

The “Greening” of the UN Framework on Climate Change and Environmental Racism

What Payment for Ecosystem Services Means for Peasants and Indigenous Peoples, Women and Men

ANA ISLA

Dans cet article, l’auteure présente la perspective d’une écologie politique de l’environnement suivie de critiques écoféministes et écosocialistes qui soulignent que le système patriarcal capitaliste a maintenu des relations de pouvoir sur les femmes, les paysans, les autochtones dans les pays soi-disant sous-développés et sur la nature. Ensuite elle applique ces données aux analyses issues du protocole de Kyoto, au Costa Rica, du programme REDD+ au Brésil. Elle a décrit la guerre des autochtones et des paysans qui subsistent en dépit des économies émergentes. Elle a introduit le capitalisme “vert” comme une autre façon d’accumuler et avance que la vraie guerre n’est pas contre la pauvreté et les émissions de gaz mais contre subsister.

The Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in November 2014 confirms that “human influence on the climate is clear, and [that] recent anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases are the highest in history. Recent climate changes have had widespread impacts on human

and natural systems.” (IPCC 2014: 2). The Fifth Assessment Report predicts further increases in average surface temperatures, and the report demonstrates that anthropogenic emissions such as fossil fuels, cement, and flaring, as well as forestry and other land uses, are central in the warming of the climate worldwide. Many scientists agree that the most effective way to respond to the loss and damage of ecosystems produced by global warming is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions made by coal, oil, gas, and cement in large corporations located in the U.S. (21), Europe (17), Canada (6), Russia (2), Australia (1), Japan (1), Mexico (1), and South Africa (1) (Heede). As the Fifth Assessment Report states, “Limiting climate change would require substantial and sustained reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that, together with adaptation, can limit climate change risks” (8). A net reduction in emissions by 2050 could keep global warming below two degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit). However, scientists argue that two degrees Celsius is a prescription for a long-term disaster (Roach).

While the large-scale drivers of deforestation and climate change remain unaddressed, a grim concern at the United Nations Conference on Climate Change (UNCCC) is the development of numerous “payments for ecosystem services” (PES) for carbon capture. In this paper, I analyze the UNCCC neoliberal political ecology of monetizing nature: first, through the Kyoto Protocol, an international treaty which extends the 1992 UNFCCC that commits State Parties to reduce greenhouse gases emissions; and second, through REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), a mechanism that has been under negotiation by the UNFCCC since 2005, with the objective of mitigating climate change through reducing net emissions of greenhouse gases in the industrial world as long as it can purchase carbon credits from indebted rainforest-dense countries. There are several other payments for ecosystem services, resulting from the Conference of the Parties on Climate Change, that I do not cover in this piece due to space constraints.

I will focus on the ways that corporations and governments in industrial countries maintain they can achieve

emissions reductions through buying forestry certifications that attest to the claim that carbon has been absorbed in the forest in question. In this paper, I will draw on ecofeminist subsistence perspectives and ecosocialism to look at the use of the forest as carbon credit. My purpose is to challenge claims often made by the UNCCC that the “green economy” creates social

how the patriarchal capitalist system maintains relationships of domination and subordination of women, peasants, Indigenous peoples, the so-called developing countries, and nature. I then apply these insights to analyze the Kyoto Protocol in Costa Rica and REDD+ in Brazil. I document a war against the subsistence lifestyle of peasants and Indigenous people,

In short, nature is transformed into a means of production and value commodification of ecosystem services.

Key concepts in the “green economy” are: natural capital and payment for ecosystem services. Natural capital refers to the goods and services that the planet’s stock of water, land, air, and renewable and non-renewable resources (such as plant and animal

They advocate that the “green” economy can resolve this problem through the monetization of nature, meaning the transformation of ecosystem components or processes into products or services that can be privately appropriated, assigned exchange values, and traded in markets.

equality, reduces poverty, confronts ecological destruction, and combats climate change. Instead, I argue that the “green economy” is a new stage of capital accumulation, led by the United Nations, which is a result of monetary economics being applied to nature, and which I call “greening.” It has nothing to do with cutting greenhouse gas emissions or climate change. Instead, both the Kyoto Protocol and REDD+ program swing the burden of reducing climate change onto the indebted periphery and its inhabitants, thus delaying the decision to move to cleaner technologies. This approach allows industrial countries to continue building polluting infrastructures, and therefore rely even more on dirty energy. This “greening’s” *raison d’être* is the restructuring of indebted peripheral capacities to expand global capital and create new conditions for capital accumulation, while robbing and undermining the original sources of all wealth—the soil and the worker.

