

Growth Is Plunder

Thinking Politically

ifc Against Miserablism

Richard Burke believes that people revolt when they become convinced that it is possible to succeed.

29 Obama's Scramble for Africa

Nick Turse reports that under President Obama operations in Africa have accelerated far beyond the more limited interventions of the Bush years.

33 Latin America Moves Left and Forward

Carmelo Ruiz-Marrero worries that Latin America's leftist revolution runs on oil and natural gas.

36 Sustainable Colonialism® in the Boreal Forest

Russ McSpadden explains the potential of an indigenous occupation to stave off clearcuts.

38 The Urban Revolution

Richard Burke reviews David Harvey's Rebel Cities.

40 Inside the Psyche of the 1%

Don Fitz documents that people who prize material possessions are significantly less happy.

46 Mr. 1%

Poem by Henry Robertson.

47 Alternative Future

Poem by Henry Robertson.

Less of What We Don't Need

23 A Critique of Jacobson and Delucchi's Proposals for a World Renewable Energy Supply

Ted Trainer calculates that, for several days in a winter month in good wind regions, there would have to be almost total reliance on some other energy source.

Biodevastation

2 We Grow Enough Food but Still Can't End Hunger

Eric Holt-Giménez notes that the bulk of industrially-produced grain crops goes to biofuels and confined animal feedlots.

3 The Politics of Bread in Egypt

Stan Cox observes that prime lands of the Nile Valley and Delta are being lost to urban sprawl.

5 Rio+20: Farmers Mobilize against Green Capitalism

La Via Campesina objects to the irrigation of industrial crops while food crops are left without water.

9 Vavilov's Achievement

Carmelo Ruiz-Marrero remembers a dozen scientists who starved to death while guarding the seed collection.

14 Occupy Monsanto: Occupy the Dialectic

Don Fitz describes an action when police and store management had no idea of what activists were doing until they were in the middle of doing it.

Thinking Economically

21 Did Organized Money Defeat Organized Labor?

Barry Finger realizes that the more labor supports the Democrats, the more labor is treated by them with scorn and contempt.

We Grow Enough Food but Still Can't End Hunger

by Eric Holt-Giménez

A new study from McGill University and the University of Minnesota published in the journal *Nature* compared organic and conventional yields from 66 studies and over 300 trials. Researchers found that on average, conventional systems out-yielded organic farms by 25%—mostly for grains, and depending on conditions.

Embracing the current conventional wisdom, the authors argue for a combination of conventional and organic farming to meet “the twin challenge of feeding a growing population, with rising demand for meat and high-calorie diets, while simultaneously minimizing its global environmental impacts.”

Unfortunately, neither the study nor the conventional wisdom addresses the real cause of hunger.

Hunger is caused by poverty and inequality, not scarcity. For the past two decades, the rate of global food production has increased faster than the rate of global population growth. The world already produces more than 1 ½ times enough food to feed everyone on the planet. That’s enough to feed 10 billion people, the population peak we expect by 2050. But the people making less than \$2 a day—most of whom are resource-poor farmers cultivating unviably small plots of land—can’t afford to buy this food.

In reality, the bulk of industrially-produced grain crops goes to biofuels and confined animal feedlots rather than food for the one billion hungry. The call to double food production by 2050 only applies if we continue to prioritize the growing population of livestock and automobiles over hungry people.

But what about the contentious “yield gap” between conventional and organic farming?

Actually, what this new study does tell us is how much smaller the yield gap is between organic and conventional farming than what critics of organic agriculture have assumed. In fact, for many crops and in many instances, it is minimal. With new advances in seed breeding for organic systems, and with the transition of commercial organic farms to diversified farming systems that have been shown to “overyield,” this yield gap will close even further.

Rodale, the longest-running side-by-side study comparing conventional chemical agriculture with organic methods (now 47 years), found organic yields match conventional in good years and outperform them under drought conditions and environmental distress—a critical property as climate change increasingly serves up extreme weather conditions. Moreover, agroecological practices (basically, farming like a diversified ecosystem) render a higher resis-

tance to extreme climate events which translate into lower vulnerability and higher long-term farm sustainability.

