DRAFT

Beyond the "Green Economy": System Change, Not Climate Change?
Global Movements for Climate Justice in a Fracturing World

Tadzio Mueller[a] and Nicola Bullard[b]

a. Rosa Luxemburg Foundation
b. Focus on the Global South

Abstract

The socio-ecological crisis is proceeding apace, at the same time as governments around the world are scrambling to kickstart the process that caused these crises in the first place: unchecked economic growth. Two projects have emerged that promise deliverance from the path toward collective destruction: on the one hand, the green economy project; and on the other, the climate justice project/movement, in which both authors are involved. The paper sets out to do three things: first, explain the emergence of, and reasons for, the relative weakness of these two projects when set against the persistence of business as usual. Second, to investigate the climate justice movement's contention that sustainable alternative sets of social practices can be found at local levels, by including a number of short case studies of such alternatives, written by practitioners on the ground. Third, to engage with the crucial strategic questions currently facing the global climate justice movement, regarding the generalization of particular, local practices; the societal base of a project of transformation; and the framing of the struggle for climate justice.

The project to green capitalism

Already before the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September 2008 it had become obvious to all who in fact wanted to know that 'neoliberal globalisation', that is, the project best summarised by Harvey (2005) as consisting of the triple policies of privatisation, deregulation and financialisation, had run out of steam because it was increasingly unable to sustain profit rates. In March 2008 Martin Wolf at the *Financial Times* penned the following memorable sentence: "Remember Friday March 14 2008: it was the day the dream of global free-market capitalism died." And Lord Stern, author of a report for the British government on the economic gains that could be derived from engaging with climate change, argued that "we need a good driver of economic growth to come out of this period, and it is not just a simple matter of pumping up demand."[1] What was needed, in short, was a new model of capitalist development, and there was broad agreement from left to right – from Larry Summers to Thomas Friedman, from Ban ki-Moon to Al Gore (REF ALL) – what would lie at the core of such a new model: the 'greening' of the world economy.

The focus in greening the economy was in response to the growing realisation that our system of production and consumption, based as it is on the need for and the possibility of infinite growth fuelled by fossil energy, was quickly running into certain *limits* imposed by the fact that we continue to live on a finite planet. This tension – between the requirements of capital accumulation on the one hand, and the requirements of collective human survival in relatively stable eco-social systems – is today increasingly manifesting itself in a broad set of crises of which the climate crisis is only the most prominent. Others are the loss of biodiversity, the energy crisis, desertification, overfishing, deforestation and many others (cf. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005).[2] It was precisely this intersection of an ecological and an economic crisis that proposals for some kind of 'green capitalism' sought not only to address, but in fact to exploit: crises, we know at least since the days of Joseph Schumpeter are not necessarily threats to the overall stability of capitalist economies. In fact, by destroying overaccumulated and inefficient capital, by reducing overcapacity and by creating opportunities for new market players, crises act as some kind of radical diet for capitalism, they are its "creative destruction" (Schumpeter 1942). The hope, then, was that a broadly Keynesian programme of state incentives and investment could be implemented that would kill two birds with one stone: on the one hand, shift the economy away from the fossilistic development path which can only lead to ruin; on the other, create a new engine of capitalist growth and accumulation in the form of 'green technologies', renewable energies, electric cars and so forth.

To be sure, this 'project' for a green modernisation of capitalism took, and still takes, a number of forms, some of which stand in outright opposition to one another.[3] On one end there is the nationalist-mercantilist version promoted by the likes of Thomas Friedman – who argues that "[m]aking America the world's greenest country is not a selfless act of charity or naïve moral indulgence. It is now a core national security and economic interest" (2008, 23) – and the Heinrich Böll Foundation's Ralf Fücks (REF), which hopes to draw on both ecological and national-competitive affects to power their respective countries in a new global race to (ironically, one might add) *both* save the planet *and* outgrow their every competitor. The left wing of the project, in turn, is

---

[1] Nicholas Stern, (2/12/2008) "Upside of a downturn", www.ft.com/climatechangeseries
[2] And maybe this piece about 7 limits of which we've passed three?
[3] For an excellent summary see IfG 2011, and Candeias 2011.

probably marked by the British *Green New Deal Group* – and in its wake, the *programme* (but not necessarily the *practice*) of the German Green Party – whose 'Green New Deal' (GND) seeks to utilise the intersection of an ecological, an economic and a social crisis of reproduction (GNDG 2008; Die Grünen 2009) in order to roll back neoliberal finance capitalism, expand the welfare state, *and* green the economy. In other words, in between and including these two poles we find a wide variety of positions that would, if successful, enact very different policies and necessarily be based on very different social forces (which role, for example, would 'finance capital' play in this?). Their centrepiece, however – if we exclude for the moment the possibility of a 'green economy' project that is nothing more than public-relations 'greenwashing' – would in each case be some greater degree of state intervention into the economy (through stimulus packages, active industrial policy, possibly mercantilist trade promotion) in order to rapidly accelerate the growth of 'green' sectors of the economy, but in all cases there would be no major deviation from the existing market-based system.

We, or more generally, the movement(s) we have been involved in, have been very critical of this project (or indeed, these projects, as there are important differences between them. GND is not the same as green growth) (REFs). Indeed, in the run-up to the COP15 climate summit in Copenhagen, many of us suggested that the centrepiece of an envisaged climate deal, the expansion of global carbon markets in a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, was, at best, an ecologically irrelevant attempt at creating new investment opportunities for overaccumulated financial capital. We argued, like many others, that it was madness to try to solve a crisis – the socio-ecological crisis – that was the direct result of capital's need for infinite growth by once again kickstarting precisely capitalist growth. (REFs: Exner, Candeias, M&P, etc…).

Not that this criticism was disingenuous: there were good reasons, both substantive and strategic, to develop a position that was openly critical of the development of what was feared might morph into a new 'Green Washington Consensus'. [4] But, to be fair, the promoters of some form of green modernisation in general, and of a GND in particular, had some strong points, two in particular. First, a GND, with its combination of financial regulation, green deficit spending and strengthening of the welfare state, was quite possibly the only project to articulate at least a conceptually coherent way to solve a whole host of the crises (political, economic, socio-ecological) currently facing much of the world. Second, and linked to this, it made not only a conceptual claim to be able to solve or at least mitigate these crises, it also outlined a *strategy* for doing so – by creating its own social base. To quote at some length from the initial report published by the GNDG (2008, 6):

> [W]e hope to correct a number of critical oversights. These include the ways in which environmentalists have tended to neglect the role of the finance sector and economic policy; how those involved in industry, broadly defined, have failed to grasp the malign effects of the finance sector on the overall economy; and how trade unionists have for too long ignored financial and environmental concerns. We hope that the publication of this report will help bring these diverse social and industrial forces together, leading to a new progressive movement. We believe that our joint signatories point to the possibility of *a new political*

---

[4] According to UNEP, the "greening of economies has the potential to be a new engine of growth, a net generator of decent jobs, and a vital strategy to eliminate persistent poverty." (UNEP, Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication, p.15). Cynics might note that the Washington Consensus offered the same silken promises.

