented (Phase IV) resisters return to systems disruption on a local or regional scale (Phase III). And if that is successful, resisters move back down to Phase II, focusing their efforts on the worst remaining targets.

And provided that humans don't go extinct, even this scenario will require some people to stay at Phase I indefinitely, maintaining a culture of resistance and passing on the basic knowledge and skills necessary to fight back for centuries and millennia.

The progression of Decisive Ecological Warfare could be compared to ecological succession. A few months ago I visited an abandoned quarry, where the topsoil and several layers of bedrock had been stripped and blasted away, leaving a cubic cavity several stories deep in the limestone. But a little bit of gravel or dust had piled up in one corner, and some mosses had taken hold. The mosses were small, but they required very little in the way of water or nutrients (like many of the shoestring affinity groups I've worked with). Once the mosses had grown for a few

seasons, they retained enough soil for grasses to grow.

Quick to establish, hardy grasses are often among the first species to reinhabit any disturbed land. In much the same way, early resistance organizations are generalists, not specialists. They are robust and rapidly spread and reproduce, either spreading their seeds aboveground or creating underground networks of rhizomes.

The grasses at the quarry built the soil quickly, and soon there was soil for wildflowers and more complex organisms. In much the same way, large numbers of simple resistance organizations help to establish communities of resistance, cultures of resistance, that can give rise to more complex and more effective resistance organizations.

Underground Organization

The hypothetical actionists who put this strategy into place are able to intelligently move from one phase to the next: identifying when the correct elements are in place, when resistance networks are sufficiently mobilized and trained, and when external pressures dictate change. In the US Army's field manual on operations, General Eric Shinseki argues that the rules of strategy "require commanders to master transitions, to be adaptive. Transitions—deployments, the interval between initial operation and sequels, consolidation on the objective, forward passage of lines—sap operational momentum. Mastering transitions is the key to maintaining momentum and winning decisively."

This is particularly difficult to do when resistance does not have a central command. In this scenario, there is no central means of dispersing operational or tactical orders, or effectively gathering precise information about resistance forces and allies. Shinseki continues: "This places a high premium on readiness—well trained Soldiers; adaptive leaders who understand our doctrine; and versatile, agile, and lethal formations." People resisting civilization in this scenario are not concerned with "lethality" so much as effectiveness, but the general point stands.

Resistance to civilization is inherently decentralized. That goes double for underground groups which have minimal contact with others. To compensate for the lack of command structure, a general grand strategy in this scenario becomes widely known and accepted. Furthermore, loosely allied groups are ready to take action whenever the strategic situation called for it. These groups are prepared to take advantage of crises like economic collapses.

Under this alternate scenario, underground organizing in small cells has major implications for applying the principles of war. The ideal entity for taking on industrial civilization would have been a large, hierarchal paramilitary network. Such a network could have engaged in the training, discipline, and coordinated action required to implement decisive militant action on a continental scale. However, for practical reasons, a single such network never arises. Similar arrangements in the history of resistance struggle, such as the IRA or various territory-controlling insurgent groups, happened in the absence of the modern surveillance state and in the presence of a well-developed culture of resistance and extensive opposition to the occupier.

Although underground cells can still form out of trusted peers along kinship lines, larger paramilitary networks are more difficult to form in a contemporary anticivilization context. First of all, the proportion of potential recruits in the general population is smaller than in any anticolonial or antioccupation resistance movements in history. So it takes longer and is more difficult to expand existing underground networks. The option used by some resistance groups in Occupied France was to ally and connect existing cells. But this is inherently difficult and dangerous. Any underground group with proper cover would be invisible to another group looking for allies (there are plenty of stories from the end of the war of resisters living across the hall from each other without having realized each other's affiliation). And in a panopticon, exposing yourself to unproven allies is a risky undertaking.

A more plausible underground arrangement in this scenario is for there to have been a composite of organizations of different sizes, a few larger networks with a number of smaller autonomous cells that aren't directly connected through command lines. There are indirect connections or communications via cutouts, but those methods are rarely consistent or reliable enough to permit coordinated simultaneous actions on short notice.

