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We are proud (and relieved) to present the Social and Climate Justice Caravan 2009 reader. Between the end of November and the beginning of December, representatives of movements from the global South will travel in two buses from Geneva via France, Germany and Belgium to Copenhagen. The caravan starts in Geneva, where members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) meet to negotiate on further trade liberalisation, and will end in Copenhagen, where governments will be negotiating on a future international climate change agreement.

The caravan brings together individuals representing organizations and movements that fight against climate change, neoliberal globalization, the destruction of nature and for the rights of small farmers and indigenous peoples. They come from many countries and regions and their struggles are all different – but they all have a message on climate and social justice to bring to Europe. Through public meetings, discussions and actions, the caravan wants to draw attention to the consequences of trade liberalization and climate change for people and movements in the global South. Through meetings and workshops, participants seek to establish networks with local activists and hope to mobilize as many people as possible to Copenhagen. This reader has been compiled by a small group of people in Berlin. We have tried to turn the reader into a platform through which movements from the global South can present their positions on climate and trade and the struggles they are involved in. The process of compiling the reader reflects very much the conditions and difficulties of linking movements worldwide at grass-roots level – but also the beauty and strength of global solidarity and cooperation.

It would have been great, if the movements themselves could have come together and agreed on what they would like to communicate through this reader – but distances were too long and everyone is involved in daily struggles. We would have liked to see this reader published in many languages, but we did not have enough time nor money. We would have liked to include texts by all the movements participating in the caravan – but not all visas have been confirmed yet, not all activists live close to the internet and our links with movements in some countries are much stronger than with others. And of course, this reader would have looked different had we had more time and had been greater in number. But even under these conditions, we have managed to compile a reader which, we hope, reflects what the caravan is all about – thanks to the support so many people have offered. Translations and proofreading have been done by people all over the world, who have responded to an electronically-circulated call for translators and proofreaders. We mostly know only their names and e-mail addresses – but they have done a brilliant job. We have contacted the caravan participants and many of them have replied. Some of them have travelled to the next city for better internet access, in order to be able to send a photo. Others have written texts in the middle of their daily activities and repression.

We hope that this compilation of texts will give you a strong picture of global struggles – despite potential shortcomings. If you find something is missing here, if you disagree with some of the positions expressed in this reader, if you find it to be ill-balanced in some respect – please remember: this is just another part of an ongoing conversation. Some additional texts and translations will be available at the caravan website www.climatecaravan.org.

Happy travelling on the roads of global grass-root struggles!
Within the climate negotiations are attracting much media and political attention, the Copenhagen meeting is not, however, the only major international meeting at the end of 2009. Shortly before government officials responsible for climate matters leave for Copenhagen, their colleagues responsible for trade will already have returned from Geneva.

Geneva is the seat of the World Trade Organization (WTO) – and it is going to be the location of the 7th Ministerial Conference of the WTO. For the first time since the Seattle debacle in 1999, and exactly ten years after the day the WTO conference had been shut down by protesters, the WTO dares to hold a ministerial conference in a major city in a developed country. In Geneva, trade officials and ministers will try to make “progress” concerning the negotiations on further trade liberalization. They have been trying for some time.

In 2001, trade representatives assembled in Doha for their follow-up meeting after Seattle, far away from any possible protest. They decided that the world economy needed further trade liberalization. Against a background of growing concern by “developing” countries and civil society about the negative social and environmental impact of trade liberalization, in particular in the countries of the global South, the new round of negotiations on further trade liberalization was proclaimed to be a “development round”. The most important issues that were singled out for negotiations are:

- **Further liberalization in the agricultural sector**: Negotiations have focused on a mixture of the reduction of domestic support to agriculture (e.g. in the form of subsidies), limiting support for the export of agricultural goods (e.g. in the form of export subsidies) and tariff cuts for agricultural products. While, after many years and difficulties, negotiations were reported to be close to a “deal” in July 2008, they eventually failed, mostly because India was not satisfied with the modalities of the so-called special safeguard mechanism which is to allow countries to raise tariffs in order to protect poor farmers against sudden increases in the import of agricultural goods.
- **Further liberalization in the service sector**: The service negotiations are, essentially, about different countries making offers on the service sectors and modalities where they would commit themselves to further liberalization. So far, many countries have been reluctant to make further commitments.

**Non-agricultural market access**: This is about further liberalization of trade in non-agricultural products, including the reduction or elimination of tariff and other measures which are considered to be “trade barriers” by trade liberalists. Disagreement is about the level, sectors and modalities of further liberalization. Critics have expressed the view that current negotiation drafts cater mainly to the interests of “developed” countries. However, in total, things have not been going too well for the advocates of further trade liberalization.

Agreement has not been reached in any of the negotiation areas so far – despite years of negotiations. WTO Secretary General Pascal Lamy is desperately trying to put the negotiations back on track by repeatedly calling on parties to be more committed to producing results in the negotiations. And what is civil society doing about all this? Not too much, it seems. While social movements are mobilizing for Copenhagen, much less is happening concerning the trade negotiations in Geneva. Only a few NGOs observe the WTO negotiations closely. Given the fact that a major “breakthrough” in the WTO negotiations is unlikely to occur in Geneva, this choice may be reflecting a certain sense of reality. However, trade liberalization has done enough harm during the past 15 years – and to what degree efforts to mitigate climate change will be successful also depends on future trade patterns. Thus, there are plenty of reasons for taking to the streets of Geneva.

**Trade policies have gendered impacts to men and women**

Trade policies have differential impacts to men and women because of their differences in their access to and control over resources, their roles and positions, their participation in decision-making bodies and processes in society, in the community and households. The continued adherence to the trade policies forged the WTO has however placed our countries into a position of underdevelopment resulting to increasing unemployment, migration from rural communities to urban or outside the country, increasing food prices, hunger and poverty. Trade liberalization policies have resulted among others in the flooding of the market with cheap imported agricultural and fisheries products in our countries and has displaced women farmers in vegetables, rice and other crops, women fishers from their sources of food and livelihood and indigenous women from their ancestral lands.

We believe that marginalized women like rural women should continue to organize and strengthen themselves, articulate their issues and demands and let their voices be heard in the different arenas and continue to forge solidarity with other sectors and movements. Our organization continues to conduct education and information activities and mobilizations to raise our concerns and issues.
called for the strike demanding that the government enact a law to prevent the entry of retail giants. Protest marches were also taken out in different parts of the state.

More than 150,000 traders marched in Thrisur and held a mammoth rally. The speaker of the Kerala Legislative Assembly inaugurated the rally. Many members of parliament and members of Legislative Assemblies were present in the historical rally. After the meeting, all the 150,000 people gathered in the meeting lighted candles and pledged to resist the corporate hijack of retail.

The Halla Bol protests were also organized in other major cities across India.

Free Trade – a critical perspective

The Trade Strategy Group is a forum to discuss and strategise around key trade issues, particularly in order to inform and mobilise broader social movements about South African government policy in the context of national economic perspectives, bilateral and multilateral trade and investment agreements and related multilateral commitments.

Key Principles

The history of “free trade” has always been a history of exploitation and plunder of the earth’s natural resources, where the needs of people have been sacrificed to the demands of corporations for profit and governments supporting them. So it is again today with the World Trade Organisation and “free trade” agreements, which facilitate the further concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few Transnational Corporations and tiny elites in the Global South. Since the launch of the WTO in 1994, we have seen an accelerated process of de-industrialisation, appropriation of our natural resources and destruction of social services, leading to huge job losses and mass impoverishment.

The WTO is not just about imports and exports of goods. Each round of trade negotiations creates increasing encroachments on every aspect of economic and social activity in all countries throughout the world. The WTO seeks to extract wealth from the South, to continue servicing both the debt of the North and the over-consumption within the North. By bringing services, agriculture and food under its control, by creating a new instrument of control through so-called ‘intellectual property rights’, and by trying to also draw investment, competition policy and government procurement within its framework, the WTO takes away governments’ authority to regulate the economic, social and cultural spheres for the benefit of human development and undermines people’s access to and democratic control over their government.

The neoliberal, “free trade” policies institutionalised in the WTO undermine the interests of people both in the South and the North. The WTO’s undemocratic and unaccountable system of operation, based on pressures and arm-twisting by the powerful over the weak has created greater poverty, inequality, gender inequality, and indebtedness throughout the world. It has promoted unsustainable patterns of production and excessive consumption for a minority of the world’s population and is accelerating the destruction of the global environment.

The greater emphasis on bilateral (government-to-government) and regional “free trade” agreements side by side with the WTO’s agreements are other means for promoting the same interests and policies. Because WTO negotiations have slowed down due to pressure from social movements and resistance by groups of some governments in the South, the governments of the rich industrialised countries are seeking to secure their economic interests and those of their corporations through bilateral and regional agreements, e.g. the SA-EU trade agreements or the Economic Partnership Agreements. These agreements are all trying to reinforce the WTO and go further than them with demands for service liberalization, high protections for so-called intellectual property rights of corporations, free movement and guarantees for international investors, open access to government procurement (public tenders), uniform competition policy throughout the world and standards for trade facilitation. In South, the controls on government policies from all such agreements, together with the governments’ internal macro-economic policy orientation, are undermining the urgent tasks of reconstruction and development, the redistribution of wealth and the elimination of poverty in our country based on access to decent and secure jobs or sustainable livelihoods and the promotion of democracy and the empowerment of our people.
Excerpt from the SEAFish Pool of Consensus
Preamble of the Nasugbu Declaration, Philippines

Several of the groups participating in the climate and social justice caravan are fishermen associations. These two pages present some of their positions and activities.