In this paper, first, I present the political ecology of the environmental management perspective, followed by critiques from ecofeminists and ecosocialists that have underlined

women and men, in the peripheral and emerging economies. I conclude by introducing “green” capitalism as another phase of capital accumulation, arguing that its real war is not against poverty and emissions of greenhouse gases but against subsistence.

The Environmental Management Perspective of the United Nations

Since the recognition of the environmental crisis (WCED), nature has become monopolized as a property of globalized capital. Articulated by the World Bank, at the Earth Summits, capitalist development and the environment have become linked. According to World Bank economists, the root of the environmental crisis is due to the absence of prices for biodiversity, air, water, scenery, etc. (see Pearce and Warford; Hamilton). They advocate that the “green” economy can resolve this problem through the monetization of nature, meaning the transformation of ecosystem components or processes into products or services that can be privately appropriated, assigned exchange values, and traded in markets.

species, forests, and minerals) provides. “Payment for Ecosystem Services” (PES) is a voluntary transaction in which a buyer, from the industrial world, pays a supplier for a well-defined environmental service, such as a patch of forest or a form of land use, and that supplier effectively controls the service that ensures his supply (Fatheuer 46). PES can be quantified through the calculation of compensation, i.e., the costs and benefits of a decision. In sum, payments for ecosystem services represents tons of CO₂ from an arboreal project that declares it is reducing CO₂ emissions and avoiding deforestation.

The monetization of nature and its services has unified financial institutions, corporations, the industrial world, indebted periphery, emerging markets, environmental non-government organizations (ENGOS), and others. For instance, in Central America, the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, developed Plan Puebla Panama (PPP), also called the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. The 2002 Earth Summit in Johannesburg, South Africa, outlined the *Iniciativa para la Integración de la Infraestructura Regional Sudamericana*

(IIRSA) (the South American Regional Infrastructure Integration Initiative). The argument in both initiatives is that investment in infrastructure needs to be scaled up to support the broader economic growth and development agenda that will be expanded by the commodification of nature. In 2012, the Earth Summit Rio+20, held in Brazil, promised to deliver the “green economy” by stimulating reduction of carbon emissions, efficient usage of natural resources, and social inclusion, through the monetization of nature (Isla). The People’s Summit, held at the same time as Rio+20, however, called the “green economy” a false solution. They maintain that the ecological calamity is due to production and consumption patterns developed by the market economy.

Critiques to the Environmental Management Perspective: Ecofeminism and Ecosocialism

Feminists worldwide (Shiva; Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies; von Werlhof; Salleh 1997, 2004) challenge the environmental management school by arguing that in the current economic system, in which there are three economies working—the market economy, the sustenance economy, and the natural economy—the clash between these economies, has produced the current social and ecological crises.

The *Market Economy* is the visible and regulated part of the growth economy. It counts in the GDP. The growth economy is a cultural, financial, and political system in which the means of production and distribution are privately owned to create surplus value and increase labour productivity. This domain (of men) has created a public world that ignores the physical reality of human existence. It is where pollution is produced by industrialization, urbanization,

and consumerism, resulting in the *ecological rift* expressed in the social and ecological crises.

The *Sustenance Economy or Social Reproduction* is the invisible unpaid or poorly paid parts of the economy that sustain metabolic relations with nature. Those in this economy are feminized, resourced, primitivized, and diminished. But *they are suited for the continuance of life* and do not produce waste. This economy is reproduced by:

- women, through the maintenance of a home, bearing children, socializing children to reproduce labour power, though their work is enforced by rape, harassment, and sexual assault;
- peasants working on subsistence farming and horticulture;
- Indigenous people’s cultural survival lay knowledge; and,
- colonies that reproduce biological infrastructure for all economic systems.

Feminists argue that the sustenance economy bridges human and natural cycles, because this work is universal, integral, and in touch with the ecosystem. It rarely uses up more matter/energy in resources than is needed for bodily provisioning. All of these members can meet their needs for health care and nutrition through their resources and knowledge. Nevertheless their work is enforced by repression. Most times, they are reduced to cheap labour or DNA.

