

"This essay was submitted as part of TNI's call for papers for its [State of Power 2015 report](#). The essay was not shortlisted for the final report and therefore TNI does not take responsibility for its contents. However the Editorial Board appreciated the essay and it is posted here as recommended reading."

The Global Ecological Crisis and Weaving New Power Relationships

Skye Bougsty-Marshall

Abstract

The expanding litany of scientific warnings coupled with the mounting lived experience of the imminent climate crisis cannot curb the ecological destructiveness of capitalism, nor move states to break with its logic to preserve the integrity of the earth. To confront these pathological sets of social relationships, this paper examines how power operates to produce us as subjects who then act to conform to this system and the deformed set of values it fosters. Only through understanding the functioning of power can we effectively resist the operations of capitalism bringing about global ecological catastrophe and begin to recompose our social and ecological relations. The further challenge explored by this paper becomes how to connect the multiplicity of resistances into a global rhizomatic network of experiments in practices of disobedience and of striving to realize new worlds.

The current and accelerating scale with which the global capitalist system ravages ecosystems is staggering as it transgresses various ecological planetary boundaries, from massive species extinction and ocean acidification to climate change, radically threatening life on this planet. The window for even radical action is rapidly closing. Therefore, we need to understand the relations of power underpinning this system in order to develop modes of resistance that have the potential to avert planetary collapse.

Through adopting a local analysis of power that allows us to conceive of power as an acentered network of intersecting lines of relations, one can begin to recognize capitalism and the state not as entities, but as comprised of a set of social relationships and local operations of power. Such a perspective reveals how effective disobedience can be conceived not as a direct clash with constituted power but instead as the withdrawal of consent to the political order, as a direct negation of its legitimacy. This approach proceeds by deactivating these enslaving relationships and opening spaces to create political conditions to engage in ongoing experiments with developing new harmonious social and ecological relationships. The pressing task then becomes how to bring together and coordinate these new spaces of freedom to weave them into a global web of connections. This network of connections can serve to strategically codify and coordinate resistances and alternative experimental political practices that foster

new subjectivities and social relationships offering hope of averting the looming planetary collapse.

Planetary Emergency

The depth and scale of anthropogenic impacts on global ecosystems present humanity with the grave and urgent need to radically reconstitute society as a whole in order to reconfigure our relationship with the planet on which we depend. As 150-200 species go extinct daily in the midst of the sixth mass extinction in planetary history,¹ global emissions continued to increase 2.1% in 2013.² Updating the data from the most recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—the authoritative (though conservative) international scientific body on climate change—if emissions continue at current levels we have 21 years until we will reach the level of concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere associated with catastrophic climate change in excess of 2°C.³ The recent bilateral pledge made by the United States and China received a great deal of fanfare and would commit the former to reduce its carbon emissions at least 26 percent below 2005 levels by 2025 and the latter to both get 20 percent of its energy from renewables and peak its emissions by 2030. However, experts suggest the voluntary pledges are more politically significant than substantive, as they would likely only change global temperature increases by 0.1°C.⁴

This trajectory is rendered even more despairing against the backdrop of a growing chorus of respected scientists, including NASA's James Hansen, who argue that the evidence suggests that not 2°C but 1°C of warming is the maximum we can afford before tipping points are triggered that lock in irreversible catastrophic climate change.⁵ In a mere six years we will have exceeded the emissions limit associated with staying under 1.5°C increase in temperatures.⁶ Meanwhile, states across the globe continue to facilitate the destruction of the global capitalist machine, with governments of G20 states spending an estimated \$88 billion annually on fossil fuel *exploration*.⁷ In fact, in 2012, global subsidies for the production and use of fossil fuels were estimated to be \$775 billion, while subsidies for renewable energy stood at \$101 billion in 2013.⁸ Taken together, climate change and the other cascading ecological crises we face will have a profound impact on our species and the entire living world.