We, the members of SEAFish believe that artisanal fisherfolks are among the poorest and most socially, politically and economically disadvantaged segments of our societies. The fishery resources that we depend on are a vital source of food and make a valuable economic contribution to peoples of the country, the region, and the world. Fishery remains one of the major contributors to production and economic growth of majority of the nations in the Southeast Asia region and people in fishing communities such as the artisanal fishers, women and children play important roles in the management and protection of fishery resources.... Therefore, priority should be given to artisanal fisheries and women and children in fisheries in recognition of their importance as a source of food for local consumption, income and employment and as a means of promoting rural development, food sovereignty and sustainable livelihood. We call for justice in fisheries which respects, upholds and protects artisanal fishers’ rights, women and children’s rights, access and control rights, users’ rights, and management right as the basic principal for inland waters and coastal and marine resources management.

Taking Action at the WTO

The Kilusang Manggisingda ng Pilipinas (KM) fisher coalition and its South East Asian counterparts rallied in Hong Kong at the 6th Ministerial Meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO), in December 2005. They utilized a “fluvial parade” – a parade of boats and ships in the harbour in front of the convention centre where the WTO meeting was being held – as the means of protest to the ongoing talks that will further enhance international policies on fishery trade. In the culmination of its campaign on the so called Doha development round in 2006, the KM coalition again with its allies in the South East Asian region, went to Geneva, Switzerland. For the 1st time in Geneva, a water based campaign, using Asian boats (which were crafted in advance by Asian fisherfolk that went to Geneva) was successfully conducted. The Asian boats were joined by local yachts and campaigners in Lake Geneva.

Fishers insist: No to New Loans, the Asian Development Bank Must Pay

Manila, Philippines, 16 June 2009 - Hundreds of small fishers gathered in front of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) Headquarters to demand payment for the environmental problems that ADB projects wrought to coastal communities. The demand was made during the opening of the High Level Dialogue on Climate Change in Asia and the Pacific, organized by the Asian Development Bank. In this meeting, top government officials from Asia and the Pacific along with big corporations who own and sell technologies necessary to mitigate climate change and experts discuss clean development mechanisms and clean energy technology to reach a consensus and put forward modalities for the Conference of Parties on Climate Change in Copenhagen in December 2009.

“All they are after in this gathering is to sell their ideas and technologies for their own gain and not to help the poor and most vulnerable sectors like us” said Pablo Rosales of Kilusang Mangingisda, a member of SEAFish. Forcing us to obtain loans to purchase clean-energy technologies is not the solution. Those who pollute and exploit the environment should bear the costs, not us.”

The Southeast Asia Fish for Justice Network, SEAFish, in a statement puts the blame on the ADB for the massive mangrove deforestation in Southeast Asia for its role in promoting and financing aquaculture and coastal conversion projects in the region. At present, an estimated 2 million hectares of mangroves has been cleared to give way to large scale aquaculture and other projects. Only 30 percent of the original mangrove forest cover is left. “In Indonesia and Philippines alone, mangrove deforestation for the past 20 years has reached an estimated area of 700,000 and 380,000 hectares respectively” said Pepe Tanchuling, SEAFish Coordinator. Denuded mangrove forests contribute to the deterioration of coastal resources and marine ecosystem that are essential in protecting fishing communities from the impacts of climate change. Climate change results in extreme weather conditions and brings natural disasters that are far greater than hundred years ago. The reason why thousands of fishers died in Aceh, Indonesia was that no mangroves that could buffer the onslaught of the tsunami were already cut” claimed Riza Damanik of KIARA, a fisheries justice coalition in Indonesia. Mangrove loss also intensified the social problems of coastal poor. Aside from being storm buffers, mangroves play an important role in carbon sequestration. Now that mangroves are gone, the hazards and risks of coastal communities to climate change impacts increased by three folds. Since the Asian Development Bank was part of this problem, it should pay for the damages to the environment, the fisherfolk associations demanded.

Adapted from http://www.seafish4justice.net/campaigns.php.

The Process of Black Communities in Columbia (Proceso de Comunidades Negras - PCN) is a sector of the social movement which brings together various organizations and individuals working for the recognition and implementation of the rights to territory, identity, participation and development of the Afro-colombians.

Proceso de Comunidades Negras, www.renacientes.org, Columbia

Andhra Pradesh Vyavasaya Vruthidarula Union-APVVU is a trade union federation promoted in the state of Andhra. APVVU being people’s movement involves struggles for land distribution and implementation of land reform laws, minimum and equal wages, discrimination against untouchability, against displacement and protection of forests and rights of adivasis, agricultural workers, small farmers and children’s rights with gender equity perspective.

Andhra Pradesh Vyavasaya Vruthidarula Union, India
Open Letter to Trade Ministers

In September India hosted a ministerial level meeting on WTO negotiations. Parallel to the event 122 organisations from many countries representing farmers, workers, consumers and women wrote an open letter in which they rejected any further liberalisation of trade in food in the WTO and instead called for policies which will achieve food security, rural development, and safeguard farmers’ livelihoods through Food Sovereignty.

Excerpt of the open letter

“The WTO, along with bilateral and regional “free trade” agreements replicating the same neoliberal model in agriculture promoted for three decades by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, allow agribusiness exporters in rich countries to subsidize their products and then export them into developing country markets, disadvantaged small-scale family farmers. Specifically:

* The deregulation of trade in agriculture has resulted in the abolition of commodities boards that helped manage supply, and instead replaced them with commodities markets. These highly deregulated, volatile markets expose farmers to enormous instability due to the dramatic shifts in price associated with the speculative behavior endemic to these markets, particularly in developing countries which have been pressured to sharply reduce their import tariffs.

* The global agricultural system allows rich countries to massively subsidize their agribusiness exports. When these subsidized exports flood into developing country markets, they represent unfair competition for local farmers, destroy local livelihoods, and increase hunger and poverty. The limits that do exist are routinely violated by the United States and EU. The recent Farm Bill passed by the United States does not limit these subsidies to any significant degree. The Food and Agriculture Organization found that all 102 of the developing countries that were studied experienced import surges between 1980-2003; these import surges occurred more frequently after the implementation of the WTO’s Agreement on Agriculture.

* The global trade system does not allow for governments to protect and support sustainable food production for domestic consumption nor to protect farmers from predatory corporate behavior. Many developing country governments are prohibited from increasing protective tariffs, providing fertilizer or other input subsidies, or protecting certain products from global trade, by the WTO, bilateral trade agreements, or IMF and World Bank policies. These policies, taken together, have resulted in failed global agricultural system including extremely volatile commodities markets, a lack of global access to nutritious and affordable food, an increase in hunger, and the erosion of farmers’ incomes. These policies have culminated in the global food crisis we face today, where about 30,000 people die every day of poverty-related causes, many due to malnutrition and hunger. The FAO estimates that over one billion people are now going hungry, with about 150 million more people experiencing hunger as a result of the current food crisis.

Unfortunately, proponents of further liberalization have sought to take advantage of the food crisis to actually expand, rather than reform, their failed policies. In the current agriculture negotiations in the WTO, the most powerful rich countries are demanding that developing countries further open up their markets, while refusing to reduce the subsidies they provide for agribusiness exports that wreak immense havoc on markets in developing countries. At the same time, many developing countries are working towards protective policies including carving out farm products from tariff reductions, as well as allowing an increase in tariffs or quotas for products facing dumping – especially for certain products which are essential for food security, rural development, and farmers’ livelihoods. In the WTO, these policies, called Special Products and Special Safeguard Mechanism (SP/SSM), are advocated for by a coalition of over 46 developing countries which includes land ownership rights, or problems faced by peasants and small farmers, challenges, environmental challenges for agriculture and rural development. AMP is an independent peasants’ mass and resistance movement.

Global Justice

IGJ vision is a Global Justice Order through Social Movement and its mission is to deconstruct globalization and facilitate social transformation so that a criticism of globalization is constructed through research, advocacy and education. IGJ’s objectives are the development of critical awareness against globalization, global, national in the communities and local policies protecting and appreciating life and existence values, and a New World Order based on pluralism, diversity, continuity and justice.

Anjuman-e-Muzareen: Pakistan

Anjuman-e-Muzareen Punjab is working for landless peasants. It is directly run by the peasants and small farmers under the banner of AMP. We are working in all dimensions of agriculture which includes land ownership rights, or problems faced by peasants and small farmers, challenges, environmental challenges for agriculture and rural development. AMP is an independent peasants’ mass and resistance movement.

Delivering protest mail to the G8

The Canadian Union of Postal Workers

When the G8 happened in Kananaskis, we brought in postal workers from the area and used funds from the union education fund to finance training for people in Western Canada and people from small localities who had never done anything like this. People were very afraid, but when the time came people felt very strong. We went to the demonstration where everybody gathered and postal workers went around with pens and asked: ‘Do you have a message for the prime minister? He had to have it.’

One arrest they sent their executive assistant to the G8. People were like Macho men. During the week on demonstrations were expected. And the confrontation would happen at Kananaskis. So most people just wanted to go to Calgary, where peaceful demonstrations were expected. And the ones who wanted to go to Kananaskis were like Macho men. During the week this changed. One woman who did not want to go in the beginning said: ‘I found my dignity and they cannot touch me any more’.

Dave Bleakney
the national representative for education

Small scale sustainable farmers are cooling down the earth

C

urrent global modes of production, consumption and trade have caused massive environmental destruction including global warming that is putting at risk our planet’s ecosystems and pushing human communities into disasters. Global warming shows the effects of a development model based on capital concentration, high fossil energy consumption, overproduction, consumerism and trade liberalization. Global warming has been taking place for decades, but most governments have refused to deal with its roots and causes. It has been only recently, once transnational corporations have been able to set up huge moneymaking schemes that we hear about possible solutions designed and controlled by big companies, and backed up by governments. Farmers - men and women - around the world are joining hands with other social movements, organizations, people and communities to ask for and to develop radical social, economic and political transformations to reverse the current trend.