Individual cells rarely have the numbers or logistics to engage in multiple simultaneous actions at different locations. That job falls to the paramilitary groups, with cells in multiple locations, who have the command structure and the discipline to properly carry out network disruption. However, autonomous cells maintain readiness to engage in opportunistic action by identifying in advance a selection of appropriate local targets and tactics. Then once a larger simultaneous action happened (causing, say, a blackout), autonomous cells take advantage of the opportunity to undertake their own actions, within a few hours. In this way unrelated cells engage in something close to simultaneous attacks, maximizing their effectiveness. Of course, if decentralized groups frequently stage attacks in the wake of larger "trigger actions," the corporate media may stop broadcasting news of attacks to avoid triggering more. So, such an approach has its limits, although large-scale effects like national blackouts can't be suppressed in the news (and in systems disruption, it doesn't really matter what caused a blackout in the first place, because it's still an opportunity for further action).

Analysis of Strategy

World War II vs Decisive Ecological Warfare

When we look at some struggle or war in history, we have the benefit of hindsight to identify flaws and successes. This is how we judge strategic decisions made in World War II, for example, or any of those who have tried (or not) to intervene in historical holocausts. Perhaps it would be beneficial to imagine some historians in the distant future—assuming humanity survives—looking back on the alternate future just described. Assuming it was generally successful, how might they analyze its strengths and weaknesses?

For these historians, phase IV is controversial, and they know it had been controversial among resisters at the time. Even resisters who agreed with militant actions against industrial infrastructure hesitated when contemplating actions with possible civilian consequences. That comes as no surprise, because members of this resistance were driven by a deep respect and care for all life. The problem is, of course, that members of this group knew that if they failed to stop this culture from killing the planet, there would be far more gruesome civilian consequences.

A related moral conundrum confronted the Allies early in World War II, as discussed by Eric Markusen and David Kopf in their book The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing: Genocide and Total War in the Twentieth Century. Markusen and Kopf write that: "At the beginning of World War II, British bombing policy was rigorously discriminating—even to the point of putting British aircrews at great risk. Only obvious military targets removed from population centers were attacked, and bomber crews were instructed to jettison their bombs over water when weather conditions made target identification questionable. Several factors were cited to explain this policy, including a desire to avoid provoking Germany into retaliating against non-military targets in Britain with its then numerically superior air force."[19]

Other factors included concerns about public support, moral considerations in avoiding civilian casualties, the practice of the "Phoney War" (a declared war on Germany with little real combat), and a small air force which required time to build up. The parallels between the actions of the British bombers and the actions of leftist militants from the Weather Underground to the ELF are obvious.

The problem with this British policy was that it simply didn't work. Germany showed no such moral restraint, and British bombing crews were taking greater risks to attack less valuable targets. By February of 1942, bombing policy changed substantially. In fact, Bomber Command began to deliberately target enemy civilians and civilian morale —particularly that of industrial workers—especially by destroying homes around target factories in order to "dehouse" workers. British strategists believed that in doing so they could sap Germany's will to fight. In fact, some of the attacks on civilians were intended to "punish" the German populace for supporting Hitler, and some strategists believed that, after sufficient punishment, the population would rise up and depose Hitler to save themselves. Of course, this did not work; it almost never does.

So, this was one of the dilemmas faced by resistance members in this alternate future scenario: while the resistance abhorred the notion of actions affecting civilians—even more than the British did in early World War II—it was clear to them that in an industrial nation the "civilians" and the state are so deeply enmeshed that any impact on one will have some impact on the other.

Historians now believe that Allied reluctance to attack early in the war may have cost many millions of civilian lives. By failing to stop Germany early, they made a prolonged and bloody conflict inevitable. General Alfred Jodl, the German Chief of the Operations Staff of the Armed Forces High Command, said as much during his war crimes trial at Nuremburg: "[I]f we did not collapse already in the year 1939 that was due only to the fact that during the Polish campaign, the approximately 110 French and British divisions in the West were held completely inactive against the 23 German divisions."[20]

Many military strategists have warned against piecemeal or half measures when only total war will do the job. In his book Grand Strategy: Principles and Practices, John M. Collins argues that timid attacks may strengthen the resolve of the enemy, because they constitute a provocation but don't significantly damage the physical capability or morale of the occupier. "Destroying the enemy's resolution to resist is far more important than crippling his material capabilities . . . studies of cause and effect tend to confirm that violence short of total devastation may amplify rather than erode a people's determination."[21] Consider, though, that in this 1973 book Collins may underestimate the importance of technological infrastructure and decisive strikes on them. (He advises elsewhere in the book that computers "are of limited utility."[22])

Other strategists have prioritized the material destruction over the adversary's "will to fight." Robert Anthony Pape discusses the issue in Bombing to Win, in which he analyzes the effectiveness of strategic bombing in various wars. We can wonder in this alternate future scenario if the resisters attended to Pape's analysis as they weighed the benefits of phase III (selective actions against particular networks and systems) vs. phase IV (attempting to destroy as much of the industrial infrastructure as possible).

