Cyberactivism on the Participatory Web

Edited by Martha McCaughey

Contents

4 Dangerous Places

Social Media at the Convergence of Peoples, Labor, and Environmental Movements

Richard Widick

POSTCARDS FROM THE FUTURE OF CLIMATE CHAOS

From the advent of Indymedia at the 1999 battle of Seattle anti-World Trade Organization protests, to the worldwide diaspora of anti-globalization protests (2000–2003) and the great anti-war protests starting in 2003, all the way up through the United Nations climate protests in Copenhagen in 2009, WikiLeaks, Occupy Wall Street, and the Arab Spring, the digital communication revolution has been transforming how social movements are assembling themselves on a planetary scale. In the same way that these movements and ruptures express the transformative effects of new Internet technologies that came of age in the 1990s, so now does the emergent global climate justice movement of the 20-teens embody and express the transformative potential of emergent social media technologies that came of age in the 2000s.[1]

Looking backwards from these decades of technology-driven historical change, we now see clearly an equally profound continuity: Changing mass media have shaped every modern social movement, each in its own time and place. Each movement bears the mark of dawning communications and transportation technologies that were, in their time and place, transcending barriers to collective action and consequently reorganizing power-laden social relations. Where would the 19th-century abolition movement have gone without the Black Press that arguably began with the founding of *Freedom's Journal* in 1827?[2] How would the Civil Rights Movement have unfolded absent the publication of those horrific photos of Emmit Till's bludgeoned and river-bloated corpse in the September 15, 1955, issue of *Jet Magazine*?[3] The Montgomery bus boycott?[4] The news footage of viscous police dogs flashing teeth and chewing up peaceful kids at the Children's Crusade in Birmingham 1963? The March on Washington? What impact did constant TV news footage from Vietnam have on the free speech and anti-war movements of the 1960s? Or consider the modern environmental movement absent those Apollo 17 "blue marble" photos of December 7, 1972.[5] We should also mention the media storm unleashed when Commander Marcos and the EZLN revolted in Chiapas on DAY 1 of the North American Free Trade Agreement: January 1, 1994.[6]

What these examples show is how social movements really get moving when individuals are able to identify with each other through shared experience facilitated by images (especially visual but also narrative), reaching *through media* across every previous barrier of time and space to recognize the social and increasingly environmental conditions of their shared grievances. It might now seem cliché, but in 1999, when the Seattle anti-World Trade Organization protestors chanted down the police and National Guard with "The Whole World Is Watching! The Whole World Is Watching!" they were announcing the arrival of a new digital era in activism, protest, and resistance.

More than that, Seattle was a postcard from the future we are living out now, in the dawning era of global warming and rapid anthropogenic climate change. Every day brings new reports of new places suffering new environmental stresses and new species facing new hardship due to rising temperatures, rising seas, and rising ocean acidification, not to mention disappearing ice caps, retreating glaciers, shrinking water supplies, creeping deserts, and invading pests. Increasingly, local people naturally tuned into their local social and environmental conditions awaken to the fact that their unique place-based struggle shares a common logic with other places and ultimately with everyplace across the horizon of globalization: Some local natural or social resource—such as a community of labor—that had once been shared as a public good is now being legally privatized, designated as fungible (saleable, transferable property), and subjected to market forces. The results are predictable: Long-term public value streams emergent from rooted communities and stable ecosystems are converted into short-term private profits. Ascendant neoliberal economic globalization—defined as the universalization of private-property-rights-driven industrial production and exchange—brings with it the globalization of social and environmental problems and thus resistance and ultimately social movements.

As a crucial correlate of these monumental changes, emergent global activism serves as an indicator of just how far and fast they are happening. What do the new opportunities for digital and social media participation in ever-wider communities, publics, and movements mean for the future of social movements in general, and to the global climate justice movement in particular? This question of the role of information and communication technologies in social movements lay at the heart of my study of California's redwood timber wars, and now it guides my current research on climate justice.[7]

California's long-simmering redwood timber war exploded in 1985 when MAXXAM announced its clear-cut liquidation plan for the newly acquired Pacific Lumber Company and its principal old growth holdings in the Humboldt Bay region, including the famed Headwaters grove, and only simmered down again when victorious forest defenders succeeded in coercing the state

and the federal government to buy Headwaters Grove for preservation in 1999. The decade following the movement to save Headwaters started with the fiery convergence of newly networked peoples, labor, and environmental movements at the anti-World Trade Organization protests in Seattle.

But whereas over the last quarter of the 20th century redwood forest defenders demanded transition to sustainable forestry and preservation of the last 1% of ancient redwoods (by 1985, 96% had already been cut, 3% had been preserved in parks, and the last 1%, which remained in private hands, had become the center of local land-use politics), and projected their concerns into the anti-globalization movement that burst on the scene in Seattle 1999, the climate justice movement now demands the same on a global scale—nothing less than the transformation of cultural/economic development away from its current tendency toward manifestly unjust and unsustainable dependence on pollution-heavy global privatization of nature by the fossil-fuel system, led by the big oil companies, and toward socially just and sustainable development dependent instead on democratically regulated renewable energies. These two struggles embody, each in their own time, both the social and environmental consequences of capitalist world system expansion.

IMAGINATION

The underlying, space-crunching communications and transportation technologies that make such global economic expansion possible also make possible the new, global protest movements. Today, for example, we observe how transnational peer-to-peer cultural production of shared knowledge drives the creation of collective political subjectivities that flash up wherever and whenever the big international institutions (WTO, IMF, WB, UNFCCC, etc.) convene to advance their objectives of global governance. Notwithstanding much debate concerning the relative strength or weakness of the *digital social ties* implied in that statement, what cannot be denied is how social media technologies are fueling the imaginations of legion erstwhile social movers, activists, youth, and untold other previously more sedentary social forces.[8] Not everyone can put their bodies into the street and, on a moment's notice, join an immigrants' rights march in Los Angeles, for example, but they can log on and channel some portion of their attention into the digital semiotic groundswell. What effect does that possibility have on their *imagination*, which I claim is *the crucial resource* for any and all social movements?

Why imagination? Before a person gets directly or physically involved in a movement, for example, by showing up at a meeting or joining a rally or donating money or starting to organize or changing her own daily life in ways that prefigure the world she hopes to achieve, she must first make the connection and imaginatively project herself into an absent collectivity, a group, about which she will learn precisely through *mass media*, the already

ubiquitous reach of which is multiplied by symbiotic social media that channel its fodder ever further and faster.[9] How much of the blogosphere is in fact the reposting, with commentary, of content culled from mass media? This is one way in which the digital communications revolution produces deep change in the *practice* of both individual and collective subjectivity. The new possibilities it presents to all—for participation, for self education, and for adding our voices to the public debate over crucial ideas—changes the way we think about ourselves as belonging to this or that group, or being vested in this or that political process. It changes how we judge our own personal efficacy and hence our prefigurative fantasies of power and heroism.[10] Can I really participate in the United Nations international climate talks, for example, or the global climate justice movement? What would that look like? What's the climate buzz on social media? Climate movement groups and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are tweeting like crazy, and so is the Secretary General of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which convenes the UN climate talks (themselves fully online at unfccc.int). Social movements are nothing without these technological possibilities for seeing beyond oneself to identify with distant or wide-flung communities of grievance. Such projections rely on new fantasies that emergent semiotic channels of planetary social (mass) media make increasingly possible.[11]

DANGEROUS PLACES

A related and even more primary condition of such possibility is the fundamental role of *place* in every actual, concrete appearance of an individual's imaginative projection of self into community or identification with distant causes. Most people remain grounded in, and most attached, to their local relations, and when the open channel of social (mass) media reflects on their homegrown conditions, allowing them to see themselves in the face of such others, identification is possible and fantasies ignite. Daydreaming sets in. Look at that! Could I be part of that? Could I do that here?

