

Marco Armiero, Massimo De Angelis (Forthcoming 2017) Anthropocene: victims, narrators, and revolutionaries. South Atlantic Quarterly.

Keywords: revolutionary subjects; environmental conflicts; wasteocene; commoning

Abstract:

The absence of a reflection on revolutionary practices and subjects is the main weakness of the radical critique of the Anthropocene. The risk is to envision the Anthropocene as a space for villains and victims but not for revolutionaries. In this respect we believe that it is crucial to challenge the (in)visibility and (un)knowability of the Anthropocene beyond geological strata and planetary boundaries. We argue that as the Capitalocene, the Anthropocene has left its traces in the bodies of people upon which the new epoch has been created. The traces of the Capitalocene are not only in geological strata but also in the biological and genetic strata of human bodies; exploitation, subordination, and inequalities are inscribed into the human body and experienced, visible and knowable by subalterns without the mediation of – many times actually in opposition to – mainstream scientific knowledge. We inflect the concept of Capitalocene with our own Wasteocene, which serves to stress the contaminating nature of capitalism and its perdurance within the socio-biological fabric, its accumulation of externalities inside both the human and the Earth's body. We envision the Wasteocene as one of the features of the Capitalocene, especially adapted to demystify the mainstream narratives of the Anthropocene. In order to enhance our arguments we build upon the findings of the global Environmental Justice atlas (hereafter EJOLT atlas) of environmental conflicts and on our own in-depth research on the struggles against toxic contamination in Campania, Italy.

Contributors' note:

Marco Armiero is the Director of the Environmental Humanities Laboratory at the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm. He has been post-doctoral fellow and visiting scholar at Yale University, UC Berkeley, Stanford, the Autonomous University in Barcelona, and the Center for Social Sciences at the University of Coimbra. In English he has published *A Rugged Nation: Mountains and the Making of Modern Italy* (2011) and co-edited *Nature and History in Modern Italy* and *History of Environmentalism*.

Massimo De Angelis is professor of Political Economy at the University of East London. Among many other publications he is the author of *The Beginning of History: Value Struggles and Global Capital* (Pluto 2007) and a book on *Commons, Complexity and Social Transformation* (Zed, forthcoming)

Anthropocene: victims, narrators, and revolutionaries

Marco Armiero and Massimo De Angelis

The return of grand narratives and their ghosts

The grand narratives are back. After a long emphasis on multiple and partial stories, global metanarratives are again gaining ground. It is not by chance that a few years ago Cambridge University Press released the *History Manifesto* (Guldi and Armitage 2014), an ambitious project, as the title unequivocally reveals, which aims to return history to global explanation of human society.

Nonetheless, it is not historians but scientists who have created the most powerful historical narrative of the last decades. This narrative does not speak anymore of structural injustices, economic progress or inevitable revolutions. As a matter of fact, it does not rely on ideologies at all, but on the brute facts of science - or at least this is how the story goes. The Anthropocene is literally based on geological strata accumulating the traces of humans in the texture of the planet (Crutzen and Stoermer 2001). But the Anthropocene is also a historical tale that goes far beyond the specific issues studied by geologists. Planetary boundaries are not inscribed into the soil; nevertheless, they delimit the contours of the Anthropocene, setting the possibilities for survival of humans on Earth (Rockström et al. 2009; Steffen 2015). While the geological strata will tell us whether - or even when - the Anthropocene began, planetary boundaries instead reveal whether - or even when - the Anthropocene will end, crashing against the biophysical limits of the planet. As Ben Dibley (2012) has argued, the geologic Anthropocene and planetary boundaries are part of the same global narrative; in both cases scientists have taken the lead in proposing an all-inclusive explanation of the present crisis and even of its possible outcomes.

The Anthropocene is a grand narrative because it proposes universal truths, or laws, and considers universal agents, working rather poorly with the nuisances of the specific, which is, instead, the daily bread of social scientists and humanities scholars. There is no room for differences in the geological strata or in planetary boundaries. The Anthropocene is the age of one planet and all humans as a whole; never has the “We” been more powerful in a historical narrative than now (Chakrabaty 2009).

Critical scholars have argued that such universalism erases hierarchies, power relations, and historical inequalities. Rightly, Jason Moore (2014) has proposed to call the new age the Capitalocene, remarking that capitalism has actually shaped the planet and not a biological and indefinite human species. For example, according to a recent study by Oxfam (2015), the richest 10 per cent of people in the world are responsible for 50 percent of lifestyle emissions. Also, it is through capitalist development — measured in GDP growth — that greenhouse gasses have accumulated in the atmosphere, fish stocks have been depleted, biodiversity halved and so on, one horrifying statistic after another. It is capital as a social force that appropriates nature for its own use, not the *Anthropos*. All the same the repressive, military, financial and ideological/marketing apparatuses through which global capitalism orients social forces continue to disregard the many barriers necessary to maintain the earth’s delicate Holocene equilibrium. Meanwhile other social forces orient themselves to do just the opposite, to heal, to value outside the criteria of capital, to struggle to stay within ecological limits, to create new ways to socially cooperate within those limits, to establish resilient livelihoods providing commons that are also ecologically sustainable. These are human beings, they are “*Anthropos*”, affected by the Anthropocene or Capitalocene, even if they are not its cause.

