

Green Criminology and Native Peoples:
The Treadmill of Production and the Killing of Indigenous Environmental Activists

Michael J. Lynch
University of South Florida

Paul B. Stretesky
Northumbria University

and

Michael A. Long
Oklahoma State University

Abstract

During the development of green criminology, little attention has been paid to how Indigenous/Native Peoples (INP) are victimized by green crime and how they employ environmental activism to resist externally imposed ecological destruction. In the past decade, news services and environmental interest groups have reported on the killing of INP environmental activists who have resisted ecological destruction across the world. Here, we begin to develop a green criminological view of INP victimization and resistance to ecological destruction within the context of the global capitalist treadmill of production, while drawing upon concepts of colonization, imperialism, genocide and ecocide. Our analysis suggests that in the contemporary capitalist world system, expansion of the treadmill of production's ecological withdrawal process (i.e., the withdrawal of raw materials used in production) not only accelerates ecological disorganization in developing/underdeveloped nations, but may be harmful in nations where INP are dependent on access to nature for survival.

*Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Ragnhild Sollund for her comments on our proposal for this special issue in early 2017. This manuscript is an extension of a paper presented at the 2016 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology—part of a project we had been undertaking over several years. We would also like to thank Avi Brisman, the reviewers of this manuscript, and Averi Fegadel for their comments.

Key Words: ecocide; ecological disorganization; environmental justice; environmental victimization; genocide; green criminology; indigenous peoples; treadmill of production; world systems theory

Introduction

This special issue comes at an important point in the transition of criminological thinking, marking nearly three decades of green criminological research.¹ To date, green criminologists have addressed numerous crime and justice concerns associated with environmental destruction that harms humans, nonhuman species and ecosystems. While three decades seems like a long time, green criminology remains a “youngster” relative to other forms of criminology, and many subjects remain ripe for investigation. In this article, we examine green crimes experienced by Indigenous or Native Peoples (INP),² who are also among the most socially and economically marginalized people globally, but whose victimization has not been exposed, analyzed, understood and addressed to the extent that it should, especially within criminology (cf. Crook et al., this issue; Goyes et al. 2017). For example, the *United Nations’ Division for Social Policy and Development of Indigenous Peoples* notes that INP comprise 5% of the world’s population and 15% of the global poor, while about 80% of INP globally are classified as poor.

INP are affected by numerous forms of green crime and victimization. Here, we focus attention on the interaction between INP genocide, ecocide and the expansion of the global treadmill of production (ToP), and view this work as an extension of green criminology research addressing environmental justice (Stretesky and Lynch, 1998; Brisman 2008). To examine these issues, we sketch a political-economic

¹ First use of the term “green criminology” is associated with Lynch (1990). Shortly thereafter, and independently, Mahabir (1990:152) used that term in a book review, noting that “our discipline needs to be revised to include . . . the criminality that results in pillaging the very foundation of human society—the physical and cultural environment. We should be thinking about a green criminology.” Other pre-1998 uses of the term “green criminology” appear in Frank and Lynch (1992) and Lynch (1994).

² This observation applies to other marginalized groups, such as migrant agricultural workers and women, who have also been neglected in the green criminological literature (Lynch 2017; cf. Gaarder 2013; Wacholz 2007). We use the term Indigenous/Native peoples to be consistent with the political, academic, organizational (e.g., The United Nations’ Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) and especially the self-identification of such groups of people. Other terminology includes “first peoples” and “aboriginal peoples.” The term “Indigenous,” derived from Latin, is generally used to refer to: (a) peoples who have a tribal claim to land in a region; and (b) native cultural groups, historically associated with early settlements in an area, who are culturally distinct from settlers, and are adversely impacted by colonization (see Hitchcock and Vinding 2004).

argument concerning INP victimization and INP resistance to ecological harms/ecological disorganization generated by the ToP. Green criminologists have made some reference to the green victimization of INP (e.g., Goyes 2015; Lynch and Stretesky 2012, 2013; Moloney and Chambliss 2014; Van Solinge 2010) and their resistance against green victimization (Rojas-Paez 2017; Weinstock 2017). This important issue deserves more extensive attention, both in terms of theoretical development and for humanitarian reasons. INP throughout the world are under increased attacks from the ToP, as it seeks new raw material sources, promoting extensive ecological destruction on INP lands. Prior studies employ examples of harms against INP. Those studies have included examples of state and state-corporate violence against indigenous peoples (Goyes 2015; Rojas-Paez 2017); harms from mining (Guierrez-Gomex 2017; Rojas-Paez 2017), rubber (Rojas-Paez 2017) and palm oil extraction (Mol 2017); and laws related to addressing INP human rights (Rojas-Paez 2017). Brief theoretical sketches have been presented exploring how harms against INP represent extensions of colonialism (Goyes and South 2017; Mondaca 2017; Rojas-Paez 2017) and result from neoliberalism (Gutierrez-Gomez 2017; Mol 2017; Rojas-Paez 2017).

In this article, we address the harms to INP, the killing/murder of INP activists and INP resistance to harms associated with resource extraction from a political-economic perspective using a combination of approaches, but drawing most directly on ToP theory. In doing so, we illustrate how the ToP affects INPs through forms of genocide that stem from ecocide, with the latter connection posited by Crook and Short (2014).

Political-economic approaches have been employed to examine how the global economic structure divides nations into developed and under/less-developed nations. Following World War II, as an extension of the United Nation's *Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean*, Raúl Prebisch (1949, 1950) began to explore how trade relationships between nations promoted unequal economic development across nations. Prebisch's work is important as it demonstrates how nations become disadvantaged through unequal economic exchanges. Prebisch's ideas were later extended by

Andre Gunder Frank (1966, 1967), in his books *The Development of Underdevelopment*, and *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, which established the utility of dependency theory for conceptualizing the exploitation of Latin American nations and their resources by more highly developed capitalist nations (see also Frank's book, *Economic genocide in Chile*; for an early application to African nations see, Rodney 1972). These perspectives were instrumental in generating specific Latin American and African dependency theory approaches, which contend that the same processes that generate economic expansion in core (Northern) nations, generate underdevelopment in semi-peripheral and peripheral nations through economic and ecological exploitation of the latter nations. These arguments have been modified over time and incorporated into world systems theory and theories of unequal economic exchange, ecologically uneven development, and unequal ecological exchange (see below) to critique both modernization arguments and other approaches that place the blame for economic underdevelopment (relative to developed nations) on the characteristics of the cultures, peoples, and economic, political and social organization in underdeveloped nations. In contrast, dependency theories illustrate how underdevelopment *was imposed* on certain nations as a result of the organization of global capitalism. In this tradition, the terms "developed" and "underdeveloped" are specific—employed because they also contain a political and economic understanding and critique of how the structure of the global economy established economically exploitive hierarchical structure between nations. In our view, ToP theory is one perspective useful for conceptualizing how the structure of the global economic system continues to impose economic and ecological exploitation on some nations, and in the process, facilitating the ecological genocide of INP. In brief, lands belonging to or inhabited by INP frequently contain natural resources targeted for ToP withdrawal. Those withdrawals constitute *attacks* on INP and ecosystems, and involve partnerships between ToP organizations and state governments that facilitate treadmill access to INP lands and resources. Moreover, those attacks have generated INP resistance. INP have a long history of resisting the global expansion of capitalism, dating to the early 1500s. INP resistance to capitalism has

also generated a long history of violent, repressive counter-responses that includes genocide, illustrating the connection between genocide and ecocide throughout the expansion of capitalism (see Crook, et al., this issue).

To make this argument, we begin with a brief review of ToP theory. Next, we examine the historical connection between the expansion of capitalism, colonialism, ecological disorganization, ecocide and genocide. We then examine INP resistance to the expansion of capitalism, and discuss framing contemporary INP resistance to global capitalist expansion as part of class struggle, and explore INP resistance as a threat to capital's global hegemony (Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005). From here, we provide an overview of violent responses to INP resistance to ecological destruction focused on the killing/murder of INP environmental activists.