Specifically, Pape argues that targeting an entire economy may be more effective than simply going after individual factories or facilities:

> Strategic interdiction can undermine attrition strategies, either by attacking weapons plants or by smashing the industrial base as a whole, which in turn reduces military production. Of the two, attacking weapons plants is the less effective. Given the substitution capacities of modern industrial economies, "war" production is highly fungible over a period of months. Production can be maintained in the short term by running down stockpiles and in the medium term by conservation and substitution of alternative materials or processes. In addition to economic adjustment, states can often make doctrinal adjustments.[23]

This analysis is poignant, but it also demonstrates a way in which the goals of this alternate scenario's strategy differed from the goals of strategic bombing in historical conflicts. In the Allied bombing campaign (and in other wars where strategic bombing was used), the strategic bombing coincided with conventional ground, air, and naval battles. Bombing strategists were most concerned with choking off enemy supplies to the battlefield. Strategic

bombing alone was not meant to win the war; it was meant to support conventional forces in battle. In contrast, in this alternate future, a significant decrease in industrial production would itself be a great success.

The hypothetical future historians perhaps ask, "Why not simply go after the worst factories, the worst industries, and leave the rest of the economy alone?" Earlier stages of Decisive Ecological Warfare did involve targeting particular factories or industries. However, the resisters knew that the modern industrial economy was so thoroughly integrated that anything short of general economic disruption was unlikely to have lasting effect.

This, too, is shown by historical attempts to disrupt economies. Pape continues, "Even when production of an important weapon system is seriously undermined, tactical and operational adjustments may allow other weapon systems to substitute for it. . . . As a result, efforts to remove the critical component in war production generally fail." For example, Pape explains, the Allies carried out a bombing campaign on German aircraft engine plants. But this was not a decisive factor in the struggle for air superiority. Mostly, the Allies defeated the Luftwaffe because they shot down and killed so many of Germany's best pilots.

Another example of compensation is the Allied bombing of German ball bearing plants. The Allies were able to reduce the German production of ball bearings by about 70 percent. But this did not force a corresponding decrease in German tank forces. The Germans were able to compensate in part by designing equipment that required fewer bearings. They also increased their production of infantry antitank weapons. Early in the war, Germany was able to compensate for the destruction of factories in part because many factories were running only one shift. They were not using their existing industrial capacity to its fullest. By switching to double or triple shifts, they were able to (temporarily) maintain production.

Hence, Pape argues that war economies have no particular point of collapse when faced with increasing attacks, but can adjust incrementally to decreasing supplies. "Modern war economies are not brittle. Although individual plants can be destroyed, the opponent can reduce the effects by dispersing production of important items and stockpiling key raw materials and machinery. Attackers never anticipate all the adjustments and work-arounds defenders can devise, partly because they often rely on analysis of peacetime economies and partly because intelligence of the detailed structure of the target economy is always incomplete."[24] This is a valid caution against overconfidence, but the resisters in this scenario recognized that his argument was not fully applicable to their situation, in part for the reasons we discussed earlier, and in part because of reasons that follow.

Military strategists studying economic and industrial disruption are usually concerned specifically with the production of war materiel and its distribution to enemy armed forces. Modern war economies are economies of total war in which all parts of society are mobilized and engaged in supporting war. So, of course, military leaders can compensate for significant disruption; they can divert materiel or rations from civilian use or enlist civilians and civilian infrastructure for military purposes as they please. This does not mean that overall production is unaffected (far from it), simply that military production does not decline as much as one might expect under a given onslaught.