Thus the question comes out naturally, once we rescale the notion of social conflict and put it at the heart of our contemporary moment: if capitalism as a system is the agent of the Anthropocene, what is the revolutionary subject which can overthrow it? The mainstream idea seems to suggest that scientists can be the revolutionary subject in the Anthropocene.

Since the contradictions of this new era are not as apparent as those of capitalism, one needs special skills or even tools to recognize its challenges. But the recipes of the scientists are turned into energy efficient new technologies that, used in a regime of capitalist growth, cannot turn the wheel of the Anthropocene. Efficiency is after all only a ratio (Piercen 2005), the reduction of which does not bring about absolute cuts of CO₂ gases or agents of ocean acidification. Capital's systemic *conatus* of self-preservation is accumulation, which translates into endless striving for economic growth. Thus far, decoupling growth from emissions has been only a dream.

The absence of reflection on revolutionary practices and subjects is the main weakness of the radical critique of the Anthropocene. The risk is to envision the Anthropocene as a space for villains and victims but not for revolutionaries. Several scholars have uncovered the depoliticizing effect of the Anthropocene (Swyngedouw 2011 and 2013; Houston 2013); nonetheless, revealing the unequal distribution of responsibilities in the making of the current ecological crisis does not automatically imply a quest for revolutionary alternatives embedded in practices of subjectification, commoning, and sabotage. In this respect we believe that it is crucial to challenge the (in)visibility and (un)knowability of the Anthropocene beyond geological strata and planetary boundaries. We argue that as the Capitalocene, the Anthropocene has left its traces in the bodies of people upon which the new epoch has been created. The traces of the Capitalocene are not only in geological strata but also in the biological and genetic strata of human bodies; exploitation, subordination, and inequalities are inscribed into the human body and experienced, visible and knowable by subalterns without the mediation of – many times actually in opposition to – mainstream scientific knowledge. The Capitalocene also forces the bodily boundaries of the subaltern towards thresholds, the crossing of which will change radically their lives, if not placing in question their very survival. Placing the bodily experience of subalterns at the center of our analysis does not question the existence of a global threat for the planet, but aims to individuate the revolutionary practices and

unearth the alternative processes of knowledge production which not only question the capitalist system rather than trying to fix it, but also defend or build alternatives.

In order to enhance our arguments we will rely on a few empirical cases of contamination and resistance. More specifically we will build upon the findings of the global EJOLT atlas of environmental conflicts and on our own research on struggles against toxic contamination in Campania, Italy. Looking at the Anthropocene from place-based struggles over contamination illuminates the stratification, or embodying, of the Anthropocene's violence in the organosphere¹ -- what we call the Wasteocene -- and how this may create revolutionary subjects through the experience of resistance and commoning. Against the abstract "we" of the Anthropocene and its governmentalization of the self, a revolutionary project encompasses the making of collective identities out of struggles, building upon the embodied experience of capitalist violence. We inflect the concept of Capitalocene with our own concept of Wasteocene, which serves to stress the contaminating nature of capitalism and its perdurance within the socio-biological fabric, its accumulation of externalities inside both the human and the Earth's body. We envision the Wasteocene as one of the features of the Capitalocene, especially adapted to demystify the mainstream narratives of the Anthropocene. As we will illustrate below, while clearly imposing the violence of capitalism on humans and nonhumans the Wasteocene as the Anthropocene can easily deliver the "we" message, thereby blaming all, fostering technological fixes, and relying on the experts for diagnosis and solutions. However, it is not in a name that a revolutionary subject can be created. While using Capitalocene or Wasteocene may reveal actual injustices inscribed in the Anthropocene, it does not on its own transform victims and affected individuals into revolutionary subjects. As we illustrate through our second example, the constitution of revolutionary subjects occurs in the making and experience of the Wasteocene, in an antagonistic relationship with the forces that create it.

Resisting the Anthropocene: Evidence from the EJAtlas

In short, neither a species nor a gas but a particular mode of production has affected different realms of ecological systems to a degree of starting a new geological era. This is correct, only to the extent that we understand capital as a class relations of struggle (Cleaver 1979) plus something else, an outside that is constituted in this struggle (De Angelis 2007). In this sense, the *anthropos* in the Anthropocene is actually a misplaced subject. To the extent that we are talking about the Capitalocene, we need to replace the universalistic “we” of the human species — the “We” of the Anthropocene — with a different “We”, one that is constituted through two interrelated moments. In the first place, the “we” of the working class that struggles to overcome itself as working class, and also strives to overcome deep divisions in power and access to wealth within the planetary working class broadly defined: essentially, an anti-neoliberal stance. Second, a correspondent “we” made of a multitude of subjects whose practices are outside the value practices of capital, often in the shape of commons systems. To envisage the space of revolutionary subjectivity we have to search the outside of capital constituted by these subjectivities. The outside of Capital is also the outside of the Anthropocene; this outside is made of existing modes of production and cooperation constituted by subjectivities that operate to buffer the effect of capital’s externalities while reproducing livelihoods. Those modes of production in common, value practices and aspirations have developed around the world as a leopard skin surrounding areas where this outside is still dormant; nonetheless, if those projects develop and become hegemonic, they may unleash a new era, in which both the body of the anthropos and of the Earth are the center of people’s concerns in organising their own lives in common.