Thus do today's changing technological conditions of possibility for collective subjectivity open up new and qualitatively distinct opportunities for social movements to channel up local, place-based attention to grievance and conflict into global publics that identify and self-organize under common knowledge of governance, economy, and other social forces that variously appear to exercise hegemony or otherwise tower over smaller-scale or individual interests. With such newly shared and so more confident knowledge supplanting or at least augmenting the symbolic figures (i.e., perceived authority figures, catastrophic events, unrealized desires, fatal losses, and unjust grievances) that had previously motivated people in their ongoing struggles, movements can be more effective, exercise more reach, and more successfully recruit.

Social media are helping make such places *dangerous* to the powers that be, and that have profited off those places for so long—dangerous because, as places hosting modern institutions of economic exchange based on private property rights, public spheres built on rights of free speech, and polities built on political rights of universal participation, their local histories of cultural and economic conflict are recorded in daily news, stored in local archives, and debated in media-driven political campaigns. When, in the course of events associated with colonization by the capitalist world economic system, unusual violence breaks out and starts producing corpses—as it inevitably does when proponents of modernity get busy installing their new systems over and in the place of previous ways and means of life—the ensuing reports and photographic evidence capture a snapshot of the social relations prevailing in that historical moment. Everyone chimes in to the open public sphere with opinions, analysis, and new facts. Reports are made and records are kept. Stories told and retold accumulate into archives of violence and become increasingly potent symbols and political weapons. Monuments and historical markers spring up. The event, the violence, and its archive get built into place. Such places remember, in other words—by which I mean they increasingly come to exist as such, as meaningful places, as archives of the objective violence of the social relations by means of which the place was originally colonized, developed, modernized, or otherwise internalized within the ascendant world order (culture) of global capitalism.

In the resulting *dangerous places* of the modernizing world, such constitutive violence lies just beneath the surface. It structures the historical archive within which contemporary social and environmental conflicts are conducted. Hence, *colonization by the culture system of modern capitalism*—with which necessarily prolix term I mean the dynamic institutional triad of constitutionally set up and legitimated private-property-rights-driven markets, free-speech-rights-driven public spheres, and political-rights-driven democratic polity—is the process by which the subjective, criminal violence of historical agents, acting as emissaries of the colonizing culture system, authorized by its laws and legitimated by its narratives, gets objectified in the deep cultural structures of place that come to preside over future political consciousness. Subjective violence by the victors of historical struggles pervades and eventually becomes the objective, structural violence of institutions.[12] Slavery made the United States a place where Jim Crow could make sense and work well for the powerful. Jim Crow, in turn, made a place where the prison industrial complex could make sense and big profits. This objective system of violence haunts the built environment with landmarks like Louisiana's Angola State Prison, which endures as a visual legacy of white power spanning each of these eras.[13] Indian genocide in the redwoods made a place where it now makes sense for white capitalists to fight with predominantly white labor over the spoils of industrial timber production on what had been the First Peoples' land. One hundred years of such struggle between big timber capital and labor over the spoils of industrial timber

extraction, which cut 96% of the ancient redwood forests and built huge accumulations of timber capital as well as thriving working class mill towns, made Humboldt a place where it makes sense for forest defenders to revolt against the status quo and link their current struggles to the labor wars and Indian wars that set the social and environmental conditions of the present. What these two historical narratives share is their common modernity— they are both particular instances of the general story of how subjective, criminal violence set up the institutions of markets, public spheres, and polities everywhere in the new world that we now call developed, modern. Each is an allegory illuminating the creation of the social systems of objective violence that we take for granted today, and which form the cultural unconscious—the system of cultural assumptions—that inform everyday life in the United States.

Canadian political philosopher Charles Taylor calls this basic institutional set-up *the modern social imaginary*, using the term *imaginary* in a way that imbues the theoretical concept with psychological dynamism, and which suggests that the unconscious body might have a strong role to play in the process.[14] From this perspective, in what follows capitalism will come to be understood not merely as an isolated sphere of productive activity, separate from society, but rather as the objective system of violence embodied in legalized private property and the enterprises (firms, etc.) that can operate as such only because they are nested in a broader set of institutions (civil society, the state, etc.), the combination of which amounts to a new set of shared assumptions, a new moral order that is shared, above all, by those who have become, by force or by choice, or by some combination of such agencies, modern.[15]

MODERN SOCIAL IMAGINARIES

The term "social imaginary" refers to the shared self-understandings that are embodied in a group's characteristic set of institutionalized actions, and which define the group as such, as an object of experience. The shared understandings have objective ramifications because they are always already, by definition, *put into action*—they are ideas being performed without necessarily being conscious. For example, the shared idea that voting is good is embodied in the cultural practice of democracy, with obvious objective effects in the world. Any particular social imaginary, or culture, is distinguished as such, as unique, precisely by the constellation of such ideas and the practices within which they are embodied and expressed objectively. Today, modern societies share the assumptions discussed above, for example that private property is good and legitimate, that free speech is to be valued, and that polities should be ruled by their peoples. Free markets, open public spheres, and democratic governance are the hallmarks of modern legitimacy.

More useful than the widely used term "culture," the term social imaginary refers to values, expectations, norms, beliefs, morals, and ideas of what is good and sacred—but it frames these also, coterminously, as always already embodied and performed in collective, objective institutional practices. Emile Durkheim would have called them social facts.[16]

The term social imaginary moves us beyond the reductionism of either idealism or materialism, a path Marx himself took in writing that "Man makes history, but not under conditions of his own choosing." Explaining the remark, he continued: "The beginner who has learned a new language always translates it back to his mother tongue, but he assimilates the spirit of the new language and expresses himself freely in it only when he moves in it without recalling the old and when he forgets his native tongue."[17] These two dialectical statements embody the logic of structure and agency that drives sociological knowledge production, and which I place at the center of my own use of cultural, linguistic, psychoanalytic, economic, and environmental theory to further develop the term modern social imaginary.[18]

Looking closer at the term will be instructive: If the social is objective and collective, the term must be read *objective and collective imaginary*. And if the term *imaginary* refers to the imagination, and thus to the active, representational, meaning-making activity of a subject, the term must be read *objective collective active representation*. Finally, if we follow structuralism's use of Saussurian linguistics and construe the objective collective social order as a symbolic order—an a priori meaning-making system precisely comparable to a language system that subjects put to use—the term must ultimately be read as follows: Social imaginaries are *objective collective symbolic orders of and for active representation*. A social imaginary is thus a usable system of ideal elements already up and running in an institutional structure; a system of meaningful institutions into which people are born and which they therefore tend to embody and naturalize exactly like they do their first language. To every individual, the social imaginary within which it emerges as a thinking and acting subject exists as a structural condition of possibility of its experience as a member of the group, in the same way that its mastery of its mother tongue is a condition of possibility of its coherent speech in and among the same group. A social imaginary is thus something that people use, and must use, to make meaning. This concept applies a linguistic metaphor to all social life: Society is a conversation—actually more like an argument.