Capitalism = Climate Chaos

The virtually unparalleled level of scientific consensus surrounding the gravity of the threat of climate change, as well as the almost daily release of further documentation of the extent of intersecting ecological crises, cannot assail or forestall the economic logic of capitalism. Capitalism is an economic system predicated on endless growth which is incompatible with ecosystemic integrity on a finite planet. This can be illustrated through Marx's "general formula of capital"—M-C-M'. In a simple commodity (C) economy, money (M) is simply used as a medium to facilitate exchange between commodities with particular use values—schematized as C-M-C. In this process an exchange begins with one commodity and the process terminates with the consumption of the other commodity, with money functioning as the intermediary for the exchange.

Under capitalism, however, money is exchanged for labor and material means of production in order to produce a new commodity (C), which is to be exchanged for a greater amount of money (M'), with M' representing the value of the original input plus the added value, which is considered surplus value or profit ($M + \Delta m$).⁹ And due to the coercive laws of competition the capitalist is forced to again reinvest this money (M') into the production process to remain competitive because if she does not then her competitor who did invest in cost-saving improvements to the production process will eventually out-compete her. Thus the process does not logically end with obtaining M', but instead this is reinvested starting a new phase in the circuit and leading to M-C-M'', then to M-C-M''', and so on in an endless sequence of accumulation. Thus capital reflects an ineluctable drive to ever-increasing accumulation, which perpetually requires consumption of more resources and energy, the creation of more waste, and the inevitable ecological degradation associated with the capitalist necessity for ceaseless growth on a limited earth.

Moreover, the systematic despoliation or “underproduction” of the conditions of production constitutes another unavoidable ecologically destructive feature embedded in the logic of capitalism.¹⁰ As mentioned above, the drive for greater accumulation coupled with the laws of competition cause capitalist corporations and states to be inherently motivated to minimize costs associated with worker welfare and ecological protection. Capitalism deteriorates ecosystems through extraction of raw materials and dumping of toxins and waste, erodes the mental and physical well-being of the labor force, and wears down infrastructure created by the state. Underproduction of these conditions of production occurs when corporations and states, through pursuing strategies for profit accumulation that result in degeneration of soils, abysmal working conditions, and crumbling infrastructures, fail to protect or replenish these conditions of production. Thus, capitalists are driven to externalize costs in order to accumulate, but in not caring for ecology and worker health, they ultimately destroy the foundation upon which production and accumulation is based. We will see this ever more clearly with the phenomenon of climate change.

Furthermore, capital, as a pure economic logic, abetted and intensified by neoliberalism, strives to reformulate social, political, ecological, aesthetic, moral, and community values as economic values. Through its univocal conception of value, capital serves to shape our actions and how we imagine our relationships with one another and the ecosystems that support us, as well as mediates how we cooperate together to reproduce our world. This reconfiguration of personal and social life in strictly economic terms obliterates a whole ecosystem of values which are foundational to the continued maintenance of life on this planet. This inherent drive of capitalism to commodify ecological values, when multiplied and extended globally by its structural imperative for endless expansion, leads to the devastation of the natural world we are ever more acutely experiencing. The relative imperviousness of the continuing flows of financing from Wall Street—as the embodiment of global financial capital—to extractive industries, even as these businesses’ activities are directly and transparently causing the climate catastrophe (not to mention their literal mutilation of communities and ecosystems), testifies to this singular rapaciousness. For instance, 2013 was a record

year for coal financing, with commercial banks providing more than \$88 billion to the main 65 coal companies, which amounts to four times more than was provided in 2005.¹¹

Power Irrigates the Social Body

Despite the immiseration and chaos this system engenders and on which it feeds, we remain obedient to and even actively enable it. This stems from the productive nature of power and the occlusion of its operations that ensure we largely misapprehend its workings. Power is successful to the extent that it is able to mask its operations.¹² Power functions to produce us as subjects who then unknowingly become accomplices in our self-enslavement and obedience to this system.