alliance: an alliance between the labour movement and the green movement, between those engaged in manufacturing and the public sector, between civil society and academia, industry, agriculture and those working productively in the service industries. (emphasis added)

But where is the project – be it a GND or even a much less ambitious 'green economy' – today? Even in Germany, where, arguably, 'green' fractions of capital have historically been strongest when compared to any other OECD-country, the project is pretty much dead, to some extent abandoned even by its own authors (Bütikofer cited in Dellheim 2011; Giegold 2011 – but see Schick 2011), as it never managed to become the properly European vision they had hoped for. And indeed, Europe is rather busy at the moment collapsing in on itself. In the United States – which in 2010 recorded its highest increase in CO2-emissions since 1998[5] – the weakness of precisely such a green fraction of capital vis-à-vis finance capital (in control of the Democratic Party) and extractive industries (in control of the Republican Party), and the near-breakdown of the political system ensures that no green investment programme will be forthcoming. The more or less left-wing governments of Latin America, although some of them talk the talk of 'climate justice', are increasingly recognised as being engaged (or trapped) in the same classic developmentalist trade-off of social progress combined with environmental devastation (Gudynas xxxx; Mueller 2010) as their 1970s forebears. As for China's much-vaunted push into renewable energies and (voluntary) commitments to the reducing the carbon intensity of its rapid economic growth, much of this is undone by the heavy reliance on large scale hydro and nuclear and the devastating environmental consequences of being the world's largest factory. And, finally, as for those who had long hoped that an impulse for the decarbonisation of the economy would come from the *global* level – so as to avoid the collective action dilemma whereby nobody would forego economic growth (a necessary corollary of decarbonisation in a "fossilistic" (Altvater 2007) economy): the UNFCCC is completely deadlocked, no significant emissions reductions are on the table for the 17th COP in Durban, South Africa (REF), and there is, according to all informed observers, no realistic chance whatsoever of what around the COP15 was referred to as a "fair, ambitious and binding" (FAB) deal. In short: there is little, if any, chance of global capitalism being significantly 'greened' any time soon. Wherever one looks, the coalition of social forces that would push such a project remains too weak, and given that the centrepiece of any green modernisation project would have to be massive state investment into the green economy (however precisely understood), the fact that the last bloc in power pretty much looted the kitty during the last round of bailouts and stimulus packages means that precisely those state coffers that would have to finance such a project are empty.

The global movement(s) for climate justice

For all its undoubtedly widespread appeal, however, the story that it was possible to save the climate *and* 'the economy' at the same time (again something that all versions of the 'green economy' have in common) was not the only one. Against and beyond this story, another one had been growing in the shadows for several years by the time the eyes of the world came to rest on Copenhagen and the COP-process: the story of *climate justice*. Here, we try to provide a (very) brief history of this somewhat ephemeral global movement, an explanation of the concept of climate justice – and of

---

[5] See Reuters 2011. http://planetark.org/enviro-news/item/62991

how this movement ended up pinning many of its hopes on what turned out to be a massive failure: the COP15 climate summit in Copenhagen.

Every movement tells stories about where it came from: they are never 'true' representations, only ever myths that seek to give meaning to the disparate practices constituting the society or movement in question[6]. And when tracing the emergence of a movement, there is always one impossible question to answer: when and where does the first act start? Indeed, in this case this usual difficulty of movement story-telling is amplified as we understand the process that, with a certain dose of Gramscian optimism,[7] can be referred to as the *emerging global climate justice movement* (GCJM) as the result of the productive merging of (sectors of) *two* 'movements' (ignoring for a moment the problem of infinite regression that seems to pose itself here) that had both passed the zenith of their strength, or which had at least reached the limits of their respective present strategies[8].

It is, on the one hand, a subset of what we shall here call the alterglobalisation movement (AGM),[9] or put differently, it is the second round of struggles in a wider cycle of global justice struggles, that is, struggles that consciously address themselves to a global level understood as a crucial site of the production and regulation of injustice. The key articulations of this movement – the moments when an ordinarily dispersed networks of people come together and/in order to recognise themselves as part of one movement – were initially the 'Global Days of Action' around the summits of global institutions like the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the IMF or the G7/8, as well as networks like *ATTAC* and *People's Global Action*, and later increasingly the various global and continental social forums, in particular the World Social Forum (Sen 2004). The "event"[10] most frequently associated with the AGM is no doubt 'Seattle', that is, the protests against the biannual 'ministerial' of the WTO in November 1999, an event that, in an inspired turn of phrase, Naomi Klein (2004) described as the movement's "coming out party". Its iconic slogan, "Another World is Possible", came to symbolise the end of the heroic phase of neoliberalism's hegemony, the end of Thatcher's "There is no Alternative", the end of the Fukuyama's "End of History", where before they had appeared to be no resistance.

---

[6] And it is precisely the fact that "movements" are never stable objects, but floating signifiers in political stories, that renders attempts to answer the question of whether something "is, or is not" a movement (Bedall et al. 2010; Dietz 2011) somewhat pointless. Movements, if the poetic reference be allowed, do not simply emerge, they are always also 'sung into being', they are the results of the stories that are told about the interconnections between a multiplicity of practices that are often, particularly in the case of *global* social movements, geographically and sociologically highly dispersed. Agamben (2005) succinctly summarises this ongoing, Schrödinger's cat-like confusion in his formula that "when the movement is there pretend it is not there and when it's not there pretend it is".

[7] Sitting in a fascist prison, the Italian communist Antonio Gramsci spoke of the need for a "pessimism of the intellect", coupled with an "optimism of the will" (REF)

[8] For similar but of course specifically differing readings of the history of this (potential) movement, see Angus 2009; Goodman 2009; Building Bridges Collective 2010; Dawson 2010; Tokar 2010; Bedall et al. 2011; Brunnengräber 2011; Dietz 2011.

[9] Neither among activists nor in the academic literature has any consensus on naming the movement ever emerged. Other names include the 'global justice movement', the 'movement of movements', while the most widely known name – the 'anti-globalisation movement' was widely rejected by those involved in this cycle of struggle. The best overviews can be found in Notes from Nowhere (2003) and Mertes (2004).

[10] "For French philosopher Alain Badiou, an event is a break, a moment of rupture with a clear 'before' and 'after', where the 'after' could not be foreseen even from within the event itself, and whose meaning is primarily ascribed in retrospect" (Mueller and Trott 2010, X).

On the other hand, the GCJM is composed of two subsets of the environmental movement. First, it is inspired by the "environmental justice movement" (EJM), which emerged in the US during the 1980s as a repudiation of the mainstream environmental movement's focus on merely 'ecological' concerns (its "environmental racism"[11]). Addressing "the radical unevenness between the beneficiaries of ecological degradation and those that bear its costs" (Goodman 2009), the EJM showed that apparently 'ecological' questions were in fact always also questions of social power, and that, therefore, the former could never be solved without addressing the inequalities in power that produced them. Second, it draws the more radical wing of the set of internationally active NGOs that have formed the "civil society" sector of the "Rio model of environmental governance" (Brand and Wissen, 2010), a sector that split in 2007 when the network Climate Justice Now! (CJN!) was formed as a breakaway group from the more established Climate Action Network (CAN)[12].