Industrialized countries and the industrialization of agriculture are the biggest sources of global warming gases, but it is farmers and rural communities - and especially small farmers and rural communities in developing countries - that are among the first to suffer from climate change. Changing weather patterns bring unknown pest along with unusual droughts, floods and storms, destroying crops, farmlands, farmstock and farmers houses. Moreover, plants, animal species and marine life are threatened or disappearing at an unprecedented pace due to the combined effects of warming and industrial exploitation. Life at large is endangered by the decreasing availability of fresh water resources.

Destruction caused by global warming goes beyond the physical. Changing, unpredictable weather means that local knowledge, which has been the basis for good agricultural management and adjusting to climate conditions, is becoming less relevant, making farmers more vulnerable and dependent on external inputs and techniques.
Farmers' Movements
Small Scale Sustainable Farmers are Cooling Down the Earth

Farmers have to adjust to these changes by adapting their seeds and usual production systems to an unpredictable situation. Droughts and floods are leading to crop failures, increasing the number of people going hungry in the world. Studies predict a decline in global farm output of 3% to 16% by 2080. In tropical regions, global warming is likely to lead to a serious decline in agricultural production (up to 50% in Senegal and 40% in India) and to the acceleration of farmland turning into desert. On the other hand, huge areas in Russia and Canada will turn into crop land for the first time in human history, yet it is still unknown how these regions will be able to grow crops. What is expected is that millions of farmers will be displaced from the land. Such shifting is regarded by industry as a business opportunity through increasing food exports and imports, but it will only increase hunger and dependency around the world.

Corporate food production and consumption are significantly contributing to global warming and to the destruction of rural communities. Industrial agriculture

1) Transporting food all around the world
Fresh and packaged food is unnecessarily travelling around the world, while simultaneously local farmers are denied appropriate access to local and national markets. In Europe and the USA, for example, it is now common to find fruits, vegetables, meat or wine from Africa, South America or Oceania; and we find Asian rice in the Americas or in Africa. Fossil fuel used for food transport is releasing tons of CO2 into the atmosphere. The Swiss peasants' organisation UNITERRREA calculated that one kilo of asparagus imported from Mexico needs 5 litres of oil to travel by plane (11,800 km) to Switzerland, while a kilo of asparagus produced in Switzerland only needs 0.3 litres of oil to reach the consumer.

2) Imposing industrial forms of production
The so-called “modernized” agriculture, especially industrial monoculture, is destroying the natural soil processes which lead to the storing of carbon in soil organic matter, and replaces them by chemical processes based on fertilizers and pesticides. Due notably to the use of chemical fertilizers, intensive agriculture and animal production monocultures produce important quantities of nitrous oxide (NO2), the third most significant greenhouse gas responsible for global warming. In Europe 40% of the energy consumed on the farm is due to the production of nitrogen fertilizers. Moreover, industrial agriculture production consumes much more energy (and releases much more CO2) to run its giant tractors to harrow and plough the land and to process the food.

3) Destroying biodiversity
Carbon is naturally captured from the air by plants and it is stocked in wood and organic matter in the soils. Some ecosystems such as native forests, peat lands and meadows stock more carbon than others. This carbon cycle has been part of the climate balance for thousands of years. Corporate agribusiness has now shattered this balance by imposing widespread chemical agriculture (with massive use of oil-based pesticides and fertilizers), by burning forests for monoculture plantations and by destroying peat lands and biodiversity.

4) Converting land and forests into non-agricultural areas
Forests, pastures and cultivated lands are rapidly converted into industrial agricultural production areas or into shopping malls, industrial complexes, big houses, large infrastructure projects or tourist resorts. This in turn causes massive carbon releases and reduces the capacity of the environment to absorb the carbon released into the atmosphere.

5) Transforming agriculture into an energy consumer
On the energy level, the first role of plants and agriculture is to transform solar energy into energy in the form of sugars and cellulose that can be directly absorbed in food or transformed by animals into animal products. This is a natural process, which brings energy into the food chain. However, the industrialization process of agriculture over the last two centuries has lead to an agriculture, which consumes energy (fertilizers, use of tractors, oil based agrochemicals...).

The false solutions
Agrofuels (fuels produced from plants, agriculture and forestry) are often presented as one of the solutions to the current energy crisis. However, leaving aside the insanity of producing food to feed cars while so many people are starving, industrial agrofuel production will actually increase global warming instead of reducing it. Agrofuel production will revive colonial plantation systems, bring back slave work and seriously increase the use of agrochemicals, as well as contribute to deforestation and biodiversity destruction. Intensive agrofuel production is not a solution to global warming; neither will it solve the global crisis in the agricultural sector. The impacts will again be felt most seriously in developing countries, as industrialized countries will not be able to cover their agrofuel demand and will need to import huge amounts from the South.

Carbon trading
Under the Kyoto Protocol and other international frameworks “carbon trading” is presented as a solution for global warming. It is a privatization of carbon after the privatization of land, air, seeds, water and other resources. It allows governments to allocate permits to big industrial polluters so they can trade “rights to pollute” amongst themselves. Some other programs encourage industrialized countries to finance cheap carbon dumps such as large-scale plantations in the South as a way to avoid reducing their own emissions. This allows companies to make a double profit while claiming falsely that they contribute to carbon sequestration. On the other hand, natural areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America are being treated as mere carbon sinks and privatized through the so called sale of environmental services, thus kick- ing communities out of their land and reducing their right to access their own forests, fields and rivers.

GM0s
Genetically modified trees and crops are now being developed for agrofuel production. Genetically modified organisms will not solve any environmental crisis as they themselves pose a risk to the envi-
**FARMERS’ MOVEMENTS**

**SMALL SCALE SUSTAINABLE FARMERS ARE COOLING DOWN THE EARTH**

Food sovereignty as the key to life on earth

Via Campesina believes that solutions to the current crisis have to emerge from organized social actors that are developing modes of production, trade and consumption based on justice, solidarity and healthy communities. No technological fix will solve the current global environmental and social disaster. A true agrarian reform, that strengthens local and national economies and markets, empowers peasant and family farmer-driven agriculture, artisan-style fishing, pastoralist-led grazing, and protects food production, distribution and consumption based on environmental, social and economic sustainability.

**Interview with Kannaiyan:**

**Democratic Decentralization of the Means of Production**

Kannaiyan is Organizing Secretary for the Erode District chapter of the farmers’ association Tamizhaga Vivasayigal Sangam (TVS) in Tamil Nadu, India. TVS is a participant of the caravan. Nic Paget-Clarke conducted the interview during the 5th International Conference of La Via Campesina in Matola, Mozambique.

Are you yourself a farmer?

Yes, I am a farmer.

What do you farm?

Our main crops are all kinds of vegetables, banana, and sugar cane.

For generations you have been farmers in your family?

Yes, my parents, my grandfathers. All these years, we have lived of farming only.

Can you tell me a little about your farm-

ers’ association?

Our association does not belong to any political party. It is a non-political-party association. We work only for the cause of the farmers. We take up all kinds of farmers’ issues at the state, district and local level.

We are into this GMO issue, genetically engineered crops. We oppose these genetically-engineered seeds and policy changes are underway. The government wants to line-up very quickly the companies who are applying to conduct research, the commercial release of seeds, breeding and multiplication, and the marketing of the genetically-engineered seeds. We are opposing that, 100 percent, at the national level.

The second thing we are working on is the WTO (World Trade Organization) agreement on agriculture. We pressured the government of India to safeguard the interests of small and marginal farmers in the country. We are going to ask the government to explain this – what we farmers will get out of the WTO if agriculture is in the purview of the WTO. The government has to explain this to us. This is a largely agricultural country. It is unlike in the West where 3-5 percent of the people depend on agriculture. Here, 60-70 percent of the people are in agriculture. Most of them are small and marginal holders, two to five acres, like that. Mr. Pascal Lamy (Director General of the WTO), immediately after the breakdown of the negotiations in Geneva, visited India. Do you know whom he met? The officials in the government, the negotiators, the Commerce Ministry, and the Confederation of Indian Industries - not the farmers. It was mainly on the agreement on agriculture. So, farmers are not even considered as stakeholders. It is definitely going to benefit the interests of the trading companies, not the farmers. That is one thing that we are working on.

Why are you opposed to genetically-modified organisms?

We farmers use traditional seeds in agriculture, over thousands of years, and indigenous breeds of cattle, livestock. This genetic engineering, which is controlled by very few companies like Syngenta and Monsanto - the technology is with them. This will, basically, take away the rights of the farmers over seeds.

What will be the impact on the regular farmer?

We will have to keep buying seeds from these companies and they will be free to fix prices. Even now, 70 percent of the cotton being cultivated in India is BT cotton because all the seed companies in the country have now become allies to Monsanto.
that. Still, farmers are spraying against sucking pests. The cost of production is on the increase but the cotton price is depressed. As a result of these kinds of things, among cotton farmers in India, since 1992, more than 150,000 farmers have committed suicide due to severe depression in the prices, the severe crisis in agriculture. Imagine, India is a big country. There are millions of farmers who are committing suicide? Our government is not taking this as a serious national issue. They are not really looking into ending this kind of crisis.

One of the things talked about here at the conference is the concern that the economy is run based on capital accumulation and the world is exactly, particularly the international market. Are there things that your organization is doing, or are the farmers doing, in organizing themselves, locally, that presents an alternative? Yes. They are not vocally talking against capitalism, like that. We are not into that. But we small, marginal, and medium-level farmers who are really working to protect the interests of farming are taking up all these things in this way: opposing this WTO issue, opposing the World Bank’s entry in the agricultural sector, and opposing the industries which are the main capitalist forces who are producing these garments. Particularly garments, but also tanneries. They are not bothering about pollution. This is the way we are fighting against capitalism.