We are accustomed to the view of power as that force which is external to the actor and impinges on, constrains, represses, or subordinates her actions. However, following Foucault, power crucially is productive and creative. It forms and formulates the subject through providing coordinates for her social positioning—as student, worker, professional, heterosexual, consumer, black, woman, debtor—that she, in turn, lives through thereby rendering such position coextensive with her social identity and orienting the vectors of her desires.¹³ For instance, subjects engage in gender identity-producing performances through acting out a predetermined and subtle script—the clothes we wear, the make-up we put on, etc. There are hundreds of minute norm-conforming performances we act out daily in ways of which we are largely unaware but in so doing perpetuate these norms and govern ourselves and one another. The norm is reproduced through the acts of subjects that seek to approximate it, through the normalizing idealizations concretized in and through these acts.¹⁴

This is how subjects are both the effect and vehicle of power. Discourses and normative constraints are not external to individuals, but are guaranteed by individuals subscribing to them and reproduced through being subjected by them. The operation of power through subjects internalizing and then self-activating these mechanisms of power effaces power relations and dominance, rendering them difficult to perceive, as we act in apparent freedom and participate in their (re)production in the ways we relate to and govern ourselves, our bodies, and each other.¹⁵ Power can infuse and achieve effective control “over the entire life of the population only when it becomes an integral, vital function that every individual embraces and reactivates of his or her own accord.”¹⁶

We can see this in the freedom associated with flexible work and self-entrepreneurship—the seductive promise held out in neoliberal discourse—that manifests in a significant focus on self-investment and maximal responsibility for one’s own conduct. This obfuscates and depoliticizes any causal role of systemic social and economic factors bearing on one’s relative economic success, which greatly reduces the capacity for collective organizing and political action. It also induces highly individualized orientations and voluntaristic modes for addressing collective problems. Thus, ecological problems are recast in terms of individual actions and proposed solutions

mediated by the market. This must be countered to re-politicize the collective nature of such problems and the commensurate collectivized responses required.

Thus, we must conceive of power as not merely suppressive or repressive, operating on its objects (“from above”), but also as productive and creative, operating within and through them (“from below”), as not in a position of exteriority to other relationships but interior to and traversing them. This means that power, in addition to bringing about that which must be resisted, also, and more perniciously, gives rise to the forms resistance assumes.¹⁷ Because power shapes and configures its own resistance, it is crucial to engage in analysis of specific power mechanisms to properly understand the operation of power.

For instance, the proliferation of environmental NGOs is viewed as a necessary counter-weight and the primary form of resistance to the ever-increasing destructive ecological effects of global capitalism. Populated by dedicated individuals and frequently performing noble work, NGOs’ financial dependence on foundations inherently circumscribes the scope of their work to what will receive funding, which unfortunately structurally excludes fundamental changes to the system from which funders clearly benefit. Channeling resistance through NGOs also tends to neutralizes more radical, systemic forms of dissent through institutionalizing the actors and their demands into avenues that can be more easily managed by capitalism and the state. Hence, this approach to power enables us to apprehend modes of resistance against domination of people and ecosystems by capitalism and the state that do not inadvertently reinscribe and reinforce those very power relationships.

Sets of Social Relations

In the early 20th century, German anarchist Gustav Landauer argued that social and political formations, like the state and capital, depend fundamentally for their existence on individuals continuing to give them their support. Thus, withdrawal of this support and constituting ourselves apart from these institutions, thereby rendering them redundant, is the key to dissolving them.¹⁸ On this view, capitalism and the state are sets of relations, and our obedient practices and behaviors serve as the basis for their continuance, even as we are currently bound to them in hopes of meeting our material needs.

