

Aykut Çoban

PEOPLE’S CLIMATE POLITICS AGAINST HEGEMONIC CLIMATE POLITICS

Translated by Bircan Tamer, Helin Nur Güler, Onur Yılmaz

Published in *Abstrakt Dergi* (Dossier 9), November 26, 2021

Part I - <http://www.abstraktdergi.net/peoples-climate-politics-against-hegemonic-climate-politics-1/>

Today we are faced with two main strategies for solving the problem of climate change. In the first, (symptomatic) measures are applied within the capitalist system, which tend towards “energy transformation” and alleviate symptoms, rather than addressing the causes. Examples of such policies in action abound in many countries: broadly similar, they defer to the interests of capital. This may be termed the hegemonic climate politics. The second strategy is that of anti-capitalist climate politics of the people as exploited workers and oppressed segments of society. The two policies differ not only in terms of solutions, but primarily in terms of their grasp of the causes of the climate question. Unlike the first, the second acknowledges that the climate has changed due to the functional laws of capitalism, its structural qualities. It is impossible to get rid of the structural characteristics of capitalism without eliminating capitalism, and as long as these characteristics exist, there can be no solution to climate change. I will not discuss here the details of the structural characteristics of capitalism that cause ecological destruction (for which, see Shepherd 2021). But I will examine the links between the structural contradictions of capitalism and the dilemmas created by climate policies in practice for the past three decades.

In this article, I aim to discuss the climate politics of the people in the face of hegemonic climate politics. The way to prevent climate change is to get rid of capitalism, which is the cause of the problem. However, there will be those who sneer at this approach by asking the following questions: “What happens until capitalism disappears? System change remains abstract, what are your concrete recommendations? Won’t the solution be deferred until after capitalism?” In reality, ending capitalism is a concrete eco-political goal in itself. None the less, an absurd understanding that there will be no social struggle with regard to the climate until this goal is achieved still appears.

We can take the first step to respond to the similar questions and views of those who object to the second style of politics, with the following initial proposal: anti-capitalist struggle and ecological struggle complement one another as two components of a single process (which we may term ecosocialist struggle). I will try to present below the basis upon which the two struggles are carried out in concert. It is not enough to determine the fact that the struggles are related to one another. It is also necessary to show how various fighting forces can act jointly for the same purpose. In the service of building a united front of forces in struggle, I consider that the

discussion of the climate, the problem areas and solutions therein, can be more productive. Ultimately, uncovering the source of the problem also allows you to see what the solution is. In addition, by answering the question “what are your concrete recommendations?”, we can also head off objections of the sort “will it wait until after capitalism?”. In this context, I will deconstruct the climate question considering its various dimensions and causes specific to capitalism. I will try to identify the tactics of struggle that will lead us to a solution in terms of the cause of the transformation of the climate into a problem. Here are five questions which I will examine and the basic formulation of their solutions, or five theses:

Climate crisis is:

1. an ideological question / in need of ideological and scientific struggle,
2. a question with a spatial scale and a temporal dimension / a struggle that interacts between different scales and is not postponed to the future,
3. an economic question / an economic struggle,
4. a class question / a class struggle,
5. is a political question / solved by political struggle

I must emphasize that I only make these distinctions to facilitate discussion. A social struggle is carried out together with its economic, class, political, ideological, and scale dimensions. Based on the five issues and solutions I have listed, I will discuss ways to develop joint action that will bring together the forces of struggle to overturn capitalism, which is the cause of the climate question. I will try to establish theoretical bridges between goals, subjects, and methods.

Ideological Dimension

For a while there has been a trend of climate change denial. Representatives of capital in politics and the media argued that the climate had not changed at all. However, the symptoms of the changing climate could not be hidden. After a while, when this “denialism” did not pay off, right-wing ideologues began to seek new methods. A new trend which has been on the rise for several years is “climate racism”, also popularly known as “eco-fascism”. This time, those who try to confront various climate-related proposals with disbelief are completely distorting the relationship between problem and solution. They criminalise migrants affected by climate change, poor and oppressed peoples, as if they were the cause of ecological degradation. This trend, common around the world, has also been observed in Turkey. The last example of this in the summer of 2021 was during the fires that ravaged many places in the Mediterranean and Aegean regions due to the changing climate, when racists emboldened by hate speech blockaded roads to catch imagined criminals. As the fires burned, they stopped people and asked for IDs, published lies and distortions in the media, and helped to push forward a campaign of defamation with their own hate speech.

In nationalist ideologies, an attitude towards refugees, migrants, and other peoples who stand outside the sovereign nation is developed by establishing a relationship between avoiding harm to the ethnic purity of the nation and avoiding harm to the purity of nature, citing disturbances

to climate and environment. Migrants, for example, are presented as a kind of pest species that create ecological problems in the countries where they seek refuge and damage the national ecosystem (Turner and Bailey, 2021; Adler-Bell, 2019; Turhan and Armiero, 2017). Eco-fascist ideology is set in front of the climate demands of the people, while at the same time those demands are used for the expansion of racist politics. In addition, migrants are confronted with attempts to close borders under the pretext of environmental protection. Moreover, with climate racism, the responsibilities of capital and the state leading to ecological destruction and the climate impasse are obscured.¹ Thus, both the real causes of the problem are hidden and the climate demands of the companies and the state, which are rising in society, are exacerbated by racism.

Another element that undermines climate politics is the creation of a language of expertise. There are numerous concepts, institutions, organizations, regulatory rules, reports and acronyms for the climate policies that countries put in place. It is impossible for ordinary people to participate in an esoteric discussion that only climate experts understand. Thanks to such specialization, a discourse suitable for deflecting both the causes and solutions of the climate question and misleading the public is born.