The Capitalocene thus is ridden with and hides different value worlds. Take for example the superb ecological justice atlas project produced by the EJOLT team (ejatlas.org). Here are described only a small fraction of contested sites of environmental struggles in the world, in which on one side are the forces of capital, and on the other localized opposition to it, often

associated with a different way of relating to nature and one another. The variety of cases included in the EJOLT atlas is extraordinary, including 436 Land acquisition conflicts, 308 cases of Mineral Ore exploration, 280 Struggles over Water access rights and entitlements, 208 cases of deforestation, 141 regarding waste facilities, just to mention the largest categories. While illustrating what environmental injustice is, each of these cases in turn makes visible some victims/revolutionaries (depending on what moment of the cycle of struggle we pick) and some villains.

Take for example carbon offsetting, the “strategy” sanctioned by the Kyoto protocol as a way for governments and private companies to earn carbon credits to be exchanged on dedicated markets as part and parcel of the “financialisation of nature” (Bond 2015). This is not the place to review the absurdity of using the logic of market metrics to deal with the greatest of all environmental issues, climate change, or the speculative enrichment of the few in a fluctuating “carbon price”, within a mechanism criticized even by Pope Francis (2015).² For our purpose, carbon offsetting implies the clashing between two types of “anthropos”, two types of human social and value practices: on the one hand those who are willing to substitute existing local forests with eucalyptus plantations in order to gain the right to sell carbon credits on the market to heavy polluters elsewhere in the world, and, on the other hand, the displaced communities who would have taken care of those forests for their own livelihoods. The discourse of the Anthropocene hides this huge cleavage within humanity, this endless struggle between the logic of reproduction of commoners and the profiting of capitalists.

In Bukaleba, Uganda, for instance, one type of *anthropos*, instituted as a Norwegian company “Green Resources,” acquired in 1996 a 50-year license to 9165 hectares of land from the government, in the Bukaleba Central Forest Reserve. Green Resources also has plantations in Tanzania and Mozambique, and it is the largest plantation in Africa outside South Africa. The project in Bukaleba has produced approximately 100,000 tCO₂. More is expected due to establishment of a new charcoal plant. The economic value of that project depends on

the price of carbon, which is today relatively low, at around 8 euro a ton in the European market. Let us say a million euros is the price for violently displacing 13 communities who have lost their rights to use the forest commons, the abuses of remaining community members arrested for trespassing what is now a no grazing zone, environmental degradation due to the use of agrochemicals in the plantation ending up in rivers and lakes, and biodiversity being damaged also by clearing indigenous trees to make space for non native pine and eucalyptus trees. Biodiversity is one key indicator of the Anthropocene, which is in this case obviously reduced not because the local *anthropos* wanted it to be so. Carbon offsetting operations like these do not necessarily reduce carbon, since they have replaced local species of trees and there are great doubts that carbon credit mechanisms will result in lower CO₂ emissions.³ Clearly, the victims here are also agents; violence used upon resisting subjects is always the means to reduce subjects to victims.

The case of the eastern Indian region of Orissa proposes the same kind of clash of interests and values. Here, the Indian company J R Power Gen Private Ltd. signed a memorandum of understanding with the Orissa government to develop a power plant at Kishore Nagar and build a 1980 MW thermal plant. In 2009 the state government issued notes for the acquisition of the land, highly fertile ground for rice paddies and other crops. Clearly, a case of clashing value practices is present here, the company wanting to profit and the locals wanting to reproduce their livelihoods and protect the local environment (a means for their own livelihood reproduction). Hence a movement of local farmers and communities has been developed, occupying railroads and stopping trains, demanding the scrapping of the project and that instead the government keep its promises for a local irrigation project (Samal 2016).

We could go on for a while following the network of conflicts represented in the EJOLT atlas, but in each of them we would find not “humans”, but *anthropos* socially constituted along opposing positionalities and giving rise to different social forces pursuing conflicting goals, moved by clashing values. Clearly there are always ambiguities in struggles;

activists can be co-opted, commoners can get compensation and leave (paying later the price for squalid forms of urbanizations that never matched what was promised), but the point remains: *to the extent that the Anthropocene is the Capitalocene, the anthropos is constituted through struggle.*