Capitalism and the Treadmill of Production

To understand contemporary patterns of ecological destruction, one must begin with capitalism and its tendency to promote the acceleration of ecological destruction (Foster 2002, 2000, 1999, 1992), and, in particular, how the capitalist ToP increased ecological disorganization following World War II (Schnaiberg 1980). That discussion begins with the observation that the contemporary world is dominated by the economic, political and social order of capitalism. As an economic system, capitalism is tied to the constant expansion of profit-making and creating conditions conducive to the growth of capitalism. These observations combine to suggest that in the contemporary world system of capitalism, the global expansion of capitalism is tied to the growth of the treadmill of production (Bunker 2005).

The ToP perspective identifies organizational changes in the capitalist mode of production that occurred since the end of World War II (Schnaiberg 1980). In this view, the expansion of production has been driven by technological innovations involving the increased use of fossil fuel and chemical energy to enhance the rapid, efficient withdrawal of ecological resources (ecological withdrawals) and their

transformation into commodities (production). The expansion of ToP withdrawals and production, in turn, accelerates the production of pollution (ecological additions). It follows that the expansionary tendencies of the capitalist ToP can occur only alongside constantly expanding raw material inputs into the system. Globally, about 45% of aggregate gross domestic product (GDP) results from agriculture, the energy sector, manufacturing, and the materials sector, with some unknown portion due to related economic sectors (e.g., construction; wholesale and retail trade; transportation and warehousing; food services; waste management and recycling; management of corporations; financing; insurance; advertising; real estate sales and rentals; professional, scientific and technical services).

Constant expansion of production not only increases ecological withdrawals, but ecological destruction associated with those withdrawals, as well as increases in ecological additions (pollution) from withdrawals and production. Taken together, ecological withdrawals and additions create ecological disorganization, and as production, withdrawals and additions expand, so too does ecological disorganization and the deterioration of global and local ecosystems (Foster 2000; for a criminological applications, see Lynch et al. 2013; Stretesky, Long and Lynch 2013).

Increasing raw material inputs into the capitalist system of production leads to expanded efforts to locate new raw material sources. Historically, raw material resources in nations where capitalism originated were depleted rapidly by the expansion of capitalism (Foster and Clark 2009; Moore 2000, 2003), promoting conquests of the “new world,” and generating extensive ecological destruction in colonized nations (Moore 2003; for a general history of these issues in Latin America, see Galeano 1997). This historical pattern of natural resource use and importation emerges in all nations wedded to capitalism. This situation emerged in the early 1500s, promoting efforts to colonize un/non-developed territories as sources for raw materials, foods and energy.³ These processes of colonization to feed the

³ Here, we follow accepted conventions in using these terms. “Undeveloped” and “nondeveloped” nations refer to regions of the world where either (a) there were no formally recognized indicators of state governments from a

growth of capitalist production and consumption also generated a flow of what are called “metabolic materials”—energy-related materials, such as fertilizers, foods and timber—from “undeveloped” (and later, “under-developed” and even “developing nations”) through transfers to core capitalist nations (Foster, Clark and York 2010). Such processes redistributed metabolic materials unevenly across nations through colonization and trade—and have continued until the present (Foster, Clark and York 2010). As the ToP expands and spreads capitalist economic organization, development itself becomes unevenly distributed across nations, creating “developed” (exploiting) nations and “underdeveloped” (exploited) nations and ecologically unequal exchanges between these nations (Jorgenson 2006; Rice 2007; Shandra et al., 2009). Ecologically unequal exchange accelerates the flow of metabolic and raw materials from “underdeveloped”/“developing” nations to developed nations. This process also promotes expanded consumption of goods in “developed” nations through increased ecological withdrawals extracted from “less developed”/“underdeveloped” nations. In this way, this process also promotes the expansion of ecological destruction in “less developed”/“under-developed” nations to fuel the cycle of capitalist expansion driven by the ToP in developed nations (Clark and Foster 2009).

Enter Genocide

European perspective; or (b) in the current world, large land tracts that have no evidence of “modern” development (e.g., lack cities, roadways). “Under-developed,” “less developed” and “developing” nations refer to the conditions of development compared to advanced capitalist nations. Other potential terms include “Third World,” “Fourth World,” “Developing World,” “Global South,” “Low Income Nations.” All of these terms can be critiqued. For example, “Third World” is a Cold War era term; “Fourth World” is restricted to poor and stateless people, marginalized nations, and concepts of marginalized people being connected in a Fourth World of existence. The use of the term “developing” has been criticized for implying inferiority; “Global South” is criticized for creating what some suggest is an arbitrary division that lumps nations together geographically even if they are not similar, and which, through the use of the equator as a measure, sometimes also separates nations into segments without other justifications.

Important to this general history of the development of capitalism, which varies in its specific manifestations within any nation over time (Jorgenson 2006), are the ways in which the expansion of capitalism and colonization promotes imperialism and affects INP. In our view, imperialism involves political and economic control of another nation/territory through the use of military power and violence, and achieves this end through cooperation of the state and powerful (corporate) economic interests in the controlling (imperialist) nation (for a discussion, see, e.g., Callinicos 2009). The coupling of capitalism, colonial conquest and imperialism promotes ideological justifications for oppressing and eradicating INP in colonies to facilitate control of the colonized nation (Bayly 2004), and this process has been tied directly to the emergence of INP genocide (Huseman and Short 2012; Levene 1999; Moses and Stone 2013; Wolfe 2006; Woolford 2009). In particular, Crook and Short (2014:299) argue that the political economy of capitalism, as it plays out historically, generates “ecologically induced genocide.”

Crook and Short argue that ecologically induced genocide has its own history, and that history is tied to shifting patterns in the global spread—or “spatial plain”—of capitalism. In some locations (such as in Latin America, beginning in the early 1500s), INP experienced ecologically induced genocide associated with what is called the “first conquest.” This situation was extended in new ways since the 1960s during the “second conquest” (Maybury-Lewis 1984). INP throughout the world have been and continue to be exposed to ecologically induced genocide, and the vast majority of INP have been swept into the externally imposed political economic system of capitalism, though there remain a few “uncontacted” INP in South America, India and Africa who perhaps have yet to directly experience ecologically induced genocide (see <https://www.survivalinternational.org/>). Following Crook and Short (2014), we can hypothesize that globally, most INP have been adversely impacted by ecologically induced genocide.

Crook and Short (2014) expand previous discussions of the capitalism-genocide experience for INP by linking those observations to ecocide, specifically through an analysis of the development of the

United Nation's Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and Lemkin's work on genocide (1944; see also Churchill 2002). In this view, ecocide—the destruction of the natural environment—can generate conditions that produce genocide by threatening the physical and cultural existence of an indigenous group. For Crook and Short (2014), this process is carried out globally by capitalism's extractive and agricultural industries—and we would add, capitalist production, because this is the reason for extraction. Moreover, Crook and Short (2014) argue that the history of contemporary global capitalism creates a form of ecological imperialism linked to the global process of “metabolic rift” (Foster 1999)—or through the unequal transfer of energy from “underdeveloped”/“developing” nations to “developed” nations, and we would add, generates the green victimization of INP. In short, we can say that the ToP facilitates INP genocide through accelerated ecological withdrawals that promote ecocide by destroying and disorganizing ecosystems that INP rely upon for survival, and that this process generates various forms of green victimization that INP experience. Thus, in contemporary global economic circumstances, ecologically induced genocide occurs when the capitalist ToP seeks raw materials for extraction in locations inhabited largely by INP, and, in the process, destroys the ecosystems INP rely upon to sustain life. Examples of this process can be seen throughout the history of capitalism, most recently in the logging of rainforests, the mining of minerals and precious metals, the transformation of rainforest into corporate plantations, and the exploration for and extraction of oil and gas in economically underdeveloped nations throughout the world.

As noted below, this process has long met with INP resistance to capitalism, and there is significant evidence of INP resistance to expansion of the ToP in recent years. Traditionally, social movement research addressed resistance to ecocide largely through examinations of environmental social movements in developed nations. Critiques of that approach led to calls for expanding environmental social movement research to include non-Western movements (Buttel and Taylor 1992), and recognition of the emergence of “new” environmental movements among INP (Varse 1996). A key issue is how to

frame those INP movements theoretically (Varse 1996). Thus, in the section that follows, we address INP resistance to ecocide as part of the process of genocide against INP stimulated by the ToP.