Representatives of governments, capital, and NGOs, as climate experts, produce climate policies in practice at United Nations meetings and ministry buildings. This can be termed the hegemonic climate politics. I will discuss various elements of this politics below. First of all, climate change, a multifaceted problem with many causes under capitalist policy, is reduced to a singular cause, carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere.

Undoubtedly, fossil fuels that lead to greenhouse gas emissions need to be abandoned. But greenhouse gas emissions are not the underlying cause of the problem, they are a result. It is necessary to underline this fact. The cause of climate change is the capitalist totality formed by the following intertwined elements: Capital accumulation, commodity production, residues, profitability, private property, labor exploitation, commodity consumption, individualisation of environmental responsibility, energy hunger created by these processes, energy from fossil sources, problems contained by renewable energy, degradation of carbon and other natural cycles in all these processes, and the collapse of ecosystems. A politics that focuses on emissions does not have the capacity to solve all these phenomena. Moreover, the emissions it focuses on cannot be cured due to these facts. I will discuss capitalist facts and anti-capitalist solutions as I proceed.

The tools proposed as a policy of reducing carbon dioxide gases in hegemonic climate politics are renewable energy, carbon capture technology, “blue and green hydrogen”, “clean coal”, carbon (emissions) trade, carbon tax, fine, reforestation, donation of money for planting a tree every time a journey is made by air travel, reducing consumer waste and so on. These proposals within the capitalist order are spread by academics, associations, political parties, media and state institutions, decorated with expert language.

Since it is hegemonic politics, it magnetically attracts some of its opponents. So much so that even in some opinions where the emphasis is placed on “capitalism is the cause of the climate

question”, the emission reduction proposals of hegemonic climate politics are adopted and reiterated. However, in terms of causal relationship, since the problem arises from the facts and processes of capitalism, the solution should be shaped by anti-capitalist methods.

In hegemonic climate politics, ideological propaganda is made as a means of solution of the elements that are actually part of the climate question. At the top of this inventory are market mechanisms that price nature, trees, pollution, carbon dioxide. However, the structural contradictions of capitalism are an obstacle to the success of even marketist solutions in the market economy. For example, a World Bank publication admits that while tax and similar carbon pricing proposals are very popular in many countries, current carbon pricing remains very low in the economies in which it is applied, meaning it does not work (World Bank, 2020). Similarly, reforestation through the donation of money to non-governmental organizations such as TEMA or by the Ministry of Forestry does not create a reforestation effect that will solve the climate question, contrary to what is suggested.

Only 7 percent of the world’s forests are the result of human reforestation, and the rest having formed on their own. Moreover, some of the trees are planted for the production of commodities as timber or firewood. Under capitalism, which destroys the environment through mining, construction, timber, tourism and similar commodity production activities, the solution to deforestation is sought in the production of trees as commodities! In sum, between 2010 and 2020, the total rate of reforestation caused by human reforestation and spontaneous reproduction combined is only half the rate of deforestation. In other words, reforestation is far from equating even the forests that are being destroyed (FAO, 2020).

The greatest achievement of hegemonic climate politics is that it hides the fact that capital is the primary perpetrator of the climate question. In this approach, even when the climate question is reduced to fossil fuels, companies that extract and sell oil, coal, natural gas, airlines that use gasoline, sea transportation companies, companies that generate electricity in thermal power plants, industrial livestock companies... they are not held responsible for the climate question. Typically, consumers are shown to be responsible for carbon. The consumer is told that “the planet is being driven to destruction because you do not reduce carbon dioxide emissions, sort your garbage, make a list when you go shopping, still do not buy energy-efficient appliances, do not insulate the exterior of your residence, do not drive an electric car”, etc. This ideological diversion saddles the individual with both the problem and the solution. Here again, the ideological framework of the capitalist approach is employed. Capitalism’s perception of individualism creates the illusion of an individual who is isolated from all capitalist structures, which, as a transcendental subject, can change the course of the world through their free consumption choices. It is beyond doubt that the consumer cannot succeed in undoing all the carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere by fossil companies.

As can be seen, the culprits have been chosen: ethnic identities, refugees, consumers and carbon dioxide converted into a fetish. Thus, property relations under the economic and political structures of capitalism that cause the climate question and the capitalist class are ideologically defended.

Breaking Ideological Codes

Here are some examples from the content list of a struggle to lift the ideological veil from the climate question:

A clear understanding of the cause-and-effect relationship between climate and historical materialistic scientific analyses against ideological obfuscation. In order to be able to speak about the truth, we must raise the fight for the removal of barriers to the rights and freedoms of thought and expression, scientific research and dissemination of its results, through press, meetings and demonstrations, organizing for rights and freedoms.² To build and support left, socialist, independent media outlets, newspapers and magazines that report the truth. An effective fight against hate speech, eco-fascism, and ecological racism. This means that the struggle to expand rights and freedoms, the struggle against ecological racism and fascism, and the climate struggle complement one another.

Not long ago, prestigious academic organizations in the west came together and issued two separate statements on biodiversity loss and climate change, calling for urgent action against the G-7, representing seven highly developed countries. In both statements, the climate crimes committed by companies, capitalist classes and G-7 states, the ecological destruction they commit, the financial responsibilities they must bear are not mentioned even in passing (see “Reversing...” 2021; “A Net Zero...” 2021 in Bibliography)

*An important item on the list of struggles also appears here: To ask and answer the question “why do we not discuss the responsibility of the fossil fuel companies that cause the climate crisis and the state that defends and protects them” in academic symposiums, UN meetings, parliamentary commissions and general assembly, climate rallies and newspaper columns, to open this discussion; In order to directly show the blame of companies and the responsibility of the state, the real causes of climate change will need to be emphasized ceaselessly, and the class dimension of the climate question I discuss below will need to be raised.