The network of power relations forms a “dense web that passes through apparatuses and institutions, without being exactly localized in them.”¹⁹ Thus power is not like an object that is acquired or held, but rather it is exercised from innumerable points in a network of shifting relations. This understanding of social and political space as exhaustively comprised by a complex web of intersecting power relationships does not preclude particular lines and points in the network—like the state or capitalism—from being more socially determinative than others. However, the state is not a “thing” exterior to us that can be seized and wielded by a dominant class or group to end capitalism without thereby merely reproducing the intricate network of power relations that manifests in exploitation, domination, irreducible forms of oppression (e.g.,

patriarchy, racism, heterosexism, etc.), and deterioration of the biosphere. We are not controlled by a state or capital as institutions apart from us, set above or outside a “civil society,” but instead “we all govern each other through a complex web of capillary relations of power.”²⁰

This is not to say the state or capital are not real or do not have material effects, that they can simply be wished away, or that the profane violence wrought by each and in tandem is an illusion, but it is to reveal the critical foundation of their existence. Macropolitical practices or relations like the state and global capitalism are products of the manifold intersections and confluence of specific local, or micropolitical, practices and must be understood and assayed on the basis of them. We are disciplined in countless ways through school, for example, to be individualistic and competitive to mirror our economy rather than nurture cooperation and a conception of ourselves as a collective “we”. The innumerable interconnections in the world are effaced through money and commodities mediating our relationships. As such, we do not care to think about how the electricity is produced as we are spellbound by television, or about our complicity in the enforced poverty, grotesque working conditions, and terrible pollution that go into extracting rare earth metals to enable us to enjoy our new (obsolescent) cell phones. It is a grave, and historically borne out, error to believe that the destruction or replacement of dominating macropolitical arrangements will result in the dissolution of the complex power relations and the oppressive effects reflected in them.²¹

In analyzing capitalism and the state form as particular sets of relations among subjects and the local practices yielded through the myriad interactions of such relations, we can see how deactivating and reconceiving these relationships through the connection of experiments—even if initially small in scale—in the construction of alternative modes of social, political and economic relations and organization is critical. This can offer a way to avoid both the indefinite wait for the revolution to arrive (which, in aspiring to totalizing transformation through enacting a changing of the guard at the helm of the state, will leave unaddressed the underlying power relations) and the perpetuation of existing forms of domination through injecting energy into them anew through reformist demands.²²

This politics of demand can change the content of these structures of domination and exploitation but it cannot change them as dominating and exploiting structures; it cannot alter the nature of the relationships constituting them, their form. This serves as an example of how power gives shape to its own resistance that can unintentionally reinscribe the power relations it seeks to resist. To the extent that we continue to come to the state to mediate and redress our grievances, we remain circumscribed within the horizons of state logic, perpetuating the set of relationships constitutive of the political system each time we make claims or demands upon it for the conferral of recognition, inclusion, or gifts of heretofore denied rights. These demands can affect policies only within the unquestionable parameters of capitalism, private property, and profit and the destructive ecological effects endemic to these, as outlined above. This is not to maintain that struggling for reforms is never worthwhile—e.g., to sometimes achieve important short-term palliatives to mitigate the most severe depravities of capitalism

and, in the case of the United Nations climate negotiations, to not completely cede the negotiating terrain to untrammelled corporate and national government interests. But it is to accentuate the consequences of this politics of demand that both provides the state with positive energy which could be directed towards building alternatives and serves to relegitimize and further sediment the set of social relationships constituting the dominant global political order.

Armed with this analytic lens for understanding the multifarious ways local power relations constitute macropolitical practices of the state and global capital, we can orient ourselves to evaluate the complex bonds, specific practices, psychic attachments, idealizations, and investments of desire as specifically contributing to the macropolitical functioning of the state and capital or, in contrast, eroding and undermining their operation, weaving different relationships that do not sustain those constituting these social formations. If we are capitalism and the state and each is in all of us, then we must subtract ourselves from this condition and create openings in which we can come to define ourselves through different relations.²³ Thus, disobedience can work to depose the political order through removing the vital energy and reconfiguring the social relationships and practices on which the system depends and that serve as its basis for perpetuation. The existence of the state and capitalism is sustained through psychic attachment to and co-dependency on their power, through the persistent acknowledgement and idealization of the dominant authority of each.²⁴ Change will only come through individuals withdrawing their collective support and undertaking at a micropolitical level to deactivate the multiplicity of ways in which we are bound to the prevailing organization of power at the level of our social relationships and subjectivities.