Indigenous/Native Peoples, Ecocide and Genocide: A Brief Overview

Indigenous/Native Peoples are not passive subjects in the capitalist world system; rather, they possess the ability to resist the treadmill of ecological destruction and its role in the genocide of INP worldwide. INP have a long history of resisting the forms of genocide and ecocide that global capitalism imposes, and numerous studies provide evidence of INP resistance to colonization, ecocide and genocide over the course of global capitalism's history (Ali 2009; Blomley 1996; Gedicks 1994, 2001; Fenelon and Hall 2008; Fenelon and Murguia 2008; Hall and Fenelon 2015, 2013; LaDuke 1999). According to Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas (2005: 242), indigenous resistance to ecological destruction is "explicitly rooted in a reaction against the expansion of the frontiers of predatory forms of global capitalism into new territories (e.g., the Amazon) and economic activities (e.g., the commercial exploitation of traditional knowledge and biodiversity)."

But, how should INP resistance to colonization, ecocide and genocide be framed theoretically? Traditionally, INP resistance to colonization and ecological destruction was framed as a cultural response; reference was made to INP reverence for nature and religious beliefs that accord nature high standing as the "giver of life"—and thus the inspiration or reason for INP resistant to ecocide (e.g., LaDuke 1999). Because many INP exist in a closely bound relationship to nature, the destruction of nature is, in this view, depicted as a process, which destroys the basis of INP existence. The issue here, then, is how the INP-nature relationship "ought" to be interpreted for the purposes of framing discussions around INP resistance to ecocide, ecological destruction, ecological disorganization and the ToP.

To be sure, one can limit this analysis to the assumed perspective of INP themselves by taking a "cultural view." The "cultural view" positions INP culture and its reverence for nature and traditional INP

practices, against the opposing forces of externally imposed development. This cultural approach may be useful but tends to overlook the role of externally imposed development. Political-economic criticisms of the “cultural view” suggest that it involves generating a social construction of INP, and that consequently there is no concept of INP that is simultaneously independent of the ideas of development and modernization (Dove 2006). That is to say, INP and INP interest do not exist on their own, but become subjects of concern only by being opposed to concepts such as modernity (Hirtz 2003).

Dove (2006) has argued against the cultural approach and in favor of a world systems theory (WST) view. Under WST, the INP subject is created objectively as opposed to subjectively—by the global expansion of capitalism—and the INP becomes an historical subject with the imposition of a global system of capitalism (Wolf 1982). This latter observation has importance in relationship to conceptualizing and understanding INP resistance to ToP-imposed ecological destruction. Indeed, several researchers have argued that if INP resistance to colonization, ecocide and genocide emerges in response to the externally imposed forces of global capitalism, then it is possible to interpret INP resistance to those forces in relation to the class structure of global capitalism (Hall and Fenelon 2008, 2005a, 2005b, 2004, 2003; Fenelon and Hall 2008; Fenelon and Murguia 2008).

From a political economic perspective, as Hall and Fenelon (2008) argue, the global political economy of capitalism reconstructs the “political-cultural” space that INP are allowed to occupy through imposition of the external structure of capitalism. We can say that this process not only occurs globally, binding INP in different nation-locations together because they share a common position defined by global capitalism’s oppression and exploitation, but that it may also occur somewhat uniquely for INP in different national contexts. What should not be overlooked in recognizing the latter point, however, is the similar situation that INP find themselves occupying in the class structure of global capitalism across nations—that is, regardless of their exact physical location or form of ecological exploitation in any specific national context.

Through a combination of colonization, ecocide and genocide, the ToP endeavors to take control of the raw material resources that INP rely upon for survival, and which INP own or can access freely through legal agreements with governments. Successful efforts to undermine those agreements force INP to relinquish their access to raw materials and redefine the space that INP may occupy. In response, INP may either: (a) accept or become subject to conditions of domination by “joining” marginalized members of the lowest class in capitalism as a state-dependent population that must rely on state assistance for survival; or (b) resist efforts to strip them of access to raw materials and the lands on which they depend for survival.

The situation INP face is similar to the one identified by Marx (1842) in his essays on the theft of wood. The German theft of wood statutes to which Marx referred expanded the concept of “theft” by including the collection of dead wood in those statutes. In doing so, the state facilitated the interests of the landed and capitalist class with respect to demarcating ownership of nature/resources that were once held in common. Access to fallen/dead wood, Marx noted, was a customary right of the poor who required some access to nature to meet their survival needs. In denying the poor this customary access, capital was asserting its monopoly power, and through the legal structure of capitalism, was overriding traditions that provided the poor with access to the means of production (e.g., common lands) that serve as alternatives to wage labor as a form of subsistence (Marx 1842). In doing so, the laws of capitalism imposed conditions that required the poor to become part of the working (wage) class to survive, and effectively separated the working class from nature (Marx 1842), restricting access to nature to land-owners and producers, which is the first prerequisite of capitalist production (Burkett 2009). Moreover, by restricting access to nature through law, the poor and working class must rely on capitalism and the destruction of nature to survive (Marx 1842), forcing them to participate in ecological destruction by taking up a position in the working class and depending upon consumption of products generated through ecological destruction tied to capitalist production.

On a global scale, a similar process emerges in relation to INP in the contemporary capitalist world system. First, penetration and conquest of INP lands by capital challenges traditional INP land use and imposes legal ownership principles consistent with the structure of capitalism. Second, that imposition transforms INP into subjects of capitalism and redefines their existence. Third, the outcomes described above are made possible by the state, which at previous points in history, had already participated in the marginalization of INP by disposing them of their lands, and re-defining where they might live by granting them land concessions. With respect to the genocide-ecocide nexus, the state facilitates genocide by leasing rights it had previously granted to INP to developers (corporations), such as oil, mineral, precious metal extraction rights), turning INP lands over to capitalist ventures. Moreover, the state may facilitate INP genocide more directly by relocating INP to promote ToP extraction processes, and, as illustrated below, can do this by moving INP to urban areas clearly making them part of the urban poor and members of a marginalized segment of the working class. In this way, INP customary access to nature is removed through a combination of capital penetration and state actions, subjugating INP to the laws of capitalism.

One could also argue that the intersection of ToP invasion/intrusion and state authority involves efforts to expand the hegemonic control of natural resources by capitalism by applying the property laws of capitalism to INP societies. Here, hegemonic control is expanded at two levels simultaneously: locally, as ToP extractive capital penetrates previously undeveloped areas, and globally, as new areas of control are added to the ToP extraction network. By facilitating capital penetration, and doing so persistently across nations seemingly regardless of any national efforts to recognize the rights of INP, states become central to ToP expansion, ecological destruction and ecocide, and part of the genocide of INP. It is in this sense that Moloney and Chambliss (2014) identify “green crimes of the state,” illustrating how those crimes impacted Native Americans through the example of the slaughter of bison in the US.

INP Resistance to Ecocide, Genocide and the ToP

Capital penetration into, and state control and redefinition of INP lands establish conditions for INP genocide tied to ecocide. As noted above, INP have long resisted those efforts. In the early history of global capitalism, colonization, ecocide and genocide, INP resistance often took the form of violence. Under the contemporary legal structure of global capitalism, INP responses to capital penetration and ecological destruction have been modified—and such responses deserve some attention. INP have become more likely to use the legal structure of capitalism (litigation, legislation, lobbying), public protest and social movement strategies over violent responses. One can say that these outcomes are indeed a “neat trick” from the perspective of capital. First, INP acceptance of these strategies has moved violence from a strategy of first resort to one of last resort. Second, in accepting these strategies, INP display acceptance of the legal rules of capitalism and the idea that states respond to democratic participation (which is sometimes true). Nevertheless, for INP, acceptance of capitalism’s legal system is likely to create barriers for successful INP resistance because access to the legal system is tied to economic resources. Because INP have few economic resources, this type of legal recourse is not likely to favor INP. The latter observation is a hypothesis that can be tested by collecting information about the outcomes of INP cases filed through “acceptable” legal means.