Your local associations, what do they talk about? They do not always talk about the WTO, World Bank, or genetically-modified seeds because these issues have not reached them yet. They take up local issues, for example the infrastructure and the local water-bodies. One company, which is setting up in one village, they are going to burn these coconut shells to be used in industries. That is highly polluting. So they are taking that up in that village.

Are local markets being developed? Are there any imports? We have local markets. Rice is produced from paddy. It is locally processed, made into rice, and marketed locally. We sell all our vegetables in local markets. There is a direct market for farmers, by name Uzhasar sandai, where local farmers sell their products directly to consumers in nearby towns. But, also, there is an impact from the international market. For example, palm oil is imported from Malaysia. Pepper is imported from Sri Lanka. Tea is imported. These are having disastrous impacts on the agricultural prices in India. Now, the thinking is, if we have a short age in production-import. But, importing means you are destroying your self-production, the Indian market, and livelihoods. You are importing unemployment. Imagine if rice is imported - what will happen to all the rice farmers? Probably we need a thinking of increasing the production of oil seeds, increase the production of pulses, food grains, now the thinking is shift to imports.

Your strategy includes opposing that. Does it include an alternative? The alternative is to promote local agriculture with the re-gaining of traditional knowledge, and we have our farmer friends who are well-trained in this promotion of organic farming. We are training other farmers and we are also associating with other groups of people and farmers’ networks who are promoting organic farming. We are in support of that and a large number of people who are shifting into organic farming.

What does food sovereignty mean to your organization? To our organization, food production and food sovereignty should remain in the hands of peasants in India. It should not be dependent on food imports. We strongly oppose food imports. The sad situation in India is that people are shifting from food crops to commercial crops, particularly my region, in the hilly region of Tamil Nadu, the ragi millet was staple food there. They were producing ragi until recently. But now they are shifting to maize production. It is being used as industrial goods. It is not directly used as a food crop in India. It is being used in the poultry industry. For chickens, eggs - there it is used. We are campaigning for food sovereignty, which means the food production should remain in the hands of farmers, peasants in India.

Looking at India as a whole, what is going on with agriculture? Do you see a trend in what the government is trying to do? In the whole of India, a large stretch of agricultural lands depend on monsoon agriculture. If monsoon fails, your crops will fail. Now, instead of improving it, the government thinking of increasing the production of oil seeds, increase the production of pulses, food grains, now the thinking is shift to imports.

Would you call this a neoliberal program? Has it been spreading up recently? Yes. In the 1990s, a very important change came into existence. Foreign companies, before the ’90s, were allowed to hold only 49 percent of a company. But it was lifted and foreign companies were allowed to have 51 percent, which means the companies can directly have the control, have the decision, to influence the region. Now you can have your own company there with 51 percent equity. About 500 multinational companies are operating in India. One company came, the East India Company, which enslaved us, then the British Empire, which ruled us. Now there are more than 500 companies there in India, operating, which means exploitation and also internal exploitation. These urban centers are exploiting villages, sucking the blood of the people. And, since the ’90s, the gap between rich and poor is widening.

Is food sovereignty a solution to that situation? Yes. Definitely. Food sovereignty will be the solution for that.

Why? For example, I was born in Chennin lai, a place where there was a number of hand-looms by the time I was a small child. Slowly, hand-looms completely disappeared and power looms came. Power looms are also good. They use little power and the productivity is much higher than the hand looms, and they also generate employment. They are labor intensive, too. But, now, the jet looms are coming. Power looms are disappearing. It is technological progress. Large numbers of spinning mills are there. Very few people are employed as labor. It doesn’t provide more employment because of automation. If you have hand-spinning, or if you produce, you can have a machine which is developed by which you can spin in your own village, if the small medium-sized machines are developed, then, in the off-season, the agricultural people need not move away from the villages to the towns in search of employment. You will get employment throughout the year. You can have spinning there. You can have weaving there. Then you will have production involving people across the country. If you have hand-spinning, or if you have a machine which is developed by which you can spin in your own village, if the small medium-sized machines are developed, then, in the off-season, the agricultural people need not move away from the villages to the cities in search of employment. You will get employment throughout the year. We are not against industrialization. We are against the very, very capital-intensive, highly technological industries which involve fewer humans and require more capital, which is polluting the nature. This kind of industry we don’t want. When you decentralize industries, you are promoting mass production by involving the masses of this country because India is a highly populated country.

Industrialization should be a decentralized, equitable development of humanity. Only when this level is destroyed and a few hands, that leads to exploitation. Accumulated capital is accumulated in order to influence the region. These urban centers are exploiting villages, sucking the blood of the people. And, since the ’90s, the gap between rich and poor is widening. When you decentralize industry, you are promoting mass production by involving the masses of this country because India is a highly populated country.

Does this also transfer into democratic participation? Once you decentralize the production model, then it will lead to real democracy. Democracy is not just electing people and transforming power. When money is accumulated, capital is accumulated in a few hands, that leads to exploitation. Only when this level is destroyed and the people’s model, the decentralized model, is established, will that lead to a healthy democracy. It will lead to the equitable development of humanity.
The Bangladesh Krishok Federation – a land occupation movement

We established the Bangladesh Krishok Federation (BKF), today the largest rural based peasant movement in Bangladesh, in 1976. Together with the Bangladesh Krishok Samiti (BKS), has helped to occupy 70,600 acres of khas land for roughly 100,000 men and women. In total, the organization enjoys a network of 1.5 million people.

In addition to the land occupation movement, we are also involved in other action-oriented activities, such as the fight for fair prices for farmers’ products, the promotion of organic farming (which is our traditional farming method), subsidies for agriculture etc. A few years ago we started to develop the idea of food sovereignty for the farmers, and we have been advocating the protection of indigenous seeds. We are also against the World Trade Organization, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and multinational corporations that are the key players attempting to destroy the agricultural sector in Bangladesh. We have actively opposed the introduction of Genetically Modified crops in Bangladesh having had already bitter experience with the introduction of hybrid crops during the Green Revolution. We believe in genuine agrarian reform to solve the existing problems in the rural areas. We are totally against market-led land reforms that benefit the multinational corporations and international institutions such as the World Bank. Moreover we have long been demanding the abolition of absentee landownership and the proper distribution of the ceiling excess land among landless. We defended women’s emancipation and we are committed to cooperate with the struggle of women.

One of the most serious challenges ahead for the movement is the reemergence of Islamic fundamentalism that has reemerged in Bangladeshi politics to an alarming extent. And to focus their grassroots network on empowering rural women.
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FARMERS' MOVEMENTS
ACTION REPORT: INDIAN FARMERS WILL NOT ALLOW IMPORTED RAW SUGAR

Action Report: Indian farmers will not allow imported raw sugar

Muzaffarnagar: Hundreds of Indian Farmers from the Bhatiyan Kisan Union (BKIU) stopped a goods train carrying a consignment of about 26,000 quintals of Brazilian raw sugar in the state of Uttar Pradesh (UP) on 31 October 2009 and burnt a few sacks of raw sugar. The train eventually went back the next day when the farmers threatened to set fire to all the sugar onboard if the imported sugar was not returned.

Farmers from UP have been protesting over the past couple of years over procurement delays and the lowering prices of sugarcane. Their incomes are falling, but their costs are rising. More expensive farm inputs are also leading to increased indebtedness. Overall, the price farmers receive for the actual growing of their raw sugarcane for farmers at a low Rs. 107.76 per quintal for the year 2009-2010. India’s sugarcane farmers continue their struggle and they refuse to disappear. They have decided not to allow the imports of cheap raw sugar in UP and stated that if it enters the state territory, it will be burnt. They have also taken a pledge that all goods trains with imported raw sugar for processing in sugar mills in Uttar Pradesh will be stopped.

Later on the 1st of November at the banks of the holy river Ganga in Gadhmkutashwar, UP farmers under the leadership of BKU president, Mahendra Singh Tikait, took a vow to stop sugar mills until received a fair price for their produce. Thursday, 05 November 2009, by Via Campesina, South Asia

Experiences of a farmers’ movement

Pakistan

Our movement Anjumane-Muzareen Punjab collects small and landless peasants on one platform. Formally, we started in June 2000, after a decision by the higher authorities to change the system of rent. This opened space for fighting for land rights. But still the authorities did not want to negotiate with us.

On several occasions unprovoked violence erupted between the movement and the authorities during the course of which twelve tenants lost their lives and hundreds, including women and children, sustained terrible injuries. The police registered hundreds of false cases against peasants. In the course of protest rallies and demonstrations by villagers, women and children played an important role to advance the movement.

There was an immediate reaction from foreign ambassadors as well as media, civil society organizations, human rights organizations, political parties whose representative paid several visits to the Okara (district) area to show sympathy for the peasants.

FARMERS’ MOVEMENTS
TOWARDS ECOLOGICAL AND JUST AGRARIAN SYSTEMS

People’s Alternatives to Industrial Agriculture in South Africa

Towards Ecological and Just Agrarian Systems

We oppose the currently dominant ‘export-led’ production strategies and unfair free trade. Furthermore, we reject exploitation of labour and support the protection of tenure security for farm workers. We aim, instead, to encourage maximum food self-reliance through the creation of local production to serve domestic markets. Through education and awareness we also hope to facilitate consumer demands for diverse agro-ecological produce.

In this regard, we support an agro-ecological farming model of farming. This entails systems that are sustainably managed to conserve natural resources and prioritise social justice. Such systems must also draw on and enhance dynamic knowledge base of indigenous farming practices while combining these with socially responsible science and technology.

We resolve to engage energetically with government at local, provincial and national levels to demand greater recognition and active support for agro-ecological farming practices through farmer assistance. Necessary support for farmers includes infrastructure such as roads, storage facilities and equipment, as well as appropriate participatory research and training/retraining of extension workers to advance agro-ecological farming rather than hinder it.