This debate is important because it opens the way to combating the influence of hegemonic climate politics that dominates the search for alternatives. If this is not done, hegemonic climate politics continues to ideologically colonize science, trade unions, democratic mass organizations, and left-wing politics as a whole. An example of such ideological bondage on the labor front is that trade unions run a lobbying event in the European Union that promotes the system of emissions trading. Worse, the steelworkers’ union federation (IndustriAll Europe) has defended demands that would weaken the emissions trading system in favour of employers (Thomas, 2021). Underdeveloped southern countries are also ideologically colonized by a climate policy that looks out for the interests of developed northern countries. Instead of raising the flag with internationalist networks against developed countries that change the climate with their cumulative emissions that have been going on for a hundred and fifty years, underdeveloped countries adopt the global north’s climate policy and chase a share of climate funding.

Similarly, various environmental NGOs are subject to hegemonic climate politics with its rhetoric of consumer behavior change. This style of politics spreads its call for green consumption to the

consumer average, which is a very consuming, very waste-causing and high emissions average in developed countries such as the US, EU countries, Canada and Australia. It presents this high average as a valid phenomenon for workers, peasants, unemployed, immigrants, poor women, oppressed races, nations and identities all over the world. It generalizes the bourgeois and small bourgeois consumer to all humanity by separating it from class and social divisions. Thus, this style of politics ignores the unpretentious interaction of the toiling and poor peoples with nature, and prepares the environment for the marginalization of an alternative social struggle suitable for this interaction. An example in Turkey is the demand for “reduce your portions” for everyone, even though the majority of the population lives below the poverty line (Doğan, 2021). A similar view appears in the proposal to prevent food waste by consumers to reduce greenhouse gas emissions caused by food litter. However, even in a report of TÜSİAD (the Turkey-wide chamber of commerce), it is stated that the food waste that consumers are responsible for in Turkey does not exceed five percent of the total food losses. Food losses occur during production, processing, storage, distribution and at the consumer market itself (TÜSİAD, 2020: 34-5). As here, the climate crisis impasse is directly related to the mismatch between the real causes of the problem and the proposals presented as solutions.

In short, hegemonic climate politics based on carbon reductionism places its hope in market mechanisms and proposes consumer behavior change. It is imposed on the world by the imperialist countries of the north; When the ideological chains that colonize science, trade unions, chambers of commerce, democratic mass organizations are broken down, only the search for real solutions to the climate question can gain strength.

Part of the fight in the ideological sphere is the adoption of a language of struggle instead of the disgressive (and demoralising) directions of hegemonic climate politics. According to a study conducted in Australia, eco-anxiety and a feeling of eco-depression about climate change not only have no positive impact on personal well-being, it also does not trigger any positive behavior with respect to the climate. What’s more, the study found that a feeling of eco-depression weakens people’s tendency to participate in collective action. In contrast, those who report “eco-anger” about the changing climate show great interest in both personal behavior change and collective action. The social and geographical inequalities that people experience on ecological issues provoke eco-anger, and anger is a driving force for collective action. Because of these findings, the researchers are proposing the establishment of language that promotes eco-anger in the campaigns and training of climate struggle organizations. Such language is also compatible with the solution of the climate question, as it does not feed anxiety and depression, leading people to collective struggle while caring for public health (Stanley, Hogg, Leviston, Walker, 2021)

There is also the question of who eco-anger targets, and which institutions. Fascist, racist, nationalist parties and environmental organizations direct anger towards the “other” in society, racialized groups or outsiders to national identity, particularly immigrants. By doing so, anger arising from ecological and social injustice is used as a conveyor belt of inhumane fascist violence on communities in the grip of the same inequalities. In addition, by holding all humanity (“we did this,” “look in the mirror, see the culprit”) and the consumer individual accountable for the changing climate, the messages that fuel anxiety and depression create an environment suitable

for climate inaction in a way that limits social struggle. Instead of the apocalypse that awaits humanity in the future, there is a good chance of success in a political strategy that places climate inequality between the bourgeoisie and the working classes, the current effects of the climate crisis, the companies that led to this effect, and government policies at the center of anger now.

Dimension of Temporal and Spatial Scale

In the late 1980s, the concept of “time-space compression” entered the discourse. With this concept, the effects of the time accelerated by the innovations in manufacturing, communication and information technologies were emphasized to the exclusion of discussions of space (Altvater, 1989; Giddens, 1990; Harvey, 1990; Massey, 1991). Class context, ethnic identity and gender inequalities should be taken into account when evaluating the findings that time is accelerating and reducing the importance of space. Online money transfers are examples of changing time-space relations in terms of air travel, digitized capitalism, capitalist classes and upper income clusters. In contrast, the reality of time-space compression is often highly controversial in terms of the working classes. For example, about 90 percent of Turkey’s population does not have a passport to allow time-space compression. Space neutralizes time, whether in the case of migrants fleeing their country or those displaced by ecological or other reasons, or if laborers are exposed to the effects of extreme weather events such as death, disability, trauma. The Covid-19 epidemic is also a period when space destroys time in terms of the workers who have to go to work and the working children who cannot go to school and do not have internet and computers.

Climate change, on the other hand, suggests removing the place from the shadow of the accelerated time of capitalism and treating the time-space relationship with past-present-future ties in the long term. If the hundred-year-long trend of rising temperatures continues in the coming years, the climate is expected to be affected in many places. Settlements and forests destroyed by fires due to rising temperatures, melting glaciers, thawing permafrosts, radical changes to land structure due to desertification are all expected (IPCC, 2021). Therefore, unlike the time-space compression thesis, which emphasizes speed and short-termism, the themes raised in the summer of climate change are urgency (measures that are urgently required to be implemented) and long-termism.