Above, we briefly described the conditions that face INP and which may spur their resistance, but we have yet to deal adequately with the various forms of INP resistance. As we have suggested, INP resistance may include protests, social and news media, as well as the formation of environmental watch groups, blockades, the formation of guardian/patrol groups, legal petitions, and sometimes violence. In interpreting these responses, one should not overlook the fact that INP resistance entails acts that push back against the hegemony of global capital (Rodríguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005). INP resistance to global capital’s hegemony challenges global capitalism’s efforts to eradicate the INP (genocide) through ecocide. In addition, INP resistance is, we suggest, wholly revolutionary because the goal of resistance is to maintain an alternative lifestyle and a set of social, political and economic relationships independent

from capitalism. INP resistance also stimulates counter-resistance, and in recent decades, there is significant evidence that ToP responses to INP resistance have become quite violent, as demonstrated below.

The Killing of INP Environmental Activists

Recently, news stories, as well as environmental organizations and INP organizations, have drawn attention to the killing of INP environmental activists (for a discussion, see, e.g., Goyes et al. 2017). For example, while collecting materials for this project, some media sources reported on the killing of INP activist Berta Caceres in Honduras in March 2016. Caceres, a leader of Honduras' indigenous Lenca people, became involved in efforts to protect INP as an undergraduate university student, founding the Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras (COPINH) in 1993 (culturesofresistance.org). Over the years, Caceres organized numerous community protests to protect INP from ecocide. In 2006, responding to requests for assistance from INPs in Rio Blanco, Caceres began a campaign to stop construction of the Agua Zarca Dam. She employed peaceful protests, brought the case to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and filed complaints with the International Finance Corporation (IFC)—the branch of the World Bank that was providing financial support for the project (Goldman 2016). The government of Honduras ignored these efforts and moved ahead with the project. In 2013, Caceres upped the response, establishing a blockade that prevented access to the dam. The blockade withstood eviction attempts and violent attacks from the Honduran military, private military contractors and employees of the dam construction firm (Abelenda 2016). During one incident in 2013, INP activist Tomas Garcia was killed. Death threats against Caceres followed. The death of Garcia led IFC to withdraw funding for the project due to concerns over human rights violations, and the project ground to a halt (Abelenda 2016).

Caceres' involvement in numerous ecocide prevention protests had long ago made her a target of ToP reprisals. Responding to that concern, in 2009, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights listed Caceres as a person under threat of violence due to her activism, and requested that the Honduran government provide her with security. These requests went unanswered and Caceres was shot to death March 3, 2016. When Beverly Bell (2016) wrote a eulogy for Caceres, she noted that she had begun writing it years earlier because of the violent threats Caceres had received.

Space does not permit us to tell the stories of and honor all the INP environmental activists who have been killed for their commitment to protecting the ecosystem and INP from genocide. Tooney (2012) states that 1,150 environmental activists were killed in the Amazon region from 2000-2010. *Global Witness* has attempted to keep track of these killings, reporting 1,376 such killings from 2002-2016. Eighty-percent of those killings are concentrated in five nations (Brazil, Honduras, Philippines, Colombia and Peru).

For example, reporter David Hill (2014) suggests the Peruvian government has essentially given the police and military "license to kill" environmental activists, many of whom are INPs. Hill reviewed a 2009 incident in northern Peru involving two INP groups, the Wampis and the Awajuns. The Wampis and Awajun engaged in peaceful protests opposing new legislation designed to facilitate compliance with a 2009 US-Peru trade agreement. That law made it much easier for corporations to access raw materials (specifically, oil and natural gas) for export derived from extraction activities on INP lands. Opening of those lands to natural resource extraction was part of Peruvian President Alan Garcia's economic development plan for Peru during his second term as president (2006-2011), which staked expanded economic development on increased natural resource extraction and exports by giving oil extraction rights to ToP organizations. Essentially, Garcia, the leader of the Peruvian state, was willing to expand the ToP's access to raw materials on INP lands to facilitate economic development (an example of dependent development) in Peru through ecocide and the genocide of the Wampis and Awajun. The INPs, however,

initiated protests that stood in the way of Garcia's plans. Responding to questions about INP resistance, Garcia attempted to dismiss INP efforts, referred to the INP as "confused savages," "barbaric," "second-class citizens," "criminals," and "ignorant," and compared them to the Peruvian terrorist group, the Shining Path (Quiroz 2010).

Two important incidents occurred in response to the Wampis/Awajun protests. First was the "Battle at Devil's Curve" (June 5 2009). The Wampis/Awajun had blockaded a major highway in the region (near Bangua) to prevent oil drilling and logging. The estimated 5,000 protestors took control of an oil pumping station. Approximately 600 armed police were dispatched to end the protest and seize the pumping station. Descriptions of the events that lead to the massacre are unclear and vary across sources, but INP leaders claim government helicopters began the violent incident by firing at protestors. Thirty-three people were killed in the attack: 11 INP and 22 police officers. These figures vary across sources and INP leaders claim 40 INP were killed, including three children (http://www.democracynow.org/2009/6/8/peruvian_police_accused_of_massacring_indigenous). The following day, an additional dispute between the Peruvian national police and environmental protestors erupted at a petroleum processing facility owned by the Peruvian government's nationalized oil company, Petroperu. The media claimed that INPs had kidnapped and held 38 police hostage. Arriving national police fired on the unarmed INP protestors, killing 25 and wounding 150.

Such stories, though under-reported in the popular mass media, have occurred throughout the world. News stories highlight how repressive state responses intersect with corporate interests in the withdrawal of ecological resources and create conditions where INP environmental activists become the victims of state violence (Moloney and Chambliss 2014) and perhaps even covert corporate violence designed to eliminate resistance to the ToP.

Examples of INP genocide and ecocide are numerous, and we add a few additional examples below.

The Sami of Northern Sweden and Finland. Neglected in discussions of INP, the Sami, who have inhabited Northern Europe since the end of the ice age, have been blocking roadways to protest forest destruction from logging and metal ore mining that impacts the winter grazing grounds of their reindeer herds (Greenpeace 2003). The forms of ecocide/genocide experienced by the Sami and their resistance against ecological destruction has rarely been discussed in the academic literature (Churchill 2000; Wilmer 1993). Sweden is the largest producer of metal ore in the European Union, and the ore industry plays a significant role in the Swedish economy and provides numerous jobs. In Finland, the issue involves destruction of forests used by reindeer to promote logging (Greenpeace 2003). This dispute began in the 1950s (Lawrence and Raitio 2006). As in other places around the world, the battle here pits economic development and the expansion of the ToP against the survival of INP.

INP in Colombia. There is a long history of genocide and ecocide affecting Colombia's INP—spanning fifty years and involving 84 different Colombian INP tribes. The situation in Colombia is complex because it also involves effects from the Colombia-US war on drugs, the destruction of agricultural-drug areas, and the “displacement” and killing of INP in those locations. On the development side, the expansion of coffee and other mono-crop plantations have destroyed significant portions of the rainforest in Lower Calima and the Andean forest, placing INP lifestyles at risk. In the late 1970s in Balsa, INP peoples (primarily the Paez) were evicted from their lands by the National Army of Colombia; INP resistance leaders were imprisoned and some were reported killed (World Rainforest Bulletin 2007). Evictions of Paez people also occurred in the late 1980s. In 1992, INP leader Miguel Labio Quiguanas was found murdered (World Rainforest Bulletin 2007). Evictions of the Nayans in 2001 to promote pine plantations also led to the deaths of 100 INP who were reportedly “torn apart, sawn up, thrown down cliffs by paramilitary groups” (World Rainforest Bulletin 2007). Some suggest these killings undertaken by the state

and private paramilitary groups, were supported by military training and funding provided by the US through “Plan Colombia” (Carasik 2016).