We are committed to building an ecological learning network – a “living university” – consisting of farmer-to-farmer education. This would be done through exchange visits, experiential learning sites and the documentation and dissemination of experiences which demonstrate the possibilities and benefits of agro-ecological farm-
FARMERS’ MOVEMENTS
TOWARDS ECOLOGICAL AND JUST AGRARIAN SYSTEMS

ing methods and contribute to the continual improvement of these methods.

Building resistance

We are determined to resist free trade agreements as well as policies at international, national, regional and local levels, which promote a neo-liberal agricultural model of chemical and energy-intensive methods. This system includes mechanised farming equipment, global transport of inputs and outputs, including farming inputs such as fertilisers and pesticides all of which are petroleum-based. This agricultural model also includes technologies, such as GMOs, which are centred on maximising corporate profit and power. This model favours big business and limits the responsibility of the state to achieve socio-economic, environmental and political goals for the well-being of people and the environment.

Noting that Southern Africans are eating GMOs as staple foods, we call for immediate public research on the impacts of GMO food on the health of people, particularly vulnerable groups such as children and those affected by HIV and AIDS. In the interim, we demand the labelling and separation of GMO seed and produce in order to allow farmers and all people the right to information and adequate participation in decision-making on existing GMO legislation, we will actively pursue all means to challenge and reverse pro-GMO policies and their implementation. In the long term, our aim is for South Africa and the whole of Africa to be a GMO-free zone.

Popular education

In the context of current concern about rising food prices, collusion and price fixing amongst supermarkets and food processors, we commit ourselves to engage in public advocacy, education, and awareness in order to gather support amongst the broader public to build conscientious resistance against the industrial model of food production. We set out to popularise information on the politics of food and seed, the privatisation of life and the dangers of industrial farming (including the impact of chemicals, GMOs and related social issues such as farmer debt), and to promote agro-ecological alternatives to this paradigm. In addition, this can be done through the sharing of information on farmers’ varieties and traditional seeds through seed and farmer’s festivals, seed exchange programmes and by celebrating the links between seed, culture and food. These are essential for promoting a more sustainable means of food production.

Policy and action research

We call for independent research into the impact of rural government programmes that are focused on the industrialisation and corporatisation of rural economies. Such research would include the impact on rural livelihoods, land, culture, food security and sovereignty resulting from programmes such as those which promote agro-fuels, and the Massive Food Production Programme.

Our alternatives

We propose the transformation of agricultural and broader national economic policies away from the ‘growth and export-driven’ orientation to one which supports the well being of people, involves meaningful public participation, and puts local needs first, within the framework of national and regional food sovereignty. Specifically, we will use the potential commercialisation of GM potatoes to highlight and mobilise all sectors of the population around cross-cutting issues.

Building coalitions

In order to promote and advance the above, we aim to forge coalitions and create a co-ordinated platform through forging linkages with the widest possible range of social movements at both the national and regional (Southern African) levels. The text has been sent to us by one Canadian participant who attended the meeting.

The Gitxsan are a thriving, active First Nations people who derive their strength from the 33,000 square kilometres of traditional territory in British Columbia, Canada.

The Gitxsan


INDIGENOUS MOVEMENTS

Struggling for the decolonisation of power and knowledge

Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas CAOI

We are an organization representing the original Indigenous Peoples of the Andes. We are in the process of suggesting alternatives for bringing about “Buen Vivir” – living well - (“Allin Kawsay” in Quechua, “Sumaq Tamiaq” in Aymara, “Inti Full Muqen” in Mapudugung-Mapuche). We are re-discovering the strength of the principles of the Andean worldview; exercising our territorial, political, cultural and spiritual collective rights; driving the integration of the indigenous movement of the Ayba Yala; developing alliances with all excluded social sectors; and influencing international processes concerning the rights of the peoples. It is not a ghost that haunts the Andean Region. We are men and women with our feet well set on the ground. We defend our beautiful land, because we are part of it. In a word, we defend our right, and the right of all, to life. Capitalism has now brought nature and the survival of the human race to the point of collapse. In its aggressive commodification of “Pachamama” (Mother Earth) and natural resources (earth, water, fossil fuels, minerals, biodiversity), it meets with resistance from the indigenous peoples. Its campaigns to privatise public services encounter the resistance of the diverse local communities and identities. Capitalism is not only about exploitation and oppression, but also about the colonisation of power and knowledge. It creates various crises: social exclusion, environmental degradation, cultural collisions and now, famine and the food crisis. Productivist development works in just a few of the dominant countries and some emergent ones, but in most parts of the planet, it is used against its own societies, employing democracy, social and public policies of content and possibilities. In this context, we as indigenous organizations share a common focus on De-colonialism, Equality, Autonomy, Inter-culturalism, and “Buen Vivir”. We are working on making our responses stronger and bringing them closer to each other. The goal is to develop proposals from our on-going experiences to address the crisis of the state and development, from the perspective of peoples’ and communities’ collective rights. The decolonisation of power and knowledge and “Buen Vivir” shall be integral to the agendas of the social movements. Amongst our objectives are defending the earth and our territories and unity with Mother Nature as well as the development of legitimacy and alternatives to expand the political influence of the indigenous movement in the international arena.

This text has been compiled from the website of CAOI and translated from Spanish.
Indigenous peoples in the Pacific

White supremacist, capitalist imperialism and genocide shattered that world for many indigenous peoples in the Pacific last century. We live with the repercussions of that history of genocide and dispossession every day. Colonialism in the Pacific continues in the models of development that are being sold through a masquerade of trade, governance and security, and market based ‘solutions’ to climate change. Te Ata Tino Toa (a collective of Maori activists), are looking forward to forging a strong collective understanding and response to the dual threats of neoliberalism and climate change on the Climate Caravan.

Te Ata Tino Toa are representative of the long tradition of struggle and resistance by Maori against colonisation and the Crown sponsored theft of Maori land and resources. Maori continue to resist the pressures of colonisation and cultural and economic genocide. Such a concept embraces the spiritual link Maori have with ‘Papatuanuku’ (Earthmother) and is a part of the international drive by indigenous peoples for self determination.

The Pacific, is facing huge stress and huge regional pressures. Climate change is a clear and present danger to the Pacific peoples, land, lives; culture and peoples are at risk. Climate change is no distant threat, it is happening now. Rising sea levels are eating up the land of the islands, salination means more and more arable lands for cultivation become untenable. The human face of climate change in the Pacific, is heart breaking, land is the cornerstone of the heart of all Indigenous peoples.

From Geneva...

For much of the past decade, the Pacific Islands countries have faced immense pressure from New Zealand and Australia, and aid donors to move towards trade liberalisation through new free trade agreements.

Free trade agreements involving the region include the Pacific Islands Countries Trade Agreement (PCTA), the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) with the European Union, and the extension of the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER) with Australia and New Zealand to include deeper “economic integration”.

The move towards free trade is driven largely by the interests of business (exporters, service suppliers and potential new investors) based in the Pacific’s developed-country ‘partners’. Clothed in benevolent, paternal words, greed and racism lie at the heart of Pacer-Plus, pushing the western, neoliberal way of doing things on the Pacific.

To Copenhagen

Te Ata Tino Toa stand with all Indigenous peoples of the Pacific, to ensure those most responsible for climate change are held responsible and those most affected by it are supported in the defence of their land rights, and their collective responsibility to care for lands, forests, our oceans and peoples. Standing together for mother earth and for lives of dignity, and self determination. Indigenous peoples of the Pacific are deeply alarmed by the accelerating climate devastation brought about by unsustainable development, and we are experiencing profound and disproportionate adverse impacts on our Pacific cultures, human and environment.

Freedom Fighters

The International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests is a world-wide network of organisations representing indigenous and tribal peoples living in tropical forest regions (Africa, the Asia-Pacific and the Americas). The Alliance was founded in 1992 during an indigenous conference in Malaysia, where the Charter of the Alliance was adopted, and has been fighting continuously for the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples ever since.

International Alliance of Indigenous Peoples, Panama,
http://www.international-alliance.org/

The World March of Women is an international feminist action movement connecting grassroots groups and organisations working to eliminate the causes at the root of poverty and violence against women. We struggle against all forms of inequality and discrimination directed at women. Our values and actions are directed at making political, economic and social change. They centre on the globalization of solidarity; equality between women and men, among women themselves and between peoples; the respect and recognition of diversity among women; the multiplicity of our strategies; the appreciation of women’s leadership; and the strength of alliances among women and with other progressive social movements. World March of Women, www.worldmarchofwomen.org

http://climate.conscious.maori.nz/
http://climate.conscious.maori.nz/

World March of Women
INDIGENOUS MOVEMENTS

A democracy – less than one meter above the sea

The Kuna people live on a series of 50 tiny islands in an archipelago of 360 known as Comarca Kuna Yala, situated in the Pacific Ocean and straddling the Colombia-Panama border. They gained autonomy after a bloody struggle with colonial police in 1925. Today 70,000 Kuna manage their day-to-day affairs completely autonomous from the other regions, having seen that they lead to environmental destruction. They also have refused roads leading in from Panama knowing that a road would open their territory up for invasion by (post-)colonialists. Still today they have refused the huge tourist trade that could ‘develop’ their paradise. But now all the Kuna, altogether nearly 40,000, have to prepare to move from their islands to the near-by mainland, as all these islands are less than a meter above sea level.

The Kuna have already send representatives to the protests against the WTO ministerial conference in Seattle, exactly ten years ago in Seattle, USA. One of them has been Ibe. As he puts it: “Our organization wishes to struggle and to fight together, as fighting is necessary, without distinguishing between different ideologies, colours or nationalities. But we should act with respect for diversity of culture, diversity of opinions, and the diversity of all the people who live on the planet.”

It’s all about reducing the use of crude oil

An interview with Esperanza Martinez from the international network Oilwatch about the idea of leaving oil in the ground.