The time of processes in nature, for example, the carbon cycle, differ from the time of capitalist production. Fossil energy sources take a long time to form, millions of years. However, they are burned in a short period of time in order to obtain energy for economic purposes.. The climate-changing greenhouse effect of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere during the burning of fossil fuels is long-lasting, lasting for five to seven hundred years. Under capitalism, the period of use of fossil fuel reserves has been shortened and the time for proportional accumulation of carbon dioxide gases in the atmosphere has accelerated compared to the past.

As Ian Angus (2021:147) points out, “there is a difficult conflict between the time of nature and the time of capital – between the cyclical processes of the world system that have evolved over millions of years and the need for rapid production, distribution and profit by capital.

Climate change is a problem created by capitalism from the past to the present, and the future is under threat as capitalism continues. Indeed, the climate question is a result of the fact that time in capitalism is always defined by today. Although the capital cycle is short, it is also dependent on long-term cycles of nature such as carbon, nitrogen, water, phosphorus. Capital accumulation occurs thanks to natural assets formed in these cycles. The carbon cycle, for example, allows coal to form, but the carbon dioxide released when coal is burned also affects the climate as it returns to the cycle. In contrast, capital resists the guidance of medium and long-term perspectives due to the phenomenon of making a profit in a short time. While capital creates a world in the form of its short-term cycle, the climate question shows the irreconcilable contradiction between the time of capital and the time of nature.

In addition, the time of capital and the time of labor are also in contradiction. In capitalism, the time of the capital cycle is short. This means that the money invested in production is to become profit as value as soon as possible, that is, it is desirable to complete the capital cycle quickly. Under capitalism, shortening time and increasing speed are important in terms of profitability. In a short time, a profitable activity is achieved by shortening the circulation time of the capital. This feature of capitalism contains a contrast in terms of laborers and nature. With profit, capital becomes reinvestment in the accumulation cycle. Thus, the new cycle begins in the exploitation of labor and the capitalist plundering of nature. However, it takes two decades for the workers who produce commodities to reproduce biologically, constituting a phase in the capital cycle. Social reproduction of the worker, that is, going to work healthy the next day, seems to be short-term, but health is a long-term concept. Air pollution and all kinds of chemicals as emissions to which they are exposed in the workplace on a daily basis degrade the health of the worker over. Greenhouse gas emissions, which have long-lasting effects on the climate, disrupt the health of the laborer as air pollution, the woman who reproduces labor and the baby who will be tomorrow's laborer.

In addition, the consequences of climate change as extreme weather events are felt by laborers immediately, here and now.³ Drought, frost, floods, typhoons, extreme cold, extreme heat waves and fires lead to the deaths, disability, health problems, loss of crops in agriculture and livestock, loss of workday, migration, displacement and displacement of many workers, peasants, unemployed, migrants, women, children and the elderly. While working people will experience such effects more frequently and more intensely in the future as climate change intensifies, they are experiencing severe ecological destruction even at present.

Jean-Marie Harribey (2014:201) reflects two inseparable propositions of a Marxist political ecology about time: "Respect for the [past] time that led to the control of all people over the time they lived and the development and complexity of living systems." In capitalism, the dominance of capital over the present and the future is absolute, the same cannot be said for the control of other segments of society over time. While capital is now moving, its future is already struggling to buy, to outperform its competitors, to create the conditions for future wealth. As a result of this practice, which does not respect the past accumulation of nature and humanity, the future of the earth is destroyed. Capital's understanding of time, which rotates in the present and is disconnected from the past, is an obstacle to revealing the causes of ecological problems.

In terms of working people, the importance of the concept of three-dimensional time is key here. The past roots, current mechanisms and actors of the order that led the earth to destruction are clarified by conceiving of time in labor. Thus, instead of a future that will deepen the ongoing destruction, it opens the way to building a future where salvation from that order can be achieved.

The capital cycle has short and long-term effects on workers, both in terms of exploitation and the consequences of a changing climate. Hegemonic climate politics, in turn, ignores the short-term capital cycle and its consequences. It also proposes a calendar spanning decades, rather than intervening now in the changing climate. The target year for decarbonization of climate policies in practice is 2050. In capitalism, measures to meet the long-term requirements of the climate are not implemented here and now, they are constantly postponed and delayed into the future. Thus, on the one hand, there is the time of capital and the time of climate policies implemented by states, and on the other hand, there is the time of laborers and nature who are in irreconcilable opposition to these two.

The climate crisis is historical. However, there is no yesterday and tomorrow in hegemonic climate politics. The past is ignored to trivialize the historical climate burden that the established companies of developed countries have created for a hundred and fifty years. The future is obscured by a scenario of a world heading towards climate catastrophe and apocalypse with the possibility of a six-degree temperature rise. The emphasis on doomsday no-tomorrowism is used as a means of public adoption of solutions of hegemonic climate politics, which claims to change that destiny. Because it is suggested that it is possible to get rid of the apocalypse, for example, to the extent that the Paris Agreement is implemented. This apocalyptic-liberation pendulum itself is an ideological tool that provides justification for climate policy tools in practice.

These findings lead us to two separate understandings of climate change in terms of timescale. What hegemonic climate politics is interested in is climate change as a possibility of a future apocalypse, against a climate change that the working classes are already experiencing in a concrete place, here and now, today.

Research findings honestly provides enough information about the future of the climate. Hegemonic climate politics, on the other hand, creates uncertainty that it justifies the adoption of its proposals: "If the following market mechanism measures are implemented as climate policies in the next three decades, if these technologies can be developed, if companies are supported with such a public budget," etc. In this article, I try to show that these policies cannot be effective due to the internal contradictions of capitalism, and that the geo-engineering upon which it relies creates empty dreams. Moreover, it is clear that the research findings in climate indicators have set new records in the past three decades. For these reasons, we know that there is no real uncertainty, that the climate question under capitalism is locked into insolvency.