Resisters in this scenario had a different perspective on compensation measures than military strategists. To understand the contrast, pretend that a military strategist and a militant ecological strategist both want to blow up a fuel pipeline that services a major industrial area. Let's say the pipeline is destroyed and the fuel supply to industry is drastically cut. Let's say that the industrial area undertakes a variety of typical measures to compensate—conservation, recycling, efficiency measures, and so on. Let's say they are able to keep on producing insulation or refrigerators or clothing or whatever it is they make, in diminished numbers and using less fuel. They also extend the lifespan of their existing refrigerators or clothing by repairing them. From the point of view of the military strategist, this attack has been a failure—it has a negligible effect on materiel availability for the military. But from the perspective of the militant ecologist, this is a victory. Ecological damage is reduced, and with very few negative effects on civilians. (Indeed, some effects would be directly beneficial.)

And modern economies in general are brittle. Military economies mobilize resources and production by any means necessary, whether that means printing money or commandeering factories. They are economies of crude necessity. Industrial economies, in contrast, are economies of luxury. They mostly produce things that people don't need. Industrial capitalism thrives on manufacturing desire as much as on manufacturing products, on selling people disposable plastic garbage, extra cars, and junk food. When capitalist economies hit hard times, as they did in the Great Depression, or as they did in Argentina a decade ago, or as they have in many places in many times, people fall back on necessities, and often on barter systems and webs of mutual aid. They fall back on community and household economies, economies of necessity that are far more resilient than industrial capitalism, and even more robust than war economies.

Nonetheless, Pape makes an important point when he argues, "Strategic interdiction is most effective when attacks are against the economy as a whole. The most effective plan is to destroy the transportation network that brings raw materials and primary goods to manufacturing centers and often redistributes subcomponents among various industries. Attacking national electric power grids is not effective because industrial facilities commonly have their own backup power generation. Attacking national oil refineries to reduce backup power generators typically ignores the ability of states to reduce consumption through conservation and rationing." Pape's analysis is insightful, but again it's important to understand the differences between his premises and goals, and the premises and goals of Decisive Ecological Warfare.

The resisters in the DEW scenario had the goals of reducing consumption and reducing industrial activity, so it didn't matter to them that some industrial facilities had backup generators or that states engaged in conservation and rationing. They believed it was a profound ecological victory to cause factories to run on reduced power or for nationwide oil conservation to have taken place. They remembered that in the whole of its history, the mainstream environmental movement was never even able to stop the growth of fossil fuel consumption. To actually reduce it was unprecedented.[25]

No matter whether we are talking about some completely hypothetical future situation or the real world right now, the progress of peak oil will also have an effect on the relative importance of different transportation networks. In some areas, the importance of shipping imports will increase because of factors like the local exhaustion of oil. In others, declining international trade and reduced economic activity will make shipping less important. Highway systems may have reduced usage because of increasing fuel costs and decreasing trade. This reduced traffic will leave more spare capacity and make highways less vulnerable to disruption. Rail traffic—a very energy-efficient form of transport—is likely to increase in importance. Furthermore, in many areas, railroads have been removed over a period of several decades, so that remaining lines are even now very crowded and close to maximum capacity.

Back to the alternative future scenario: In most cases, transportation networks were not the best targets. Road transportation (by far the most important form in most countries) is highly redundant. Even rural parts of well-populated areas are crisscrossed by grids of county roads, which are slower than highways, but allow for detours.

In contrast, targeting energy networks was a higher priority to them because the effect of disrupting them was greater. Many electrical grids were already operating near capacity, and were expensive to expand. They became more important as highly portable forms of energy like fossil fuels were partially replaced by less portable forms of energy, specifically electricity generated from coal-burning and nuclear plants, and to a lesser extent by wind and solar energy. This meant that electrical grids carried as much or more energy as they do now, and certainly a larger percentage of all energy consumed. Furthermore, they recognized that energy networks often depend on a few major continent-spanning trunks, which were very vulnerable to disruption.

"Appropriate Technology" Tactics

There is one final argument that resisters in this scenario made for actions against the economy as a whole, rather than engaging in piecemeal or tentative actions: the element of surprise. They recognized that sporadic sabotage would sacrifice the element of surprise and allow their enemy to regroup and develop ways of coping with future actions. They recognized that sometimes those methods of coping would be desirable for the resistance (for example, a shift toward less intensive local supplies of energy) and sometimes they would be undesirable (for example, deployment of rapid repair teams, aerial monitoring by remotely piloted drones, martial law, etc.). Resisters recognized that they could compensate for exposing some of their tactics by carrying out a series of decisive surprise operations within a larger progressive struggle.