Networks and Rhizomes

This withdrawal from the system does not carry with it a hegemonic, universal program for constructing new social and ecological relations. It will be a perpetual process of openness and experimentation with alternatives developed through a continual (re)negotiation of common social values using participatory democratic practices.²⁵ As we have seen, the traditional revolutionary strategy as a direct assault on the heart of the state and its nerve centers to stop capitalism's destruction of ecosystems does not reflect how power fully operates and, therefore, results in entanglement within the existing system. What is required is a response of a "diffused process of disintegration," a process that is open and attacks power in its nodes, in appreciation of its reticular nature.²⁶ The critical issue is how we can build a network of resistances to deactivate capitalism's assault on the biosphere as quickly as possible, as well as develop collective spaces where we can endeavor to define ourselves through different relations than those sustaining the capitalist system.

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's analysis provides a useful conceptual framework to grapple with this issue. For them, rhizomes are:

acentered systems, finite networks of automata in which communication runs from any neighbor to any other, the stems or channels do not preexist, and all individuals are interchangeable, defined only by their *state* at a given moment—

such that the local operations are coordinated and the final, global result synchronized without a central agency.²⁷

Any element in the rhizomatic arrangement can connect with any other element in a mobile, variable manner, while maintaining their heterogeneity and difference. This is in contrast with a hierarchic model which requires some overarching authority, organization, cause, or idea in relation to which organization is articulated and the identity or status of its constituent parts are defined.²⁸

In a rhizome, connections multiply from any neighbor to any other without a dominant “trunk” or hierarchy of relays or relations along which connections must pass or by which they are ordered. Thus, in the context of a rhizome, there is no integrating operation or signifier, only a non-linear series of infinitely expanding connections distributed in n-dimensions spreading out in all directions. The resultant network exhibits self-organizing capacities arising from these non-fixed connectivities and enabling it to coordinate local operations and synchronize global actions without the addition of a structuring or unifying entity or agency. Kudzu, birds flocking, fish schooling, the internet, and brains’ dense, malleable networks of neurons, axons, and dendrites—all operate significantly as rhizomes.

Therefore, to create the necessary federated and transversal connections between multiple different political struggles against the mangling of our planetary ecosystems requires affirming and connecting at least one consequence or element from each struggle to the other. These shared elements and concrete political practices—e.g., coordinated slogans, actions, tactics, communications, etc.—act as relays between these bodies, serving as connections from which other offshoots may sprout. For instance, beginning on November 24th, 2014, a web of acts of disobedience erupted across the United States, all connected by acting through the consequence of the political condition created by the decision of the grand jury in Ferguson, Missouri, not to indict a white police officer who killed an unarmed black teenager. Powerfully, there is no central authority coordinating the protests that sprang up across 170 US cities, but instead they are the product of a horizontal, decentralized network with many sets of relays in all directions. Moreover, from these connections other offshoots have snaked outward as the struggle for racial justice linked with protests against the economic injustices of Wal-Mart’s practices, as well as the consumerism of Black Friday which resonates with ecological struggles. Thus, we can begin to see how the rhizomatic network must establish relays with other struggles across issues in all directions—racial injustice, ecological loss, economic exploitation, police militarization stemming from global militarization, etc.—in recognition of the interrelationships among the depredations of capitalism.

Zapatistas’ *Encuentro*

The Zapatista practice of the *Encuentro* constitutes a critical example of creating a medium through which to connect many different political struggles acting together to confront the micro and macro relations of capitalist domination.²⁹ According to the Second Declaration of La Realidad, through the *Encuentro* the Zapatistas sought to

facilitate the cultivation of a non-hierarchical, decentralized international network of resistances, recognizing the similarities and differences across struggles.³⁰ It constructed a space with no decision-making authority or representation, no rigid organizational container, where multiple singular political conditions could come together as irreducible struggles maintaining their heterogeneity and autonomy.³¹ Thus, in developing this space and its associated international communication network, the Zapatistas sought “to weave the channels so that words [and actions] may travel all the roads that resist.”³² The *Encuentro* then functions as a medium from which rhizomatic connections can spring and sets of relays can be established, overspilling this open space the Zapatistas created and sending offshoots into the world.