The question of whether to implement intra-capitalist proposals is left to uncertainty in climate politics, which also weakens the ability to predict future requirements. When it is not known what awaits society, what the requirements will be, under what conditions it is necessary to correct, the ability to set future-oriented policies and develop climate adaptation strategies for

the effects of climate change is paralyzed. The devastating effects of the changing climate arise from the relationship between the risk of destruction and the predisposition to be harmed by destruction. The damage from destruction is related to which segments of society will be subjected to the effects, that is, the existing social order. In this respect, the effects of climate change do not show a break from the past, on the contrary, they are produced by the past (social relations) (Compton, 2020: 1-2)

So, in the existing capitalist order, the current political failure on climate change is also transforming into a lack of policy in terms of meeting the needs of the future. Moreover, the poor working classes that suffer the most from climate change are condemned to unprotected, policy-free destruction in the future as they are today. Both the climate uncertainty of the existing capitalist order and the impasse created by the wider population as climate fragility present us with a political struggle that will change this order as a solution. I will return to this point.

Rejection of a Future Adjusted to Capital

One can claim that adaptation measures to climate change have been developed for the laboring, peasant and “fragile” communities. However, the prescribed adaptation is a policy of adapting capital to the changing climate without harming capital, and determining the dispensable and indispensable population clusters among the popular classes as they are affected by the changing climate. With the adaptation policies on hand, it is decided who among those affected by climate change have the potential to endure the changing climate and to what extent they can do so. Those who can adjust are mostly unaffected, while those who are unable to adjust are forced to completely carry the burden and are harmed by climate change. For instance, climate refugees for whom no national or international protection measures are foreseen are at the top of the list of the dispensable.

A noteworthy division exists between adaptation policies. The first type are those policies to adapt to certain environmental conditions in a changing climate. The second are the adaptation policies that enable people to develop their capacity to respond to uncertain situations where it cannot be predicted to what extent the conditions will change along with the climate. Accordingly, through “capacity building”, it becomes possible for the affected people to make decisions and take action according to unstable conditions, even in ways they do not foresee (Compton, 2020: 4). In other words, the promise of the hegemonic climate policy to the working and poor people consists only of advising them to prepare themselves for the changing climate (develop their capacity). Among the suggestions, useful information and experience transfers can also be found. However, the programs organized with the support of the World Bank, European Union and similar organizations serve to ideologically colonize the political perspectives of local communities affected by climate change with hegemonic climate politics.

The hegemonic climate policy’s emphasis on “urgency” does not offer measures that will soon improve the situation of workers who are currently being affected. The “net zero carbon” target, envisaged by the international climate regime for thirty years later, has been adjusted to the transformation of capital in the long run. In this respect, these policies aim at the smooth exit of

the capital from the climate crisis and its trouble-free adaptation to the requirements of decarbonization without experiencing an energy problem. Long-term emission reduction and adaptation policies restructure capital in the face of the climate question without harming capital.

A climate-changing future is the result of political decisions made already. For this reason, the future of the climate in fifty years is built by the policies that have been put into practice in the past (that is, today) and those that have not. In this respect, the importance of the timing of policy objectives cannot be overstated. The contradiction between the emphasis on the implementation of “urgent” measures in the international climate regime and the postponed targets to 2050 allows for the possibility of paralyzing the alternative climate struggle. When climate experts spread the warning of urgency, it causes climate-reactive elements to tail the inadequate official policies. Elements anticipating urgent measures are brought to the point of accepting policy tools that do not have the power to solve the climate question, such as the minimal promises of the Paris Agreement, the minimal effects of carbon trading, the minimal effects of introducing electric cars, the minimal effects of using energy-efficient light bulbs at home, and the bare minimum set by future emission reduction targets. The word urgency, framed in this way, becomes one of the ideological tools of climate policy. In the face of the urgency-target contradiction, the task of the climate struggle is **to make it a problem that the targets have been postponed to thirty years later, and to make the capital interests behind this postponement to the agenda to meet the targets ‘early’**. When these 2050 policy goals are achieved within a few years, the urgency of the problem has been responded to ‘adequately’.

There may be some objections to this determination, arguing that “exit from the fossil cannot take place in a few years”. It is precisely this objection that feeds the urgency-goal contradiction. As a matter of fact, hegemonic climate politics does not see an end to fossil fuel use as an immediate goal. It is indexed to the smooth adaptation of capital, especially fossil fuel companies, to the “energy transformation”. Without such an immediate goal, no effort is made to find policy tools to achieve it, no concern is shown to answer the question “energy for what, for whom?”.

Climate inequalities are both social and spatial. The effects of climate change are unevenly distributed in terms of local, rural-urban, regional, national and international scales. For example, 24 million people around the world have been displaced, relocated or migrated due to disasters related to extreme weather events in 2019 alone. The vast majority of these people are in underdeveloped countries (International Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2020). Poor coastal cities and island states are unevenly affected by sea level rise. Agricultural activity areas are in the grip of drought and desertification. On a neighborhood scale, extreme heat and cold are not felt in the neighborhoods where the wealthy live, and have deadly effects in the neighborhoods of the laborers.