The *Nature* article examined yields in terms of tons per acre and did not address efficiency (i.e. yields per units of water or energy) nor environmental externalities (i.e. the environmental costs of production in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, soil erosion, biodiversity loss, etc) and fails to men-

The bulk of industrially-produced grain crops goes to biofuels and confined animal feedlots.

tion that conventional agricultural research enjoyed 60 years of massive private and public sector support for crop genetic improvement, dwarfing funding for organic agriculture by 99 to 1.

The higher performance of conventional over organic methods may hold between what are essentially both mono-cultural commodity farms. This misleading comparison sets organic agriculture as a straw man to be knocked down by its conventional counterpart. While it is rarely acknowledged, half the food in the world is produced by 1.5 billion farmers working small plots for which monocultures of any kind are unsustainable. Non-commercial

poly-cultures are better for balancing diets and reducing risk, and can thrive without agrochemicals. Agroecological methods that emphasize rich crop diversity in time and space conserve

soils and water and have proven to produce the most rapid, recognizable and sustainable results. In areas in which soils have already been degraded by conventional agriculture’s chemical “packages,” agroecological methods can increase productivity by 100–300%.

This is why the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food released a report advocating for structural reforms and a shift to agroecology. It is why

Hunger is caused by poverty and inequality, not scarcity.

the 400 experts commissioned for the four-year International Assessment on Agriculture, Science and Knowledge for Development (IAASTD 2008) also concluded that agroecology and locally-based food economies (rather than the global market) were the best strategies for combating poverty and hunger.

Raising productivity for resource-poor farmers is one piece of ending hunger, but how this is done—and whether these farmers can gain access to more land—will make a big difference in combating poverty and ensuring sustainable livelihoods. The conventional methods already employed for decades by poor farmers have a poor track record in this regard.

Can conventional agriculture provide the yields we need to feed 10 billion people by 2050? Given climate change, the answer is an unsustainable “maybe.” The question is, at what social and environmental cost? To end hunger we must end poverty and inequality. For this challenge, agroecological approaches and structural reforms that ensure that resource-poor farmers have the land and resources they need for sustainable livelihoods are the best way forward.

Eric Holt-Giménez is the executive director of the Institute for Food and Development Policy, www.foodfirst.org.

The Politics of Bread in Egypt

by Stan Cox

As Egypt’s revolution moves into what could be its most crucial phase, its supporters are demanding that the slogan “bread, dignity, and social justice” be recognized as more than a slogan. But a recent United Nations report warns that “economic issues, which have been central to the Arab uprisings, are trailing behind the political issues” in the struggle over the future of Egypt and its neighbors, “potentially risking the erosion of popular support for democratic transition if they are not properly addressed.”

On the list of economic issues in Egypt, food is never far from the top. As people warily look ahead to a new constitution, presidential elections, and an uncertain future beyond that, one thing is guaranteed: The country’s epic daily struggle to provide bread to every citizen will go on.

Egyptians consume more bread per person than do people in any other nation. Each day, families in every income bracket bake or buy stacks of aish baladi, or “village bread” (aish means “life” as well as “bread”). The light brown, oven-inflated discs are produced by more than 20,000 small, government-subsidized bakeries to be sold for five piasters (less than a US penny) apiece, or by private bakeries that sell at a far higher price.

The government also issues ration cards with which families can buy a given quota of subsidized flour, rice, sugar, cooking oil, and tea each month at

of the United States and all of our agriculture were clustered within 60 kilometers of the Mississippi.

That leaves only one twenty-fifth of a hectare of agricultural land per Egyptian, or a 20-by-20-metre postage stamp of ground sown to wheat, rice, maize, lentils, beans, vegetables, cotton, animal forage, and date palms. As a result, Egypt has become the world’s number-one importer of wheat, and imports a large share of many other food requirements—a trend the country’s new leaders are trying to reverse by increasing yields per hectare.