The Eviction of the Sengwer people of Kenya. In December, 2015, Yator Kiptum, a member of the Sengwer people of Kenya (Embobut/Cherangany Hills) presented a report at the UN’s 21st Annual Conference on the Parties (COP21). As Kiptum noted, the Sengwer were originally evicted from their plains land homes and forest by the British in 1895 to allow the area to be settled by white farmers. The British also engaged in acts of forced assimilation into British culture and economic relationships, both of which can constitute genocide. In recent years, and in disregard of orders from the Eldoret High Court in 2013 asserting the rights of the Sengwer to remain in the forest and act as forest stewards, the government of Kenya has used Kenyan Forest Service (KFS) guards to evict the Sengwer from the Cherangany by force. These evictions can also be tied to World Bank funding for development programs in Kenya. During those forceful evictions, the KFS burned the homes and belongings of the Sengwer (<https://www.forestpeoples.org>). These evictions are supposedly being carried out to preserve the land, an activity that the Sengwer people have performed for hundreds of years.

INP in Borneo. In recent decades, deforestation in Borneo has been extensive. According to Gaveau and colleagues (2014), only about 37% of Borneo’s 1973 forest cover remained intact in 2010. As Worrall (2015) notes, the story of deforestation in Borneo is typical of other “underdeveloped” nations’ experiences and is driven by an intersection between demand for timber from “developed” nations and weak internal state environmental controls related to timber extraction. For Borneo’s INP, this has diminished access to forests and timber, changed the geography of the land leading to reduced access to water and expanded water pollution. These effects have been especially dramatic for the Penan people, who were among the last hunter-gather tribes in Southeast Asia (Worrall 2015). The government of Sarawak reports that there are about 9,500 Penans, and that 400 of them remain nomadic.

For the Penan, conflicts between remnants of their hunter-gatherer lifestyle and more modern, stationary village existence tied to rice production continue to pose quality of life issues (Kouizumi, Mamung and Levang 2012). These problems stem from efforts to transform the Penan into “settler communities” in the 1950s led by United Kingdom corporate interests, the expansion of logging, the building of dams on traditional Penan territories, the development of mass-plantations (mostly palm oil) (Hance 2011), and in more recent years, development of plans for coal mining and rare metal extraction facilities. Such outcomes are consistent with arguments concerning the intersection of imperialism, neocolonial state politics, capitalism, genocide, ecocide and INP.

In recent years, the Penan have actively resisted expanding ecological destruction. In 2012, the Penan attempted to prevent construction of the Murum Dam by blocking the only roads to the site (Newlands 2012). In 2008, Penan environmental activist, Kelesau Naan, who battled the expansion of logging, was found beaten to death (MacDonald 2008). Naan, at the time in his 70s, could not read or write, but had filed suit in 1998 to recognize Penan ownership of forest lands—a suit that was never addressed by the courts—and established roadblocks to interfere with logging (Parry 2008).

INP in Brazil. The earliest extended discussions of deforestation effects in Brazil date to the early 1960s (Latham 1960), and became a subject of increasing interest following publication of Poppino’s (1968) book, *Brazil: The Land and the People*. Poppino explored how economic cycles in Brazil related to the production of food commodities (coffee, sugar), tobacco, minerals (diamonds, gold), rubber and timber for export were reshaping Brazil’s landscape. As Fearnside (2005) argued, however, modern concern with deforestation in Brazil became more widespread following the opening of the Transamazonian Highway in 1972 and increased efforts by the government to expand access to, “settle” and extract resources from rainforests inhabited by INP. This led to increased economic activity including deforestation for cattle ranching, which was highly subsidized by the government. Fearnside noted that

increased rates of deforestation in Brazil were, particularly after 1991, driven by “increasing globalization of the forces of deforestation.” and especially linked to the soy and cattle markets.

The above developments also relate to the historical context of Brazil. Colonization of Brazil by the Portuguese began in 1500 with the expansion of capitalism. The Portuguese began with extraction of brazilwood from rainforests, and later deforestation for sugarcane production. By the 1530s, colonization was expanded by dividing Brazil into 15 regions that were turned over to nobles to rule. Early on, Portuguese colonization met with INP resistance, and INP religious leaders and village chiefs organized numerous resistance movements that included efforts to recruit African slaves into rebellions against the Portuguese (Metcalf 2005). INP resistance led to the failure of many of the 15 colonial regions. Much of the colonial period in Brazil (1500-1822) included a long history of state and corporate violence against INP and rural peoples to expand colonial acquisition of land. Imperialist/colonial genocidal practices also included the Catholic Church’s efforts to instill Catholicism and eradicate INP religious practices, and this led to a significant long-term decline in INP population and the dismantling of INP culture (Metcalf 2005).

Throughout the long history of regime changes in Brazil, external forces of production often resulted in detrimental conditions for INP. In more recent decades, Brazil’s military dictatorship (1964-1985) came under increased scrutiny, which was characterized by increasing economic inequality, rising national debt, and government sponsored kidnappings, illegal imprisonment, torture and murder as reported by the post-1985 Brazilian government (the Brazilian National Truth Commission and later the Special Commission on Political Deaths and Disappearances).

Political liberalization of the state following the 1985 reorganization also stimulated INP resistance to ecological destruction. The Brazilian Constitution of 1988 recognized for the first time the rights of INPs to their lands (Tooney 2012) and as of 2015, 471 indigenous land areas had been recognized by the Brazilian government, while applications for 200 additional parcels have yet to be processed.

According to Brazil's *Instituto Socioambiental* (the ISA), government-granted INP land areas protect important Brazilian ecosystems, including portions of the Amazon Rainforest. Following development of the Transamazonia Highway, however, deforestation increased, and by the mid-1990s, an area known as the "Arc of Deforestation" in the Brazilian rainforest had been identified. Researchers note that by 2003, deforestation in Brazil had reached more than 16% (Fearnside 2005), but was less than 2% in INP land areas.

INP land right protests have led to numerous conflicts between INPs, the extraction industry and the Brazilian government in recent years (Tooney 2012). In 2015, INPs from the Juruna and Arara organized resistance against the building of the Belo Monte Dam, which affects approximately 3,000 INP in 34 villages in 11 INP territories near the dam (Osava 2015a). INPs filed suit to stop dam construction under laws related to the prevention of ethnocide (Osava 2015a). For some INP, the dam project changed their way of life, preventing fishing in waterways dried up by the dam or forcing them to move from communities in areas flooded by the dam (Osava 2015b). In theory, under Brazilian environmental law, affected persons are supposed to receive settlements for their losses from developers (in this case the construction firm, Norte Energia), which can include cash payments or re-settlement. Developers prefer to offer small cash settlements and when the dam flooded the island of Padeiro, several INP Arara families were offered cash settlements of \$ 1,286 per family (Osava 2015b). In response, the Arara families filed suit for more appropriate compensation, which they said should include enough land to farm because this was an important part of their livelihood (Osava 2015b). Other INP left homeless by the flood were provided housing constructed by Norte Energia in urban areas—which is not the most suitable relocation target for INP, but is consistent with genocidal efforts to eradicate INP. Other INP have been moved to areas far from the river in the Amazon jungle (Osava 2015b).

The Itapacrica hydroelectric dam case, like the Belo Monte Dam, created extensive environmental changes and altered the lifestyle of INP river residents. While some residents were compensated for

flooding, the dam occupies Pankararu territory, and the Pankararu have yet to be compensated for their loss of lands, loss of fishing access, or destruction of their ceremonial waterfall (Osava 2014; on the Tele Pires Dam, see Ortiz 2012; on the dams on the Madera River, see Claire 2008). Downriver, the project impacts the Xoko people, where reduced water flow has affected fishing and rice farming. These dam construction projects are no small concern to INPs in Brazil, where forty-three larger dam projects are slated for construction (Fearnside 2017).

Efforts have been made to undo INP land rights in Brazil, including attempts to amend the constitution to limit INP land rights granted in the 1988 through amendment PEC 215. Those proposing PEC 215 believed it necessary to curb INP land claims in order to enhance economic development in Brazil. This effort has also generated INP resistance and more than 1,000 INP leaders met in April 2015 to organize a movement against PEC 215 (Rigby 2015).