According to Taylor, what is *modern* about modern social imaginaries is the emergence in the period 1500 to the present of a specific set of practices that comes to dominate social life, not just social life in the places where they were created, but social life everywhere that they are exported, and each of which draws energy and legitimation from the idea of individual rights. In modern societies, those characterized by a *modern social imaginary*, the idea of individual rights promotes the strength and legitimacy, and hence the geographical extension, of one specific set of reciprocally constitutive institutions (practices): Again, these are private property markets, free speech public spheres, and polities ruled by the people. Modernization means precisely the extension of these institutional practices in time and space, a sweeping wave of social changes driven by the Euro-Anglo-American liberal cultural *discourse of rights*.[19]

Again, as this modern capitalist culture, this social imaginary, expands in space, colonizing new places that previously hosted some other social system, it invariably remakes them into what I call *dangerous places*—places that remember events of extraordinary violence in landscape, architecture, institutions, and mass media narratives and photojournalist images of dead bodies, weeping relatives, catastrophic poverty, starvation, oppression, denuded and poisoned landscapes, resistance, and war—but especially dead bodies, and doubly so when these are imbued with the absence of justice for the perpetrators.

To whom are such places of modern objective violence dangerous? How do they drive the formation of social movement publics? What pushes them upwards and outwards from local to global and universal significance? And how do the more recent social media technologies increasingly ensure the connection of these places to emergent global political subjectivities? By way of answering, I first revisit my ethnographic journey into California's redwood timber wars, and then I report back from my ongoing field research at the UN climate talks in Durban, South Africa (2011); Doha, Qatar (2012); and Warsaw, Poland (2013).

CALIFORNIA'S REDWOOD TIMBER WARS

California's narrow redwood ecozone reaches from the coast inland up to 30 miles, and stretches from Big Sur in the south to the Oregon border in the north. Between discovery in 1850 by white European ambassadors of the U.S. capitalist economic (culture) system, and the purchase of the last 1% of privately owned, unprotected acreage by Charles Hurwitz and his MAXXAM corporation, the big timber companies took 96% of the ancient redwoods, yielding some of the world's finest lumber for building and contributing greatly to the construction of California's great cities of San Francisco, Sacramento, and Los Angeles, as well as the rebuilding of San Francisco after the great fire of 1906.

What happened to the indigenous peoples who lived there, and to the workers whose labor made the whole affair profitable? The Wiyot people who inhabited Humboldt Bay were reduced from somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 to perhaps 200 between first colonization in 1850 and the massacres of 1860. The Hupa, Karuk, and Yaruk tribes, which populated the redwood forested riverbanks of the Trinity, Arcata, and Klamath Rivers, and the Whilkut, Chilula, Nongatl, Chimariko, Mattole, Sinkyone, Lassic, and Wailaki tribes, which inhabited the wider Humboldt Bay redwood

region, were reduced to a minimal threat by dint of murder, starvation, and ultimately forced relocation to camps and reservations.

With this genocide, the previously communally held native lands were opened to privatization by whites, who transformed them into legal property under compulsion by the U.S. state land system. Thus rendered for all-out industrial competition in redwood lumber production over the ensuing decades, the rising lumber barons subjected them to continually increasing scales of production and consolidation through acquisition and merger into massive corporate tree farms, sometimes reaching 200,000 to 300,000 acres (MAXXAM and Simpson timber, respectively, in 1985). Themselves subjected to unremitting price competition, they advanced their own interests through continual division and subdivision of the labor process; by speeding up their axes, saws, and mills in order to increase labor productivity; and by relentlessly substituting machinery for human labor.[20] And they fought labor organization with every tool they had, including blacklists and direct, murderous violence.[21]

Exploitation by the lumber barons provoked labor resistance, and what followed was common enough: the violent repression of redwood labor movements, and in the end a compromise that promoted smooth, rapid, and eventually massive escalation of production.

The result was nearly total deforestation. Ninety-six percent of the original giants were cut, and in the process the great lumber barons and their corporate followers laid many thousands of miles of logging roads without much thought to engineering their integrity. For generations they bled, and continue to bleed, large-scale erosion into the salmon-bearing streams, at once both destroying the salmon's magnificent productivity and raising the long-term cost of salmon and redwood production alike.

In this way, colonial genocide cleared the way for private-property-rights-driven capitalism, which came in and set the social and environmental conditions for the redwood timber wars that erupted in 1985. In that year, CEO Charles Hurwitz brought the MAXXAM Corporation into the redwoods on a wave of deregulated junk bond leverage. First he bought the local Pacific Lumber, owner of 200,000 plus acres, including most of the last 1% of uncut and unprotected, privately owned old growth (3% had been preserved in parks). Then he announced a plan to cut it all, roiling this once distant and obscure place that was already occupied by the remnant and marginalized tribes, who nevertheless had learned to share the deteriorating forests and rivers with generations of exploited labor and an unceasing tide of educated urban refugees who thought they were heading back to land and away from the harsh city life of politics and consumerism. The political awareness and organizational skills of this last group ended up transforming this erstwhile hinterland into a media hub and symbolic center of converging indigenous, labor, and environmental movements.

Woodland creatures played a crucial role at this juncture. Several endangered species use these forests, and so the forest defenders used two of them,

the marbled murrelet and the spotted owl, and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to fight back against Hurwitz. They sued repeatedly on behalf of the birds, fighting every timber harvest plan they could on a case-by-case basis, depending on which of California's Forest Practice Rules MAXXAM was violating at each particular site. They conducted a relentless campaign of civil disobedience as well, blocking roads and trespassing into active logging sites to shut or slow the cut down by putting their bodies in the way of the work being done. And finally in 1990 they staged the largest environmental protest to date—Redwood Summer, a whole season of direct-action civil disobedience modeled on Mississippi Summer, the 1964 civil rights campaign. The idea was the same—create an influx of outsiders capable of breaking through the monopoly on established reality exercised by the timber industry—just like the white monopoly exercised over power in the 1960s South. People came from all over the nation to shut down the logging and defend the ancient redwoods.

But right before the summer *season of protest* began, some still unknown individuals planted a bomb in the car of lead organizers Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney. They were not killed, but critical damage was done to their bodies, the Redwood Summer campaign, and the redwood forest defense. The FBI proceeded to arrest them for carrying the bomb and associated the movement with terrorism in the public sphere with several press releases and appearances. In the end the FBI never pressed any charges, because there was no evidence. But, by investigating the victims and not doing a wider inquiry, they tainted the movement in the media and contributed to the defeat of legislation then pending that would have radically transformed the timber industry in California—the California's *Forests Forever Initiative* state ballot initiative which was on ballot that fall and would have banned clear cutting as well as even residual harvesting of any trees over 150 years old. The measure was defeated by a narrow margin of 4%. That was a giant victory for industrial timber interests all over California, not just in Humboldt.