The *Natural Economy* is reproduced through ecological processes: the water cycle, the oxygen cycle, and the nitrogen cycle that sustain all life forms. The ecosystem provides life through its free environmental services and it is a perfect recycling body where nothing goes to waste. The *water cycle* is organized around the heat of the sun that causes water in rivers, lakes, and seas to evaporate.

The moist air rises, it condensates into particles of water or ice. Water precipitates out of the clouds and back to the earth’s surface. The *oxygen cycle* is produced around the plants that produce oxygen. Animals breathe the oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide (CO₂), and plants absorb CO₂ and produce more oxygen. The *nitrogen cycle* is organized by bacteria that help the nitrogen change between states, through decomposing bodies, until plants and trees absorb them through their roots. Human and non-human animals get nitrogen from plants. It produces free environmental services and does not produce waste, however nature’s work is enforced by ecocide or destruction of nature.

In sum, ecofeminists maintain that the market economy is a small island surrounded by an ocean of unpaid, caring, domestic work, and free environmental services.

Ecosocialists also contest the environmental management school. They claim that in the ecosystem, time and space modalities in the market economy are in conflict with the time and space of the natural economy. They maintain that the planet is materially finite, meaning there are biological limits to the volume of economic activity the biosphere can support. Elmar Altvater, for example, argues that the first law of thermodynamics (i.e., the total amount of energy in the universe is constant), and the second law of thermodynamics (entropy always increases in the universe) are natural laws that the economic system cannot overcome (84-85). He contends that ecological modalities of time and space are irreversible and inevitable as disorder increases in the universe. Jean-Paul Deléage contends that capital cannot control the reproduction and modification of the natural conditions of reproduction in the same way it aims to regulate industrial commodity production (50). Despite this reality, Michael Goldman

maintains that "...Global Resource Managers continue to serve the institution of development, whose *raison d'être* is restructuring Third World capacities and social-natural relations to accommodate transnational capital expansion" (47). According to John B. Foster, Brett Clarck, and Richard York, Marx's analysis highlights the *metabolic rift*, a rift that clashes with

The "Greening" of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Environmental Racism

At the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, governments first agreed to tackle climate change. Scientific theories have highlighted the fact that forest vegetation absorbs and stores carbon

carbon dioxide, focused on the forests of indebted countries. The Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Fund evolved into the Clean Development Mechanism that allows a country to implement an emission-reduction project in developing countries, while giving industrialized countries some flexibility in how they meet their emission reduction. Since the indus-

Capitalism robs and undermines the original sources of all wealth—soil and worker—by reducing nature's use value to goods and services for capital accumulation. The expropriation of producers from their conditions of labour constitutes the common basis of class struggle in a capitalist system.

the natural cycles of life under capitalism. Capitalism robs and undermines the original sources of all wealth—soil and worker—by reducing nature's use value to goods and services for capital accumulation. The expropriation of producers from their conditions of labour constitutes the common basis of class struggle in a capitalist system. In sum, ecosocialists challenge the political ecology of neoliberalism, that is, the transforming of global nature into "market natures," but they still deny that the class politics of capital accumulation is tied to the experience of the unwaged (women and Indigenous people) or poorly waged (peasants and colonies), being resourced and the degradation of their natural work condition.

What follows exposes how the use value of nature is damaged and how the unwaged and poorly-waged are incorporated into capital accumulation by the Kyoto Protocol implemented in Costa Rica (Isla) and the REDD+ programs implemented in Brazil. I argue that giving monetary value to the natural economy requires damaging the soil and devaluing other forms of peasant and Indigenous peoples' social existence.

that might otherwise trap heat in the atmosphere, driving up temperatures and speeding up climate change. At the Climate Change Convention held in Kyoto in 1997, industrial countries proposed the creation of mechanisms to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Absorbing carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the overflowing waste of industrial countries to reduce the greenhouse effect has become part of the sustainable development agenda. According to the UNFCCC, countries or industries that manage to reduce carbon emissions to levels below their designated amount would be able to sell their credits to other countries or industries that exceed their emission levels.

The Kyoto Protocol was the aftermath to the UNFCCC, which set a non-binding goal of stabilizing emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000. Among the six kinds of targeted gases is CO₂, which is discharged disproportionately by the industrial world. However, reducing emissions implies high costs for industries. So the major emitting corporations, with the backing of their governments, proposed a self-interested solution: the creation of a global market in

trial world is not held responsible for mitigating its own level of emissions, this type of solution allows the industrial world to continue polluting as long as it can purchase carbon credits from indebted rainforest-dense countries. Meanwhile, energy-related emissions produced by the increase in the amounts of fossil fuels, cement, and flaring, mainly in the industrial world, proceed unimpeded.