Participants in the second *Encuentro*, held in Spain in 1997, formulated such an offshoot—the plan for Peoples’ Global Action (PGA) began to crystallize as a global network that would serve as a vehicle to go beyond debate and exchanges to coordinate actions against neoliberalism on a global scale.³³ Since its inception the following year in 1998, PGA became one of the most important networks for anti-capitalist and alter-globalization groups and individuals to coordinate actions. Born out of the space cultivated by the *Encuentro*, and serving as an excellent example of the potential and fruits of developing a web of mobile connections, PGA was instrumental in coordinating Global Days of Action as storms of radical disobedience against the World Trade Organization, the G8, and the World Bank.³⁴ In these ways, the Zapatistas have created a global practice of solidarity through their *Encuentros* that facilitated the creation of a rhizomatic network “without hierarchy, centralization, territory, state or party,” comprised of a multiplicity of heterogeneous struggles against neoliberalism.³⁵

The political condition and space opened up by the practice of the *Encuentro* in which connections can proliferate does not subsume or represent its constitutive differentiated elements in reference to a fixed grounding identity or organization and has no distinct existence apart from these concrete elements it brings together. It functions as a condition or basin of attraction around and through which concrete actions and individuals participate, contest, and transform one another, as well as the condition itself. The political condition thus “acts as a mobile and flexible point or proper name like ‘Zapatismo’, ‘Peoples’ Global Action’, or ‘Occupy’, around which diverse groups,” participant-subjects, and practices, responding to different analyses of microrelations of power, can coalesce and take collective action.³⁶

The *Encuentro*’s slogan, “for Humanity and against Neoliberalism,” serves as just such an adaptable referent. At the same time, through its generic formulation of humanity and neoliberalism it creates a maximally inclusive space with a minimum of representation that can bring together and create links among groups and actions that remain unequivocally against neoliberalism, against capitalism and the state.³⁷ Following the model of the *Encuentro*, we can imagine various mutable, generic referents—“for healthy sustainable living and against ecocide,”³⁸ “for the planet and against domination,” etc.—each of which could function as a potential vortex around and through which rhizomatic connections could be formed. Heterogeneous political configurations or struggles (with their own conditions, elements and practices, and

subjects) could then intermix and deploy relays fostered through their participation in this porous political space. To disable the dominant capitalist relations that are global in scope will require correspondingly extensive and intensive networks of radical disobedience that coordinate and conjoin their capacities for disordering and evacuating the political order of its power.

From rhizomatically linking the multifarious practices emerges a “fractal movement space” in which resistances, subversions, participatory democracy, and experiments in alternative modes of living and nurturing relations interact and overspill their local borders iterating across local-to-global levels.³⁹ Within the context of the complex microrelations, interactions, and exchanges comprising this network milieu, unexpected macro-level outcomes can arise that are not capable of being known in advance. This capacity of a complex system for generating emergent properties can have powerful spontaneous, accelerating effects that have the potential to manifest in plateaus. Plateaus are confluences of circumstances that lead activities of radical disobedience, for instance, to a sustained level of intensity that does not automatically exhaust itself in a climax. As such, the “heightening of energies is sustained long enough to leave a kind of afterimage of its dynamism that can be reactivated or injected into other activities, creating a fabric of intensive states between which any number of connecting routes could exist.”⁴⁰

How Do We Change the System and not the Climate?

Drawing on the foregoing analysis, we can begin to see how to create a medium through which to enable the multiplicity of struggles to sow connections to coordinate strategies and actions in a shared existential struggle to prevent ruinous climate change. In such a network, an action by members of Bangladeshi communities against the Phulbari coal mine, which will displace between 50,000-220,000 of them, can be synchronized with actions against the project’s financiers—South African groups targeting Polo Resources Ltd. and activists in New York disrupting LCG Holdings and Luxor Capital Group—while using the media platform afforded by New York and Johannesburg to amplify the message and send off new offshoots.⁴¹ In this way, this network could function as an omnidirectional channel by which to coordinate mutually reinforcing strategies; build sustained affective relationships among groups; share resources (material, media, intellectual), information, best practices, lessons learned, etc.; and connect actions on local-local, local-national, and local-global levels.