But in the following months, forest defenders launched more logging lawsuits against MAXXAM, and in his defense Hurwitz filed a 5th-Amendment-based so-called *takings* lawsuit against the federal government, claiming that the ESA murrelet regulations had taken *all of the value* of his property at Headwaters Grove.

Finally, in 1999 Hurwitz, the state of California, and the Federal government under Clinton settled the lawsuit out of court with the so-called *Headwaters Deal*, in which they exchanged combined funds and lands valued at around $500 million for the 2,700 acres of Headwaters Grove—even though Hurwitz had paid only double that amount for the whole company in 1985, which then held over 200,000 acres, the old growth mill town of Scotia with its 235 company houses, a giant welding company (later sold for $30 million), an office building in San Francisco (later sold for $50 million), and more.[22]

Going back to 1988, we see that MAXXAM had another problem brewing. In 1988 it acquired the Kaiser Aluminum Company in yet another leveraged buyout. Kaiser was global and unionized, and by 1998 the company was locked in heated contract negotiations with its United Steel Workers. When the negotiations broke down, the steel workers went on strike, MAXXAM locked them out, and, believe it or not, they shipped in laid-off timber workers from Humboldt to replace steel workers at their Spokane, Washington, factory. They even drove them onto the site in ominous looking buses with blacked-out windows. The steel workers promptly headed down to Humboldt and allied themselves with the forest defenders, setting the stage for United Steel Workers from Kaiser and Humboldt forest defenders to famously march together in Seattle against the WTO.

In the spring of 1999, I embarked on two years of field research on the scene of this struggle, living and working in Humboldt's ancient redwoods, participating in the timber wars, and dwelling as much as possible in the libraries and historical archives of the region. Using participant observation, interviews, and archival study, I traced the social and ecological conditions of the timber wars back across 150 years of colonization, industrialization, and deforestation, during which I ultimately recognized that these three consecutive historical phases can each be understood as distinct but related forms of conflict over property. First came the struggle for property in land—an epoch of colonial Indian wars; then a struggle for property in values produced by industrial labor directed at redwood ecology—an epoch of union struggles; and finally a struggle for property in ecology itself—an epoch of deforestation, environmental resistance, and converging labor and ecology movements. But these discoveries in the field and in the archives sent me back even further—all the way back to the modern *culture of rights* that characterizes the deep structure of American nationalism and market revolution.

Assembling these ideas in the interest of explaining the region's contemporary environmental politics, I was learning how the politics of timber war are performed on a cultural landscape built over successive decades of Indian wars, labor wars, and timber wars. In assembling the story and comparing public discourse in these three epochal struggles, I discovered how each had produced a particular moment of *extra*-ordinary violence around which social memory has crystallized over time: the genocidal massacre of Wiyot Indians during their world renewal ceremony in 1860, the killing of strikers at the gates of the Holmes-Eureka Mill during The Great Lumber Strike of 1935, and the car bombing of forest defenders in 1990. Representations of these events now saturate the living, symbolic, and built social world of Humboldt. Each spasm of *violence* provoked a media spectacle that captured an image of the social relations prevailing in that historical moment. The narratives and symbols they provoked, for example in newspaper reports, labor publications, court records, and historical accounts, now circulate continuously in Humboldt; they inhabit the museums,

libraries, and mass media *archives*; they structure its built landscape and its architecture of social *memory*; and so they shape its practical cultures of timber production and environmental resistance. They haunt Humboldt's embattled landscape of company towns, museums, monuments, and parks as well as its raucous public debate over corporate forestry.

As an ethnographer of the timber wars, I discovered how these events became allegorical of the dominant tendencies and struggles in each epoch—how the stories are told and retold, how they accumulate meaning over time, how the texts accumulate, and how the retellings grow and enter peoples' lives and identities. For example, in Humboldt today, one still encounters these stories everywhere. When talking about the struggle against MAXXAM, conversations almost always lead back to the bombing of organizers Judy Bari and Darryl Cherney—the bombing punctuates the story. When people talk about it, and the bombing gets mentioned, mention of the violent event which seems to say, "see, that's what happens when environmental movements get really radical and then get close to victory by putting peoples' lives on the line, like in the civil rights movement, that's when somebody tries to pop them!" Such stories of extraordinary violence become a resource for the movements, which build on them and retell them, always relying on one or more communications media to propound their moral arguments and to broadcast their claims, educating people and building their own publics. Today, such stories are increasingly told and retold through new social media, in which the new possibilities of peer-to-peer coproduction multiplies their range and deepens their perspective considerably.

The case of Humboldt unfolded in an open public sphere in which opposing individuals representing competing interests openly debated the meaning of subjective acts of the most extraordinary violence, as they do in every new place that the modern social imaginary establishes itself, for, by the definition above, to be modern is to practice (property) rights-driven markets, (free speech) rights-driven publics, and (voting) rights-driven polities together. This performative institutional troika makes places into archives of social memory of constitutive violence that, over time, increasingly mediates future consciousness, and thus of course future projects and politics. It makes places dangerous namely to capital, by which term in this instance I mean those accumulations of objectified labor and ecological values and the nameable agents of their enjoyment. In Humboldt, that means the big timber corporations who must now tread more lightly on forest soils and communities that remember genocidal white colonial violence in the same long narrative/image as labor massacres and bombed out environmentalists. To see this idea telescoped in a single concrete particular image, visit the deforested, salmon-stripped mountain banks of the Eel River where it flows through MAXXAM's anti-union company town of Scotia, California—site of the 1860 massacre of the Wiyot peoples, reduced from around 2,000 pre-colonial population to 200 after just 10 years of white presence. The

company has changed names, but the colonial, industrial, and environmental traces of its making are left for our perusal, and for our fantasies of power, participation, and potential prefiguration of converging indigenous peoples, labor, and environmental movements. That is the symbolic work that MAXXAM can do for progressive movements on the scene today.

This method can now be generalized and applied to new research. As I used the concept of modern social imaginaries to study local markets, publics, and polity in the redwoods, and discovered in the process how signature events of extraordinary violence allegorized the region's history of colonization, industrialization, and globalization, other researchers in conflict-torn regions at the erstwhile margins of the world economic system's expansion might similarly tune into local archives. Are they also accumulating dangerous, violent stories about primitive accumulation, labor struggle, and environmental struggle? Do they also embody the legacy of capitalism? Are they showing the common cause? Are they building into archival engines for converging peoples, labor, and environmental movements?

Global ethnographers of such *dangerous places* can now, using new social media, much more easily tune into the local, place-based modern social imaginaries and enter their archive of violent colonization, industrialization, and environmental degradation. They can encounter from afar the archival legacy of rights-driven markets, publics, and polity ruled by the people. They can dig up the images and narratives of extra-ordinary violence, raise them into public consciousness, and assemble them into dangerous stories about the common conditions and causes of emergent peoples, labor, and environmental movements. And they can channel these local stories into global public arenas, in support of local projects by identifying struggles across every social barrier.