Roughly by, say, the middle of the last decade, each of these movements had run into troubles of their own. The alterglobalisation movement, for all its spectacular successes in shutting down summits, contributing to rendering the WTO a pointless talkshop, and the general delegitimation of global neoliberalism, was facing a shifting adversary. In 2005, the G8 managed to co-opt the movement to such an extent that, in Edinburgh, 100.000 people marched *for* not *against* the summit, asking the G8 to 'Make Poverty History' (Dowling and Trott), and in 2007, neoliberalism had lost so much of its ideological and integrative power that the same G8 no longer spoke about freeing the markets of the world, but of solving that general problem of humanity, climate change – a move towards which the AGM then had no response (Turbulence 2007). Outside of the US, the AGM lacked a frame with which to tackle socio-ecological problems. At the same time the environmental movement, entirely aside from the rapidly advancing destruction of the biosphere, was facing its own challenges. Its radical wing (not just the EJM in the US, but also the emerging 'climate camp'-process in the UK and beyond[13]), which had always been grounded in particular "struggles against dispossession, exploitation, contamination or industrial expansion in local areas" (Building Bridges Collective 2010: 27), had to start engaging with the undeniable globality of both climate change *and* of the central attempt to mitigate it, the UNFCCC. All the while the more radical NGOs that had been a (frequently reluctant and always critical) part of the UNFCCC-process had come to realise that little but the much-maligned market-based mechanisms of emissions trading and carbon offsetting (for a classical critique cf. Lohmann 2006) would ever come out of this process if the situation didn't change radically.

These factors would come to intersect with another one, that we have already described above: the emergence of what in retrospect seems an all too brief time window – say, from mid-2005 (Katrina) to late 2009 (after Copenhagen) – when it seemed that the entire world was talking about climate change. Suddenly, frustrated alterglobalists looking for a new topic, a new antagonist, a new project, found themselves seeking to "environmentalise" the AGM (Mueller 2008), EJ-activists found themselves globalising their profoundly localist movements (Ross 2010), and many environmental NGOs (e.g. Friends of the Earth) found themselves rapidly radicalising. In short, what would become the GCJM was the result of the simultaneous environmentalisation of the AGM; the globalisation of the EJM; and the radicalisation of the NGOs – all thrown together in

---

[11] For a good overview of the grounding of the GCJM in "environmental justice" see Dawson 2010.
[12] For a brief history of these two networks, see Reitan 2010.
[13] On which Bedall et al 2011; Frenzel 2011.

the political cauldron of what many hoped would be the second Seattle: the climate justice mobilisation towards (and in part against) the COP15 in Copenhagen.[14]

Interlude: whose climate justice?

But before we jump into that seething cauldron to relive the excitement and ultimate disappointment of those days, a brief interlude seems in order. Above, we argued that the "climate justice" frame emerged from the radical, US-based "environmental justice"-movement, which in turn was based in so-called "frontline communities", usually of colour: African-American, Hispanic, and Native American. In this reading, CJ, although encapsulating a set of core demands on which more below, is less a demand as such ("´What do we want? Climate justice! When do we want it? Now!"), but in fact *the very struggle* against the injustices that produce climate change. However, the term has since then been taken up by a wide variety of actors with differing political agendas, so a brief explanation seems useful, also in order to distinguish the CJM from other wings of a broader 'climate movement'.

To start with, that climate change is an issue of (in)justice is widely acknowledged. In essence, those who have done least to cause the problem suffer most from it as they tend to lack the resources necessary to adapt to or compensate for the effects of climate change, while those who have done most to cause the problem tend to suffer least from it, as the very resources they accumulated by destroying the biosphere are now used to adapt to the disastrous effects of climate change (Tokar 2010: 17-19). But opinions diverge rather more widely on what precisely CJ might mean. Brunnengräber and Dietz (2007, 104) assert that "the concept of 'climate justice' generally refers to a solution of the climate crisis in which the burdens and costs of such a policy are fairly distributed", while Santarius (2008, 126) of the German *Wuppertal Institute* understands the term as referring to the search for "rational criteria for the distribution" of emissions rights[15].

There are, then, about as many definitions of CJ as there are actors using the term[16]. Fully aware of the futility of trying to find the 'actual' meaning of a contested term that increasingly serves as an "empty signifier" (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) around which a variety of political projects articulate themselves, here we will outline the understanding of CJ that dominates in the loose set we have chosen to call the GCJM – and as such, will engage in some myth-telling of our own. The first time, as far as we can assess, that the CJ concept is used in political discourse is in 1995, when US-indigenous activist Tom Goldtooth, who had himself grown up politically in the 'EJ' struggles, adapted this notion in order to introduce it into the then-ongoing international climate negotiations about what would later become the Kyoto-Protocol[17]. The fight to redefine climate change as an issue of EJ and of human rights had thus been joined, with the next salvo from the movements being, in 1999, the publication of a widely read report, *Greenhouse Gangsters vs. Climate Justice* (Corporate Watch 1999) that chose as its main target the fossil fuel industry, rejected a focus on individual solutions in favour of structural analysis and transformation, explicitly pitched the struggle for CJ as a global one, and developed one of the abiding frames of the movement, namely the reference to the market-based mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol as "false solutions" (Dawson 2010). In

---

[14] Full disclosure: the authors of this paper were heavily invested in the creation of this story (e.g. Mueller 2008). But in this, we were far from alone: See Bond 2009; Klein 2009.
[15] Translations TM.
[16] Brief footnote on tcktcktck's use in their "join the fight for CJ"-campaign? Cf. building bridges, p. 29
[17] Source: personal communication with Tom Goldtooth

2002, a meeting in Bali for the first time brings together some of the organisations that would later form the core of the movement and articulates the *Bali Principles of Climate Justice*; in 2004, a number of groups and networks critical of the KP's focus on market-based mechanisms in general, and carbon trading in particular, gathered in Durban, South Africa, to form the *Durban Group for Climate Justice.*

Finally, in 2007 at the COP13 in Bali, Indonesia, this dissident group of organisations was finally strong enough to provoke open conflict with CAN, which had hitherto monopolised the environmental NGO space inside the negotiation process, after the cosy lobbying strategy advanced by CAN pretty much lay in tatters. Out of this emerged the network *Climate Justice Now!* – a formation of disaffected "insiders" and groups on the outside coming from the AGM. The press release announcing CJN!'s foundation articulated the set of demands that would form the rallying point of the GCJM in Copenhagen. The release, later refined to a set of principles (CJN! 2007), called for

- leaving fossil fuels in the ground and investing instead in appropriate energy-efficiency and safe, clean and community-led renewable energy
- radically reducing wasteful consumption, first and foremost in the North, but also by Southern elites.
- huge financial transfers from North to South, based on the repayment of climate debts and subject to democratic control. The costs of adaptation and mitigation should be paid for by redirecting military budgets, innovative taxes and debt cancellation.
- rights-based resource conservation that enforces Indigenous land rights and promotes peoples' sovereignty over energy, forests, land and water.
- sustainable family farming and fishing, and peoples' food sovereignty.