It is clear that hegemonic climate politics is not only blind to the contradictions between the time of capital and the time of labor and nature, but also indifferent to spatial inequalities. In terms of an anti-capitalist climate struggle, what needs to be done is **a line of struggle that is based on temporal contradictions and spatial inequalities**. There is no time for working and poor people

to wait for capital to be restructured for “decarbonisation”. For instance, those affected by the flood in the Eastern Black Sea Region, the people damaged by the drought in the region, the villagers whose bees and cattle were burned in the fire in Manavgat, the small fishermen affected by the warming sea water in the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, the orchards in Aydin whose products are destroyed by “clean” energy source GES in the place of fossil fuels, people protesting against thermal power plants in Bartin, the miners and local people who are exposed to the deadly consequences of the coal mine in Soma, the problems of all these individuals are now the organizing areas of the climate struggle at local-regional scales.

These examples also demonstrate that climate, just like labor exploitation, is an issue uniting working people in different regions and countries. The common ground of being exposed to climate questions and labor exploitation for the working people, peasants and oppressed segments of society creates an opportunity for the establishment of organizational and operational ties between climate struggles from the local to international scale.

Imperialist relations that are the subject of international scale, create national and local consequences. The oil and mining operations of international companies both render the local scale uninhabitable and violate human rights (Shell, which produces oil in Nigeria, ignores the right to life of the Ogoni people; In Bolivia, where the lithium battery and raw material Tesla needs for the “green transformation” in automobiles are extracted, one of the reasons for the military coup is this very same mineral lithium, the search for natural gas in the Mediterranean reinforcing/feeding the tension between states). In addition to imperialism, the global context of the climate question also makes the international scale highly important. Policy instruments in practice are sectarian in the payment of “climate debts” of developed countries to underdeveloped countries and in terms of climate refugee issues. Because of the many issues of the international climate regime that I have addressed above, a critical debate on an international scale is on whether to tackle it inside or outside the UN system, or both inside and outside. Recently, various ecological organizations have given up hope on the UN climate negotiations, attempting to create a struggle outside of this system (i.e., Glasgow Agreement, 2020). The international organizations of the socialist and communist parties under various names do not lead and operate an effective struggle on the climate question, and the international ecology and climate networks do not have the power to challenge the UN climate diplomacy. The task of developing organized actions and methods of struggle that will ensure interaction and unison between these structures outside the UN stands before these organizations. Otherwise, under current conditions, the question of whether it is inside or outside the UN is meaningless, because the UN climate regime will continue to impose its hegemonic climate policy on the world in the empty space it finds.

The causes of climate change pointing to developed countries highlight the need to raise the struggle on an international scale. However, the conditions in which the climate struggle develops make it necessary to take into account the transitivity between spatial scales. The struggle against domestic air pollution, the effects of coal stoves at home and in the atmosphere, energy insulation of the house, etc. starts right at home. But a struggle that emphasizes the individual consumer in the household is tantamount to surrendering to liberalism’s concept of

the individual. A collective struggle should be promoted against the problems that are personally affected in the home, expanding the scale. Additionally, the source of almost all problems that occur at the home scale is realized on other scales. The coal that comes to the house is mined in the coal mine. A miner who burns coal at home is poisoned while extracting coal on a workplace scale. That mine is operated by a company. The state gives the licenses to that company on a national scale. The state apparatus carries out the planning of the coal-based energy sector. All kinds of mines, thermal power plants, oil extraction platforms, oil refineries, automobile factories, and cement plants are built on a local scale. Struggles also necessarily take place on a local scale. Municipalities and provincial organizations of ministries exercise various powers at the local level. Climate action plans are made at the city/municipal scale. Local governments will fight against the decisions taken or not taken by the local governments. However, most of the permissions granted for the facilities that I have just mentioned and that are implemented on a local scale are issued at the central level, at the national level. Besides, the principles of economic development, plans, programs, sectoral priorities, which energy sources will be utilized to obtain energy, and which capital group that will be responsible for ecological destruction will take the tender from the state are determined at the central level. In this case, a national-scale struggle that expands from the local scale to the national scale is developed and this struggle is tied/knitted with solidarity, unison in action, alliances and unions between local and national organizations. Therefore, raising the opposition to the decisions taken on a national scale and to the government that shapes these decisions is utterly inevitable. On the other side, an internationalist struggle against the UN climate regime and institutions organized on an international scale is carried out on an international scale. Here also, the expansion of local and national organizations to an international scale is the question. In short, while raising the struggles at home, workplace, neighborhood, local, national and international scales, it is an obligation to establish the transitivity between them.

Part 2, <http://www.abstraktdergi.net/peoples-climate-politics-against-hegemonic-climate-politics---2/>

Economic Question / Economic Struggle

Climate crisis is an economic question.

Ecologically speaking, production is the transformation of energy and material. According to laws of physics, inputs and outputs throughout this transformation are equal to each other (benefits obtained through production processes, along with outputs being wastes left at the end). Capitalist production, on the other hand, requires obtaining a surplus product corresponding to the exploitation of labor within such an input-output equality. This is the source of the contradiction between ecology and capitalist economy (Altvater, 1989: 67). The continuous production of surplus value for capital accumulation (as in the mining, forestry, animal husbandry, fossil energy sectors) constantly increases the use of inputs. As a result, wastes such as carbon dioxide, methane etc. continuously increase.

Capital tends to grow incessantly. The slowdown or interruption of capital accumulation creates an economic crisis. The expansion of commodity production is mandatory for continuation/continuity of capital accumulation. Commodity production is possible due to exploitation of nature and labor. The aim of economic activity as commodity production is the maximization of profit (surplus value). Hence, cheap energy is provided, raw materials are intensively used, labor exploitation rate is increased, nature is commercialized and commodified at a continuously increasing rate, all of which leave nothing but waste and emissions behind. For instance, the activities of manufacturing, energy, mining, construction, cement, industrial livestock, tourism, lumber companies give rise to deforestation. Land use is modified by transforming wood into timber, forests into mining sites, valleys into quarries, pastures into landfill sites, highlands into touristic facilities, fields into housing area, olive orchards into thermal power plants. Changes that occur due to processes such as deforestation, loss of pastures and fields, concretization, etc. cripple nature's capacity to absorb emissions. While on the one hand emissions increase in commodity production and consumption processes, changes in land use accelerate climate change.