With the ongoing rise of modernity, understood as the expansion to universal significance of the modern social imaginary, this world is being made into a single place, with reports coming in from its wide-flung, constituent *dangerous places* now assembling themselves into a planetary engine driving the global convergence of movements around the unfolding catastrophe of climate change. These places, as archives of violence, are precisely the substance—the mass media content—that new cyberactivists, as soon as they tune into the modern social imaginary and realize the possibilities it has objectified for them, can and are beginning to use in their newfangled construction of transnational collective subjects of social movement. Find a real place, enter the archive, do the history, discover the events that captured public attention for the violence they did, start your blog, open it to comments, post your evidence online, and open the channel up from your locale into the global semiotic flow of identificatory attentions that establish, with ever more certainty, the common logic of social movements in the 21st-century epoch of imperial globalization. One emergent global capitalist social imaginary. One planet, with only one atmosphere, as its industrial fodder. And one social movement (of movements) to the barricades!

CLIMATE JUSTICE NOW

As the summer of 2013 arrived, the United Nations was gearing up yet again for another international climate conference, hoping to make progress on two distinct work streams—first, a new treaty for adoption in 2015, and implementation in 2020, designed to govern global carbon policy in the post-2020 era, and second, a year-by-year effort to increase ambition in reducing CO_2 emissions incrementally in the years leading up 2020. Like the Durban COP 17 in 2011 and the Doha COP 18 in 2012, the Warsaw conference of 2013 brought the familiar convergence of issue-driven, NGO-centered coalitions (like CAN, Greenpeace, etc.), as well an emergent, more radical distributed network movement—Climate Justice Now!

The convergence of people and movements at these climate COPs is reminiscent of those great spectacles of resistance that made the anti-globalization movement familiar to all—but there are important differences. A story from my fieldwork at COP 17 illustrates one driving force of the changing scene:

"Mic Check!" cried the middle-aged white woman, who turned out to be a Canadian representative of the Global Justice Ecology Project.[23]

"MIC CHECK!" came the sonorous reply from a crowd of around 200 folks, all of whom had UN badges granting them entry to the international climate talks.

"I've been coming to these COPs since 2004," she continued. "I'VE BEEN COMING TO THESE COPs SINCE 2004," repeating her words by shouting at the top of their lungs in the style that Occupiers all around the world have taken to calling *the human microphone*.

"They are dominated and controlled by the 1 percent."

"THEY ARE DOMINATED AND CONTROLLED BY THE ONE PERCENT."

"That will not change . . . "

"THAT WILL NOT CHANGE . . . "

"Unless we make it."

"UNLESS WE MAKE IT."

"And if we go . . . "

"AND IF WE GO . . . "

"We will not have . . . "

"WE WILL NOT HAVE . . . "

"The power to make that change."

"THE POWER TO MAKE THAT CHANGE"

"So I say . . . "

"SO I SAY . . . "

"Occupy the COP."

"OCCUPY THE COP!"

"Occupy the COP!"

"OCCUPY THE COP."[24]

Such was the scene inside Albert Luthuli International Convention Center on December 9, 2011, at COP 17 in Durban, South Africa. The UN climate talks were on the verge of collapse after 10 days that had failed to produce any significant agreement on the issues at hand—who and by how much and on what timetable should each nation commit to cutting greenhouse gasses, in the interest of heading off runaway global warming and climate change? Frustrated activists demanding "Climate Justice Now!" adopted the Occupy tactic and Mic Checked the 17th Conference of Parties (COP)—the annual global climate conference that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has convened in a different city every year since 1995.[25]

The national delegations had met. The environmental ministers had made their ritual three-minute statements. The NGOs had convened their official side events on every conceivable topic, from the Third World Network's panel "What must Durban deliver?" on opening day to "Multi-stakeholder Collaboration to Reinforce Adaptation Opportunities for African Pastoral Peoples," a panel convened by the Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC), featuring speakers from Conservation International, UNESCO, WMO, the Ministry of Water from Chad, and the director of the nomadic women's association of Chad.[26] And the global Day of Action had come and gone, bringing 15,000 protestors through the streets of Durban past city hall to the militarized perimeter of the Albert Luthuli International Convention Center.

My work was done, or so I thought, and late in the afternoon of the last scheduled day of negotiations, I headed to the central café at the Hilton and sat down for a late lunch. But then a sound caught my attention. It grew until I realized that the shouting and singing was clearly in protest. I jumped up from my table, switched on my video camera, and hustled inside the conference hall, wading into the agitated sea of bodies . . . The Occupation of COP17 was on, and I was there to witness it, quite by accident, not unlike my fortuitous arrival at the WTO protests in Seattle in 1999, the so-called Battle in Seattle that contributed so much to the anti-globalization movement.[27]

Yes, I had known the potential for protest—no, I didn't expect what happened next. Yes, I had been at the Occupy site in the designated protest zone outside the concrete barriers that made central Durban look like the U.S. green zone in Iraq. But even though I talked to everyone I could, and had been told to expect the unexpected, I had not heard the call to action. I had been asked several times, "are you on Facebook or Twitter?"—to which I had to respond that "sorry, no, my iPhone has no international SIM card, my local cell is just a phone, with no Internet, and the web connection at my local residence is not worth the trouble—so basically I'm off the network. But can you call me on my local phone if anything comes up?"

"Really?" replied one twenty-something international hipster from the rich world north, probably the U.K., "that's not how it works any more.

You've got to be online if you want to be in the movement and find out what's going on." That is how everyone except for me knew where to go. But thankfully I got lucky and happened on the scene, not as a protestor, but rather as a visual, participatory ethnographer shooting video, still photos, and conducting interviews in and among not just the converging social movements and activists who trail the COP around the world, year after year, but also the corporations that pursue their interests here and the political delegations that come to represent their countries.

Paradoxically, I proceeded to experience just how crucial new social media have become by having my own microcosm of service denial. As these reflections on COP 17 suggest, e-mail, blog, and web-based organizing have become essential *conditions of possibility* for converging social movement groups and activists, who flock to these big international conferences in order to participate in a truly global democratic experiment in self-governance. Now the social movements are going digital in ways we have to understand if we want to gauge their potential and compare them to previous movements. What would Seattle 1999 have looked like, we might ask, had there been an #OccupyWTO Twitter feed comparable to that of #OccupyCOP17? Perhaps there would have been a convergence of 500,000 indigenous, labor, and environmental activists and protestors, instead of the 50,000 that managed to shut down the WTO ministerial conference.

FROM ANTI-GLOBALIZATION TO THE CLIMATE JUSTICE MOVEMENT

One thing we learn from the sequence of events Seattle 1999-to-Warsaw COP 19 is that all of this digital globalism brings the local more dearly into play. Place-based movements become ever more relevant not just to the local scene, but to the global flow of signs constitutive of emergent global subjectivities, for example transnational social movements like the global climate justice movement. Everyone on the ground in Seattle had come from somewhere—far or near, and they came bearing the weight of their own witnessing, from their hometowns and villages across the globe, to confront power, as they see it, with a modicum of face-to-face criticism.