This is precisely the type of adoption of shared practices or common participation in a consequence of a political condition that creates connections and generates the potential for offshoots, reinventions, and mutual transformation of practices and the conditions of the practices. The greater the diffusion, number, and variety of the links renders the network more robust, adaptive, and capable of producing hybrids of practices, irruptive conflagrations, and plateaus. Through the connection of elements with significant numbers of interacting individuals, groups, and movements comprising a dynamic open system that continually evolves, the network in turn realizes the potential

for greater reflexivity and self-transformation through iterative feedback loops that can foster the development of even greater complexity among the network.⁴²

Conclusion

The imperative for limitless growth and relentless commodification of ecosystems endemic to the functioning of capitalism means it will ineluctably continue driving catastrophic climate change. As such, we must urgently deactivate the operations of capital through analyzing and attacking the concrete network of local power relations to destabilize the macropolitical system. At the same time, we need to continue subtracting our energies and reconfiguring our social relationships that act to perpetuate this parasitic political order. To meaningfully confront this system which is global in scope and organizes as such will require constructing a global rhizomatic network through which to coordinate strategies, actions, and alternative practices to disintegrate and go beyond capitalism. Only through developing these kinds of mobile, diffuse connections among resistances and experiments in reweaving egalitarian social and ecological relationships can we dissolve the political order that is unraveling the intricate web of global ecosystems on which all life depends.

Bio

Skye Bougsty-Marshall is an international human rights and environmental attorney, researcher, and activist. He has worked across a range of contexts and countries with communities and movements struggling for dignity, self-determination, and sustainable environments in which to live in the face of corporate and state abuses. Presently, his areas of research and work center on developing a global network of movements, groups, and activists to coordinate strategies and actions to urgently confront the social and economic system unraveling ecosystems and driving impending climate catastrophe.