It goes without saying that there are counter-examples; there are many instances in which alternative ways of doing and valuing are coopted within capital's initiatives. One example is clearly the development of aboriginal-controlled carbon markets in Australia. In other cases, the livelihoods of the poor are pitted against conservation agendas, such that what used to be a common forest is now a state or private managed one, with correspondent prohibition of local (often) indigenous groups from grazing, hunting, fishing, gathering food, wood and fodder, and therefore a life in destitution. These and many other cases would seem to show that we should abandon old political categories assuming binary contestants. The world is more complex, there are multitudes after all, not masses of revolutionary subjects. And, we would add, fortunately so, because complexity, and its varieties of measure, are the stuff of commons and their resilience, if mechanisms of self-regulation of this complexity are found. Sometimes capital coopts the specific variety of specific commons. For example, the Fish River Carbon Credit (<http://www.fishriver.com.au/>) is one of the projects in Australia to valorise aboriginals and their knowledge of low carbon bush burning, in view of producing carbon credits that are then sold and reinvested in indigenous jobs and maintenance of the land. The Fish River Fire Project has managed to reduce the area burnt in the late dry season from about 36% in the period between 2000–2009 to approximately 1% in 2012. Greenhouse gases are reduced, indigenous knowledge is put to work, and good jobs are created for indigenous people.

Carbon credits and cap and trade mechanisms are anathema to many environmentalist movements, not only because they are riddled with corruption, but also because they cannot achieve the needed drastic reduction of greenhouse emissions. On average we think this is

true. But it is also clear that if a way for the commons exists to tap into this clearly capitalist mechanism, the alternative being destitution, so be it: people need to eat, hence a *structural coupling* of the commons with the capitalist system is necessary until local commons find alternative ways to integrate among themselves. Thus, in a complex world there exist both value binaries and accommodation, that is, a temporary suspension of those binaries in order for each system to use the complexity of the other, or in Luhmann's terms, structural coupling. In our case, an absolutely ineffective global system for reducing greenhouse gases — the carbon market — uses the complexity of Aboriginal knowledge, to gain legitimacy and expand into new — more “corporate responsible” — areas. Nonetheless, indigenous knowledge is preserved and used, indigenous people and their communities access income, and — in this case — carbon is potentially sequestered, since every year bush fires are controlled through indigenous techniques that have proven successful for this task. Binaries can exist within complex systems, as long as we understand that complexity is also made of structural coupling among otherwise opposed systems and temporary accommodations, or *deals*. But the fate of the deal, its own resilience, depends in this case on the destiny of a mechanism being heavily contested, in which what is clearly at stake is a binary that is in tension, and the site of struggle. But we should ask ourselves the question: what will become of these examples of good practices if the sham of carbon markets were to collapse under the weight of its own ineffectiveness?

Out of the Wasteocene

While the EJAtlas is a crucial tool to visualize the spatial dimensions of the Anthropocene, to project it almost literally onto the land, one might ask what the Anthropocene would look like if we were to focus our attention on the body. Strata of toxins have sedimented into the human body, arriving, according to the most recent studies in epigenetics, to be inscribed

into the genetic memory of humans (Guthman and Mansfield 2013). Exploring the Anthropocene through the human body might offer more insights about social inequalities than the geological obsession with the precise starting point of the new era. It also may allow us to better understand how revolutionary subjects are *produced*, something the EJAtlas is not set up to do. As we will see, the embodiment of inequalities in the human body does not produce only victims but also rebellious subjects who do not comply with the neo-liberal narrative of the Anthropocene.

Nobody speaks of the Anthropocene in the Land of Fires, the area in the Neapolitan hinterland where illegal dumping of toxic waste is affecting the lives of thousands of people.⁴ Evidently, people living and dying there have other languages and worries. It is not that they are unaware victims; rather decades of mobilization have created expert communities well informed on the complex matter of body/environment relationships (Armiero 2014). It was thanks to the work of grassroots activists that the attention of public opinion and the authorities shifted from the trash in the Neapolitan streets to the invisible threat of toxic waste, affecting mainly the subaltern communities living at the fringe of the metropolis (Armiero and D'Alisa 2013).

Looking at what has been called the Anthropocene from the Land of Fires or other underclass neighborhoods overlooking a more or less legal dump might be an interesting experiment. From several points of view waste can be considered the essence of the Anthropocene; both symbolically and materially, it embodies humans' ability to affect the environment to the point of transforming it into a gigantic dump. Archeologists know very well that a dumpsite is the mirror of a society; cultures - and their relationships with the environment - are inscribed into the strata of garbage (Rathje and Murphy 2001). Precisely as in the Anthropocene discourse, also with waste, history is mixed with the earth in a material sense, becoming legible through the stratification upon which our world is built. Waste also represents the ironic conundrum of humans' relationships with the environment: the wealthier the society becomes,

the more waste it produces, jeopardizing its very existence. It has been said so many times that garbage is a luxury for rich societies; this does not mean that the poor do not have waste, rather it says something about who produces garbage and who gets it. Isn't this the perfect metaphor for the Anthropocene? The metaphor becomes even more effective because waste is the typical trope of an Anthropocene-kind of environmentalist discourse. While complaining about waste, everybody concurs in its production, thereby any protest over waste becomes questionable. With waste, as with the Anthropocene, it is not a matter of antagonist politics but of self-reflexivity and/or expertise. In short, what is needed is the governmentalization of both the self and society. "Do you recycle"? The neo-liberal project brings back everything to the individual who is asked to face the consequences of her/his actions and make the changes needed, following the instructions of the experts. We argue that both the Anthropocene discourse and the waste discourse conflate the individual and the society at large – or, using the Anthropocene vocabulary, the species. If people live in this mess – either the local wasteland of the Land of Fires or the global dump of climate change - they should only blame themselves as a member of the universal human species, or, in the optimistic version, act as a member of the same universal human species to improve the situation.