On the other hand, in this scenario resisters understand that DEW depended on relatively simple "appropriate technology" tactics (both aboveground and underground). It depended on small groups and was relatively simple rather than complex. There was not a lot of secret tactical information to give away. In fact, escalating actions with straightforward tactics were beneficial to their resistance movement. Analyst John Robb has discussed this point while studying insurgencies in countries like Iraq. Most insurgent tactics are not very complex, but resistance groups can continually learn from the examples, successes, and failures of other groups in the "bazaar" of insurgency. Decentralized cells are able to see the successes of cells they have no direct communication with, and because the tactics are relatively simple, they can quickly mimic successful tactics and adapt them to their own resources and circumstances. In this way, successful tactics rapidly proliferate to new groups even with minimal underground communication.

Hypothetical historians looking back might note another potential shortcoming of DEW: that it required perhaps too many people involved in risky tactics, and that resistance organizations lacked the numbers and logistical persistence required for prolonged struggle. That was a valid concern, and was dealt with proactively by developing effective support networks early on. Of course, other suggested strategies—such as a mass movement of any kind—required far more people and far larger support networks engaging in resistance. Many underground networks operated on a small budget, and although they required more specialized equipment, they generally required far fewer resources than mass movements.

Strategic Criteria Checklist

Continuing this scenario a bit further, historians asked: how well did Decisive Ecological Warfare rate on the checklist of strategic criteria we provided at the end of the Introduction to Strategy (Chapter 12, page 385 of the *Deep Green Resistance* book).

Objective

This strategy had a clear, well-defined, and attainable objective.

Feasibility

This strategy had a clear A to B path from the then-current context to the desired objective, as well as contingencies to deal with setbacks and upsets. Many believed it was a more coherent and feasible strategy than any other they'd seen proposed to deal with these problems.

Resource Limitations

How many people are required for a serious and successful resistance movement? Can we get a ballpark number from historical resistance movements and insurgencies of all kinds?

The French Resistance

Success indeterminate. As we noted in the "The Psychology of Resistance" chapter: The French Resistance at most comprised perhaps 1 percent of the adult population, or about 200,000 people.[26] The postwar French government officially recognized 220,000 people[27] (though one historian estimates that the number of active resisters could have been as many as 400,000[28]). In addition to active resisters, there were perhaps another 300,000 with substantial involvement.[29] If you include all of those people who were willing to take the risk of reading the underground newspapers, the pool of sympathizers grows to about 10 percent of the adult population, or two million people. [30] The total population of France in 1940 was about forty-two million, so recognized resisters made up one out of every 200 people.

The Irish Republican Army

Successful. At the peak of Irish resistance to British rule, the Irish War of Independence (which built on 700 years of resistance culture), the IRA had about 100,000 members (or just over 2 percent of the population of 4.5 million), about 15,000 of whom participated in the guerrilla war, and 3,000 of whom were fighters at any one time. Some of the most critical and decisive militants were in the "Twelve Disciples," a tiny number of people who swung the course of the war. The population of occupying England at the time was about twenty-five million, with another 7.5 million in Scotland and Wales. So the IRA membership comprised one out of every forty Irish people, and one out of every 365 people in the UK. Collins's Twelve Disciples were one out of 300,000 in the Irish population.[31]

The antioccupation Iraqi insurgency

Indeterminate success. How many insurgents are operating in Iraq? Estimates vary widely and are often politically motivated, either to make the occupation seem successful or to justify further military crackdowns, and so on. US military estimates circa 2006 claim 8,000–20,000 people.[32] Iraqi intelligence estimates are higher. The total population is thirty-one million, with a land area about 438,000 square kilometers. If there are 20,000 insurgents, then that is one insurgent for every 1,550 people.

The African National Congress

Successful. How many ANC members were there? Circa 1979, the "formal political underground" consisted of 300 to 500 individuals, mostly in larger urban centers.[33] The South African population was about twenty-eight million at the time, but census data for the period is notoriously unreliable due to noncooperation. That means the number of formal underground ANC members in 1979 was one out of every 56,000.