- Jamail, D. (2013, December 17). The coming 'instant planetary emergency'. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <http://www.thenation.com/article/177614/coming-instant-planetary-emergency#>.
- ² Garside, B. (2013, November 18). Global carbon emissions rise to new record in 2013: Report. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/19/us-global-carbon-emissions-idUSBRE9AI00A20131119>.
- ³ Pidcock, R., & Pearce, R. (2014, November 13). Six years worth of current emissions would blow the carbon budget for 1.5 degrees. *The Carbon Brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.carbonbrief.org/blog/2014/11/six-years-worth-of-current-emissions-would-blow-the-carbon-budget-for-1-point-5-degrees/>.
- ⁴ Spross, J. (2014, November 17). At this rate, the world will have to cease all carbon emissions in 2040 to stay under 2°C. *Think Progress*. Retrieved from <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/11/17/3593093/iea-report-carbon-budget-2040/>.
- ⁵ Hansen, J., et al. (2013, December 3). Assessing 'dangerous climate change': Required reduction of carbon emissions to protect young people, future generations and nature. *PLOS ONE*. Retrieved from <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0081648>.
- ⁶ Pidcock, R., & Pearce, R. (2014, November 13). Six years worth of current emissions would blow the carbon budget for 1.5 degrees. *The Carbon Brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.carbonbrief.org/blog/2014/11/six-years-worth-of-current-emissions-would-blow-the-carbon-budget-for-1-point-5-degrees/>.
- ⁷ Bast, E., et al. (2014, November). The fossil fuel bailout: G20 subsidies for oil, gas and coal exploration. *Overseas Development Institute & Oil Change International*. Retrieved from <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9234.pdf>.
- ⁸ Bast, E., et al. (2014, November). The fossil fuel bailout: G20 subsidies for oil, gas and coal exploration. *Overseas Development Institute & Oil Change International*. Retrieved from <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9234.pdf>.
- ⁹ Foster, J.B., & Clark, B. (2012). The planetary emergency. *Monthly Review*, 64(7). Retrieved from <http://monthlyreview.org/2012/12/01/the-planetary-emergency/>.
- ¹⁰ O'Connor, J. (1991). On the two contradictions of capitalism. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 2(3).
- ¹¹ Bank Track. (2014, October). *Banking on coal 2014*. Retrieved from http://www.banktrack.org/show/pages/banking_on_coal_2014_report#tab_pages_main.
- ¹² Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, vol. 1: An introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Random House.
- ¹³ Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- ¹⁴ Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.
- ¹⁵ Lorey, I. (2006, January). Governmentality and self-precarization: On the normalization of cultural producers. *Transversal*. Retrieved from <http://eipcp.net/transversal/1106/lorey/en>.
- ¹⁶ Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 24.
- ¹⁷ May, T. (1995). *The political philosophy of poststructuralist anarchism*. University Park: Penn State University.
- ¹⁸ Lunn, E. (1973). *Prophet of community: The romantic socialism of gustav landauer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- ¹⁹ Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, vol. 1: An introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Random House, 95.
- ²⁰ Day, R.J.F. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. London: Pluto Press, 124-125.
- ²¹ May, T. (1995). *The political philosophy of poststructuralist anarchism*. University Park: Penn State University. It is important to note that neither the micropolitical nor the macropolitical can be completely reduced to the other; there remains a heterogeneity between them notwithstanding their entanglement through their reflexive interplay and mutual supposition and reinforcement.
- ²² Day, R.J.F. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- ²³ Day, R.J.F. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- ²⁴ Newman, S. (2010). Voluntary servitude reconsidered: Radical politics and the problem of self-domination. *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies*, 1. Retrieved from http://anarchist-developments.org/index.php/adcs_journal/article/view/3/3.
- ²⁵ Day, R.J.F. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- ²⁶ Laudani, R. (2013). *Disobedience in western political thought*, (J.F. McGimsey, Trans.). New York: Cambridge, 149.
- ²⁷ Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 17.
- ²⁸ Karatzogianni, A. & Robinson, A. (2010). *Power, resistance and conflict in the contemporary world: Social movements, networks and hierarchies*. New York: Routledge.
- ²⁹ Nail, T. (2012). *Returning to revolution: Deleuze, guattari and zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- ³⁰ EZLN (Zapatista Army of National Liberation). (1996, August 3). Second declaration of la realidad (reality) for humanity against neoliberalism. Retrieved from http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/1996/ccri_encount_aug.html.

- ³¹ Nail, T. (2012). *Returning to revolution: Deleuze, guattari and zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- ³² EZLN (Zapatista Army of National Liberation). (1996, August 3). Second declaration of la realidad (reality) for humanity against neoliberalism. Retrieved from http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/1996/ccri_encount_aug.html.
- ³³ Khasnabish, A. (2010). *Zapatistas: rebellion from the grassroots to the global*. London: Zed Books.
- ³⁴ Khasnabish, A. (2010). *Zapatistas: rebellion from the grassroots to the global*. London: Zed Books.
- ³⁵ Nail, T. (2012). *Returning to revolution: Deleuze, guattari and zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 176.
- ³⁶ Nail, T. (2012). *Returning to revolution: Deleuze, guattari and zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 121-122.
- ³⁷ Nail, T. (2012). *Returning to revolution: Deleuze, guattari and zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- ³⁸ Bougsty, T. (2012). *Healthy sustainable living: A vision for the future of humanity*. Bloomington: IUniverse.
- ³⁹ Chesters, G. & Welsh, I. (2006). *Complexity and social movements: Multitudes at the edge of chaos*. New York: Routledge, 142-143.
- ⁴⁰ Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, x.
- ⁴¹ Bank Track. (2014, November 17). *Dodgy deals: Phulbari coal mine*. Retrieved from http://www.banktrack.org/show/dodgydeals/phulbari_coal_mine#tab_dodgydeals_issues.
- ⁴² Chesters, G. & Welsh, I. (2006). *Complexity and social movements: Multitudes at the edge of chaos*. New York: Routledge.