The country’s crops—all irrigated—are generally very productive, but with every grain harvest, nitrogen, phosphorus, and other nutrients are removed from the soil and must be replaced. Berseem clover, a legume that pulls its nitrogen from the air, is a ubiquitous fodder crop, and the nitrogen- and phosphorus-rich manure from livestock can be returned to the soil. And food crops are often interplanted with date palms, whose long-lived roots help hold the soil. But neither practice can replace the nutrients that are sucked from the land year-round by most food crops.

Therefore, Egypt’s farmers have little choice but to apply very large quantities of synthetic fertilizers in order to maintain their crop yields, making grains like wheat even more costly to produce. And those farmers, the large majority of whom cultivate plots of less than a hectare and a half, are not cash-rich, meaning that the government must step in to pay them a subsidized price for grain in order to keep the farm economy going.

The per-person endowment of cropland is one of the smallest in the world.

designated shops. But, as with people in other countries (most prominently, India) that have public food distribution systems, Egyptians have distinctly mixed feelings about these programs.

Farmland limited

Food security policy has little room to maneuver in Egypt, where the per-person endowment of cropland is one of the smallest in the world. Virtually all 82 million Egyptians, along with almost all agricultural lands, are squeezed into just 5% of the nation’s total land area: A strip running 8 to 15 kilometers wide along the Nile River and fanning out through the Delta. It’s as if the entire population

Vanishing land

The recent United Nations' report recommended a broad range of actions to improve the sustainability of agriculture in the "Arab Spring" nations, including investments in drought-resistant crops and improved water conservation; re-use of agricultural waste; biogas systems to capture methane from manure; agroforestry; focusing investment on small farms; crop diversification; and a reduction in water pollution from fertilizers and other agricultural chemicals. Several of those measures are already being pursued to varying extents in Egypt.

However, some measures have been of doubtful benefit. The average Egyptian has gained little, for example, from an initiative in the Delta region aimed at growing organic crops, mostly vegetables, herbs, and fruits. For

one thing, almost 60% of the organic foods produced end up being exported, mostly to

Europe. The newspaper *Al-Masry Al-Youm* reports: "It is easy to find organic Egyptian herbs and vegetables in Italian and German supermarkets for high prices, while it is difficult to find them in Egypt."

On the other hand, Egyptian families—42% of whom live below the international \$2.50-per-person-per-day poverty line—struggle to meet their monthly requirement for conventionally produced, no-frills fava beans, lentils and vegetables at prices they can afford.

As the revolution struggled during the past year to build a new, democratic foundation for society, the foundation of Egypt's daily bread—its soil—was under increasing threat. Prime lands of the Nile Valley and Delta are being lost at an alarming rate to urban sprawl. Upriver from Cairo, for example, huge private homes with walled-in compounds are sprouting across the landscape in less time than it takes to grow and harvest a crop of wheat. Although the total quantity of farmland in Egypt has increased over the years thanks to the "reclamation" of desert through sprinkler and drip irrigation, those new lands are much less productive than the river-valley soils that have supported Egyptian society since before the time of the Pharaohs.

There have long been laws against building on agricultural land in Egypt, but enforcement has always been lax. During the past year, with the government otherwise occupied, there was virtually no enforcement at all. Powerful economic interests have jumped into that vacuum, and land-grabbing and construction on cropland have accelerated. Economically stressed farmers have a hard time resisting offers of big money from aggressive developers.

The government's minister of supply, Gouda Abdel-Khalek, has raised alarms over the increasing loss of good soils, but the country's new parliament

has mostly ignored his warnings, preferring instead to complain about longstanding problems in the bread distribution system, current shortages of bread and cooking fuel. But activists charge that members of parliament are creating a ruckus about a "bread crisis" and a "butane crisis" as a way of diverting attention from the struggle over Egypt's political and economic future.

That's not to say all is fine in the bread and the ration-card systems. Disparaging the quality of aish baladi seems to be something of a national pastime. In the low-income areas where people depend most heavily on food subsidies, one commonly hears complaints that lines at bread shops are long and supplies tend to run out. Bread and flour shortages occur, allegedly, because significant portions of the heavily subsidized wheat and flour that should be used for making five-piaster bread are instead being sold by millers and bakers on the open market at a healthy profit.