That is the definition of climate justice that is operative in the GCJM.

High hopes and failure in Copenhagen

And it was this understanding of CJ that provided the frame under which all these various processes would come together at the COP15 in Copenhagen. Our hopes, in fact, the hopes of everybody who was paying attention one way or another were set high. Then-British premier Gordon Brown had famously referred to this summit as "the last, best hope" (REF) for avoiding runaway climate change. Greenpeace had spent enormous resources trying to mobilise as many heads of state to the gathering, hoping that the presence of these heavyweights would somehow change what – at least to the more radical critics of the UNFCCC – was a nearly foregone conclusion: the failure of the summit to do much of anything to drastically, and in a just way, reduce global (especially Northern) carbon emissions. On the side of the movements, too, we knew that the sum of the parts that went into the mobilisation was not enough to significantly shift the global balance of forces. We knew that we needed a somewhat magic (or more conceptually speaking, the 'emergent') element, the "fairy dust" (The Free Association 2010) that can turn an ordinary demonstration into a carnival, that makes difference-without-unity become unity-in-difference – the kind of fairy dust that, in Seattle, once again opened the doors of history and allowed people on the street and far beyond to realise: a new power had arrived on the world stage. We needed another coming out party (Mueller 2008; Bond 2009; Klein 2009), and we may be forgiven for thinking then – against the strategic criticisms we will articulate below – that a mobilisation under the common (if somewhat fuzzy) banner of 'climate justice' would generate the

energy needed to fuse disparate elements into a new movement. There was, as already argued above, a widespread sense that the climate (justice) issue was here to stay, and that it would become ever more central and all-absorbing: "global warming", argued Goodman (2009), would come to "subsume[…] all other political agendas. In this respect, we can predict, and perhaps witness, a growing alignment of movements under the singularity of the climate crisis [which] is likely to, over time, emerge as a central fulcrum on which solidarities emerge and converge." Ashley Dawson (2010) suggested that, "after years of rejecting meta-narratives", CJ might be emerging as a new "comprehensive positive vision".

In the event, things turned out somewhat differently – although they started out rather well. The size of the demonstration on Saturday 12 December 2009 in Copenhagen – estimated at 100,000, almost certainly the largest popular manifestation around climate change ever in the global North – seemed to highlight the massive pressure governments were under to halt and reverse climate change. However, the size and exuberance of the mobilisation disguised significant divergences between the various blocs. This, of course, is normal when groups agree to set aside differences for the sake of maximising numbers in the street. For example, in Seattle, even though the "teamsters and turtles" made for good copy, there was actually no strong agreement between them as to what should be done with the WTO (hence the brilliantly fudged slogan "fix it or nix it!"). Similarly in Copenhagen, there was (and still is) disagreement as to what should be done about climate change, and what role the UNFCCC should and could play in that process. The largest and best-funded campaign *tck tck tck* called for governments to agree on a fair, ambitious and binding agreement. What constituted fairness and ambition was not clear, nor was it clear for whom the deal should be binding. Yet hundreds of organisations signed up to the massive campaign and a large part of the 12 December demonstration was made up of people they had mobilised. The second largest bloc in the demonstration brought together groups supporting the equally vague proposition of "System change not climate change". While clearly "anti-systemic" there was no clarity about whether the UNFCCC should play a role or what this "system change" might look like. A German newspaper commented that the demonstration was more like a "love parade for the climate" (REF).

Despite the absence of detail or precision in the demands of either tendency, the line of cleavage between them was clear: on the one side are those who believe that climate change can be addressed *within* the logic of the existing political and economic system, albeit in a "greener" and "fairer" way (the 'climate movement'), and those who believe that climate change is essentially a symptom of a deeply flawed system, call it capitalism or productivism, and as such can only be tackled though radical change that is at once economic, social and philosophical (the CJM).

At the same time as the demonstrators were taking to the streets, negotiations at the UNFCCC exposed deep rifts. Broadly, there were five groups: first the 'Annex 1' (read: rich) countries whose main concern is to reduce their own obligations and to impose on emerging competitors, in particular China, binding reduction targets. The second group comprises the big economic powers of the South – Brazil, China, India and South Africa especially – who realise that their own emissions are cause for concern but refuse to enter into a binding arrangement to reduce emissions. In addition, these countries do not need financial or technical support from the Annex 1 countries, as a result of which they occupy a strong negotiating position. The third group is the G77 + China that hangs together in an incredibly fragile alliance on the basis of demanding that Annex 1 countries meet their legal commitments to reduce emissions and provide finance and

technology to the South. The fourth group is a sub group of the G77 + China and comprises those countries that are being impacted right now by climate change and have been co-opted by the Annex 1 countries on the promise of financial assistance. This group supports binding commitments for the big Southern economies and as such is a threat to the coherence of the 'Third World' (G77 + China) negotiation position. Finally, there is the governmental 'system change not climate change' faction, whose numbers are dwindling fast. In Copenhagen, several countries, in particular the ALBA group including Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Venezuela, adopted an anti-capitalist stance – but one year later at the COP16 in Cancun, Bolivia stood along alone in taking this position.

Unsurprisingly, this contradictory constellation of interests did *not* produce a fair, ambitious and binding deal. The result of the Copenhagen negotiations, which was effectively reinforced and institutionalised in Cancun on year later, was that none of the major economies would do anything that would harm in any way their economic interests; that finance would be provided strictly according to the conditions and generosity of the Annex 1 countries; and that trade and financial markets would remain the preferred (and only) acceptable forms of "policy" intervention[18].

To many in the CJM, the summit's failure was anything but surprising. But what of our hopes of a new 'coming out party', of the powerful emergence onto the global stage of a new movement that would forever change the way people look at and deal with climate change? There were no doubt some successes in terms of the internal composition of the movement, in particular in terms of overcoming the mutual sense of distrust that had long existed between actors that constituted themselves as 'NGOs' and the more street-based, usually Northern direct action activists, and even some governments, such as Bolivia (DeMarcellus 2010; Notes from Below 2010) – briefly evoking discussions of whether the crass anti-institutionalism and 'horizontalism' of the AGM was being replaced by a softer 'diagonalism' (see also Turbulence 2009). But beyond these internal, 'compositional' effects, the planned coming out party for the CJM was clearly something of a flop: we failed to establish an anti-capitalist CJ-discourse that was visible and understandable beyond the subcultures of activists and policy-wonks, and thus failed to provide a visible alternative to despair; failed to establish a new 'pole of attraction' that would substantially reconfigure the political field around climate change; and failed to do anything to significantly advance the fight for climate justice. In some sense, the *global* CJM, however much we had invested into singing it into reality, remained something more of a potential, than a reality. (Maybe one perverse effect is that everyone now uses the term "climate justice" as a necessary badge of political correctness, but which renders CJ effectively meaningless. Perhaps one challenge is to reclaim and consolidate a "single" definition of CJ.)