The Weather Underground

Unsuccessful. Several hundred initially, gradually dwindling over time. In 1970 the US population was 179 million, so they were literally one in a million.

The Black Panthers

Indeterminate success. Peak membership was in late 1960s with over 2,000 members in multiple cities.[34] That's about one in 100,000.

North Vietnamese Communist alliance during Second Indochina War

Successful. Strength of about half a million in 1968, versus 1.2 million anti-Communist soldiers. One figure puts the size of the Vietcong army in 1964 at 1 million.[35] It's difficult to get a clear figure for total of combatants and

noncombatants because of the widespread logistical support in many areas. Population in late 1960s was around forty million (both North and South), so in 1968, about one of every eighty Vietnamese people was fighting for the Communists.

Spanish Revolutionaries in the Spanish Civil War

Both successful and unsuccessful. The National Confederation of Labor (CNT) in Spain had a membership of about three million at its height. A major driving force within the CNT was the anarchist FAI, a loose alliance of militant affinity groups. The Iberian Anarchist Federation (FAI) had a membership of perhaps 5,000 to 30,000 just prior to revolution, a number which increased significantly with the onset of war. The CNT and FAI were successful in bringing about a revolution in part of Spain, but were later defeated on a national scale by the Fascists. The Spanish population was about 26 million. So about one in nine Spaniards were CNT members, and (assuming the higher figure) about one in 870 Spaniards was FAI members.

Poll tax resistance against Margaret Thatcher circa 1990

Successful. About fourteen million people were mobilized. In a population of about fifty-seven million, that's about one in four (although most of those people participated mostly by refusing to pay a new tax).

British suffragists

Successful. It's hard to find absolute numbers for all suffragists. However, there were about 600 nonmilitant women's suffrage societies. There were also militants, of whom over a thousand went to jail. The militants made all suffrage groups—even the nonmilitant ones—swell in numbers. Based on the British population at the time, the militants were perhaps one in 15,000 women, and there was a nonmilitant suffrage society for every 25,000 women.[36]

Sobibor uprising

Successful. Less than a dozen core organizers and conspirators. Majority of people broke out of the camp and the camp was shut down. Up to that point perhaps a quarter of a million people had been killed at the camp. The core organizers made up perhaps one in sixty of the Jewish occupants of the camp at the time, and perhaps one in 25,000 of those who had passed through the camp on the way to their deaths.

It's clear that a small group of intelligent, dedicated, and daring people can be extremely effective, even if they only number one in 1,000, or one in 10,000, or even one in 100,000. But they are effective in large part through an ability to mobilize larger forces, whether those forces are social movements (perhaps through noncooperation campaigns like the poll tax) or industrial bottlenecks.

Furthermore, it's clear that if that core group can be maintained, it's possible for it to eventually enlarge itself and become victorious.

All that said, future historians discussing this scenario will comment that DEW was designed to make maximum use of small numbers, rather than assuming that large numbers of people would materialize for timely action. If more people had been available, the strategy would have become even more effective. Furthermore, they might comment that this strategy attempted to mobilize people from a wide variety of backgrounds in ways that were feasible for them; it didn't rely solely on militancy (which would have excluded large numbers of people) or on symbolic approaches (which would have provoked cynicism through failure).

Tactics

The tactics required for DEW were relatively simple and accessible, and many of them were low risk. They were appropriate to the scale and seriousness of the objective and the problem. Before the beginnings of DEW, the required tactics were not being implemented because of a lack of overall strategy and of organizational development both above- and underground.

However, that strategy and organization were not technically difficult to develop—the main obstacles were ideological.

Risk

In evaluating risk, members of the resistance and future historians considered both the risks of acting and the risks of not acting: the risks of implementing a given strategy and the risks of not implementing it. In their case, the failure to carry out an effective strategy would have resulted in a destroyed planet and the loss of centuries of social justice efforts. The failure to carry out an effective strategy (or a failure to act at all) would have killed billions of humans and countless nonhumans. There were substantial risks for taking decisive action, risks that caused most people to stick to safer symbolic forms of action. But the risks of inaction were far greater and more permanent.