In the case of the Land of Fires, and more broadly of the Neapolitan waste crisis, the governmentalization project has been effective, imposing a sense of guilt and shame on the affected people. Employing the evergreen rhetoric of southern Italians as uncivilized subjects, the mainstream public discourse has blamed local people for their unwillingness to recycle, their complicity with illegal disposal of toxics, and, in general, for their style of life. The uncivilized Neapolitans smoke, drink, and eat too much while, obviously, they do not exercise at all. Indeed, the Land of Fires is the perfect Anthropocene laboratory; capitalism infiltrates every living and non-living thing, imposing its logic over socio-ecological relationships. Making profit out of contamination - what D'Alisa and Demaria (2013) have called accumulation through contamination - capitalism enters into the body of subaltern people in two ways: on

one hand, it occupies cells with cancer and other diseases related to its organization of labour and space; on the other hand, capitalism imposes an ideology of the cure of the self which is based on individual choices, establishing what a healthy life should be. Precisely as in the optimistic Anthropocene, also in this Wasteocene story, humans can make the 'right' choices and solve the problems they have created if only they listen to the experts and follow their advice; no mention of structural injustices or power asymmetries.

In the Wasteocene as in the Anthropocene, instead of speaking of capitalism and injustice, the mainstream narrative focuses on consumerism - 'everybody is responsible' - and technology - 'experts can fix this.' But revolutionary subjects rise neither from guilt nor from a blind trust in the experts. Neither does victimization lead to a collective sense of agency but more likely to an appeal for justice to some superior authorities. In the waste crisis of Campania all these different feelings and paths have been mobilized. People have felt ashamed to be identified with garbage; they have been victimized, crying for help from the authorities or experts. Nonetheless, that experience has also created resisting communities, recalcitrant to the governmentalizing project.

In an interview, M., a middle-age woman who has participated in the struggles against a landfill in her community, stated clearly what was at stake in that mobilization.⁵ When we asked her how she became interested in waste, she testily replied: "I am not interested in waste but in commons." Later she explained that opposing the construction of a waste facility was only part of a wider struggle to defend the commons; and among those commons she also included public health. For M. fighting against a poorly planned landfill and the cutting of public funds to the health system were two sides of the same battle. Strange as it may seem, the mobilization over waste in Campania has been accompanied by a wider experimentation of commoning; not by chance, a coalition of grassroots groups has chosen as its name Rete Commons (Commons Network). The staple mobilization practice has been the presidio, that

is, the permanent public assembly of all citizens who wish to be involved in the decisions regarding their communities (Armiero and Sgueglia forthcoming). During the years of mobilization -- more or less from 2004 to 2009 -- the presidio has been both a practice and a place; it has generally started as an extemporary picket in the street to block some construction project and it has evolved towards a more permanent setting. In this sense it embodies a commoning practice, claiming a space and filling it with a new institution, the permanent assembly. In several cases the presidios became the alter-egos of the official sites where decisions have to be made, mainly the municipal councils. In the memories of activists the presidio was not only a space where the protest was organized; it was also a social space, where a new community was shaped.⁶ In underclass neighborhoods squeezed between cheap housing and shopping malls the presidio was much more than a picket against a landfill. It was literally the experimentation of new collective practices which aimed to stop not only the next waste dump but also the reproduction of the social dump made of isolation, commodification of free time, and annihilation of public spaces. In most of the cases, the presidios had rather short lives, like temporary autonomous zones (Bey 1991), even if it is still to be researched what they have left in the communities and people. We argue that the current vitality of the political landscape in Naples is largely connected to that season of commoning. Just as examples, we should mention here the flourishing of several *centri sociali*⁷ at the forefront in the struggles to reclaim urban spaces, some of them strongly connected to the waste struggles, as *Insurgentia*; the experience of Critical Mass, that is, the construction of a common platform among all kinds of grassroots groups towards the 2016 municipal election; and the fact that the current government of the city, probably the most leftist among the local administrations in the entire country, has been supporting those commoning experiences. On March 9, 2015 the Neapolitan municipal government formalized the existence of what legal scholar and activist Nicola Capone (2015) has defined as an urban common use, granting the right to manage squatted buildings “for the advantage of the local community” following a logic which goes beyond

private as well as public property. However, we believe that the most relevant legacy of the presidios is the present practice of the citizens' assemblies: during the 2016 in almost every district of Naples citizens have gathered periodically in public assemblies to decide about the future of their communities. Under the slogan "The city decides" and with an explicit Zapatista platform, a radical leftist coalition has won the 2016 municipal election forcing the mainstream opinion makers and politicians to talk of a 'Neapolitan anomaly'.