For roughly 35 years, the Ecuadorian economy has been fuelled by the extraction of crude oil. The damage to the environment has been immense. In 2007 there was a revolutionary suggestion: the so-called ITT oil field in the Yasuni National Park, the largest oil source in the country, should not be touched. As compensation, the international community would provide a financial contribution equal to half the state revenue. Should this money not materialise, the oil fields would be put out to tender to oil firms. Esperanza Martinez explains the idea behind the project.

Who came up with the idea of demanding compensation for not extracting oil?

The idea came from local communities and NGOs like Acción Ecologica and Oilwatch who campaigned against the oil companies. For a long time we have all been of the opinion that it is necessary for Ecuador to develop a post-fossil fuel energy model. For about 10 years, there has been a suggestion of having a moratorium against the expansion of the oil front. The principal argument was that it is not necessary to search for more crude oil, because even using the oil reserves that we have will cause huge environmental damage. The concept was based on the principle of shared, but differentiated responsibilities – either by demanding compensation for not extracting crude oil, or – and this was the original idea – selling the oil on the condition that it be left in the ground.

The Ecuadorian government took the concept and sold it in an international climate conference as an innovative, new idea. Was the basic idea dramatically changed?
STRUGGLES OVER RESOURCES

It's all about reducing the use of crude oil.

The part of the project that works on climate change has altered dramatically over the last year. In the search of financial prosperity, climate certificates have suddenly caused a consideration of neo-liberal market mechanisms. This commercialisation and the sale of so-called environmental services has received much criticism across the country, for these ideas do not help to reduce emissions and therefore fail to address the main issue of climate change. The ITT project should not be about giving polluting nations means with which they can offset, but not reduce their own emissions. Rather it should be about reducing oil consumption in real terms. The original position of President Correa and the Ministry of Environment towards the Kyoto Protocol was one of heavy criticism. However, when in January 2008 the discussions with developed nations began, this criticism suddenly stopped, as the proposal was presented as a sale of environmental services. We are campaigning further for this project to be taken as more than a compensation model.

How can it be ensured that future governments also leave the oil in the ground?

The guarantee concept is actually quite simple: the oil is to be “sold” to foreign donor countries or international organisations. The sale of the crude oil means that it passes into private ownership. Therefore, it cannot be sold on again. On the international oil market, these mechanisms are clearly defined. If a state sells its crude oil to Texaco, it cannot sell it to another company at the same time. Thus the attempt is to give the donor the same guarantee as a company. The donors receive the titles of ownership of the oil barrels they have bought and thereby the guarantee that the oil will hand over in the event of extraction, which would make the extraction itself nonsensical. In addition, there are international agreements with possible donor countries that certainly will not be broken. I cannot imagine any Ecuadorian government careless endangering relations with Germany or the UN. There are a large number of strong interim players that will ensure that promises are kept.

The Ecuadorian constitution of 2008 includes extensive articles on environmental protection, such as "untouchable zones", where extraction of raw materials is forbidden.

This constitution is full of exceptions. The same is true for the ITT project, which is in one of these zones. If the required sum is not attained, Congress can decide about crude oil extraction. Only if no agreement is reached here will there be a referendum. Then it would again be a decision for the Ecuadorian people. The ITT project is therefore also greatly concerned with education. Since June 2007, we have visited two to three schools on a weekly basis to talk about Yasuní, the indigenous communities and the need for a post-fossil fuel energy model. It is important to make people aware that it is a subject of economic importance but also one in which many irreplaceable aspects cannot be measured in monetary terms. Ultimately, it is Ecuadorian society that will decide, through votes in the referendum, whether Yasuní is to be exploited or not.

Interview conducted by Ines Thomsen. The interview first appeared in a longer format in Lateinamerika-Nachrichten, no. 414, December 2008.

How can it be ensured that future governments also leave the oil in the ground?

The ITT project should not be about giving polluting nations means with which they can offset, but not reduce their own emissions. Rather it should be about reducing oil consumption in real terms. The original position of President Correa and the Ministry of Environment towards the Kyoto Protocol was one of heavy criticism. However, when in January 2008 the discussions with developed nations began, this criticism suddenly stopped, as the proposal was presented as a sale of environmental services. We are campaigning further for this project to be taken as more than a compensation model.

350 million US$ each year will be paid to the government of Ecuador over a period of 13 years – and the oil will remain in the ground. This the financial proposal made by the government of Ecuador for the ITT project. The amount of money paid would equal half of the amount that could be earned, if the ITT oil field was exploited. The ITT field is located in the Eastern part of the Yasuní national park which is at the same time a UNESCO biosphere reserve. In the East, it shares a border with Peru – a chain of oil fields is situated along that border. The ITT oil field is about 200 000 hectares in size, and in its depth, about 20 percent of the oil resources of Ecuador, can be found, in the form of heavy oil.

The oil watch – The Ishpingo-Tambobococha-Tiputini (ITT) project

The Ishpingo-Tambobococha-Tiputini (ITT) project is considered to be one of the most environmentally projects and for the promotion of renewable energies exclusively.

Interview conducted by Ines Thomsen. The interview first appeared in a longer format in Lateinamerika-Nachrichten, no. 414, December 2008.

Focus on the Global South (Focus) is a non-governmental organization with twenty staff working in Thailand, the Philippines and India. Focus was established in 1995 and is affiliated with the Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute.

Focus on the Global South, www.focusweb.org
When The Earth Bleeds

I heard that oil
Makes things move
But in truth I see that oil
Makes life stop
Because

The oil only flows
When the earth bleeds

A thousand explosions
in the belly of the earth
Bleeding rigs, bursting pipes
This oil flows
From the earth’s deathbed
Because

The oil only flows
When the earth bleeds

From the Garden Court,
Marine Parade
We talk and talk
in a garden of stones
The ocean waves bathe our eyes
But in Ogoniland we can’t even breathe
Because

The oil only flows
When the earth bleeds

What will we do?
What must we do?
Do we just sit
Wall and mop?
Arise people, let’s unite
With our fists
Let’s bandage the earth
Because

The oil only flows
When the earth bleeds

Nnimmo Bassey
Nigerian poet and activist
Reproduced from www.oilwatch.org

Fundaexpresión is a Columbian non-profit organization founded in 1999 to promote proactive educational work and research within local communities. It aims to empower marginalized groups of society and achieve improved living conditions, social organization and conservation of their environmental and cultural heritage.

Fundaexpresión, Colombia, www.fundaexpresion.org

When The Earth Bleeds

STRUGGLES OVER RESOURCES

Speech by Libia Grueso,
Proceso de comunidades negras, Columbia

The first issue we want to address is that the effects of global capitalism have been something permanent for us. Since we have been brought from Africa to America, we have experienced the consequences of globalised capitalism. Beginning with the process of cultural uprooting through which we have been pulled out of our living environment, continuing through colonialism, until what is called today economic globalization. For us, capitalism has always meant slavery, exclusion, exploitation, oppression, repression and negation. Even in so-called ‘democratic societies’ like Columbia, we have not recognized the so-called ‘welfare state.’ We have always been excluded from the benefits of this ‘welfare state.’ We live in isolated regions that are at the same time linked in with the mechanisms of exploitation and the economy of resource extraction. We have been exploited as labor by the national and international capital. The consequences of economic globalization have been something permanent in the case of the black communities.

The exploitation and exclusion which we have experienced in this unjust relation with the capital, paradoxically, also have contributed to our ability to preserve and develop forms of living which are based on values different from those of the dominant society which is marked by capitalism. Our central value, in social relations, is life itself; thus, our relations with other people are founded on a respect for life and other forms of living which are based on values different from those of the dominant society which is marked by capitalism. Our historical project has always been a struggle for freedom, a permanent struggle for the construction and conservation of these values in life. We say: ‘We are, because others are (somos porque otros son).’ It is obvious for us that life cannot be without others.

These values stand in opposition to the values that emanate from every way
that capitalism expresses itself. In fact, we have experienced cruel manifestations of capital during the entire historical process, since the uprooting and the enslavement of our ancestors to America until now. Modernization has always been recognizable as barbarism in these forms of capitalism. The neoliberal project has further aggravated the conditions of oppression and exploitation. The ‘welfare state’ and the neoliberal state have transformed life into something we call ‘throw-away-men.’ There are no possibilities to produce something. Many people count for nothing in a system, in which life does not count. Neo-liberalism means the presence of multinational companies in our countries and over-exploitation. Neo-liberalism meant the total de- 

struction of the benefits of the welfare state for the few sectors that had access to these benefits. In Columbia, misery increased as a consequence of the economic model that the dictatorship of Alberto Fujimori had imposed, forcing them to leave and the oppression of their protests. CONACAMI was born out of these cleavages in our social movements. For example, what we understand ‘territory’ (territorio) to be differs from your concept of the same thing. However, we have only learnt this when coming here. It is these kind of encounters, that we need, and these kind of challenges, that we have to face, in order to indentify further points of accordance and to become more effective. The capital’s strategies force us to be more effective in our common action. For this purpose, we have to unveil the capital’s mechanisms and diverse faces of globalization. In everyday life of our communities, IWF, WTO and World Bank appear as intangible entities – which is part of the capital’s strategy. States, that are located outside of our state, decide on our future and lives. Within the framework of global action, it is important to denounce the impact of capitalized global resistance and to demonstrate that it has devastating effects on the majority of this planet’s population. It is a contribution to the struggle to uncover the mechanisms and those that are responsible of many people’s exclusion and death.

Ten years ago, on a day like today, CONACAMI was born officially. It was the response to the consequences of the economic model that the dictatorship of Alberto Fujimori had imposed, that dismantled labor, economic and social rights, under the pretext of opening the doors to foreign investment. Surrendering our natural goods to the greed of transnationals led to a mining boom. This in turn, amounted to violent incursions into the territories of communities that suffered from negative environmental impacts and their right to subsistence, by forcing them to leave and the oppression of their protests. CONACAMI was born out of these protests.