Timeliness

Properly implemented, Decisive Ecological Warfare was able to accomplish its objective within a suitable time frame, and in a reasonable sequence. Under DEW, decisive action was scaled up as rapidly as it could be based on the underlying support infrastructure. The exact point of no return for catastrophic climate change was unclear, but if there are historians or anyone else alive in the future, DEW and other measures were able to head off that level of climate change. Most other proposed measures in the beginning weren't even trying to do so.

Simplicity and Consistency

Although a fair amount of context and knowledge was required to carry out this strategy, at its core it was very simple and consistent. It was robust enough to deal with unexpected events, and it could be explained in a simple and clear manner without jargon. The strategy was adaptable enough to be employed in many different local contexts.

Consequences

Action and inaction both have serious consequences. A serious collapse—which could involve large-scale human suffering—was frightening to many. Resisters in this alternate future believed first and foremost that a terrible outcome was not inevitable, and that they could make real changes to the way the future unfolded.

1. Even the US military now recognizes this. See Macalister, "US Military Warns Oil Output May Dip Causing Massive Shortages by 2015."
2. Aric and Derrick explored the relationships between collapse, carrying capacity, racism, and the Nazis in the closing chapters of *What We Leave Behind*.
3. Shortly after this was written, the government of Spain cancelled $24 billion worth of solar investments to avoid spiraling into a national debt crisis that they worried would collapse their economy.
4. See Kevin Bales's important book *Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy*.
5. See International Union of Forest Research Organizations, "Adaptation of Forests and People to Climate Change." Also, the conversion of forests into carbon emitters because of warming. disease. logging. and fires is already happening (Kurz et al., "Mountain Pine Beetle").

6. *Science Daily*, "Regional Nuclear War Could Devastate Global Climate."

7. *Science Daily*, "Regional Nuclear Conflict Would Create Near-Global Ozone Hole, Says Study."

8. Cobalt bombs are nuclear bombs with a cobalt jacket. They were the "doomsday device" in the film *Dr. Strangelove.* Regular fallout has a half-life of days. but cobalt bomb fallout would have a half-life in excess of five years. Some experts believe that cobalt bombs could literally destroy all life on Earth.

9. Novacek et al., "The Current Biodiversity Extinction Event."

10. See Lovelock, *The Ages of Gaia: A Biography of Our Living Earth*.

11. Core samples from the floor of the Arctic Ocean show that about fifty-five million years ago the region was tropical because of a spike in atmospheric CO_2. The biota ringing the ocean was swampy with dense sequoia and cypress trees. and "mosquitoes the size of your head." The year-round average temperature was about 23°C (74°F). Since the Arctic Circle has twenty-four-hour sunlight for most of the summer and twenty-four-hour dark for most of the winter, this average must have been associated with remarkable temperature extremes. Most of the planet was virtually uninhabitable by our standards. The growth of heat-tolerant ferns eventually sequestered carbon and returned the planet to a cooler state, but that took almost a million years to occur. See Associated Press, "Arctic Circle—Ancient Vacation Hotspot?"

12. Congressional Research Service, "Energy Use in Agriculture: Background and Issues."

13. Energy Information Administration, "EIA Annual Energy Review 2008," p. 3.

14. Remember that even now. with plenty of surplus food and housing available. there are tens of millions of unsettled refugees in various parts of the world (not counting those who have been uprooted from traditional landbases and resettled in urban slums).

15. That is net population growth, the number of daily births minus the number of daily deaths.

16. For example, Joseph Tainter writes that "[a] society has collapsed when it displays a rapid, significant loss of an established level of sociopolitical complexity."

17. Again, criteria here based on Tainter.

18. Quotation from a speech by Dimitry Orlov, "Social Collapse Best Practices," given in San Francisco on February 13, 2009, online at http://cluborlov.blogspot.com/2009/02/social-collapse-best-practices.html

19. Markusen, The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing, p. 152.

20. Transcripts of the trial are a matter of public record. See "The Proceedings of the Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremburg," vol. 15, p. 350, at http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/NT_major-war-criminals.html

21. Collins, Grand Strategy, p. 214.

22. Ibid., p. 230.

23. Pape, Bombing to Win, pp. 77-78.

24. Ibid., p. 317.

25. Pape discusses how his preferred strategy of transportation disruption might play out in different settings. "Against an exceptionally import-dependent economy," he writes, "such as Japan in World War II, disruption of transportation can best be accomplished by blockading sea routes, using air power less for bombing than for shipping attack and mining. If imports can be totally cut off, the target economy will collapse when domestic stockpiles are exhausted; the Japanese merchant marine was essentially destroyed by the end of 1944, leading to the collapse of war production by the middle of 1945." Even increasing the cost of imports would have a beneficial effect. The pirates of Somalia are currently doing an excellent job of increasing the cost of international shipping, through delays, ransoms, increased insurance costs, and military expenses for defending the ships. So far, piracy off the coast of Somalia doesn't even require fund raising-it's a self- sufficient business enterprise.