Although deeply Neapolitan, those grassroots groups have been global in their ambitions, building a wide network of political connections. Since 2014 activists from Insurgentia have travelled to Kobane establishing an organic cooperation with the Kurds' militants. The revolution in Rojava has become a source of inspiration for the Neapolitan activists thanks to its blend of autonomy, social ecology, and socialism. Other groups have built a significant relationship with the municipal experience of Barcelona, prefiguring a coalition of what they define as the European rebel cities.

In the Wasteocene as in the Anthropocene the revolutionary subject is not a pre-constituted entity, ready to be mobilized when needed. Not even geographical marginality, being marginal in respect to a national or regional metropolis, is enough to determine the revolutionary subject. Neither is some archetypical local community the depository of the new revolution. As we have illustrated, in the case of the Campania waste struggles it is an embodied experience that has generated a resisting community. Basically the community does not pre-exist the mobilization but it is produced through commoning, that is through shared practices and shared narratives.

Our interpretation goes against the naturalization/celebration of community. The arrival of an evil corporation does not necessarily produce revolutionary subjects. In the case of Naples, the presence of a diffuse radical counter-culture -- the Italian centri sociali--and the mobilization of a cohort of radical scholars have met with the bodily experience of injustice.

In the places where there was nothing to mobilize, the evolution of the waste struggles towards the creation of commons and commoning institutions did not materialize. However, we are not envisioning the usual hegemonic and vanguard relationship between the masses and some sort of organized Marxist groups (*centri sociali* instead of the “glorious party”). In the hotchpotch of the waste crisis, radical activists, citizens, and militant scholars have created a new vocabulary, creative practices, and hybrid identities, reinventing themselves rather than only guiding the masses.

While the Anthropocene narrative ignores capitalism, choosing instead to speak of human species, in the Wasteocene speaking of capitalism does not hide its effects on bodies; on the contrary this is the very place where resisting subjects are made. The traces of the Wasteocene are accumulated into the bodies of subaltern subjects but they are not only clues, inert strata proving that some global process has affected that inner environment. Acting on and through the body, those traces create both sick people and resisting subjects. The experience of the capitalistic making of the body uncovers the power inequalities inscribed into the Wasteocene; in many cases it can create identities from a shared experience of subalternity, and cries for justice. The case of Campania reveals also that a revolutionary agenda cannot be delegated to the authority of some impartial scientific knowledge; in fact, the causal connections between toxic waste and toxic bodies are still controversial in the scientific debate – even if nowadays it is recognized more widely than a decade ago, when activists started to make those claims (Armiero 2013; Cantoni 2016). We neither aim to undermine the need for more scientific research, nor support some obscurantist campaign against science. Our point is that science is a battlefield rather than a blueprint ready to be applied to save the day. In the 1970s Italian urban planner Virginio Bettini (1976) wrote about the opposition between an ecology of power and a class ecology. He was writing in the aftermath of the Seveso disaster when, once more in recent Italian history, it became manifest that science was not the land

where power disappeared. It is only with difficulty that the science of capital can serve the revolutionary needs of subalterns.

Conclusion

In her *This changes everything* Naomi Klein describes the emergence of what she defines as a global Blockadia. Everywhere people are getting organized to resist to the expansion of capital in their bodies and communities. At the checkpoints of this global Blockadia, the Anthropocene ceases to be an abstract category and becomes an embodied and socially-determined reality; in other words, it stops being the Anthropocene and appears for what it really is: the Capitalocene, many times under the guise of what we have defined here as the Wasteocene. What Blockadia does is to clearly undermine the universalism of the Anthropocene narrative, breaking it up through the fault lines of class, race, and gender. Blockades divide the social field: one cannot be on both sides of a checkpoint at the same time. In disrupting the universalism of the Anthropocene, the global Blockadia has also another function, that is, making visible what is hidden in the Anthropocene. According to Ernstson and Swyngedouw (2015), violence stays invisible in the Anthropocene; as in the Greek classical theater, in the Anthropocene violence cannot be represented on the scene, it is obscene, evoked but invisible to the public, happening elsewhere in respect to the central stage. The Anthropocene projects violence into the future – the coming apocalypse – or into the past – the debate on the original sin producing it – but stays largely blind on the ongoing violence; as the Invisible Committee has stated:

You have to admit: this whole “catastrophe,” which they so noisily inform us about, it doesn’t really touch us. At least not until we are hit by one of its foreseeable consequences. It may concern us, but it doesn’t touch us. And that is the real catastrophe (Invisible Committee 2007: 80).

In this sense, revolution in, against and beyond the Anthropocene is not only a struggle for visibility on the part of invisible subjects (Hollowey 2002: 97); but also visibility of the processes of exploitation and violence producing the Anthropocene.⁸ That revolution also raises the urgency to constitute something new through commoning, which implies building connections among existing and new commons, blending protest and the making of new circuits of resilient and sustainable production in commons (PM 2014).