The total mass of all objects, machines, bricks, plastic, roads, concrete and whatnot produced throughout economic activities exceeded the total mass of living things on earth for the first time in 2020. The total mass of human-made materials has doubled over the last two decades. If we continue at this rate, there will be three times the material mass that exists now by 2040. So much so that artifacts produced every week are as much as the biomass of an average person (Elhacham, Ben-Uri, Grozovski, Bar-On, Milo, 2020).

In capitalism, these artifacts and objects are produced either as commodities or as infrastructure systems such as energy, roads, airports, dams which will support commodity production and consumption. Energy is used during both production and consumption of commodities. The majority of the energy utilized during commodity production comes from fossil fuel energy sources. Due to its attributes such as easy transportation and storage, fossil fuel energy has created a certain dependency in capitalist production. Additionally, it is also accessible 24/7. In a similar vein to the increase in commodity production, the use of fossil fuel energy, and consequently emissions, have increased. Again, the industrialization of meat production as a commodity has caused an increase in methane and carbon dioxide emissions due to livestock. As I have already mentioned earlier, increased emissions are the result. The cause of climate change is the increased production and consumption of commodities to sustain capital accumulation. Therefore, climate change cannot be halted with current policies that focus merely on emissions.

This phenomenon shows the necessity of downgrading commodity production and consumption in the field of economic struggle while tackling the climate question. For this purpose, novel praxis can be developed and expanded to prevent the reproduction of private property relations in the reproduction processes of labor. Collective production and collective consumption can be organized by neighborhood committees, assemblies, and communes on the scales of houses, neighborhoods, villages, cities, where the biological and social reproduction of labor takes place. For example, communal orchards, helping each other, working together, solidarity, building collective consumption areas in the neighborhood (laundry, ironing rooms, shared internet

access, sharing tools and objects for common use, cinema-TV rooms, repair workshops...). The capital system imposes the purchase of instant tomato paste and dried okra as commodities from the markets. Local people producing tomato paste, drying okra, sharing it according to needs, establishing a sewing houses to meet the needs of the neighborhood, developing seed exchange networks among the villagers, planning the production with village tractors that are shared by every farmer who has money or takes credit, instead of buying tractors, are some examples of common production activities that may be specified here.

All of these practices prevent the purchase of objects for individual use in each single house. These practices also limit individualistic values and private ownership, they limit individual consumption in collective ways, and hinder commodity production. Thanks to these benefits, they reduce the burden on ecosystems and the climate, and also expand the socialization, co-organization and contact of the workers while bringing together production and consumption. This kind of socialization is also the first step of the politicization of the working people.

We should not consider the neighborhood as a dormitory area, but rather as a societal living space with collective production, sharing, decision-making and implementation, ecological resistance and improvement, music, art and cultural activities. The neighborhood and village as such a collective space is an experience of searching and finding possibilities for abandoning capitalist economic relations.

Trade unions are important organizations for economic struggle. They are the means of reclaiming rights as an organized, collective unity against the exploitation of the workers getting involved in commodity production. Hence, they have the opportunity to raise the struggle of labor against ecological abuse. Nevertheless, according to official figures in Turkey, only 2 million of the 14 million workers, or 14 percent, are registered in unions. Merely 6% of the two million unionized workers are women (Gazete Duvar, 2021; Çetin, 2021). Looking at these data, it is clear that there is a need for the strengthening of trade unions, for weakening of trade union bureaucracies and a breakthrough for unionization in Turkey. Today, when climate and ecology struggles are on the rise, unions will gain double benefits by taking part in these struggles. Trade union organizations can ensure unionization by establishing a relationship of trust in action with the workers who are active in the struggle for ecology. At the same time, they contribute organizational strength to labor-ecology joint action and practices. Besides, since the symptoms of climate change such as extreme weather events affect the workers the most in the workplace, in the field and in the neighborhood, it is imperative that all unions make the climate struggle a direct and integrated part of the union struggle. Unions should bring climate demands into their agenda by including them in collective contracts and meetings. In addition, unions can organize training programs for their members on climate change politics, political ecology, ways of seeking rights in ecology/climate struggle, interaction and organizational coalition of labor and climate struggles.

The production of non-commodity objects and their share among members can be organized under the umbrella of trade unions. These areas of activity can be agricultural production on union land, as well as repair workshops for household appliances, sewing workshops, reading

workshops, painting workshops, political discussion workshops, local TV and radio broadcast workshops. On the one hand, union resistance against commodity production and consumption is developed, on the other hand, an environment of political awareness on climate and other issues is created in these workshops.

In the years when the unions were stronger, labor unions in the USA, Brazil, Italy (Barca, 2012), and Australia (Pepper, 1993: 236) had struggles involving ecological demands that resulted in certain gains. More recently, trade unions and ecology struggles were on the streets of Seattle side by side in the 1999 anti-World Trade Organization demonstrations. They were in the field at the Great Climate March 2014 in New York. There were many unions that expressed their support for the 2019 school strikes and demonstrations led by Greta Thunberg. These are important, but not enough. Trade unions must be enforced to be the decisive actors of the climate struggle, which establishes organizational ties with the labor frontier. It should be challenged, encouraged and supported by its members, by different unions, professional chambers, associations, academic organizations, ecology struggles and political parties.