Abdel-Khalek proposes that the bread distribution system be overhauled in a way that would eliminate most incentives for cheating. Under the plan, the government would continue to stockpile imported wheat along with wheat bought from Egyptian farmers at 19% over the market price. Then it would sell that wheat to millers on the open market rather than at a highly subsidized price as is currently done. Mills, in turn, would sell their flour to bakeries at full market price. Each morning, bakeries would deliver bread to retailers at the market price, but the shops would then sell it to the public for the usual, subsidized, five piasters, and the government would make up the difference. That could be done, it has been suggested, by issuing every household a "smart" card that could be used to credit the bread shop's account for the price difference when they buy bread.

When millers and bakers are no longer able to buy subsidized wheat and flour, the thinking goes, they will have no reason to sell on the side, and more five-piaster bread will be produced. But it will not be

easy to restructure a system that for decades fit comfortably into a thoroughly corrupt economy. For one thing, it will be necessary to deal with resistance from the food industries, interest groups, ty-

coons, and politicians who benefit from the current way of doing things.

Food versus cash

As in India, some in Egypt have argued that the government should junk the current food-distribution system completely and simply give people below the poverty line a subsidy in cash, to spend as they like. That idea has long been promoted by World Bank officials and others in the international community.

But such initiatives always fizzle in the face of political and economic realities. A 2010 household survey that asked low-income people about their

Egypt has become the world's number-one importer of wheat.

Prime lands of the Nile Valley and Delta are being lost to urban sprawl.

preferences heard a loud-and-clear answer: Only 2% said they would be willing to give up their food-ration cards, and just 5% would want to see bread distribution halted in favor of a cash-assistance program.

Having lived through a succession of food-price shocks over the years, including the 30% spike that triggered widespread protest in the spring of 2008, Egyptians simply don't want the government to shift the burden of price increases onto their shoulders. It's not so much the steady march of inflation that worries them as it is the wild week-to-week price swings that often occur.

A woman in a village south of Cairo told me last month: "I would be concerned about a cash system. Look at cooking oil. Its price moves up and down so much you'd never know whether or not you could afford to buy it." A farmer from another village said he would not want to see a cash transfer substituted for subsidies, because "quantities are assured" at the ration or bread shop, whatever happens with world food prices. Even if the government promised to raise cash payments annually to keep up

with to the cost of living, he said: "I would not trust such a promise."

Abdel-Khalek, who is also an economics professor, affirms those concerns when he notes that, even though the "ABCs of economics" say that a

Just 5% would want to see bread distribution halted in favor of a cash-assistance program.

cash subsidy is most efficient, "we are dealing with lives here, not textbook situations."

If Egyptians manage to wrest economic and political power from the oligarchs who have held it for so long, they will have a chance to protect their agricultural landscape and ensure a good food supply for everyone. But until that transformation happens, achieving food security along the Nile will remain a day-to-day struggle.

Stan Cox is research coordinator at The Land Institute in Salina, Kansas, USA. He is writing a book on the past and future of rationing.

Rio+20: Farmers Mobilize against Green Capitalism

Position Paper of La Via Campesina

The Rio+20 conference is over, but these warnings are unfortunately as relevant as they were before.

—Editors

June 6, 2012. Governments from all over the world will meet in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil from June 20–22, 2012, to supposedly commemorate 20 years since the "Earth Summit," the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development that established for the first time a global agenda for "sustainable development." During this summit, in 1992, three international conventions were adopted: the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Convention on Climate Change, and the Convention to Fight Desertification. Each of these promised to initiate a series of actions destined to protect the planet and all of the life on it, and to allow all human beings to enjoy a life of dignity.