In this article we have employed a few cases of local resistance against environmental injustice in order to demystify the mainstream narrative of the Anthropocene. In uncovering the violence inherent to the Anthropocene and its fictitious universalistic ethos, we propose a twofold denaturalization. On one hand, we rebut the 'naturalization' of a way of production and its ecological outcomes; it is capitalism and not the human species that is the force behind the current socio-ecological crisis. On the other hand, while the Anthropocene/Capitalocene narrative aims to organize people through time and space, subtracting from this organization is the basic form of disobedience which makes it possible to build alternatives to it. As Ranciere has written:

Any subjectification is a disidentification, removal from the naturalness of a place, the opening up of a subject space where any one can be counted since it is the space where those of no account are counted, where a connection is made between having a part and having no part (Ranciere 2004: 36)

While one can say that in the cases we have presented there is always a deep connection to the places – something along the lines of Raymond Williams' and David Harvey's militant particularism (Harvey 1995) or what Thomas Nail (2012) has called neoterritorialization– nonetheless, in its progressive versions it actually implies “relocating” the specific places into wider global frames of exploitation and resistance. It is not by chance that the communities living in what we have defined the Wastocene of the Neapolitan region have built a connection with

the Kurds' struggles which has led to the granting of Neapolitan honorary citizenship to Ocalan by the leftist municipal government.

The opposition to the universalistic Anthropocene is not the return of the local but the making of new commons and common identities through commoning.

References

Armiero, Marco. 2014. "Is There an Indigenous Knowledge in the Urban North? Re/inventing Local Knowledge and Communities in the Struggles over Garbage and Incinerators in Campania, Italy." *Estudos de Sociologia* 1.20

Armiero, Marco, and Leandro Sgueglia (forthcoming). "Wasted Spaces, Resisting People. The Politics of Waste in Naples, Italy." In *Ecological Resistance*, edited by Bron Taylor, Ursula Münster, and Joseph D. Witt. Publisher TBD.

Bey, Hakim. 1991. *Temporary Autonomous Zones*. New York: Autonomedia.

Bettini, Virginio. 1976. "Ecologia di potere, ecologia di classe nel caso Icmesa.," In *Ecologia e lotte sociali. Ambiente, popolazione, inquinamento*, edited by Barry Commoner and Virginio Bettini, 5-46. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Bond, Patrick. 2015. "Climate Change Casino: Carbon Trading Reborn in New-Generation Mega Polluters." *Counterpunch*, December 4

Bullard, Robert. 1993. *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*. South End Press.

Cantoni, Roberto. 2016. "The Waste Crisis in Campania, South Italy: A Historical Perspective on an Epidemiological Controversy." *Endeavour* 40, no. 2: 102/113.

Capone, Nicola. 2015. "The Concrete Utopia of the Commons. The Right of 'Civic and Collective Use' of Public (and Private) Goods." Paper presented to the Environmental Utopias and dystopias ELC workshop, Stockholm 11-12 December.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2009. "The Climate of History: Four Theses." *Critical Inquiry* 35, no. 2: 197-222

Cleaver, Harry. 1979. *Reading Capital Politically*. Austin: University of Austin Press.

Crutzen, Paul J., and Eugene F. Stoermer. 2000. "The 'Anthropocene'." *Global Change Newsletter* 41: 17-18.

D'Alisa, Giacomo, and Marco Armiero. 2013. "What Happened to the Trash? Political Miracles and Real Statistics in an Emergency Regime." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 24, no. 4: 29-45.