Coordinadora Nacional de Comunidades Afectadas por la Minería www.conacami.org

The Rede Brasileira Pela Integração dos Povos (REBRIP), http://www.rebrip.org.br

The Rede Brasileira Pela Integração dos Povos - Brazilian Network for People’s Integration (REBRIP) - was created in 1998. It is an association of independent and pluralist NGOs, social movements, trade unions and professional associations. They are active in the field of regional integration and trade, and are committed to building a democratic society based on an economy of development that is at the same time socially inclusive, culturally, ethically and environmentally sustainable.

Rede Brasileira Pela Integração dos Povos (REBRIP), http://www.rebrip.org.br

One feature is that of so-called ‘development’. The capital, in the form of development aid, foreign credits, investments etc. is used for a ‘development’ that serves the creation of mechanisms to exploit the resources in our territories. As far as we are concerned, this ‘development’ amounts to the monetization of our social relations. Even nature is transformed into a commodity by these development projects. The so-called ‘development plans’ of the transnational capital, together with the economy of resource extraction, imply the death of our cultural values and the death of life as such.

This paternalistic stance is, in many ways, not expedient. There is a third form of our relation with the North – and it is this latter one that we champion. It involves a relation of solidarity with the struggles of the North. If these struggles in the North exist, the said relation will be an option for us. The more the number of sectors of the North’s population that are taking up their own struggles is on the rise, the more opportunities we (the South) are given to achieve our own goals of a more just society. These goals have life itself as their essence and basic value, not the negation of life, which so far has been the result of the diverse expressions of capitalism. We reempahsize: we are, because you can be. We are to the extent that other men, women, youth movements, movements for the rights of homosexuals, trade unions, environmental movements, are able to achieve their own goals. The capitalist system resorts to ever new forms of exploitation, repression and exclusion. This implies that the diversity of resistance constitutes the sole strategy capable of encountering the capital’s activities. There’s no single formula, but an infinite number of formulas. This diversity of struggles requires solidarity, exchange, collective action and global action in local strategies. This, again, involves new challenges. These challenges concern different languages, rhythms and contexts. For example, what we understand ‘territory’ (territorio) to be differs from your concept of the same thing. However, we have only learnt this when coming here. It is these kind of encounters, that we need, and these kind of challenges, that we have to face, in order to indentify further points of accordance and to become more effective. The capital’s strategies force us to be more effective in our common action. For this purpose, we have to unveil the capital’s mechanisms and diverse faces of globalization.
I n the Southern cone of South Amer-ica, two principal types of agribusi-ness have taken over the territory. These are mono-cultures of sugar, soya and trees and the production of com-modities for export such as ethanol, animal feed, biodiesel and cellulose. Soya production is the main star in the globalised and liberalised agriculture, because it is a highly versatile commod-ity suited for industry’s needs. Soya can be turned into unlimited products. At current date, soya ingredients can be found in all kinds of food in the form of lecithin, in the chem-ical industry in such products as paint and makeup, in agrofuels (soya is a main source for biodiesel) - and soya as animal feed sustains the meat industry.

In South America, 41 million hectares of soybeans are cultivated in Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay have become the global source of animal feed and vegetable oil used both for food production and biodiesel. Soya is exported by the ‘ABCD’ transnational complex of Archer Daniels Midland, Bunge, Cargill, and Dreyfuss, which control most of the processing and trading chain and in this sense con-trol the food of the world. These trans-nationals are also involved in produc-tion, through offering producers inputs and credit and occupying powerful po-sitions in economic and political terms in the countries. Seed and pesticide producers, transnationals such as Mon-santo, Syngenta, Dow, Dupont, and BASF amongst others, also play a fun-damental role, making record business from making the farmer’s completely dependent on their technology. In South America, soya cultivation be-gan in the 60’s and 70s, but grew ex-pONENTIALLY since the 90s when strict liberalization programs took place in the agriculture sector. The policies promoted by the World Trade Organiza-tion (WTO), the Inter-American De-velopment Bank (IADB), the Interna-tional Monetary Fund (IMF) and related institutions favoured big landowners and the production for export, driv-ing out family and subsistence farmers that produce food for the local market. Currently, the international financial institutions are promoting the con-struction of a network of transport in-frastructure through the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastruc-ture in South America (IIRSA) in South America. A main phase of the plan is to make commodity production more viable through making the export via industrial waterways easier. These wa-terways will connect Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay to the industrial harbour of Rosario in Argentina. They will destroy ecosystems and livelihoods of many fishing communities. The IIRSA projects mean, in general, more exploitation of natural resources to the benefit of pri-vate corporations, while governments go into debt spending large amounts of public money to build the infrastruc-ture. Without approval by the popula-tion, IIRSA is being developed in an under-cover way.

Soya is grown in industrial monocul-tures that take up thousands of hec-tares and require no labour. It is a new system of farming, but without farm-ers. A constantly increasing proportion of soya cultivated in South America is genetically modified (GM). Roundup Ready (RR) soya is patented by Monsan-to, Syngenta, Dow, Dupont, and today causes indirect deforestation in the Western part as cattle ranchers are selling their land and moving to this area. The deforestation caused by the expansion of mono-cultures is an im-mEDIATE misfortune in South America as floods, droughts and forest fires are frequent events. Soya crops also con-tribute to climate change through the emissions of nitrogen oxide, a green-house gas, related to fertilizer use.

**Greenwash Platforms**

The impacts of the soya expansion have become so well-known that in the last years the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) began a Round Table on Responsible Soy (RTRS). The RTRS is a broad coali-tion of industry and big conservation agencies that have, since 2004, worked on developing a series of sustainable criteria for intensive soy monoculture production in South America. However, the RTRS criteria do not exclude GMDS, which is not surprising since Monsanto and Syngenta joined the Round Table in February 2009. They do not cover de-forestation, either. Thus, soya fields on recently cut prime rainforest can pro-duce responsible soya.

In June 2009, a RTRS press release men-tions for the first time carbon credits related to forests and soil protection: “The challenge now is to find mecha-nisms to reward producers who protect forests and soil by allowing them to sell carbon along with their soy.” As big producers are not willing to accept any restricting conditions and have begun to leave, the WWF has decided that the only way to save the RTRS is to reward them economically. The WWF now hopes that the RTRS will devel-op systems to sell carbon cred-its “bundled” with soya, so that companies can make claims about their own reduction (and offset) of carbon emissions and attach them to products.

The political power of the soya companies makes it impossible for local people to try to defend their rights. In many cases, people are killed when engaging in collective direct action such as stop-ping the tractor that is spraying pesti-cide next to their house. The expansion of soya is also a main reason for deforestation, erosion and climate change. In the Amazon area, more than 6 million ha of soya are al-ready grown. In Argentina, 800 ha of subtropical forest are deforested every day. In Paraguay, soya expansion has been a principal reason for defores-tation in the Eastern part of the country and today causes indirect deforestation in the Western part as cattle ranchers are selling their land and moving to this area. The deforestation caused by the expansion of mono-cultures is an im-mEDIATE misfortune in South America as floods, droughts and forest fires are frequent events. Soya crops also con-tribute to climate change through the emissions of nitrogen oxide, a green-house gas, related to fertilizer use.

The Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonia Ecuatoriana (Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonia Ecuatoriana) is the regional organization of indig-enous peoples in the Ecuadorian Amazon or Oriente region. Nine indigenous peoples present in the region are represented politically by the Confederation.


When glyphosate is sprayed on RR soya monoculture, all plants die except the GM soya, which significantly simplifies the job of weed control and dimin-ishes labour requirements. Mechanical weeding (with the use of ploughs) is substituted by chemical weeding. The great economic success is the minimal labour requirement of only two people per 1000 hectares, basing all pest managem-ent on pesticide spraying ma-chines and airplanes. The combination of RR soy monocultures and no-till has lead to an overall exponential increase of pesticide use and millions of dollars of profit for seed and chemical compa-nies.

**The chemical war**

The expansion of RR soybean crops is causing massive contamination be-cause of the intensive pesticide use. This leads not only to biodiversity loss, but in countries like Argentina and Par-aguay, people are being forced to live under “chemical war” conditions. Stud-ies in Argentina and Paraguay dem-onstrate higher malformation rates in areas of soya production. During the summer, when soya is grown, people are exposed to an intense dose of chemical drift. People continuously get sick. Subsistence farming is also affected, leading to people leave their communities as it is no more possible to live there. Frequently, soya growers corrupt the justice system and police in order to evict peasant and indigenous commu-nities. In many cases, soya estates are protected by gunmen that threaten and kill the community leaders. The chemical war is not only to biodiversity loss, but in countries like Argentina and Paraguay, people are being forced to live under “chemical war” conditions. Studies in Argentina and Paraguay demonstrate higher malformation rates in areas of soya production. During the summer, when soya is grown, people are exposed to an intense dose of chemical drift. People continuously get sick. Subsistence farming is also affected, leading to people leave their communities as it is no more possible to live there. Frequently, soya growers corrupt the justice system and police in order to evict peasant and indigenous communities. In many cases, soya estates are protected by gunmen that threaten and kill the community leaders.

The impacts of the soya expansion have become so well-known that in the last years the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) began a Round Table on Responsible Soy (RTRS). The RTRS is a broad coalition of industry and big conservation agencies that have, since 2004, worked on developing a series of sustainable criteria for intensive soy monoculture production in South America. However, the RTRS criteria do not exclude GMDS, which is not surprising since Monsanto and Syngenta joined the Round Table in February 2009. They do not cover deforestation, either. Thus, soya fields on recently cut prime rainforest can produce responsible soya.