At that time, many social organizations congratulated and supported these new conventions with hope. Twenty years later, we see the real causes of environmental, economic, and social deterioration continuing without being attacked. Worse still, we are profoundly alarmed that the next meeting in June will serve to deepen neoliberal policies and processes of capitalist expansion, concentration, and exclusion that today have enveloped us in an environmental, economic, and social crisis of grave proportions. Beneath the deceptive and badly intentioned term "green economy," new forms of environmental contamination and destruction are now rolled out along with new waves of privatization, monopolization, and expulsion from our lands and territories. La Via Campesina will mobilize for this event, representing the voice of the peasant in the global debate and defending a different

path to development that is based on the well-being of all, that guarantees food for all, that protects and guarantees that the commons and natural resources are put to use to provide a good life for everyone and not to meet the needs for accumulation of a few.

Twenty years after the Earth Summit, life on the planet has become dramatically difficult. The number of hungry people has increased to almost a billion, which means that one out of every six people is going hungry, mostly children and women in the countryside. Expulsion

Expulsion from our lands and territories is accelerating...

from our lands and territories is accelerating, no longer only due to conditions of disadvantage imposed upon us by trade agreements and the industrial sector, but by new forms of monopoly control over land and water, by the global imposition of intellectual property regimes that steal our seeds, by the in-

vasion of transgenic seeds, and by the advance of monoculture plantations, mega-projects, and mines.

The grand promises of Rio '92 have resulted in a farce. The Convention on Biodiversity has not stopped the destruction of biodiversity and has strengthened and generated new mechanisms destined to privatize it and turn it into merchandise. Desertification continues to accelerate due to industrial agriculture and the expansion of agribusiness and monoculture plantations. Global warming—with all of the disasters and dramatic suffering it is already causing—has not slowed, but has accelerated and become more severe.

The great deceit of 1992 was “sustainable development,” which social organizations initially saw as a possibility to confront the root of the problems. However, it was nothing more than a cover-up for the search for new forms of accumulation. Today they look to legitimize a new façade under the name “green economy.”

The “green economy” and other false solutions

Capitalist profit-seeking has generated the biggest systemic crisis since 1929. Since 2008, the hegemonic system has looked for ways out of its structural crisis, searching for new possibilities for accumulation that support its logic. It is in this context that the corporate takeover of agreements on biodiversity and climate change has occurred, and consequently, the development of this new financial engineering called Green Capitalism.

Governments, business people, and the organizations of the United Nations have spent these last years constructing the myth of the “green economy” and of the “greening of technology.” They present it as a new possibility to bring together environmental stewardship and business, but it is in fact the vehicle to obtain new advances of capitalism, putting the entire planet under the control of big capital. There are various mechanisms that will be advanced by the green economy and all of them will increase the destruction. More specifically:

1. The green economy does not seek to reduce climate change or environmental deterioration, but to generalize the principle that those who

have money can continue polluting. Up to now, they have used the farce of purchasing carbon bonds to continue emitting greenhouse gases. They are now inventing biodiversity bonds. This is to say, businesses can continue destroying forests and ecosystems, as long as they pay someone to supposedly conserve biodiversity somewhere else. Tomorrow they may invent bonds for water, natural “views,” or clean air.

2. These systems of buying environmental services are being used to take lands and territories away from indigenous peoples and peasants. The mechanisms that are most forcefully promoted by governments and businesses are the systems known as REDD and REDD plus. [1] They say that these are systems to reduce greenhouse gas emissions produced by deforestation and degradation of the forests, but they are being used to impose, for a ridiculous price, management plans that deny families and rural communities access to their own lands, forests, and water sources. In addition, they guarantee businesses unrestricted access to collective forest areas, enabling biopiracy. They also impose contracts that tie communities to these management plans for 20 years or more and that leave indigenous and peasant territories with mortgage liens that increase the likelihood that these communities will lose their lands. The ob-

Tomorrow they may invent bonds for water, natural “views,” or clean air.

jectives of these environmental services are to take control of nature reserves and of the territories that are under the control of these communities.