At this juncture, it is tempting to digress into a list of the hundreds of protest groups that, originating across the horizon of globalization, each from a concrete geographical place where the expanding world economic system, manifest in the activity of corporations that accumulate by externalizing costs on communities of labor and environment, provoke the grievances that set in motion the chains of identificatory events that allow, for example, a group of forest defenders from the redwood region of northern California to see their struggle against the MAXXAM Corporation as equivalent to those of native Mexicans and peasant farmers in Chiapas. They are defending their forests against the same or similar corporations

that are destroying the redwoods and the salmon of Humboldt. We are Zapatistas—and Zapatistas are forest defenders. What makes these identifications possible are the communications and transportation technologies that are now trending toward unlimited access to global virtual co-presence. Communications channels, newly global and digital, are very simply the substance of collective identification, and the faster and wider they function, the faster and wider is it possible (not necessarily probable, but possible), for the identificatory chains of equivalence to grow.

Now it is 2014, the COP has come and gone from Warsaw 2013 and is heading for Lima, Peru, in December to work on the next climate treaty, which agreement will govern the international climate policy in the crucial post-2020 decades. That period will see either a 90% cutback in carbon emissions before 2030, or runaway climate change and an ensuing era of what Christian Parenti has called *climate chaos*—the disruption of human lifeways that is already developing on the front lines of climate change in the tropics of Africa, where warming is setting off human migrations and bloody sectarian battles on the postcolonial landscape of weaponized tribal groups and failed states.[28]

In full cognizance of the situation at hand, global activists are rising up like never before, constructing the widest and deepest social movement networks the world has ever seen. The emergent global climate justice movement is one such increasingly (socially) mediated network flow of attention, an infrastructure of and for the identification of struggles; it is a convergence of peoples, labor, and environmental movements that is already shaping the UN talks and thus the global policy response to global warming, and thus by extension the future of climate change, and by further extension the livability of our planet and all the present and future lives that depend on its natural systems.[29] Be sure to follow the negotiations on Twitter at @UN_ClimateTalks for the 140-character updates of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and simply search the social media site for the handles of the big indigenous peoples, poor peoples, labor, and environmental groups. They are all there, hoping you will click their link and channel some modicum of your available attention into their particular public struggle. Maybe you will even follow them home, to the dangerous places and archives of violence that ground their participation in emergent global civil society.

CONCLUSIONS

The case of Humboldt shows how the capitalist world economic (culture) system, in its ongoing phase of globalization, drives the increasing integration and emergence of global civil society. Its market forces come, they colonize, industrialize and deforest or otherwise mine a place for its natural resources. And as the system rises and globalizes, so too do its public spheres rise and globalize.

But Humboldt is just a single case where this global process implodes in the local, producing the conditions of possibility for converging movements. Consider that the 2010 UN report titled *Universal Ownership* documented how the world's top 3,000 corporations produce so much external environmental cost that paying for them would eat up to 30% to 40% of their profits.[30] Those percentages constitute a conservative UN-style estimate. But from the standpoints of both economic history and business economics, which explain how firms plan their internal pricing, we know that the first rule of thumb is that avoided cost equals profit. Think of all the concrete, historical places of subjective-cum-objective violence where these corporations externalize their costs on communities of labor and nature.

In this way, the conditions of possibility of converging peoples, labor, and environmental movements have been and are being set up across the horizon of globalization, everywhere that colonization by the culture system of modern, western capitalism has come in and built societies modeled on its own constitutionally enumerated rights-driven private property markets, free speech public spheres, and polities ruled by the people. Each locally instantiated modern social imaginary is an archive on fire with violence, modern violence, remembering the living, symbolic, and built traces first of colonization, then of industrialization, and finally of the accumulating environmental disturbances wrought along the way.

These archives, as conditions of possibility that the hegemonic claims of the victors can and will be contested, now stand at the dawn of a new era, the era of social media. Cyberactivism is, and will increasingly become, the name of these conditions.

NOTES

1. On the global climate justice movement, visit IICAT, the International Institute of Climate Action & Theory (iicat.org); see also John Foran and Richard Widick "Breaking Barriers to Climate Justice," *Contexts: Understanding People in Their Social Worlds* 12, no. 2, 34–39; Patrick Bond, "Climate Justice," *Critical Environmental Politics*, ed. C. Death (Routledge 2014); and John Clammer, Culture, Development, and Social Theory (Zed Books, 2013), especially the chapter "Culture and Climate Justice," 144–161. Connect with the climate justice movement online by searching out the following groups: Climate Action Now (CAN), Friends of the Earth International (FOIE), Greenpeace, Climate-Justice-Now (C-J-N), SustainUs, 1Sky, and 350.org.
2. *The Black Press: Soldiers Without Swords*, a documentary film produced by Stanley Nelson (California Newsreel, 1998), tells the story of Black journalists from the abolition movement and the founding of the first Black newspaper, *Freedom's Journal* in 1827 by Frederick Douglas, to Ida B. Wells, the first female newspaper owner and civil rights crusader, Robert S. Abbot and his paper the *Chicago Defender*, the great migration, and the era of Martin Luther King.
3. "Nation Horrified by Murder of Kidnapped Chicago Youth," *Jet Magazine*, (September 25, 1955), 4–9.

4. For a useful compendium of now iconic news images that helped constitute the Civil Rights Movement, see the PBS series *Eyes on the Prize* (www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/eyesontheprize/).
5. NASA photograph AS17–148–22727, http://spaceflight.nasa.gov/gallery/images/apollo/apollo17/html/as17-148-22727.html.
6. See Big Noise Films' *Zapatista* (1998) for an indication of the power of media images at the dawn of the Internet age.
7. See Richard Widick, *Trouble in the Forest: California's Redwood Timber Wars* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009); Foran and Widick, "Breaking Barriers to Climate Justice."
8. See, e.g., Malcom Gladwell, "Small Change," *The New Yorker*, (October 4, 2010); Lee Siegel, "Trouble by a Weak Connection," *New York Times*, (July 13, 2012); Evgeny Morozov, *To Save Everything, Click Here* (New York: Perseus Books, 2013) and *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom* New York: Perseus Books, 2013); Nicolas Carr, *The Shallows: What the Internet is Doing to our Brains* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2011).
9. Niklas Luhman, *The Reality of the Mass Media* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 1: "Whatever we know about our society, or indeed about the world in which we live, we know through mass media."
10. The technological and cultural conditions of possibility of fantasies of power in the constitution of social movements is comparable to the role of fantasies of power in the reproduction of masculine domination in the occupational culture of financial trading floors; see Richard Widick, "Flesh and the Free Market," *Theory & Society* 32 (2003), 679–723. According to the sociologically inclined psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, the human subject's (in our example, the social mover's) desire (to move) is always the desire of *the Other* (that is, the desire of the group, the culture—meaning that desire is always necessarily educated by the social world in which it is and must continue operating). The term "fantasy" indicates a scene, narrative, or imagistic series that presents to the imagination the staging of a desire that is always by definition in some measure unconscious; an unconscious source of desire is the group, the social, i.e., the necessary structure within which the subject is ensconced, and with which it must communicate and act, in the same way that the competent speaker is always necessarily unconscious to some extent of the language system being used to speak. Thus, in the foregoing, the subject's desire for omnipotence in the rebuttal of forces it experiences as towering over it and determining its fate is expressed in dreams, daydreams, and/or fantasies of successful opposition; that is the type of fantasy transformed by emergent technological conditions of possibility for collective identification through media—and that is what makes it so important to social movement studies. In a different register, and basing his arguments on cognitive psychology rather than psychoanalysis, in his classic book *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice, (Harvard University Press, 1984), 373–397, Pierre Bourdieu describes the same effect of culture on desire as "the choice of the necessary."
11. On the sociological uses of cultural sociology and psychoanalytic social theory in the study of place-based social movements, see Widick, *Trouble in the Forest*, 22–23; on using the same to study the United Nations climate talks and the global climate justice movement, see Richard Widick, "Invitation to Durban: Ethnography and the Politics of Climate Activism at COP17" (working paper, The International Institute of Climate Action and Theory, 2014), last modified January 19, 2014, www.iicat.org/invitation-to-durban-ethnography-and-the-politics-of-climate-change-at-cop17-durban-south-africa-nov-28-dec-9-2011/; Richard Widick, "What is Driving our Modern