In June 2009, a RTRS press release mentions for the first time carbon credits related to forests and soil protection: “The challenge now is to find mechanisms to reward producers who protect forests and soil by allowing them to sell carbon along with their soy.” As big producers are not willing to accept any restricting conditions and have begun to leave, the WWF has decided that the only way to save the RTRS is to reward them economically. The WWF now hopes that the RTRS will develop systems to sell carbon credits ‘bundled’ with soya, so that companies can make claims about their own reduction (and offset) of carbon emissions and attach them to products.
CLIMATE CHANGE
COP 15 in Copenhagen – big fuss on hot air?

S

Seal the Deal is the slogan of a UN-led campaign in favor of a tentative definitive agreement on climate change during the 15th Conference of the Parties (COP15) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Copenhagen. If even the UN launches a campaign, matters must be really urgent, one may assume. What’s up in Copenhagen? Essentially, the answer is simple. States seek to negotiate a future international climate change agreement. Besides state representatives, a huge number of civil society representatives, researchers, media people and business lobbyists will take part in the event – more than 15,000 are expected to fill the hotels and congress halls of Copenhagen.

However, negotiators will be state representatives only – small farmers, indigenous people or poor people from “developing” countries will either not participate at all, or only as protesters, with no access to the negotiating tables. Why are these negotiations going on right now? The current negotiation process began about two years ago. Some of the major controversies that have emerged so far:

- Negotiations have been going on for two years. Some of the major controversies that have emerged so far: Who should have binding emission reduction targets under a future agreement – “developed” countries that are historically and presently responsible for the major share of emissions, or also major “developing” countries such as India and China?
- What other commitments could “developing” countries make and how can fulfillment be verified?
- What will “developed” countries contribute to the cost of financing mitigation and adaptation measures in “developing” countries, where climate change impacts will hit hardest? How shall funds be distributed?
- How to support the development of new and diffusion of existing climate-friendly technologies, and how will “developing” countries be enabled to pay for them?
- Will the future agreement essentially be a Kyoto Protocol 2.0 or will it need to be written from scratch, incorporating both elements of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol?

Consensual solutions have been emerging on some of these questions, but by far not on all of them. Are the Copenhagen negotiations thus likely to lead to the adoption of new international rules for combating climate change? The answer depends on whom you ask. However, the past two years of negotiations have been characterized by far-reaching disagreement, in particular between “developed” and “developing” countries, and the United States do not (yet) seem willing to assume appreciable binding international obligations on combating climate change.

Thus, many observers currently expect that Copenhagen will produce, at best, a loose framework for further negotiations. And what are social movements doing about the meeting in Copenhagen? They will be there, of course. For the past one or two years, global, regional and local climate-related networks have been created and plan to take action on the streets of Copenhagen. Even among them, however, there is disagreement on what they would like to see as a result of Copenhagen: an ambitious climate change agreement – or rather the failure of the negotiations. The latter would, as some hope, open up space for discussing more adequate responses to climate change and tackling its root cause – capitalist exploitation of natural resources. Yet others tend to see international climate policies as rather irrelevant – and focus on local struggles and grass-roots solutions.

If parties agree on a new climate change deal in Copenhagen in December, indigenous peoples might be the main victim of it. “Millions of people worldwide depend on forests for their survival,” says Simone Lovera, managing coordinator of the Global Forest Coalition. “Putting a monetary value on forests might lead to land grabs in areas where property rights are poorly defined and not well protected.” Increased awareness that deforestation is a big contributor to global warming has prompted international focus on conserving the worlds’ tropical forests. A plan known as ‘reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation’ or REDD, wants to turn conservation into a profitable business. Carbon stored in forests would become a commodity on the global market. Polluters in rich countries would be able to offset their emissions by buying carbon credits. The money would go to developing countries that are undertaking efforts to protect their forests. Indigenous Peoples fear that REDD will lead to loss of sovereign control over their territories and its natural elements. Their lives would be determined by global markets. A hardly reassuring idea after the financial crisis showed us how things can go wrong. REDD also reframes attention on a key moral and legal dilemma – to whom, if anyone, do forests belong? And who has the rights to sell carbon credits? Esteban Diaz, the secretary general of the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, a Kuna from Panama, points out that this is a major issue. The Kuna are world-famous for their level of autonomy and self-determination, but a Panamanian government official told Estebancio that the land and the planted trees might belong to the Kuna, but that the forest’s carbon belongs to the government of Panama. So if the Kuna want the REDD rewards they will have to cut down the forest and plant trees, replied Estebancio.

This is for real. The current definition of a forest used in REDD does not exclude tree plantations. This means old growth forests can be cut down, replanted with pine or eucalyptus and apply for REDD money, even though the amount of carbon stored in a plantation is less than twenty percent of the carbon stored in an old growth forest. In the beginning of October, environmental groups expressed outrage at an attempt by the European Union to delete a clause in the REDD text that would have prevented the replacement of forests by

New Climate Change
New Climate Deal Risks Impoverishing Indigenous Peoples

MAP is a grass-root farmers’ organization that is involved in struggles over land. It promotes small peasants’ family agriculture and opposes the massive use of toxins in agriculture, a practice which is an aggression against national sovereignty and the right to life.

Movimiento Agrario y Popular (People’s Agrarian Movement) (MAP), Paraguay
Declaration of Women in Asia on Climate Change

A gathering of over 70 women from many parts of Asia with various backgrounds – indigenous, peasant, fisher, labour – and from different networks and social justice movements met in Bangkok September 2009 and adopted a declaration, in which the following position on REDD is expressed:

The idea is to pay the people who would deforest to refrain from doing so, much like paying a thief not to rob your house or a murderer not to kill you. This allows industries to continue emitting as long as they can show paper that they are paying for the preservation of a forest somewhere. Problems with this scheme are evident. Even if deforestation was prevented, this would only be verifiable if the activities of local and indigenous people were removed and did not interfere with the assessments. Efforts have been made to convince some communities that their rights would be retained. But this is not the case. Already in some pilot REDD projects, local and indigenous peoples are being evicted. When the communities are displaced the impact on women is magnified. Women obtain livelihood and family incomes and are often the principal income earners; and through our productive and reproductive labour, we ensure the welfare of our families and communities.

We, indigenous, peasant, fisher, labour, rural and urban women, face the bulk of negative impacts of climate change and of the false solutions to the climate crisis proposed by governments and so-called experts. Women continue to produce and provide food; work inside and outside homes to augment our family incomes and are often the principal income earners; and through our productive and reproductive labour, we ensure the welfare of our families and communities.

The following declaration was adopted by a gathering of over 70 women from many parts of Asia with various backgrounds and from different networks in Bangkok, September 2009.

We recognize that the climate crisis is complex and far reaching, and we need to act urgently decisions about how to use and preserve local ecological resources should be made by local communities, with equal rights to women and men. No to market-based solutions on marine eco-systems regarding climate change. Exclude forests from carbon markets and as source of emissions offsets. No to Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) No to nuclear power plants, coal-fired power plants, large-scale hydropower and incinerators. No to agrofuels, geo-engineering and false solutions proposed by International Financial Institutions (IFIs), governments, Transnational/Multinational Corporations (TNCs/MNCs), the UNFCCC and others. Decentralize power production and distribution, with regulations that prioritize small scale power utilities. Promote and fund community-based renewable energy. Recognize the historical and ecological debt of the North to the South.

The statement was shortened for this reader. The original version is available at http://www lrcksk.org and contains positions on indigenous women’s rights, agriculture, fishery, forest, health, energy, water and sanitation, and financing for climate change adaptation and mitigation. We have only reproduced those positions that relate directly to climate change.
CARAWANE-PROGRAM
FROM WTO TO COP 15

This is the caravan program at the time of printing. Changes are almost inevitable.

GENEVA

Nov 27: Arrival in Geneva. Dinner and first meeting of participants of the caravan.

Nov 28: Demonstration against WTO. Place Neuve. Evening: food, music, relaxation at the main venue.


WESTERN ROUTE

Dec 3: Dijon hosted by Confédération Paysanne and ATTAC.


Dec 5: Action with the Collectif Urgence Climatique Justice Sociale, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace and Veloruption. Speak at March of the Precarious. Meet with the Collective of Undocumented (Foreign) Workers. Meeting with the network of documentation of international solidarity (RETIMO).

Dec 6: Stop in Northern France with Confédération Paysanne.

Dec 7: Brussels, hosted by Corporate Europe Observatory and other groups. Press interviews. Lobby action tour. Public event.

Dec 8: to Hamburg.

EASTERN ROUTE

Dec 3: Freiburg Public meeting and internal exchange at Vauban.

Dec 4: Freiburg Critical mass cycling action. Arrival in Frankfurt. Presentation and meeting in Café Exzess.


Cologne: Dinner at Allerweltshaus and discussion on neoliberalism, climate politics and perspectives from the global south.

Dec 6: Cologne. Public talks and thematic workshops. Demonstration for a different climate and an alternative agenda.


Dec 7: Berlin. Meeting with parliamentarians.

Dec 7: Hamburg. Meeting in Werkstatt 3 with talks, exchange and workshops.

Dec 8: Action day in the harbour of Hamburg. Small delegation visits coal plant Moorburg. Big public event and parallel workshops at different places in town.

Dec 9: Hamburg to Copenhagen – two buses together.

COPENHAGEN

Participation in Klimaforum activities, plus....

Dec 10-11: Tribunal on Ecological Debt, organised by Jubilee South.


Dec 13: Hit the production! Action of mass civil disobedience: blocking the harbour and Farmers’ Action day - Via Campesina against meat-industry.

Dec 14: No Borders Action! No climate refugees! Reparations for Climate Debt!

Dec 15: Resistance is Ripe! Agriculture action day.

Dec 16: Reclaim Power! Action of mass civil disobedience.

Dec 18: Last day of the summit, decentralised actions all over the city.