3. Another initiative of the green economy is to convert plants, algae, and all other organic material (residues, dung, etc.) into a source of energy to substitute for petroleum; what is called “use of biomass.” With agrofuels, this has meant that thousands of hectares that should be covered in forests or producing food are being used to feed machines. If the use of biomass energy is effectively expanded, we will see life in the seas reduced still more because an important segment of marine species will go without food. Our soils will not recuperate the organic material that is essential to conserve fertility and guard against erosion and drought. It will be im-

The great deceit of 1992 was “sustainable development...”

GREEN POLITICS — FIND IT ON LINE !



What's in of *Green Politics* (Vol 22, No. 3)?
The emphasis on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO's), with extensive coverage of the recent GMO-Free Midwest symposium in St Louis. Articles on Occupy Monsanto include photos and comments. A look at predator drones shows the ruthlessness of the “targeted assassination” policy of the US.

All issues of *Green Politics* can be seen and downloaded at the Green Party, USA website — <http://www.greenparty.org>

CHECK US OUT!

possible to feed our animals because the food they need is ever more scarce and expensive. Also, the water shortage will worsen, either directly through the cultivation of agrofuels or because our soils no longer have the capacity to absorb and retain water due to a lack of organic matter.

4. Then, they speak to us of “climate smart agriculture,” the goal of which is to convince us to accept a new Green Revolution—possibly with transgenics—and that instead of demanding effective support to defend us from the effects of climate change, we accept laughable payments that function the same way as REDD. They also seek to impose systems that are highly dependent on large quantities of agrotoxins—like direct seeding that depends on aerial sprayings of Round Up—that they would call “low carbon agriculture.” That is to say, we are obliged to accept a certain type of agriculture that will jeopardize control of our territories, our ecosystems, and our water.

5. One of the most perverse aspects of the false solutions that are promoted in international negotiations is the restriction of access to and use of water for irrigation. Using the pretext that water for irrigation is scarce, it is suggested that water be concen-



biodiversity, the countryside, wildlife, seeds, rain, etc.) to then privatize them (arguing that conservation requires money) and charge us for their use. This is called the Economy of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). It is the final assault on nature and life, but also on the means of work and the lives of the people whose livelihoods are based on agriculture, hunting, and fishing.

This “green” capitalism has the rural commons, agriculture, land and water particularly in its sights. We are already suffering from its effects in the form of land grabs or monopolization of land, privatization of water, the oceans, of indigenous territories, the national parks and nature reserves; all these

processes are being accompanied by the forced expulsions of peasant and indigenous communities.

The real solution: put peasant and indigenous farmers at the center.

We, peasants and indigenous peoples, are the ones who are concentrated in the highest levels of poverty because we have been deprived of land and we have been constrained by law or by force so that we cannot cultivate and exchange freely. Nonetheless, we are people who have been resisting expulsion from the countryside, and still we are more than 90% of the rural population. Our forms of agriculture cool the planet, care for ecosystems, and secure the food supply for the poorest.

Every real solution happens to impinge upon the unbridled profits of capital, put an end to the complicity of governments and support forms of production that effectively care for the planet. Food Sovereignty is at the heart of the necessary changes, and is the only real path that can possibly feed all of humanity. Our proposals are clear and introduce real solutions:

1. We should exchange the industrial agro-export food system for a system based on food sovereignty, that returns the land to its social function as the producer of food and sustainer of life; that puts local production of food at the center, as well as the local markets and local processing. Food sovereignty allows us to put an end to monocultures and agribusiness, to foster systems of peasant production that are characterized by greater intensity and productivity, that provide jobs, care for the soil, and produce in a way that is healing and diversified. Peasant and indigenous agriculture also has the ability to cool the planet, with the capacity to absorb or prevent almost

...export crops, agrofuels and other industrial crops are irrigated while food crops are left without water.

trated in “high value crops”; meaning that export crops, agrofuels and other industrial crops are irrigated while food crops are left without water.

6. The promotion of technological solutions that are not solutions at all is also part of the agenda of the discussions in Rio. Among the most dangerous are geo-engineering and the acceptance of transgenic crops. Up until now, none of the solutions proposed by geo-engineering have demonstrated any real capacity to solve climate problems. On the contrary, some forms of geo-engineering (like the fertilization of the seas) are so dangerous that there has been an international moratorium declared against them. To accept genetically modified organisms (GMOs), we are told that crops resistant to drought and heat will be created, but the only thing new in GMOs are more herbicide-resistant varieties, which are bringing back to the market highly toxic herbicides like 2,4-D.