Since Kyoto, rainforests have been valued economically in terms of the amount of carbon they sequester. As carbon emissions became subject to trading on the open market, the rainforests of the world became valued as carbon sinks, with predictably disastrous results for the forest dwellers. An example of this is the widespread peasant land dispossession that took place in Costa Rica.

A) Kyoto Protocol: Peasants' Expropriation and Crisis of Women and Nature

Costa Rica was the first country to take part in the Joint Implementation Program (JIP) organized by the United Nations (UNFCCC). JIP allows an industrialized country to earn emission reduction credits by buying

them from another country. Costa Rica was one of the first countries to voluntarily sell carbon credits to the industrial world to achieve emission reductions. It was presented as the international model for Kyoto and guidelines were outlined by the World Wild Life Fund (WWF) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), in collaboration with the national government (Isla).

One of the worst effects of “greening” is the crisis of nature. The Costa Rican government, through its Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE), appraises the ability of private forest farms to sell carbon credits. However, selling carbon credits is particularly promoted among large-scale agricultural entrepreneurs in association with international capital. Lands categorized as forest reserves, which receive payments for environmental services, are exempted from property taxes. This tax relief, under a scheme called Fiscal Forestry Incentives (FFI), subsidizes plantations owned by international capital to promote foreign forest species of high yield and great market acceptance, such as gmelina (*Gmelina arborea* used by Stone Forestry, a U.S. corporation) and teak (*Tectona grandis* used by Bosques Puerto Carrillo, a U.S. corporation and Maderas de Costa Rica S.A., or Macori, now Precious Wood Ltd., a Swiss corporation). These trees are native to South and Southeast Asia. Mono-arboriculture has been defined in this system as “reforestation” even though these plantations constitute artificial ecosystems, and corporations are allowed to cut the trees down after 15 years of growth and transform them into wood for floors or paper, boxes for fruit export, or for furniture. With credits provided by the World Bank, the Costa Rican government enthusiastically promoted the conversion of forest ecosystems into sterile monocultures by planting homoge-

neous forests (Baltodano 2003, 2004; Figuerola 2005).

The monoculture of tree species has become a time bomb for biodiversity in Costa Rica. The natural forest of the humid tropics is a highly productive ecosystem. For instance, a hectare of tropical forest has more than three hundred species of trees. Biodiversity means that a forest will have a great number of *leguminosae* (trees, shrubs, plants) with leaves of different sizes, which lessen the impact of rainfall and prevent erosion. Sonia Torres, a forestry engineer, explains how teak plantations have resulted in the erosion of flatlands:

Since the planting of these foreign species, I have observed that teak has a root system that grows deep into the soil, but in the rainforest the systems of nutrient and water absorption are at the surface. In general, nutrients and water are concentrated at a depth of between 70 and 100 centimeters. As a result, teak trees are encircled by flaked soil. In addition, when it rains, the large-sized leaf accumulates great amounts of water that then pours violently onto the soil. A drop of water, at a microscopic level, forms a crater; when water falls from 15 meters or more it forms holes. Water descending on soft soil destroys the soil. The far-reaching spread of the roots and the shade produced by the leaves obstruct the vegetative growth on the lower forest layer, which could prevent the soil damage from the violent cascades. (Personal interview, August 2000)

Ecologists from Costa Rica oppose the payment of environmental services for arboreal monoculture. A monoculture is not a forest because it does not reproduce itself but

rather needs external inputs such as agrochemicals to grow to maturity (Shiva). Many of the ecologists are not against selling so-called environmental services in general, but instead they promote reforestation through the natural and simple regeneration of secondary forests, which conserve biodiversity and regulate hydrology (Figuerola 2003; Franceschi). They argue that the conservation of forests with native wood species and associated plants and fauna should be a priority, that restoration and natural regeneration, with its own ecological complexity, is a legitimate goal, and that local peasants must be taken into consideration to avoid irreconcilable conflicts.