A second response has involved threats of violence and killings of INP environmental activists. From 2010-16, 256 INPs in Brazil have been killed, and perhaps it is appropriate to think of these killings as assassinations. A few examples follow to illustrate the extent of these murders and to remember the sacrifices these INP activists made:

May 2011. Reknown Brazilian environmental activist, José Cláudio Ribeiro da Silva and his wife, Maria de Espirito Santo, were shot and killed. Da Silva's ear was cut off, supposedly as evidence of his killing to collect a reward for his death.

March 2012. Three leaders of the Landless Liberation Movement (Celestina Leonar Sales Nunes; Milton Santos de Nunes da Silva; Valdir Dias Ferreira) were shot to death.

August 2013. Celso Rodrigues, a Guarani INP leader, was shot and killed.

December 2013. Guarani Indigenous leader Ambrosio Vilhalva was stabbed to death outside his home (<http://www.farmlandgrap.org>).

March 2016. Indigenous people living in Ita Poty (near Dourdas) were shot by men in three cars as reported by Catholic Pastoral Land Commission, which states that over the past 20 years, as many as 1,150 rural environmental activists have been killed in Brazil. Of those cases, fewer than 100 have reached trial.

Raveena Aulakh (2015) reported that between 2002 and 2014, 477 Brazilian environmental activists (40/year) were killed. Those killings represent about one-half of all environmental activists known to have been killed in the world during that period of time. The majority of these cases remain uninvestigated, and few people have been convicted of the killings of these 477 INP activists over the past decade.

In response to a lack of state protection, continuing encroachment on their lands, and intimidation, threats, violence and killings, some INP groups are becoming more hostile and have moved beyond legal responses and peaceful protests to protect their lands from ecological destruction. In the eastern Amazon, the Guajajara and the Ka'apor have created armed guardians to deter logging. They not only place armed check points on roadway, but have infiltrated logging camps, tied up loggers, burned trucks, tractors and housing, and then have driven the loggers off the land. The efforts of these guardians have led to a decline in logging truck traffic leaving the forest by 92% (Phillips 2015).

Conclusion

For nearly thirty years, green criminology has called attention to the intersection of ecological destruction/disorganization, environmental justice, formal and informal responses to green crime and injustice, and how those kinds of green crime and injustices affect humans, ecosystems and nonhuman animals. That literature has addressed numerous examples of the kinds of green crimes and injustices

that exist throughout the world. That literature, however, has not explored all potentially relevant issues, and this article has called attention to one of those neglected issues—the green victimization of Indigenous/Native Peoples (INP).

This article has drawn attention to the ways in which the historical development of capitalism promotes the green victimization and genocide of INP through colonization, imperialism and ecocide. As we have attempted to demonstrate, the long history of INP genocide and green victimization is a product of the political economy of capitalism and changes in the political economy/organization of capitalism over time. That history also suggests that INP genocide through ecocide has involved a state-corporate collaboration or state-corporate crime. Our political economic interpretation also suggests that in the contemporary era of global capitalism, INP genocide occurs through ecocide associated with the continued expansion of the capitalist treadmill of production.

As noted throughout, INP have long resisted the expansion of capitalism and the forms of ecological disorganization/destruction/ecocide that global capitalism imposes on INP and the lands they occupy. Evidence of INP resistance to expansion of the capitalist treadmill of production/destruction also suggests that INP resistance to ecocide/genocide can be framed as part of class struggle and resistance to capitalism, and in the case of INP, the efforts of capitalism to absorb INP and redefine their existence as members of the lowest segment of the working class through ecocide and resettlement of INP.

INP resistance to capitalism has also been transformed over time, and INP now employ social networking, public protests and the use of capitalism's legal structure as forms of resistance. Over the past few decades, INP resistance has been met with increased violence from the state and corporate interests, resulting in an increase in the killing of INP environmental activists.

These observations tell only portions of the story of the relevance of studying INP. INP are becoming increasingly organized, connecting with one another globally, and asserting their rights through

international mechanisms and laws (e.g., the Indigenous Environmental Movement meetings at the COP21 or the United Nations 21st Climate Change Conference, Paris, France, 2015). INP environmental movements and environmental activists have become important to identifying and critiquing environmental policies, and in their efforts to slow the capitalist treadmill of production. Their success in such endeavors may be vital to helping expose and control ecological destruction and preventing ecosystem collapse. But, this is an unfolding story that requires continued attention. INP in different nations, though they now cooperate and have similar interests, proceed in different ways within their own nations, and meet different levels of success. Studies of those mechanisms and their outcomes may help achieve a greater understanding of why INP environment movements fail or succeed.

In closing, it is appropriate to recall the words of Chief Big Thunder (1827-1906) of the Penobscot (Algonquin) tribe in Maine, USA :

Great Spirit, whose waters are choked with debris and pollution, help us to find the way to cleanse your waters. Great Spirit, whose beautiful earth grows ugly with misuse, help us to find the way to restore beauty to your handiwork. Great Spirit, whose creatures are being destroyed, help us to find a way to replenish them. Great Spirit, whose gifts to us are being lost in selfishness and corruption, help us to find the way to restore our humanity.

Perhaps if Chief Big Thunder had read Marx or lived in the contemporary era of global capitalism, he might have added to each of these observations the phrase “from the capitalist treadmill of production,” and included the terms “genocide” and “ecocide.” Rewritten in that context, Chief Big Thunder’s statement might read as follows: “Great Spirit, whose gifts to us are being lost [to the] selfishness and corruption [of the global capitalist treadmill of production], help us [limit the genocide of Indigenous/Native Peoples through ecocide] and restore our humanity.”

References

- Abelenda, Ana. (2016). Behind the murder of Berta Cereres: Corporate complicity. *OpenDemocracy*. April 25th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/ana-abelenda/behind-murder-of-berta-c-ceres-corporate-response>.
- Ali, Saleem H. (2009). *Mining, the environment, and indigenous development conflicts*. University of Arizona Press.
- Aulakh, Raveena. (2015). Environmental activists become an endangered species in Brazil. *TheState.Com*. October 18th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.thestar.com/news/world/2015/10/18/environmental-activists-become-endangered-species-in-brazil.html>.
- Bayly, Christopher Alan. (2004). *The birth of the modern world, 1780-1914*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Bell, Beverly. (2016). The Life and legacy of Berta Caceres. *Democracy Now* (online). Accessed May 27th, 2017. http://www.democracynow.org/2016/3/10/the_life_and_legacy_of_berta.
- Blomley, Nicholas. (1996). 'Shut the Province Down': First Nations blockades in British Columbia, 1984-1995. *BC Studies: The British Columbian Quarterly* III: 5-35.
- Brisman, Avi. (2008). Crime-Environment Relationships and Environmental Justice. *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*. 6(2): 727-817.
- Bunker, Stephen G. (2005). How ecologically uneven developments put the spin on the treadmill of production. *Organization & Environment* 18 (1): 38-54.
- Burkett, Paul. (2009). *Marxism and ecological economics: Toward a red and green political economy*. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Buttel, Frederick H., and Peter J. Taylor. (1992). Environmental sociology and global environmental change: a critical assessment. *Society & Natural Resources* 5 (3): 211-230.
- Callinicos, Alex T. (2009). *Imperialism and global political economy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Carasik, Lauren. (2016). Washington should avoid repeating Plan Colombia's failures. *Aljazeera America*. February 9th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2016/2/washington-should-avoid-repeating-plan-colombias-failures.html>.
- Churchill, Ward. (2002). *Struggle for the land: Native North American resistance to genocide, ecocide, and colonization*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.
- Churchill, Ward. (2000). The new face of liberation: Indigenous rebellion, state repression and the reality of the Fourth World. *Radical Review of Philosophy* 3 (1): 60-74.
- Clark, Brett, and John Bellamy Foster. (2009). Ecological imperialism and the global metabolic rift: Unequal exchange and the guano/nitrates trade. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 50 (3-4): 311-334.