Conversely, Pape writes: "Against a relatively resource-rich economy, such as Nazi-controlled Europe, strategic interdiction requires stopping the flow of commerce along domestic railroad, highway, and canal systems by

destroying key nodes (bridges, canal locks, and railroad marshalling yards), moving traffic, and rolling stock and cargo vessels. This mission is hard because commercial transportation systems are large and redundant and are rarely used to full capacity. Thus, the United States could not bring the German economy to quick collapse even though U.S. air forces were vastly superior."

26. Laffont, Dictionnaire historique, p. 399. This number is according to François Marcot, professor of history at the Sorbonne.

27. Collins Weitz, Sisters in the Resistance, p. 10.

28. Paxton, Vichy France, p. 294.

29. Again, according to François Marcot.

30. Paxton, Vichy France, p 294.

31. Jefferies, "The UK Population."

32. BBC News, "Guide: Armed Groups in Iraq."

33. Barrell, "Conscripts to Their Age," p. 495. Interview with Mac Maharaj, IV/Maharaj.

34. Britannica, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/68134/Black-Panther-Party

35. Demma, "The U.S. Army," chapter 28.

36. These being very approximate numbers based on Mackenzie, Shoulder to Shoulder.

Note: Though the resistance movement will have different phases and parts, the Deep Green Resistance organization is, will always be, and is committed to only being an aboveground group.

DEEP GREEN RESISTANCE BYLAWS

The bylaws lay out the Deep Green Resistance organizational structure. Download the full bylaws (docx), or read this summary:

General

DGR is formed with the goal of advancing the aboveground strategies laid out in the book *Deep Green Resistance: Strategy to Save the Planet*, including, but not limited to:

1. Building a culture of resistance against industrial civilization;
2. Normalizing the idea of underground resistance; and
3. Engaging in aboveground political struggles.

DGR members follow our Statement of Principles and Code of Conduct.

Steering Committee

The DGR Steering Committee helps the organization set policy and organize strategically for long-term, sustained success. The committee consists of an advisory board with three permanent members, and four to eight members elected each year by the general DGR membership.

View current members

Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee members are appointed by the Steering Committee to perform the basic functions that keep DGR running.

Membership

Prospective members must agree to abide by the [Statemont of Principles and Code of Conduct](#), be approved by the Personnel Committee, and commit to paying regular dues and/or submitting periodic Member Action Proposals for planned projects. Once accepted into DGR, members gain access to tools for internal communication, may vote for the elected positions of the Steering Committee, and may request funds for projects.

Chapters

The basic unit of local DGR organization is the [chapter](#). Most of the day-to-day decisions about DGR's local activities are made within chapters. Therefore, DGR places great importance on chapter organizing. DGR members benefit from forming or joining DGR chapters by gaining a community of like-minded individuals and a formal vehicle with which to do activism locally.

Chapters should meet locally at least once a month, and consider creating administrative roles, such as coordinator, membership coordinator, contact coordinator, treasurer, and literature coordinator.

Meetings

DGR holds general conference calls, an annual member conference, and encourages regional and local gatherings and meetings.

Caucuses

DGR provides spaces for marginalized classes to wield collective power and organize privately through [caucuses](#). Caucuses are accessible only to those who belong to the group for which it was created.

Conflict Resolution

The three-member Conflict Resolution Committee facilitates timely, supportive, and positive resolution of conflicts for members of DGR with the goal of maintaining organizational effectiveness despite differences in personality or opinion. This policy provides members an avenue to address and resolve interpersonal conflicts, grievances, and complaints.

Finances

The Fundraising Committee gathers donations, which are distributed quarterly by the Treasurer in response to Member Action Proposals. Funding decisions are based on DGR's strategic mission and action priorities.