As the ecosystem disintegrates, it has powerful effects on the degree of oppression endured by peasant women and children. For them, the disappearance of forests is an issue of survival, forcing them to migrate to San José, the capital of Costa Rica, and/or to other ecotourist areas, in the hope of earning an income for themselves and their dispossessed families. Introduced into the cash economy, some impoverished women have little option but to earn all or part of their living as prostitutes. Ecotourism links conservation areas and promises a risk-free world of leisure and freedom for those with money to pay. At the same time, sex tourism offers women’s and children’s feminized bodies as commodities that are pure, exotic, and erotic. This image of Costa Rica entangles two aspects of capitalist patriarchal economics: the domination of creditors (core countries) over debtors (the periphery); and the psychology of the patriarchy in which men develop their “masculation.” Masculation is the exploitative masculine identity created by the alienated world of patriarchal capitalism through compliant bodies (Vaughan). As Costa Rican people are increasingly impoverished, the

enclosure of the commons, the mark of international power relations, is stamped on the bodies of its children and women.

Jacobo Schifter estimates that there are between 10,000 and 20,000 sex workers in the country, and between 25,000 and 50,000 sex tourists—he calls them “whoremongers,” meaning regular clients—who visit each year.

greenhouse gas emissions, but instead has allowed capital to stake a total victory for a market-based approach to climate change. Thus, during the UNFCCC Conference of Parties (COP), new programs for payment for ecosystem services, such as Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Forest (REDD and REDD+) and the European Emissions Trading

droughts in South, Central and North America should be expected.

At COP 21 in France, in December 2015, the increase of greenhouse gas levels in the atmosphere, from around 360 parts per million (ppm) to over 400 ppm, was acknowledged. As a result, the international carbon markets and carbon pricing that achieved international recognition

As the ecosystem disintegrates, it has powerful effects on the degree of oppression endured by peasant women and children. The disappearance of forests is an issue of survival, forcing them to migrate to the capital of Costa Rica and/or to other ecotourist areas, in the hope of earning an income for themselves and their dispossessed families.

Eighty percent are U.S. citizens (43). Schifter concludes:

Obviously, globalization has linked us to an international economy in which each country finds their specialization. In the Latin countries, it is increasingly concentrated in our genitalia. If in agriculture and industry our hands and feet had given us food before, now penises and vaginas do. In the case of Costa Rica, whether we like it or not, sex tourism is a strong component of our Gross National Product. (265)

Tim Rogers reports that the U.S. has become Costa Rica's pimp, as crack cocaine and sex with prostitutes helps narcissistic male tourists and old retirees affirm their masculinity and “escape reality” from their dissatisfied financial and social decline back home.

As Costa Rica slides into a subordinated position internationally, the country becomes a paradise for sex trafficking, paedophilia, and child pornography.

The Kyoto Protocol has not reduced

Systems (ETS) emissions certificates were sanctioned.

B) REDD+: Expropriation of Indigenous Peoples' Territories and Crises of Nature and People

The crisis of nature in Brazil lies in the Amazon rainforest. The Amazon Basin contains the world's largest rainforest, which represents over 60 percent of the world's remaining rainforest. Through transpiration, the Amazon creates between 50 to 75 percent of its own precipitation. But its impact extends well beyond the Amazon Basin by feeding the largest river on the planet (the Amazonas), suppressing the risk of fire as well as creating moisture that travels through the canopy to Central and North America (Medvigy, Walko, Otte and Avissar). The canopy refers to the dense ceiling of leaves and tree branches formed by closely spaced forest trees that make up the level known as the overstory. The moisture, created in the Atlantic Ocean in combination with the constant rainfall in the Amazon Basin, travels through tree canopies that have now been broken. Deforestation reduces local transpiration. As a result, increasing

with the Kyoto Protocol, was central in the UNFCCC agenda. REDD+ is one type of payment for ecosystem services, which ultimately translates into compensation for destruction. This initiative, however, claims that no damage is done because destruction of biodiversity in one place will be compensated by restoring a location elsewhere. Who buys these ecosystem services? Corporations involved in extractive industries (oil, mining, etc.), industrial agriculture, the entertainment industry, airlines, the construction of large-scale infrastructure, as well as the World Bank, industrial countries, international conservation NGOs, etc. Jutta Kill (2016), referring to mining corporations, argues that the basic principal behind payment for ecosystem services is that a mining company that destroys 4000 ha. of forest for its open pit mining activities can “protect” another 4000 ha. of forest elsewhere. The communities affected, however, are not provided with any information about the industries financing or buying “offset credits” from their lands; nor they do not know why there are restrictions on the way they have traditionally used

the forest and are now being forced into hunger and food insecurity.