- Claire, Bernarda. (2012). Indians close ranks against dams in the Amazon. *Interpress News Service*. July 10th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2008/07/environment-indians-close-ranks-against-dams-in-the-amazon/>.
- Crook, Martin, and Damien Short. (2014). Marx, Lemkin and the genocide–ecocide nexus. *The International Journal of Human Rights* 18 (3): 298-319.
- Domask, Joseph J. (1998). Evolution of the environmental movement in Brazil. Paper presented at the Meetings of the Latin American Studies Association, September, Chicago, Illinois. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://courses.arch.vt.edu/courses/wdunaway/gia5274/domask.pdf>.
- Dove, Michael R. (2006). Indigenous People and environmental politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 191-208.
- Fearnside, Phillip M. (2017). How a dam building boom is transforming the Brazilian Amazon. *Yale Environment* 360. <https://e360.yale.edu/features/how-a-dam-building-boom-is-transforming-the-brazilian-amazon>. Accessed April 13, 2018.
- Fearnside, Phillip M. (2005). Deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia: History, Rates and Consequences. *Conservation Biology*. 19 (3): 680-688.
- Fenelon, James V., and Thomas D. Hall. (2008). Revitalization and indigenous resistance to globalization and neoliberalism. *American Behavioral Scientist* 51 (12): 1867-1901.
- Fenelon, James V., and Salvador J. Murguía. (2008). Indigenous Peoples, globalization, resistance, and revitalization. *American Behavioral Scientist* 51 (12): 1656-1671.
- Foster, John Bellamy. (2002). *Ecology against Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Foster, John Bellamy. (2000). *Marx's Ecology: Materialism and Nature*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Foster, John Bellamy. (1999). Marx's theory of metabolic rift: Classical foundations for environmental sociology. *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 366-405.
- Foster, John Bellamy. (1992). The absolute general law of environmental degradation under *capitalism*. *Capitalism, Nature and Socialism* 3: 77–81.
- Foster, John Bellamy, and Brett Clark. (2009). Ecological imperialism: The curse of capitalism. *Socialist register* 40 (4): 186-201.
- Foster, John Bellamy, Brett Clark, and Richard York. (2010). *The ecological rift: Capitalism's war on the Earth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Frank, Nancy, and Michael J. Lynch. (1992). *Corporate Crime, Corporate Violence*. Albany, NY: Harrow & Heston.

- Gaarder, Emily. (2013). Evading responsibility for green harm: State-corporate exploitation of race, class, and gender inequality. In *Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology*, Nigel South and Avi Brisman, eds. Pp. 272-81. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Galeano, Eduardo. (1997). *Open veins of Latin America: Five centuries of the pillage of a continent*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gaveau, David L., Sean Sloan, Elis Molidena, Husna Yaen, Doug Sheil, Nicola K. Abram, M. Ancrenaz, R. Nasi, M. Quinones, N. Wielaard and E. Meijaard. (2014). Four decades of forest persistence, clearance and logging on Borneo. *PLOS One*. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0101654
- Gedicks, Al. (2001). *Resource rebels: Native challenges to mining and oil corporations*. Boston: South End .
- Gedicks, Al. (1994). *The new resource wars: Native and environmental struggles against multinational corporations*. Black Rose Books Ltd.
- Goldman Environmental Prize. (2016). Berta Caceres: 2015 Goldman Prize Recipient, South and Central America. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.goldmanprize.org/recipient/berta-caceres/>.
- Goyes, David Rodriguez. (2015). Land uses and conflict in Columbia. Pp. 75-94 in A. Brisman, N. South and R. White (eds), *Environmental Crime and Social Conflict*. London: Routledge.
- Goyes, David Rodríguez, Hanneke Mol, Avi Brisman and Nigel South, eds. (2017). *Environmental Crime in Latin America: The Theft of Nature and the Poisoning of the Land*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goyes, David Rodríguez and Nigel South. (2017). The injustices of policing, law and multinational monopolization in the privatization of natural diversity: Cases from Colombia and Latin America. Pp. 85-113 in 55 in D.R. Goyes, H. Mole, A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Environmental Crime in Latin America: The Theft of Nature and the Poisoning of the Land*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gutiérrez-Gómez, Laura. (2017). Mining in Colombia: Tracing the harm of neoliberal policies and practices. Pp. 85-113 in 55 in D.R. Goyes, H. Mole, A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Environmental Crime in Latin America: The Theft of Nature and the Poisoning of the Land*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Greenpeace. (2003). Finnish forestry: Destroying forests, destroying livelihoods. *Greenpeace*. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/PageFiles/24591/finweb.pdf>.
- Hall, Thomas D., and James V. Fenelon. (2015). *Indigenous peoples and globalization: Resistance and revitalization*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, Thomas D., and James V. Fenelon. (2008). Indigenous movements and globalization: What is different? What is the same? *Globalizations* 5 (1): 1-11.

- Hall, Thomas D., and James V. Fenelon. (2005a.) Indigenous peoples and hegemonic change: Threats to sovereignty or opportunities for resistance? Pp. 205-225 in J. Friedman & C. Chase-Dunn (Eds.), *Hegemonic decline: Present and past*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Hall, Thomas D., and James V. Fenelon. (2005b). Trajectories of indigenous resistance before and after 9/11. Pp. 95-110 in B. Podobnik & T. Reifer (Eds.), *Transforming globalization: Challenges and opportunities in the post 9/11 era*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Hall, Thomas D., and James V. Fenelon. (2003). Indigenous resistance to globalization: What does the future hold? Pp. 173-188 in W. A. Dunaway (Ed.), *Emerging issues in the 21st century world-system: Vol. I. Crises and resistance in the 21st world-system*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hance, Jeremy. (2011). The other side of the Penan Story: Threatened tribe embraces tourism, reforestation. *Mongabay*. December 19th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://news.mongabay.com/2011/12/the-other-side-of-the-penan-story-threatened-tribe-embraces-tourism-reforestation/>.
- Hirtz, Frank. (2003). It takes modern means to be traditional: On recognizing Indigenous cultural communities in the Philippines. *Development and Change* 34 (5): 887-914.
- Hitchcock, Robert K., and Diana Vinding. (2004). *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. International Work Group For Indigenous Peoples. Copenhagen: Denmark.
- Huseman, Jennifer, and Damien Short. (2012). 'A slow industrial genocide': Tar sands and the indigenous peoples of northern Alberta. *The International Journal of Human Rights* 16 (1): 216-237.
- Jorgenson, Andrew K. (2006). Unequal ecological exchange and environmental degradation: A theoretical proposition and cross-national study of deforestation, 1990-2000. *Rural Sociology* 71 (4): 685-712.
- Koizumi, Miyako, Dollop Mamung, and Patrice Levang. (2012). Hunter-gatherers' culture, a major hindrance to a settled agricultural life: The case of the Penan Benalui of East Kalimantan. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods* 21 (1): 1-15.
- Latham, Bryan. (1960). Firth World Congress Tropical Forestry. *Empire Forestry Review*. 39 (4): 403-410.
- Lawrence, Rebecca and Kaisa Raitio. (2006). Forestry conflicts in Finnish Sami: Local, national and global links. *Indigenous Affairs* 4: 36-43.
- Lemkin, Raphael. (1944). *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Levene, Mark. (1999). The Chittagong Hill Tracts: A case study in the political economy of 'creeping' genocide. *Third World Quarterly* 20 (2): 339-369.
- Lynch, Michael J. (2017). Acknowledging Female Victims of Green Crime: Environmental Exposure of Women to Industrial Pollutants. *Feminist Criminology* [10.1177/1557085116673172](https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085116673172).