---

[18] Once it became obvious that none of the major emitters had committed to the necessary dramatic emissions reductions, the so-called "Copenhagen Accord" was negotiated outside the official processes under the leadership of the United States. The Accord claims it wants to limit global warming to 2° Celsius, but in pursuit of this (already inadequate) goal it proposes only voluntary emissions reductions, without any mechanisms for enforcing these commitments, or for penalising those countries that fail to meet their commitments. It is the resistance of governments from Venezuela, Sudan and Bolivia that ultimately stops the UNFCCC from officially adopting the Accord. Instead, the text it is merely "taken note of" – as is the quality of the catering at the summit (Mueller 2010).

The staying power of business as usual in a fracturing world

To summarise the arguments made above: both 'projects' that held out the promise of some form of (socio-)ecological transformation at the transnational/global level have, for the time being, stalled. There is neither a major push towards some kind of 'green capitalism', nor is the fight for CJ really 'going global' – all the while things are rapidly going from bad to worse in terms of the advancing destruction of the biosphere. Above, we have already attempted to explain the weakness of the 'green economy' project in terms of its insufficiently having developed the support base for its project, and of encountering empty state coffers. Here, we briefly want to expand on this explanation, and deduce from this one of the major reasons for the lack of success in our attempts at creating a global CJM. Note that these ideas are at this point little more than hypotheses – they will require more backing up in future research.

First, we suggest that the era commonly referred to as (neoliberal) 'globalisation' constituted a new kind of globality, a globality *für sich*, for itself in the Marxist nomenclature, that was different from the globality *an sich*, in itself, that had existed prior to that at least since the beginning of the capitalist world system around the time of the European conquests (with their symbolic starting date of 1492). 'Globality in itself' is constituted by being part of global systems, be they climate systems (until the escalation of anthropogenic climate change a very weak kind of globality) or trade systems. Here, 'the global' (or 'the international') level has specific effects in 'local' places, but these effects cannot be, or at least are not, consciously controlled by any one instance or actor. 'Globality for itself' (or drawing on Bob Jessop's notion of the "society effect" – REF – the 'globality effect') is generated by political/power projects that constitute 'the global' as a space of regulation and of conscious conflict between (organised) social forces. The emergence of this globality for itself can probably be traced back at least to the Bretton Woods conference that lay the basis for the post-war international economic order. But it really came into its own during the period of 'neoliberal globalisation', when the "imperial" project driven by an emerging transnational capitalist class (Sklair; dan der Pijl; Robinson) managed to empower transnational quasi-state institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO to impose its will on large parts of the world.

Second, we argue that global regulation generated global contestation. It was precisely the character of neoliberal globalisation as a conscious, institutionalised project with a number of identifiable global power centres (recall that global capitalism as such has no centre) that generated a cycle of global contestation – that allowed the AGM to take its place as the antagonist of precisely that project. Our (the AGM's) ability to contest the rules of neoliberal globalisation depended precisely on the strength of those rules. We were only as strong as our antagonist, and it was the weakening (also, at least in part, as the result of our actions) of this antagonist around the turn of the millennium that also presaged the weakening of the AGM (some REFs).

Today, with the rise of the BRICs, the "end of globalisation" (Rachman, FT), the financial crisis, neoliberalism is of course far from dead (Turbulence 2009), but it is no longer the dominant, even hegemonic force at the global level that can set rules and standards, empower institutions, and tackle systemic crises. This absence of a relative elite consensus (the kind of consensus that produced proclamations of a "New World Order" and of the "End of History") at the global level means that global institutions are growing ever weaker, as their power is derivative of the power of social forces invested or rather condensed in them (Poulantzas 1973; Gallas et al. 2011). This is the reason

behind the obvious uselessness of the WTO; the repeated breakdown of UNFCCC-negotiations; the increasing irrelevance of the UN-security council; and the impossibility of generating a strong global push towards some 'green capitalist' postponement of the socio-ecological crisis (*pace* the upcoming negotiations at the Rio+20 conference).

In the absence of such a strong global push towards a green economy, *global* movements for climate justice must similarly remain weak, at least for now. During the AGM, our power *at the global level* was largely derivative of that of our opponent – we travelled to their summits, we fought their institutions, our slogans were rejections of their dogmas. We have yet to find a way to generate our own globality for itself, and as long as theirs remains weak, so will we. As a result – and this is what we turn to in the next section, many climate (justice) movements are increasingly abandoning (or drastically reducing their presence) at the global level, in order to focus on scales where they can generate and project social power: national and local scales (REFs, 350.org, K!BN, CfCA metamorphosis statement,). And, to be sure: that is always where the struggle for CJ emerges from. The question is: is it enough for it to stay there?

The future of the climate justice movement

There has thus been a general retreat of social movements, networks and NGOs from the global climate change arena – from the UNFCCC in particular – and indeed from the attempt to develop common, transnational strategies. This can be explained in several ways.

First, the disarray within the negotiations themselves makes it difficult for any movement to coalesce in opposition to a common 'enemy' (e.g. neoliberalism' or 'green capitalism') or in support of a common 'friend'. Even Bolivia – the tragic hero of Cancun – has incited heated debates amongst progressives in the past months over its plans to construct a super-highway through indigenous territories (REF Turb homepage)[19]. Meanwhile, the 'real enemy', fossilistic capitalism, remains elusive as it lacks an identifiable and attackable centre.

Second, current economic conditions – of bust in the North and boom in the South – make it difficult for either developed or developing countries to take effective action on climate change as, under conditions of largely fossil-fuel driven growth, there is an effective trade-off between mitigation and development-understood-as-growth. Hence, the momentum that generated the high expectations for Copenhagen has subsided as national security, debt, jobs and fear of recession jostle for public attention.[20]

Third, the GCJM is itself, as shown above, a somewhat complicated coalition that was united largely by and the drive towards Copenhagen. Thrown together in the mix are indigenous peoples, peasant farmers, environmentalists, global justice activists, struggling communities, scientists, some parts of the trade union movement, anti-capitalists, movements from the Global South, and so on. Although united by a few fundamental principles, the climate justice movement has not, until now, articulated an over-arching strategy that brings the diversity of the movement into a common frame.

---

[19] Although not the topic of this paper, the contradictions that Bolivia is trying to resolve in its efforts to create conditions for social and economic development without destroying nature point to the enormous challenge of constructing new approaches to development within the dominant political economy.
[20] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_opinion_on_climate_change, accessed 4 October 2011.