Those opposed to REDD+ implementation believe the initiative is highly questionable. At COP 20 in Lima, Peru, in 2014, the World Rainforest Movement (WRM) maintained that REDD+ is the largest land grab in history and that it is a false solution to climate change. Instead, they state, these instruments threaten to extinguish Indigenous people. WRM argues that REDD+ speculates with Indigenous peoples' territory; robs communities of their autonomy by creating restrictions and prohibitions for these communities that depend on the forest for their subsistence; violates culture and tradition by integrating them into the international market; and in the process, destroys and divides communities; threatens subsistence and food sovereignty; creates conflict and exacerbates inequality, while producing huge profits for corporations. (WRM; "10 Alertas"; Bonilha).

At COP 20, the Heinrich Böll Stiftung Foundation supported a full-day seminar on *Financialization of Nature and Extractivism* organized by Latin American and Caribbean Friends of the Earth, and several other organizations. Several cases of the implementation of REDD+ in Indigenous territories were discussed and publications by the foundation were made available. For reasons of space here, I will refer only to REDD+ in Brazil where divergences of opinion over the use of market-based mechanisms between the federal and state levels have been taking place.

At the gathering, Jutta Kill (2014b), a biologist and activist, argues that REDD+ logic is problematic.

In order for the REDD offset project to generate carbon credits, the users of the land have to describe their activities as a threat to the forest. If the activities are not a threat to the forest, there

is no risk of deforestation and therefore no credits that can be generated from avoiding deforestation!... Without such a story—that the forest would have been destroyed – there is no carbon to be saved, and no carbon credits to be sold. This necessity by design to describe the land use of forest dependent communities as a risk to the forest is already reinforcing the dangerous myth that forest dependent communities and small-scale farmers are among the most important agents of deforestation. (10)

Jutta Kill (2014a, 2014b) also argues that REDD+ deepens injustice and historical inequalities. She explains that since 1999, several individual forest carbon projects have been formulated, among them the Guaraqueçaba Climate Action Project in the state of Parana. This was a joint initiative between the U.S. Nature Conservancy and the Brazilian Society for Wildlife Research and Environmental Education, and funded by General Motors, American Electric Power, and Chevron. Kill claims that this project was presented as an international model for REDD+. However the locals involved and affected by the implementation of the program consider it a failed project.¹

Furthermore, REDD+ credits constitute a form of property title. Those who possess the credit do not need to be owners of the land, water or trees that are on the ground, but they have the right to decide how these will be used. Two cases of REDD+ in Acre, Brazil, implemented under international guidelines, since 2010, outlined by the World Wild Life Fund (WWF), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Federal University of Acre (UFAC), IPAM, The Woods Hole Research Center, Embrapa, and the

German Agency for International Cooperation (GTZ) in collaboration with the local governments (Herbert, 2010; WWF, 2013) were researched by Cristiane Faustino and Fabrina Furtado. Faustino and Furtado claim that organizations and social groups of Acre have denounced REDD+ for: 1) violations to land and territory rights; and 2) violations of the rights of the peoples in REDD+ occupied territories. Relatoria del Derecho Humano al Medio Ambiente (RDHMA) (Rapporteurship of the Human Right to the Environment) investigated the Acre case and found several problems. Among them are:

- a) Indigenous people in Amazonia have no land title, deepening territorial conflicts. The Acre government has put Indigenous land on the REDD+ market without prearranging land title to the owners of the land. This situation violates ILO Convention 169 as well as the Federal Constitution;
- b) territory for subsistence and traditional activities, such as family agriculture or fishing, have been reduced or eliminated;
- c) blockage of rubber paths which is the main activity of the rubber tappers;
- d) failure to generate sufficient income for Indigenous peoples' livelihood as they have lost their subsistence economy;
- e) Indigenous land speculation has forced entire Indigenous families to move to the periphery of cities, such as the Jaminavá Indigenous people whose children are forced into prostitution and pedophilia;
- f) broken promises by the government and those that promote REDD+.