Social Imaginaries? Turning to Cultural and Environmental Sociology for Answers," *Perspectives: Newsletter of the ASA Theory Section* 31, no. 2 (2009); and Richard Widick, ibid., "Flesh and the Free Market." For a relevant discussion of publics and public formation using comparable cultural and psychoanalytic ideas, see Mustafa Emirbayer and Mimi Sheller, "Publics in History," *Theory and Society* 28 (1999), 145–197.
12. On the distinction between subjective violence ("acts of crime and terror, civil unrest, international conflict") and objective violence ("'systemic' violence, or the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth operation of our economic and political systems"), see Slavoj Zizek, *Violence* (New York: Picador, 2008), 1–2; also Patchen Merkell and Candice Vogler "Violence and Redemption," *Public Culture* 15, no.1 (2003), 1–10, 1: "Violence haunts liberal political thought. The defining image of early modern European social contract theory—and an image that remains potent in contemporary contractarian moral and political theory—locates the possibility of civil society in a compact among men who are long accustomed to the use of force in the bloody business of self-assertion and self-preservation." The liberal state substitutes objective, normalized, legitimate, monopolized, and patient violence for the pathological, subjective violence of unorganized life.
13. See *The Farm: Angola USA* (Gabriel Films and Curtis Productions, 1998).
14. Charles Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). For the best and usefully short treatments of the concept of social imaginaries, see Craig J. Calhoun, "Imagining Solidarity: Cosmopolitanism, Constitutional Patriotism, and the Public Sphere," *Public Culture* 14, no.1 (2002), 147–171; and Michael Warner, "Publics and Counterpublics," *Public Culture* 14, no.1 (2002), 49–90.
15. For an extended discussion of this cultural approach to the dynamism of modern capitalism and the basic set of institutions within which it is nested, see Widick, *Trouble in the Forest*, 20–41.
16. Emile Durkheim, *Rules of Sociological Method* (New York: Free Press, 1966), 2–3.
17. Karl Marx, "The Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker (New York: W.W. Norton, 1852/1978), 594–595.
18. Dialectical thought begins from the totality of the social system as a set of relationships between people, labor, its products, and the world. Concrete and particular events, processes, connections, and developments are viewed as inseparable from the whole without being reducible to it. For Theodor Adorno ("Sociology and Psychology," *New Left Review* 46 [1968], 67–80), concrete and particular cultural artifacts are intersectional artifacts of social structure (institutions, symbolic order) and social action; their possible meanings are a function the social totality (see also *Negative Dialectics*, trans. E. B. Ashton [New York: Continuum, 1997]). In "A Portrait of Walter Benjamin" (*Prisms*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1967), 236, Adorno wrote: "[Walter Benjamin] never wavered in his fundamental conviction that the smallest cell of observed reality offsets the rest of the world." On dialectical thinking and ecological dialectics, respectively, see Bertell Ollman, "Why Dialectics? Why Now?" *Science & Society* 62, no. 3 (1998): 338–357 and David Harvey, *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1996).
19. On the constitutional tension between liberty and democracy, see Jenifer Nedelsky *Private Property and the Limits of American Constitutionalism: The Madisonian Framework and its Legacy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Nedelsky shows how the U.S. Constitution's dual imperatives of democracy and liberty produce the schism between political rights and

civil rights that profoundly shapes U.S. political culture; also Knud Haakonssen and Michael J. Lacey *Culture of Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Richard Flacks, *The American Left and the American Mind* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); and Jeffrey Alexander, *The Civil Sphere* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

20. Environmental theorists debated the second contradictions in capitalism in the journals *Capital Nature Socialism* and *Monthly Review*. See especially John Bellamy Foster, "Capitalism and Ecology: The Nature of the Contradiction" (*Monthly Review* 54, no. 4, September 2002, 6–16) and James O'Connor, "Capitalism, Nature, Socialism: A Theoretical Introduction" *CNS* 1 (1988), 11–38; "On the Two Contradictions of Capitalism," *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 2, no. 3 (1991), 107–109; *Natural Causes* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1998); and "What is Environmental History? Why Environmental History," *Capital Nature Socialism* 8, no. 2 (1997), 1–27. Also John Bellamy Foster, *Capitalism Against Ecology* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002); "Marx's Ecological Value Analysis," *Monthly Review* 52, no. 4 (2000); "The Scale of Our Ecological Crisis," *Monthly Review* 49, no. 11 (1998), 5–17; and "The Absolute General Law of Environmental Degradation Under Capitalism" *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992). Further: Samir Amin, "A Note on the Depreciation of the Future," *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992): 21–22; Victor Toledo, "The Ecological Crisis: A Second Contradiction of Capitalism" *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992), 22–24; and Michael A. Lebowitz, "Capitalism: How Many Contradictions?" *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992), 22–24.

21. See especially Richard Widick, *Trouble in the Forest*, 175–223 on industrialization and labor history; 129–174 on colonization, the land system, and genocide; and 225–275 on the contemporary environmental movement and the conflict with the MAXXAM corporation over Headwaters Grove and the last 1% of the ancient redwoods. See also Owen C. Coy, *The Humboldt Bay Redwood Region, 1850–1875* (Los Angeles: California State Historical Society, 1929); Daniel Cornford, *Workers and Dissent in the Redwood Empire* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987); Brett H. Melendy, "One Hundred Years of the Redwood Lumber Industry, 1850–1950" (PhD dissertation, Stanford University, microfilm title B26, Stanford, 1952); and Frank Onstine, *The Great Lumber Strike of Humboldt County 1935* (Arcata: Mercurial Enterprises).

22. In fact, the deal was quite a bit more complex, involving land transfers between the Pacific Lumber Company and other local firms as well as the cash exchange, and the adoption of a habitat conservation plan restricting the company's activity on its remaining lands, etc.; see Widick, *Trouble in the Forest*, 13–20, 47–50, 261–269.

23. Visit the Global Ecology Justice Project online at http://globaljusticeecology.org/.

24. Richard Widick, field notes and audio recording produced during ethnographic research at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, COP 17, Durban, December 9, 2011.