Fourth, in addition to the heterodoxy of the climate justice space, climate change itself has proved to be an extraordinarily complex, multi-dimensional and far-reaching issue that cannot be easily understood or reduced to slogans and simplistic demands (although these authors would argue that many of the genuine solutions to climate change are politically unpalatable rather than technically or even socially complex). As such, it is difficult for the broad movement to develop a clear strategy and in its absence; practical and tactical questions cannot be answered: is the UNFCCC still relevant? Should the Kyoto Protocol be defended, or not? What is a climate justice perspective on the battle between the US and China? Where is the most effective site of action? Who are our allies? It is not that these questions could not, eventually, be resolved: indeed, the Peoples Agreement of the Cochabamba Summit on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth provides a comprehensive and generally coherent analysis and set of proposals (for an analysis cf. Mueller 2010). Yet even with a coherent narrative and demands, the fundamental questions remain: what are the levers of change, that is, where is the Archimedean point where social movements that seem comparatively weak in the face of rather daunting odds can apply pressure in order to, well, change the world? In other words, what is to be done? Secondly, how do we build a stable (and enlarging) *social base* able to bring about change while managing inherent contradictions and potential conflicts of interest? In other words, who is going to do it?

Really existing climate justice struggles

It is at this point that we need to change our perspective a bit. So far, we have told a story that located itself precisely in the realm of 'globality for itself' that we above argued has become ever weaker, ever thinner. And at this point, it would in fact be disingenuous to continue speaking at and from this position – after all, given that this paper is in fact an extended analysis of the strategic difficulties and (hopefully) opportunities facing the CJM, whom would we be speaking to? Take the still very unsubtle distinction between 'global North' and 'global South'. From the perspective of CJ-activists in the global North (certainly in most of Europe), the situation would seem to look as such: The interests of most (though, to be sure, not all) people in the global North lie in continuing with the current madness of fossil-fuel driven growth – both because they will feel fewer direct effects of climate change, *and* because their societies, by and large, have the means to adapt to those effects that do already occur. This is true as long as we can assume that a good six decades of hegemonic integration of subaltern classes has to a significant extent occurred by way of expanding opportunities for consumption. This raises the question of what would be the potential social mass base – in the North -- for a climate justice project (beyond relatively isolated protest subcultures) that could go beyond mere moralising appeals to people's better angels.

But why start from the perspective of the global North anyway? After all, from the beginning the EJ has based itself in the struggles of people in the global South (to which, in this reading, African Americans and native Americans belong) – while the CJ-discourse added the claim that any solution to the climate crisis was likely to come from the generalisation of precisely those practices of people in the global South that the spread of European 'modernity' has been busily destroying for the last 500-plus years (CJN! 2007). In the South, then, the CJ-struggle does not lack a base, at least amongst the impoverished and marginalised: but the challenge is that of the generalisability of these practices, in other words: the question of *how to create their own globality*.

Below, we have therefore done the following. Starting from the understanding that the CJ-struggle is by definition Southern-led,[21] and that the CJM in the North is, at best, for the time being a very marginal phenomenon (cf. Bricke and Mueller 2011; CfCA; reports from tar sands action?), we have decided to 'go to the grassroots', as it were, and end our discussion of the strategic challenges facing the GCJM precisely where there actually are CJ-movements, and where those strategic challenges are answered in more than the abstract.

We look at three existing examples of functioning and effective social movements or coalitions, each of which is engaging with climate change as a *component* of a broader strategy of transformation and system-change. These groups and networks did not establish themselves as climate justice or climate change campaigners as such, but rather understood the connections between climate change, climate justice and their own concerns and identified opportunities to advance these agendas in the climate arena. They are La Via Campesina, the Global Anti-Incinerator Alliance (GAIA), and the Thai Working Group for Climate Justice.

The details of organisational form, activities, climate change advocacies and challenges are in the boxes (appendix I). However, it is possible to extract some general observations.

First, in each case, the organisation or network comprises communities and groups who are already directly engaged in local issues and livelihood struggles: farmers, waste pickers or community organisations. Second, climate change *per se* is not their principal concern, although there is a clear recognition that impacts of climate change will be felt hardest by the most vulnerable and that climate change mitigation policies can also negatively affect marginalised groups – that is, the organisations' own members.

Third, the demands with respect to climate change policies and action are firmly rooted in social realities and articulated from an integrated systemic perspective: the technical abstraction so typical of expert climate change NGOs is nowhere to be seen. For example, La Via Campesina is calling for transformation of food production and consumption systems, including the ownership of the means of production, to achieve social and ecological goals, not targets of parts per million. Similarly, GAIA calls for changing consumption patterns linked to job creation for the most marginal and achieving zero-waste. The Thai Climate Justice Working Group and Networks (TCJ) calls for climate policies that support a "liveable and sustainable society" as opposed to a narrowly defined low-carbon society.

Fourth, in each case the groups reject the role of financial markets and transnational corporations and demand government action, particularly in terms of redistribution and policy intervention. Furthermore, they see their own members – waste pickers, peasant farmers, consumers, communities in struggle – and society more generally, as the drivers of change with entitlement to participation, voice, rights, information and choice. They are not the abstract "poor" but social actors with capacities and interests.
Each movement or coalition has made significant gains in terms of visibility and even claiming some counter-hegemonic success – notably the concept of food sovereignty which has percolated up to the higher layers of policy debate. However, there are real limitations in terms of enlarging the base of these formations beyond those who are immediately involved. How can the demands of small-scale agricultural producers for

---

[21] For an analysis of the politics of environmental justice and their grounding in the politics of 'race' in the US, cf.

"food sovereignty" be taken up by industrial workers in the North? How can community controlled zero-waste systems become the norm when private companies are gaining CDM credits for building waste-energy plants? How can alliances be built across classes when the fog of consumerism obscures common cause?

Although these groups are all firmly rooted in the "local" their strategies are constantly and consciously shifting from the local through to the global and back again. Being "global" does not mean that everyone must be in the same place and having a big demo: it means being able to locate and understand the complex forces that shape their circumstances and to identify political targets and policy objectives at all levels – local, national or international. But being global is not the same as creating "globality".

Conclusions

In this paper, we have shown that the green economy project – whether green capitalism through to the Green New Deal – claims to deal with the intersecting economic, ecological and social crises. However, we have seen that in the current context there is too little elite consensus for it to be viable in the near future.

Given our hypothesis of the derivative strength of global social movements, the absence of an elite consensus also implies an inability on our part to create a global oppositional or counter-hegemonic climate justice project. This has lead to a retreat from the global sphere of the (emerging) global climate justice movement.

However, we have shown that the apparent retreat from the global sphere does not mean an absence of movement: rather, though our examples, we have shown that there is a strong capacity for rooted social movements and coalitions from the Global South to analyse their context and to engage in political action at multiple levels, linking climate justice perspectives to a broader critique of development and neoliberalism. Perhaps one provisional conclusion is that the experiences and knowledge accumulated by these movements as part of the AGM has provided an overarching frame of analysis that is transferrable to "new" contexts (in this case climate change) and is the base for sustained movement building and political work.

But the question remains: how can (climate justice) movements and coalitions from the Global South create an alternative globality effect? How can the projects of, for example, zero-waste or food sovereignty become generalisable?