Faustino and Furtado cite Dercy Teles, Union President of Rural Workers of Xapuri, as she summarizes her outrage:

The impact of the green bag (REDD+) is that we lose all the rights that people have as citizens. [We] lost control of the territory. No longer can we plant. [We] can no longer do any daily activity. [We] receive some money, but only to be no more than observers of the forest, without being able to touch it. Thus, the true meaning of life as a human being is taken away. (5)

These authors conclude that REDD+ in Brazil occurs in a context of extreme inequality in which environmental NGOs such as WWF-Brazil, Comisión Pro Indio (Pro Indian Commission), Forest Trends, and Centro de Trabajadores de la Amazonia (The Centre for Amazonia Workers) are profiting while Indigenous people are dispossessed. REDD+ in this context has been “transferring responsibility for environmental degradation onto subjects that historically have maintained an environmental equilibrium throughout their traditional activities of sustenance. In this way, [people] are devalued and their different modes of land use and occupations practiced by traditional communities and Indigenous peoples are placed at risk” (Faustino and Furtado 22). Further, they submitted the following question: How is it possible, on the one hand, to meet the objectives of social and environmental recovery when, on the other hand, violations of rights occur?

La Carta de Belém Group maintain that other questions not answered by REDD proponents include: how to integrate the forest in the financialization framework; how environmental damage or mitigation payments can be calculated; what to include in the calculation; and who assesses the “true” value of an ecosystem? Belém’s Group of Brazil declared that REDD+ programs are highly political:

We stand together in rejecting mechanisms that commodify and financialize nature and market-based solutions to the climate crisis, because their impacts on territories, local residents and workers cause the violation of social and territorial rights... We believe that Brazil’s proposal to estimate the historical contribution of each country, using a concentric differentiation, is a relevant approach.... We reaffirm our opposition to the introduction of forests into carbon markets.... We instead see the solution in mechanisms to build a just transition, which do not repeat or enhance the same forms of production and consumption that caused and continue to cause global warming and the loss of biodiversity.

The murder of Indigenous women and men, denounced at the U.N. (Conselho Indigenista Missionário) points to the dispossession of land and extermination of these peoples. These communities occupy strategic territories that transnational capital requires for REDD+ and other megaprojects.

Conclusion

Kyoto Protocol replaced the natural forest for artificial forest farms in Costa Rica and REDD+ has been murdering and displacing the guardians of the forest—Indigenous people—in Brazil. In this paper, I have argued that the “greening” is a new imperialist stage of capital accumulation organized under the umbrella of the United Nations that entails four aspects:

First, the expansion of credit instruments by financial capital to create economic growth. Kyoto and REDD+ have been incorporated in Wall Street financial markets;

Second, the World Bank licensing big environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS) to broker the indebted countries’ resources with large corporations involved in economic restructuring and globalization. The role of ENGOS is to establish the monetary values of the “global commons” of the indebted periphery, such as the forest, and to export these values in stock exchanges. These new experts, most of them biologists grouped in ENGOS, have emerged as new models of modernization and environmental protection by using the discourse of “protecting” the global commons in protected areas;

Third, there are new types of markets created—such as biodiversity for biotechnology and Intellectual Property Rights, scenery for ecotourism and forest for carbon credits—located in conservation areas. A conservation area is a designated domain where private and public activities are interrelated in order to manage and conserve a region’s nature for capital accumulation;

Forth, the “greening” process, in this case forest for carbon credits, results in peasants and Indigenous people losing their land and territories and acquiring in some cases new roles as service providers in new industries such as ecotourism; in other cases forced into hunger and food insecurity.

At the end of this analysis, my conclusion is that the new imperialism led by the United Nations, through the Kyoto Protocol and REDD+ organized by the environmental management of the World Bank, ignores ecosystems, genders, species, and promotes poverty and unsustainability in the indebted periphery. The enacting of monetary value to the commons of peasants and Indigenous territories requires the destruction of nature as living grounds and devalues other forms of social existence, such as transforming agriculture skills into

deficiencies; commons (scenery, forest, mountains) into resources; knowledge of biodiversity into ignorance; peasants and Indigenous people's autonomy into dependency; self-sufficiency of men and women into loss of dignity for women's and children's bodies.