7. The most ambitious plan and the one that some governments identify as “the major challenge” is to put a price on all the goods of nature (like water,

2/3 of the greenhouses gases that are emitted every year.

2. The land currently in the hands of peasants and indigenous peoples is around 20% of all agricul-

Peasant and indigenous agriculture has the ability to absorb or prevent almost 2/3 of the greenhouses gases that are emitted.

tural land in the world. And yet, on this land peasant and indigenous families and communities produce slightly less than half of the world's food. The most secure and efficient way to overcome hunger around the world is in our hands.

4. Peasant and indigenous systems of agriculture, hunting, fishing, and shepherding that care for the land and the food supply should be supported adequately with public resources that are not subject to conditionalities. Market mechanisms—like the sale of carbon and environmental services—should be eliminated and replaced with real measures like those mentioned above. Ending pollution is a duty that no one should be able to avoid by paying for the rights to continue the destruction.

5. The legitimate use of what international organizations and enterprises now call biomass is to feed every living being, and then to be returned to the earth to restore its fertility. The emissions that come from wasted energy should be reduced through saving and eliminating waste. We need renewable, decentralized sources of energy, within reach of the people.

We are mobilized to unmask Rio+20 and green capitalism

We, peasants, family farmers, landless peasants, indigenous peoples and migrants, men and women, decidedly oppose the commercialization of the earth, our territories, water, seeds, food, nature, and human life. We reiterate what was said at the People's Summit in Cochabamba, Bolivia: "Humanity faces a grand dilemma: to continue the path of capitalism, predation, and death, or undertake the path of harmony with nature and respect for life."

We repudiate and denounce the green economy as a new mask to hide increasing

levels of corporate greed and food imperialism in the world, and as a brutal "green washing" of capitalism that only implements false solutions, like carbon trading, REDD, geo-engineering, GMOs, agrofuels, bio-char, and all of the market-based solutions to the environmental crisis.

Our goal is to bring back another way of relating to nature and other people. This is also our duty, and our right and so we will continue fighting and calling on others to continue fighting tirelessly for the construction of food sovereignty, for comprehensive agrarian reform and the restoration of indigenous territories, for ending the violence of capital, and restoring peasant and indigenous systems of production based on agroecology.

Ending pollution is a duty that no one should be able to avoid by paying for the rights to continue the destruction.

"NO" TO THE FALSE SOLUTIONS OF GREEN CAPITALISM!

PEASANT AGRICULTURE NOW!

La Via Campesina is an international movement that brings together about 200 million peasants, small and medium-sized producers, landless, rural workers and Indigenous people from around the world. La Via Campesina advocates sustainable, small-scale, peasant agriculture as a means of promoting social justice and dignity. It brings together more than 150 organizations in about 70 countries of Africa, Asia, Europe and America.

Note

1. La Via reports: "REDD+ constitutes a worldwide land grab and gigantic carbon offset scam. REDD+ is a UN-promoted false solution to climate change and the pillar of the 'green economy....' Officially, REDD+ stands for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation. However, Tom Goldtooth (Dakota/Dine), director of the Indigenous Environmental Network, insists that 'REDD+ really means Reaping profits from Evictions, land grabs, Deforestation and Destruction of biodiversity.' From Peru to Papua New Guinea, carbon cowboys are running amok trying to rip off native communities and grab the forests of the world, 80% of which are found in Indigenous peoples' lands and territories." —Editors

ToxCat



EU & UK POLITICIANS DUMP ON THE PEOPLE

ToxCat provides information on the technical, scientific and medical aspects of toxic issues in an understandable language. Communities Against Toxics, P.O. Box 29, Ellesmere Port, Cheshire CH66 3TX United Kingdom, +44(0)151 339 5473 www.communities-against-toxics.org.uk