- De Angelis, Massimo. 2007. *The Beginning of History, Value Struggles and Global Capital*. London: Pluto.
- Demaria, Federico, and Giacomo D'Alisa. 2013. "Dispossession and Contamination. Strategies for Capital Accumulation in the Waste Market." *Lo Squaderno* 29: 37-39
- Dibley, Ben 2012. "The Shape of Things to Come: Seven Theses on the Anthropocene and Attachment." *Australian Humanities Review* 52 australianhumanitiesreview.org/archive/Issue-May-2012/dibley
- Ernstson, Henrik, and Erik Swyngedouw. 2015. "Framing the Meeting: Rupturing the Anthro-obscene! The Political Promises of Planetary & Uneven Urban Ecologies." Position Paper at the Anthro-obscene 16-19 September.
- Harvey, David. 2014. *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Invisible Committee. 2009. *The coming insurrection*. Cambridge: MIT.
- Francesco. 2015. *Encyclical Letter Laudato Si*. Rome.
http://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si_en.pdf
- Gore, Al (2006). *An Inconvenient Truth*. Lawrence Bender 96 minutes, US.
- Guldi, Jo, and David Armitage. 2014. *The History Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guthman, Julie, and Becky Mansfield. 2013. "The Implications of Environmental Epigenetics A New Direction for Geographic Inquiry on Health, Space, and Nature-Society Relations." *Progress in Human Geography* 37, no. 4: 486-504.
- Haraway, Donna. 2006. *A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late 20th Century*. New York: Springer.
- Harvey, David. 1995. "Militant Particularism and Global Ambition: The Conceptual Politics of Place, Space, and Environment in the Work of Raymond Williams." *Social Text* 42: 69-98.
- Hogg, Alec 2015. "As Inequality Soars, the Nervous Super Rich Are Already Planning Their Escapes." *The Guardian*, February 23 (<http://www.theguardian.com/public-leaders-network/2015/jan/23/nervous-super-rich-planning-escapes-davos-2015>)
- Holloway, John. 2002. *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. London: Pluto Press.
- Houston, Donna. 2013. "Crisis is where we live: Environmental justice for the Anthropocene." *Globalizations* 10.3: 439-450.
- Klein, Naomi. 2015. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Malm, Andreas, and Alf Hornborg. 2014. "The Geology of Mankind? A Critique of the Anthropocene Narrative." *The Anthropocene Review* 1, no. 1: 62 -69
- Moore, Jason W. 2014. "The Capitalocene I: On the Nature and Origins of Our Ecological Crisis." www.jasonwmoore.com/uploads/The_Capitalocene_Part_I_for_website_30_March_2014.pdf (accessed 2 February 2016).
- Mudu, Pierpaolo. 2004. "Resisting and Challenging Neoliberalism: Development of Italian Social Centers." *Antipode* 36, no. 5: 917-941.
- Nail, Thomas. 2012. *Returning to Revolution: Deleuze, Guattari and Zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Oakland Institute. 2014. *The Darker Side of Green Plantation Forestry and Carbon Violence in Uganda*. Oakland, CA. http://www.oaklandinstitute.org/sites/oaklandinstitute.org/files/Report_DarkerSideofGreen_hirez.pdf (accessed June 5, 2016).
- Oxfam. 2015. "Extreme Carbon Inequality." *Oxfam Media Briefing* (December). www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/mb-extreme-carbon-inequality-021215-en.pdf (accessed June 5, 2016).
- PM. 2014. *The Power of Neighborhood and The Commons*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2004. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Read, Jason. 2003. *The Micro-Politics of Capital: Marx and the Pre-history of the Present*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Rathje, William L., and Cullen Murphy. 2001. *Rubbish!: The Archaeology of Garbage*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Rockström, Johan et al. 2009. "Planetary Boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for Humanity." *Ecology and Society* 14, no. 2 (<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art32/>).
- Samal, Debranjana. 2016. "Go Back Jr Power Plant: Rail and Road Blockade, Orissa Barta." January, www.orissabarta.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=9373:go-back-jr-power-plant-rail-and-road-blockad (accessed June 5, 2016).
- Steffen, William et al. 2015. "Planetary Boundaries: Guiding Human Development on a Changing Planet." *Science* 347, no. 6223. <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/347/6223/1259855>
- Steffen, William et al. 2015. "The Trajectory of the Anthropocene: The Great Acceleration." *The Anthropocene Review* 2, no. 1: 81–98.
- Swyngedouw, Erik. 1996. "The City as a Hybrid: On Nature, Society and Cyborg Urbanization." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 7, no. 2: 65-80.
- Swyngedouw, Erik. 2011. "Depoliticized environments: The end of nature, climate change and the post-political condition." *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement* 69: 253-274.

Swyngedouw, Erik. 2013. "Apocalypse Now! Fear and Doomsday Pleasures." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 24, no. 1: 9-18.

The Economist. 2014. "I Will Survive. Preparing for the Apocalypse." December 20. <http://www.economist.com/news/christmas-specials/21636611-when-civilisation-collapses-will-you-be-ready-i-will-survive>

White, Richard. 1995. *The Organic Machine*. New York: Hill and Wang.

¹ With the term organosphere we refer to the inner socio-natural system of human and more than human body. We are in debt to Robert Emmett who suggested us to use this word.

² “The strategy of buying and selling “carbon credits” can lead to a new form of speculation which would not help reduce the emission of polluting gases worldwide. This system seems to provide a quick and easy solution under the guise of a certain commitment to the environment, but in no way does it allow for the radical change which present circumstances require. Rather, it may simply become a ploy which permits maintaining the excessive consumption of some countries and sectors. Pope Francesco (2015: 126)”

³ For a review of the Bukaleba case, see also Oakland Institute (2014).

⁴ The Land of Fires is an area comprised between the provinces of Naples and Caserta marked by a continuous presence of toxic fires, generally ignited on purpose to cover the disposal of hazardous waste. This definition, coined by local activists, has been picked up by all Italian major newspapers in their reports on waste crisis in the Campania region.

⁵ Interview in possession of the authors.

⁶ Film festivals, activities with children, exhibitions, conferences, concerts, training courses, and social dinners were some of the activities held at the presidio (from our informants and field-notes).

⁷ The Centri Sociali (Social Centers) are old, abandoned buildings occupied by young activists and transformed into centres for political, cultural, and recreational activities. On this experience see Mudu 2004.

⁸ Precisely as for capitalism also for the Anthropocene we need to recognize with David Harvey (2014: 5) the possibility that “we are often encountering symptoms rather than underlying causes and that we need to unmask what is truly happening underneath a welter of often mystifying surface appearances”.