- Lynch, Michael J. (1994). Rediscovering criminology: Lessons from the Marxist tradition. Pp. 257-276 in D. McQuaire and P. McGuire (eds), *From the Left Bank to the Mainstream*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.
- Lynch, Michael J. (1990). The Greening of criminology: A perspective for the 1990s. *The Critical Criminologist* 2 (3) :3-4,11-12.
- Lynch, Michael J., Michael A. Long, Kimberly L. Barrett and Paul B. Stretesky. (2013). Is it a Crime to Produce Ecological Disorganization? Why Green Criminology and Political Economy Matter in the Analysis of Global Ecological Harms. *British Journal of Criminology* 53 (6): 997-1016.
- Lynch, Michael J., and Paul B. Stretesky. (2013). Native Americans, environmental harms and justice. Pp. 439-459 in J. I. Ross (ed), *Handbook: American-Indians at Risk*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO/Greenwood.
- Lynch, Michael J., and Paul B. Stretesky. (2012). Native Americans and social and environmental Justice: Implications for criminology. *Social Justice* 38 (3): 104-124.
- MacDonald, Christine. (2008). *Green Inc.: An environmental insider reveals how a good cause has gone Bad*. Guilford, CT: Lyons Press.
- Mahabir, Cynthia. (1990). Book review: 'Before the Bulldozer: The Nambiquara Indians and the World Bank.' *Social Justice* 17 (4): 146-152.
- Marx, Karl. (1842). Debates on the law on theft of wood, *Rheinische Zeitung*, 298, 300, 303, 305 and 307. Accessed May 27th, 2017. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Rheinische_Zeitung.pdf (last accessed March 18 2016).
- Maybury-Lewis, David. (1984). Demystifying the Second Conquest. Pp. 127-134 in M. Schminck and C. H. Wood (eds), *Frontier Expansion in Amazonia*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.
- Metcalf, Alida C. (2005). *Go-Betweens and the Colonization of Brazil, 1500-1600*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Mol, Hanneke. (2017). Agro-Industry Expansion Through "Strategic Alliances": The Shifting Dynamics of Palm Oil-Related Dispossession." Pp. 163-186 in D.R.Goyes, H. Mole, A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Environmental Crime in Latin America: The Theft of Nature and the Poisoning of the Land*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moloney, Christopher J., and William J. Chambliss. (2014). Slaughtering the Bison, controlling Native Americans: A state crime and green criminology synthesis. *Critical Criminology* 22 (3): 319-338.
- Mondaca, Eduardo. (2017). The Archipelago of Chiloé and the uncertain contours of its future: Coloniality, new extractivism and political-social re-vindication of existence. Pp. 31-55 in D.R.Goyes, H. Mole, A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Environmental Crime in Latin America: The Theft of Nature and the Poisoning of the Land*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Moore, Jason W. (2003). The modern world-system as environmental history? Ecology and the rise of capitalism. *Theory and Society* 32 (3): 307-377.
- Moore, Jason W. (2000). Environmental crises and the metabolic rift in world-historical perspective. *Organization & Environment* 13 (2): 123-157.
- Moses, Dirk, and Dan Stone. (2013). *Colonialism and Genocide*. UK: Routledge.
- Newlands, Maxine. (2012). One of the World's oldest tribes halts dam construction. *Ecologist*. November 6th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. http://www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/1667182/one_of_the_worlds_oldest_tribes_halts_dam_construction.html.
- Ortiz, Fabiola. (2012). Hydropower dam to flood sacred Amazon Indigenous site. *Interpress News Service*. August 20th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/08/hydropower-dam-to-flood-sacred-amazon-indigenous-site/>.
- Osava, Mario. (2015a). Indigenous people in Brazil's Amazon – Crushed by the Belo Monte Dam? *Interpress News Service*. July 16th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2015/07/indigenous-people-in-brazils-amazon-crushed-by-the-belo-monte-dam/>.
- Osava, Mario. (2015b). Fishing families left high and dry by Amazon dam. *Interpress News Service*. July 10th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2015/07/fishing-families-left-high-and-dry-by-amazon-dams/>.
- Osava, Mario. (2014). Dammed rivers create hardship for Brazil's Native Peoples. *Interpress News Service*. January 22nd. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2014/01/dammed-rivers-create-hardship-brazils-native-peoples/>.
- Parry, Richard Lloyd. (2008). Jungle tribal leader, Kelesua Naan, took on the Loggers, and it may have cost him his life. *Common Dreams*. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.commondreams.org/news/2008/01/04/jungle-tribal-leader-kelesau-naan-took-loggers-it-may-have-cost-him-his-life>.
- Phillips, Dom. (2015). Defending the Amazon. *The Washington Post* (online). October 6th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/world/2015/10/06/loggers/>.
- Prebisch, Raúl. (1950). *The economic development of Latin America and some of its problems*. New York: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Prebisch, Raúl. (1949). *Growth, equilibrium and disparities: Interpretations of the process of economic development*. United Nations, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (Available online: <http://200.9.3.98/handle/11362/1105>).
- Rodney, Walter. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

- Rojas-Paez, Gustavo. (2017). Understanding environmental harm and justice claims in the Global South: Crime of the powerful and peoples' resistance. Pp. 57-83 in D. R. Goyes, H, Mol, A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Environmental Crime in Latin America*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Quiroz, Carlos A. (2010). Avatar is real: Pandora is located in Central and South American and Africa. *Venezuelanalysis.com*. January 12th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/5063>.
- Rice, James. (2007). Ecologically unequal exchange: International trade and uneven utilization of environmental space in the World System. *Social Forces* 85 (3) :1369-1392.
- Rigby, Claire. (2015). 'We're Going to Resist:' Brazil's Indigenous groups fight to keep their land in the face of new law. *The Guardian* (online). April 23rd. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/23/brazils-indigenous-groups-battle-land-law-change>.
- Rodriguez-Garavito, Cesar A., and Luis Carlos Arenas. (2005). Indigenous rights, transnational activism, and legal mobilization: The struggle of the U'wa people in Colombia. Pp. 241-266 in B. de Sousa Santos and C. A. Rodriguez-Garavito (ed) *Law and Globalization from Below*. Cambridge Books Online.
- Schnaiberg, Allan. (1980). *Environment: from surplus to scarcity*. Oxford University Press.
- Shandra, J.M., C. Leckband, L.A. McKinney, B. London. (2009). Ecologically unequal exchange, world polity, and biodiversity loss a cross-national analysis of threatened mammals. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 50: 285–310.
- Stretesky, Paul B., Michael A. Long and Michael J. Lynch. (2013). *The Treadmill of Crime: Political Economy and Green Criminology*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Stretesky, Paul B., and Michael J. Lynch. (1998). Corporate environmental violence and racism. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 30 (2): 163-184.
- Tooney, David E. (2012). Indigenous people, environmental groups, networks and the political economy of rainforest destruction in Brazil. *International Journal of Peace Studies*. 17 (1): 73-97.
- van Solinge, Tim Boekhout. (2010). Deforestation crimes and conflicts in the Amazon. *Critical Criminology* 18 (4): 263-277.
- Varse, Stefano. (1996). The new environmental movement of Latin American Indigenous People. Pp. 122-142 in S. B. Brush and D. Stabinsky (eds), *Valuing Local Knowledge: Indigenous People and Intellectual Property Rights*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Wachholz, Sandra. (2007). 'At risk': climate change and its bearing on women's vulnerability to male violence. In *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting harms against environments, humanity and other animals*, Piers Beirne and Nigel South, eds. Pp. 161-85. Cullompton, UK: Willan.

- Weinstock, Ana Mariel. (2017). A decade of social and environmental mobilization against mega-mining in Chubut, Argentina. PP. 141-162 in D. R. Goyes, H. Mol, A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Environmental Crime in Latin America*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Wilmer, Franke. (1993). *The Indigenous voice in world politics*. London: Sage.
- Wolf, Eric R. (1982). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press.
- Wolfe, Patrick. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocidal Research*. 8 (4): 387-409.
- Woolford, Andrew. (2009). Ontological destruction: Genocide and Canadian Aboriginal Peoples. *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 4 (1): 81-97.
- World Rainforest Bulletin. (2007). Colombia: Irish-Dutch pulp company accused of serious environmental crimes. World Rainforest Bulletin, # 166. March. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://wrm.org.uy/oldsite/bulletin/116/viewpoint.html>.
- Worrall, Simon. (2015). Can Borneo's tribes survive 'Biggest Environmental Crime of our times?' *National Geographic News*. January 9th. Accessed May 27th, 2017. <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/01/150111-borneo-rainforest-environment-conservation-ngbooktalk/>.