In order to start addressing these strategic challenges, we have to look at what actual movements for climate justice movements are doing. This paper is only a start in this strategic inquiry hence we have more questions than conclusions.

BOX 1: GAIA: Global Anti-Incinerator Alliance/Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives

Who is in it? What is the purpose?
GAIA is a worldwide alliance of more than 650 grassroots groups, non-governmental organizations, and individuals in over 90 countries whose ultimate vision is a just, toxic-free world without incineration.

GAIA's greatest strength lies in its membership, which includes some of the most active leaders in environmental health and justice struggles internationally. Since 2009, wastepicker groups from Asia and Latin America, organised around the Global Alliance of Wastepickers, have teamed up with GAIA to make a case at the UN climate change talks for recycling rather than burning or burying waste. Despite wastepickers earning livelihoods from recovery and recycling -- which reduces demand for natural resources andgreenhouse gas emissions -- their successes are being undermined by "waste-to-energy" incinerators and landfills. Until 2009, they were notably absent from climate change discussions.

What is it doing?
GAIA's members work through a combination of grassroots organizing, strategic alliances, and creative approaches to local economic development. GAIA shares information online and in regional meetings, conducts coordinated campaigns toward common goals, strategizes together by participating in international trainings and skill-shares, and provides a community of support for each other.

In partnership with the Global Alliance of Wastepickers, GAIA has organized events in Bonn, Germany at the June 2009 intersessional meetings and released a statement. GAIA presented the relationship between waste and wasting to climate change, the role of wastepickers and local initiatives that can help in emission reduction goals. This partnership attended the COP-15 in Copenhagen, the COP-16 in Cancun, as well as intersessional. GAIA has intervened on the climate policy level a number of times, including before the Clean Development Mechanism Executive Board and the Transitional Committee for the Green Climate Fund.

What are your main objectives and demands? What are your main proposals for addressing climate crisis?
GAIA's international network is organizing to support community-based movements for environmental justice, zero waste, and real climate solutions. We believe that a zero waste approach to managing our resources addresses the root causes of global warming while safeguarding human health and dramatically reducing our demand on natural resources.

Our main proposals to address climate crisis are as follows:
Global Justice: We only achieve true solutions when our work supports systems of social and economic justice and ecological sustainability.
Zero Waste: Zero waste means reducing what we trash in landfills and incinerators to zero.
Waste Picker Rights: In many parts of the developing world, collecting and sorting waste "informally" provides a livelihood for large numbers of the urban poor, who often work in deplorable conditions.
Clean Production: Clean Production is a way of designing products and manufacturing processes in harmony with natural ecological cycles.
Extended Producer Responsibility: To get to the root cause of waste, communities need to stop picking up after the producers of products that become waste and begin demanding that they do so themselves.

Specific campaign objectives include: ending the support of climate subsidies (carbon credits, renewable energy standards, etc) for incinerators and landfills; and generating public funding support for zero waste systems that are inclusive of the informal recycling sector.

What are your successes?
GAIA's members are stopping incinerators and promoting alternatives through a combination of
- Grassroots organizing: building a powerful movement that has grown to include more than 650 organizations and networks in more than 90 countries.
- Strategic alliances: the partnership with the Global Alliance of Wastepickers and Allies has put waste issues in the climate waste agenda and led to significant victories at the climate policy arena, especially around the CDM.
- Stopping waste incinerators: GAIA members have stopped 150 incinerators in 25 countries.

More information see here: http://www.no-burn.org/section.php?id=75

What are the main challenges, especially in terms of building a broader and more stable base for your proposals?
Our main challenge is the trend towards privatization, corporate-led and techno-enthusiastic waste management, which in alliance with a corrupt and increasingly weakened political elite, ignores and undermines the community-based, environmental justice led approaches to waste management.

In this context, the role of the informal sector in resource recovery and associated climate change mitigation is largely overlooked in developing countries. Waste pickers require support to form cooperatives and organizations, access better equipment, negotiate direct access to waste sources, and generally improve their health, safety, and livelihoods.

At the global level, the funds and resources dedicated to solving the climate crisis are not only inadequate in scale but often misdirected towards waste-to-energy in the form of carbon credits or other kinds of subsidies.

Our current mismanagement of our waste is both a travesty and an opportunity. A travesty because it is polluting itself, and drives increased consumption and destruction of natural resources, benefiting private corporations and draining wealth from communities.

But it is also an opportunity: community-led Zero Waste offers the opportunity to reduce pollution, reduce demand for energy and raw resources, and increase local employment and community resilience.

BOX 2: LA VIA CAMPESINA

Who is in it? What is the purpose?

La Via Campesina was founded in 1993 in Mons, Belgium. At that time, agricultural policies and agribusiness were becoming globalized and small farmers needed to develop and struggle for a common vision. Small-scale farmers' organizations also wanted to have their voice heard and to participate directly in the decisions that were affecting their lives. In 2011, La Via Campesina is now an international movement bringing together millions of peasants, small and medium-size farmers, landless people, women farmers, indigenous people, migrants and agricultural workers from around the world. Its members include about 150 local and national organizations in 70 countries from Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas. Altogether, it represents about 200 million farmers. It is an autonomous, pluralist and multicultural movement, independent from any political, economic or other type of affiliation.

The main goal of the movement is to realize food sovereignty and stop the destructive neoliberal process. It is based on the conviction that small farmers, including peasant fisher-folk, pastoralists and indigenous people, who make up almost half the world's people, are capable of producing food for their communities and feeding the world in a sustainable and healthy way. The movement defends women rights and gender equality at all levels. It struggles against all forms of violence against women.

What are the main objectives and demands?

Via Campesina launched the idea of food sovereignty at the World Food Summit in 1996. This idea has now grown into a global people's movement carried by a large diversity of social sectors such as the urban poor, environmental and consumer groups, women associations, fisher-folks, pastoralists and many others.

Food sovereignty is the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through sustainable methods and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems. Food sovereignty prioritizes local food production and consumption. It gives a country the right to protect its local producers from cheap imports and to control production. It ensures that the rights to use and manage lands, territories, water, seeds, livestock and biodiversity are in the hands of those who produce food and not of the corporate sector. Therefore the implementation of genuine agrarian reform is one of the top priorities of the farmer's movement.

What are the main proposals for addressing climate crisis?

La Via Campesina advocates food sovereignty as one of the most powerful responses to the current food, poverty and climate crises. Some key climate and system-related demands from Via Campesina Africa region include:

- The global food system currently generates between 44 and 57% of global greenhouse gas emissions, almost all of which could be eliminated by transforming the food system based on the principles of agro-ecology, agrarian reform and food sovereignty.
- In order to adapt to a changing climate we need the greater resiliency of diversified agro-ecological systems (and water conservation and harvesting, watershed management, agro-forestry, ground cover, etc.) and the genetic diversity of local peasant seeds and peasant seed systems.
- An end to trade liberalization and the renewed protection of domestic markets so that African farmers can receive the fair prices that will enable us to boost production and feed our peoples.
- Comprehensive programs to support agroecological farming by small holders and to rebuild food sovereignty, including genuine agrarian reform and the defense of peasant lands from land grabbing, the reorientation of government food procurement from agribusiness toward purchasing ecological food at fair prices from small holders, and programs of production credit for small holders engaged in ecological farming instead of subsidies tied to chemical fertilizers and pesticides.