We must undo patriarchy, colonialism, capitalism, and imperialism to stop plundering the forests, the earth, and its inhabitants in other parts of the world. Ecofeminists propose a subsistence perspective for the entire world to transform the nature of our economy. Subsistence orientation means achieving another relationship with our fellow humans and non-human world. Starting points for another economy exist in the work done by women every-day without pay, and poorly paid work done by peasants, Indigenous people, and peripheral countries. A manageable size economy will allow us to live from our land, from our climate, and from our resources in that part of the earth we call home (Bennholdt-Thompson). Ecosocialists warn to create social and political frontiers before capitalist accumulation poisons the atmosphere that is the last ecological limit.

Ana Isla is a Professor at the Centre for Women's and Gender Studies, Brock University. She is the author of The "Greening" of Costa Rica. Women, Peasants, Indigenous people and the Remaking of Nature (2015).

¹For more information, please refer to the following three films: "Disputed Territory: The Green Economy Versus Community-Based Economies" (WRM 2012); "The Carbon Hunters" (Shapiro); "Suffering Here to Help Them Over There" (FERN).

References

- "10 Alertas sobre REDD para Comu-
nidades." 11 October 2012. Web.
- Altvater, E. "Ecological and Economic Modalities of Time and Space." *Is Capitalism Sustainable? Political Economy and the Politics of Ecology*. Ed. M. O'Connor. New York: Guilford Press, 1994. 76-89. Print.
- Baltodano, J. "Monocultivos arbóreos no merecen pagos de servicios ambientales." *Ambien-Tico* 123 (2003): 3-5. Print.
- Baltodano, J. "Bosques en reservas del Ida: biodiversidad y manejo." *Ambien-Tico* 133 (2004): 14-17. Print.
- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika. "Money or Life: What Makes Us Really Rich." Trans. Sabine Dentler and Anna Gyorgy. Bonn, Germany, August 2011. Web.
- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika and Maria Mies. *The Subsistence Perspective: Beyond the Globalized Economy*. London: Zed Books, 1999. Print.
- Bonilha, Patricia. "A última fronteira do capital?" *Caitalismo Verde = Neocolonialismo*, 8 December 2014. Web.
- Conselho Indigenista Missionário. "La Gran Muerte: Genocidio e violações de direitos são denunciados por indígenas e Cimi em Fórum da ONU." 19 May 2016. Web.
- Carta de Belém Group. "Declaration by the Carta Belém Group at COP 20. Lima, 2014. Web.
- Deléage, J.-P. "Eco-Marxist Critique of Political Economy." *Is Capitalism Sustainable? Political Economy and the Politics of Ecology*. Ed. M. O'Connor. New York: Guilford Press, 1994. 37-51. Print.
- FatheuEr, T. *Nueva Economía de la Naturaleza. Una Introducción Crítica*. Berlin: Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2014. Print.
- Faustino, Cristiane and Fabrina Furtado. "Economía Verde, Pueblos de los Bosques y Territorios: Violaciones de derechos en el estado de Acre." Informe Preliminar de la Misión de Investigación e Incidencia. Rio Branco, Brazil, 2014. Dhesca: Plataforma De Dereitos Humanos. Economicos, Sociales, Culturais e Ambientas.
- FERN. "Suffering Here to Help Them Over There." Video. 6 June 2012. Web.
- Figuerola, J. "Pago de servicios ambientales a la tala rasa." *Ambien-Tico* 123 (2003): 10-11. Print.
- Figuerola, J. "Nativos y exóticos pero conservando la biodiversidad." *Ambien-Tico* 141 (2005): 16-17. Print.
- Foster, John Bellamy, Brett Clark, and Richard York. *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism's War on the Earth*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010. Print.
- Franceschi, H. "Conflictos socio ambientales intercampesinos por los recursos naturales." *Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 111.12 (2006): 37-56. Print.
- Goldman, M. "Inventing the Commons: Theories and Practices of the Commons' Professional." *Privatizing Nature: Political Struggles for the Global Commons*. Ed. M. Goldman. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998. 20-53. Print.
- Hamilton, K. "Genuine Savings, Population Growth and Sustaining Economic Welfare." Paper presented at the Conference on Natural Capital, Poverty and Development, Toronto, Ontario, September 2001. Print.
- Heede, Richard (2013) "Tracing Anthropogenic Carbon Dioxide and Methane Emissions to Fossil Fuel and Cement Producers, 1854-2010." *Climatic Change* 122.1 (January 2014): 229-241. Springer Link, 22 November 2013. Web.
- Herbert, Tommie. "Setting up Nest: Acre, Brazil, and the Future of REDD." Ecosystem Marketplace, 22 July 2010. Web.