25. The UNFCCC convened the Conference of Parties in Berlin 1995; Geneva 1996; Kyoto 1997; Buenos Aires 1998; Bonn 1999; The Hague 2000; Marrakech 2001; Milan 2003; Buenos Aires 2004; Montreal 2005; Nairobi 2006; Bali 2007; Poznan 2008; Copenhagen 2009; Cancun 2010; Durban 2011; Doha 2012; and Warsaw 2013.

26. For a crash course in the complexity of these climate COPs, and for the breadth of engagement by civil society groups, see the UNFCCC's official

schedule of side events: http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/durban_nov_2011/application/pdf/see_brochure_cop_17_cmp_7.pdf

27. See Alexander Cockburn, *Five Days that Shook the World: Seattle and Beyond* (New York: Verso, 2000); Eddie Yuen, *The Battle of Seattle* (New York: Soft Skull Press, 2001).

28. Christian Parenti, *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence* (New York: Nation Books, 2011).

29. See especially Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: Penguin Press, 2004), and *Commonwealth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009); also Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society* (Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1996).

30. United Nations Environment Program Finance Initiative, *Universal Ownership: Why Environmental Externalities Matter to Institutional Investors*, ed. Adam Garfunkel (2010), last modified October 2010, www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/universal_ownership.pdf.

REFERENCES

Adorno, Theodor. "A Portrait of Walter Benjamin." In *Prisms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1967.
———. "Sociology and Psychology." *New Left Review* 46 (1968).
———. *Negative Dialectics*. Translated by E. B. Ashton. New York: Continuum, 1997.
Alexander, Jeffrey. *The Civil Sphere*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
The Black Press: Soldiers without Swords, directed by Stanley Nelson. 1998, California Newsreel. VHS.
Amin, Samir. "A Note on the Depreciation of the Future." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992): 21–22.
Bond, Patrick. "Climate Justice." In *Critical Environmental Politics*, edited by C. Death. New York: Routledge, forthcoming.
Bourdieu Pierre *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, translated by Richard Nice. Harvard University Press, 1984.
Calhoun, Craig J. "Imagining Solidarity: Cosmopolitanism, Constitutional Patriotism, and the Public Sphere." *Public Culture* 14, no. 1 (2002): 147–171.
Carr, Nicolas. *The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2011.
Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1996.
Clammer, John. *Culture, Development, and Social Theory*. Zed Books, 2013.
Cockburn, Alexander. *Five Days that Shook the World: Seattle and Beyond*. New York: Verso, 2000.
Cornford, Daniel. *Workers and Dissent in the Redwood Empire*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.
Coy, Owen C. *The Humboldt Bay Redwood Region, 1850–1875*. Los Angeles: California State Historical Society, 1929.
Durkheim, Emile. *Rules of Sociological Method*. New York: Free Press, 1966.
Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Sheller, Mimi. "Publics in History." *Theory and Society* 28, no. 1, (1999): 145–197.
The Farm: Angola USA, Directed by Jonathan Stack, Liz Garbus, and Wilber Rideau. Gabriel Films and Curtis Productions, 1998.
Flacks, Richard. *The American Left and the American Mind*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Foran, John, and Widick, Richard. "Breaking Barriers to Climate Justice." *Contexts: Understanding People in Their Social Worlds* 12, no. 2, (2013): 34–39.

Foster, John Bellamy. "The Absolute General Law of Environmental Degradation under Capitalism." *CNS* 3, no. 3 (1992): 18–20.

———. "The Scale of Our Ecological Crisis." *Monthly Review* 49, no. 11 (1998).

———. "Marx's Ecological Value Analysis." *Monthly Review* 52, no 4. (2000).

———. *Capitalism against Ecology*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002.

———. "Capitalism and Ecology: The Nature of the Contradiction." *Monthly Review* 54, no. 4 (2002).

———. "A Planetary Defeat: The Failure of Global Environmental Reform." *Monthly Review* 54, no. 8, (2003): 8.

Gladwell, Malcom. "Small Change." *The New Yorker*. October 4, 2010.

Haakonssen, Knud, and Lacey Michael J. *Culture of Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Hardt, Michael, and Negri, Antonio. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

———. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.

———. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Harvey, David. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Lebowitz, Michael A. "Capitalism: How Many Contradictions?" *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992).

Luhman, Niklas. *The Reality of the Mass Media*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Marx, Karl, "The Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker (pp. 594–595). New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

Melendy, Brett H. *One Hundred Years of the Redwood Lumber Industry, 1850–1950*. PhD dissertation, Stanford University, microfilm title B26, Stanford, 1952.

Merkell, Patchen, and Vogler, Candice. "Introduction: Violence, Redemption, and the Liberal Imagination." *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 1–10.

Morozov, Evgeny. *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York: Perseus Books, 2013.

———. *To Save Everything, Click Here*. New York: Perseus Books, 2013.

NASA photograph AS17-148-22727, http://spaceflight.nasa.gov/gallery/images/apollo/apollo17/html/as17-148-22727.html.

"Nation horrified by Murder of Kidnapped Chicago Youth." *Jet Magazine*. September 25, 1955, 4–9.

Nedelsky, Jenifer. *Private Property and the Limits of American Constitutionalism: The Madisonian Framework and its Legacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

O'Connor, James. "Capitalism, Nature, Socialism: A Theoretical Introduction." *CNS* 1 (1988).

———. "On the Two Contradictions of Capitalism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 2, no. 3 (1991).

———. "What is Environmental History? Why Environmental History." *Capital Nature Socialism* 8, no. 2, (1997).

———. *Natural Causes*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1998.

Ollman, Bertell. "Why Dialectics? Why Now?" *Science & Society* 62, no. 3 (1998): 338–357.

Onstine, Frank. *The Great Lumber Strike of Humboldt County 1935*. Arcata: Mercurial Enterprises, 1980.

Parenti, Christian. *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence*. New York: Nation Books, 2011.

Siegel, Lee. "Trouble by a Weak Connection." *New York Times*. July 13, 2012.

Taylor, Charles. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Toledo Victor, "The Ecological Crisis: A Second Contradiction of Capitalism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 3 (1992).

United Nations Environment Program Finance Initiative, *Universal Ownership: Why Environmental Externalities Matter to Institutional Investors*, edited by Adam Garfunkel. www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/universal_ownership.pdf (2010).

Warner, Michael. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14, no. 1 (2002): 49–90.

Widick, Richard. "Flesh and the Free Market." *Theory & Society* 32: (2003): 679–723.

———. *Trouble in the Forest: California's Redwood Timber Wars*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

———. "What is Driving our Modern Social Imaginaries? Turning to Cultural and Environmental Sociology for Answers." *Perspectives: Newsletter of the ASA Theory Section* 31, no. 2, (November 2009).

———. "Invitation to Durban: Ethnography and the Politics of Climate Activism at COP17." Working Paper, The International Institute of Climate Action and Theory, 2014. www.iicat.org/invitation-to-durban-ethnography-and-the-politics-of-climate-change-at-cop17-durban-south-africa-nov-28-dec-9-2011/ (accessed January 19, 2014).

Yuen, Eddie. *The Battle of Seattle*. New York: Soft Skull Press, 2001.

Zapatista, directed by Rick Rowley. Big Noise Films, 1998. VHS.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Violence*. New York: Picador, 2008.