Globally, Via Campesina's key demands of the climate negotiations are:

- Affirm the principles of the Peoples' Accord in Cochabamba.
- Establish a binding agreement to reduce by 50 percent greenhouse gas emissions in industrialized countries by 2017.
- Allocate six per cent of developed countries' GDP to finance actions against the climate crisis in countries of the global south.
- Total respect for human rights, indigenous peoples' rights and rights of climate migrants.
- The formation of an International Tribunal for Climate Justice.
- State policies to promote and strengthen sustainable peasant agriculture and food sovereignty.

What are its successes?

First and foremost, La Via Campesina continues to grow and gain strength as an international movement of small-scale agricultural producers. It is recognised as a main actor in the food and agricultural debates and is heard by institutions such as the FAO and the UN Human Rights Council, and is broadly recognized among other social movements from local to global level.

Second, the key demand of LVC – food sovereignty – has gained wide recognition as a systemic alternative to industrial agriculture. High-level analysts and policy-makers – from the UN Rapporteur on the Right to Food through to the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) – have acknowledged food sovereignty as both viable and necessary.

What are the main challenges, especially in terms of building a broader and more stable base for your proposals?

There are many tensions to be resolved in the transition from industrial agriculture to food sovereignty, not least how to overcome the power of agri-business and the perception that expansion of industrial agriculture is the only way to feed the world. In the climate negotiations, it is evident that some sectors and countries are eager to see the expansion of the CDM to include agriculture. It is also a challenge to build alliances with urban sectors and workers organisations who do not see agriculture and food production as their key concerns.

BOX 3: THAI WORKING GROUP FOR CLIMATE JUSTICE (TCJ)

Who is in it? What is the purpose?
Established in early 2008, the Thai Working Group for Climate Justice or TCJ is a coalition of Thai non-governmental organizations and individual activists whose work areas interconnected with climate justice. Members of the coalition work closely with various community groups and grassroots movements across the country whom TCJ has identified as its networks.[1] The main thematic areas currently covered by TCJ members and networks are: energy and industrial development, forest and land reform, and food security (agriculture and fishery).

TCJ's main purposes are to promote justice aspects of the climate debate in the Thai society and to advocate for climate justice to become part of the national climate policy, planning, and implementation. Equally important, the aim is to create and facilitate political space for community groups and grassroots movements in order to construct climate justice from the ground. At the same time, TCJ hopes to contribute to the regional and international climate justice movements.

What does it do?
In campaigning, TCJ works to empower Thai civil society on 'climate justice' debates and to raise public awareness. TCJ organizes public forums, including around the COPs, to stimulate and develop climate justice discussions in the Thai society as well as facilitating dialogues and establishing communication channels between concerned government agencies and grassroots movements. One of the outcomes of a public forum in 2009 was a set of recommendations from civil society for the Thai Government's positions at the COP 15 (Copenhagen) for which it continues to advocate. Representatives of TCJ have participated in COPs as NGO observers as well as taken part in civil society campaign activities, particularly with CJN!, around the COPs.

What are the main objectives and demands?
TCJ's general demands/position toward the international climate negotiations and the Thai government are:
- The key principles of climate policies and solutions must be: justice, equity, the precautionary principle, historical responsibilities and common but differentiated responsibilities.
- Climate policy making shall ensure people's participation.
- Genuine climate solutions should enhance a 'livable and sustainable society' and are not limited to a low-carbon perspective.
- Genuine climate solutions shall address voices of communities/grassroots movements and respect and recognize their rights to natural resources, land, and livelihood; and shall enhance local and traditional knowledge as a sustainable path toward communities' climate resilience.
- Developed countries must reduce their GHG emissions domestically and immediately. At the same time they must pursue ambitious mitigation targets and these targets shall be made legally binding.
- Developing countries must formulate and genuinely implement transparent emission reduction policies.
- Thailand needs to have voluntary emission reduction targets that should be domestically binding.

What are your main proposals for addressing climate crisis?
- The world needs to shift from fossil fuels based economy toward a more sustainable and livable society - this requires significant changes in the development paradigm. In transition, an energy revolution for decentralized renewable alternatives based on local resources should be the focus.
- Support sustainable and organic farming based on local resources and livelihood instead of agro-industries as a mitigation pathway and sustainable adaptation measure as well as building climate resilience for agricultural sector while taking into account food security and biodiversity preservation.
- Discouraging the use of carbon markets and carbon offsets since they have been used to avoid direct domestic emission reduction. Focusing on real emission reduction, not false/unproven/non-sustainable solutions e.g. carbon offsets, clean coal, carbon capture and storage, nuclear energy. Opposing introduction of forests, especially those being managed by communities/indigenous people, to carbon market; in particular REDD/REDD+ mechanisms.
- Communities and areas most vulnerable to climate change impacts should be identified and prioritized in adaptation and building resilience.

What are your successes?
In 2010, TCJ and its networks rejected Thailand's National Master Plan on Climate Change in 2010 and called for redrafting with genuine public participation. This campaign was successful and the redrafting process, including public hearings, began in May 2011 and is ongoing as of September 2011. TCJ has built awareness concerning climate justice within the Thai civil society and grassroots movements and has stimulated climate justice discussions in the general climate change debate.

What are the main challenges, especially in terms of building a broader and more stable base for your proposals?
Moving away from fossil fuels based economy is something quite unimaginable for most urban people and policy makers. In addition, the influence of big energy and various corporations (either private or public, multinational or national) remains significant. To a large extent, society still lacks understanding of the root causes of climate change therefore they do not understand the need for system change (for example, the relationship between consumption and climate change is not understood). The problem-solving paradigm of relevant government agencies has been very technical, conservative, and rigid. In the other hand, most grassroots movements and community groups actively join or take action on climate issues only when it helps with their specific struggles.

1. Current key member organizations include: BIOTHAI Foundation, Ecological Alert and Recovery – Thailand (EARTH), Focus on the Global South, Foundation for Consumers, Foundation for Ecological Recovery (FER), Foundation of Reclaiming Rural Agriculture and Food Sovereignty Action (RRAFA), NET (Surin) Foundation, Nuclear Watch, Project for Ecological Awareness Building, and Sustainable Agriculture Foundation. TCJ's "networks" include Alternative Agriculture Network, Assembly of the Poor, Community Forest Network, Federation of Southern Local Fisherfolks, Indigenous People Network Thailand, Land Reform Network Thailand, Northern People's Network on Natural Resources, Southern Youth Network on Local Fisheries, Women Network, and local movements against fossil and nuclear energy and industrial development.