Food production has been monopolized around the world, including in Turkey. Food import became much more widespread (resulting in climate effects from transport). Seeds have been commodified (resulting in loss of biodiversity). State subsidies for small farmers have been reduced or removed altogether. Certain lobbying arrangements were realized for concentrating agricultural lands and agricultural production in the hands of companies.⁴ Industrial agriculture paved the way for current energy intensive models (with an obvious climate impact). In addition, all of these developments make it more difficult for workers to access food. So, it is especially important to jointly produce and share food among cooperative organizations without commodifying them. A critical warning here is this: The decisive criterion for the neighborhood, commune, union activities or cooperative practices I gave as an example above is *not* to reproduce capitalistic relations. The way to achieve our goals is through the absence of labor exploitation, the establishment of joint/democratic decision-making and collective work, and crucially, subsistence production for its members, not commodity production. The cooperative approach organized under these principles creates a barrier for industrial capitalist agriculture and animal husbandry which can be classified as climate-cidal economic activities.

Class Question / Class Struggle

While examining the ideological, temporal, space, and economic dimensions of the climate question above, I emphasized the inequalities, contradictions and antagonisms between capital and labor. In those discussions, I also showed the class ties and associations of climate change. That being said, I can now address the class aspects that I did not delve into in detail there.

The climate question is a class question. The international aviation industry can be given as a concrete example of the concept of class. In a study using data from 2018, a time when there was no Covid-19 epidemic, we see that merely 11 percent of the world's population traveled by plane in that year, and only 4 percent traveled cross country. "Super passengers" account for half of the emissions in aviation, which makes up 1% of the world's population. These are the so-

called “elite passengers” who belong to the capitalist class and fly the most. The monetary equivalent of one-year climate damage of aviation is estimated to be \$100 billion. Since the class that makes half of the emissions does not bear this loss, it can be said that it receives an “implicit” financial support of 50 billion dollars a year (the Guardian, 17 November 2020). Several aspects of the concept of class can be identified based on this result. The first is related to the fact that the poor are stuck spatially rather than tempora-spatially. Second, which class members are responsible for the emissions? Third, the world’s poor have to pay for the financial burden of aviation emissions caused by the capitalist classes. Finally, there is the class nature of hegemonic climate politics, as the aviation industry has been excluded from emission reduction mechanisms for the past three decades.

Another study allocates space for periodized findings. According to the results of the study, a population of 10 percent of the world’s wealthy is responsible for 52 percent of the total emissions made between 1990 and 2015. On the other hand, the share of the poor consisting of half of the world’s population, is only 7 percent of the emissions (in the same period). The per capita emissions generated by the consumption of the 1% of the population comprising the richest people in the world are a hundred times higher than the per capita emissions of the poor who make up half of the world’s population (Oxfam, 2020).

Comparisons made regarding per capita emission rates usually show emissions that take place during consumption processes. Taking into account the ecological burdens created during production processes led by industrialists, investors, bank owners, traders, contractors, rentiers (and their practices such as investment in fossil fuel companies), the ecological differences between capital and labor take on a more frightening appearance.

I have to repeat again and again that dealing solely with emission data is fetishizing carbon. In order to avoid this mistake, it is useful to stick to the fact that capitalism structurally causes ecological and climate destruction. As Nancy Fraser said, the classes of capital have the power and authority to extract minerals, oil, coal, gas, to generate electricity, to control forests, coasts, pastures, agriculture, to use their land, to shape food systems, to develop and patent medicines, vaccines, and to dispose of waste. They hold all of these operations in their hands. This means that they have the biggest share in controlling the substances in nature, air, water, soil, animal and plant communities, forests, oceans, atmosphere and climate. Thus, the capitalist system gives the capitalists the motive (profit), tools and opportunities to sink the earth into destruction (Fraser, 2021: 102).

On the other hand, this is not the whole story. The capitalist classes prevent all other segments of society from accessing nature by transforming the elements of nature into accumulation. There are two forms of preventing this access. The first is the enclosure of nature by capital. Seed monopolies prevent farmers from using their own seeds. Tourism companies fence off coasts and plateaus, logging companies seize forests, HPP companies enclose streams, WPP companies take pastures and shores. On the other side, TPP companies occupy forests, olive groves, and plains, shopping malls enclose town squares and parks, mining seizes the stone, soil, and forests, and all are thus subjected to a regime of private property. As such, the relations of the laborers with

nature as their means of subsistence and living spaces are highly severed. Secondly, the pollution and ecological destruction created by capital prevent workers from benefiting from nature in various ways. They cannot breathe clean air, they cannot drink clean water. They cannot sunbathe on the fenced shore, walk in the forest, drink water from the stream, hold a rally in the square, or sit in the parks. Moreover, the practice of experiencing nature becomes chaotic. Workers are exposed to the consequences of the changing climate due to the activities of capital, taking the form of fires, flooding, frost, storms, typhoons, extreme heat and drought. In both cases, the living conditions of the working people suffer, their quality of life decreases, and their poverty deepens (Çoban, 2018).

Owing to the consequences of climate change for the laborers and oppressed, it is imperative that workers, unions, professional organizations, cooperatives and associations be an active part of struggles taking place over forests, pastures, agricultural lands, olive groves, shores, and squares being seized by companies and put to use for their economic benefit. It is also a necessity of the economic and class struggle that these organizations must broaden the scope of these struggles.

A report of the World Bank states that it is expected that the next period will be devoted to compensation for the lost years (on the grounds of economic recovery) of the Covid-19 epidemic (World Bank, 2021). This justification will be a new ideological and class-based excuse for neglecting climate and poverty policies, and the problems of the poor and working people due to climate injustice will continue to worsen in the following years.

Faced with inequalities deepening each and every day, the spokespersons of capital advise the rich not to carry out their expensive and ostentatious consumption in front of the public. Schwab, who is the founder and chairman of the World Economic Forum, emphasizes this proposal in his book. Apparently, there is a belief that class distinctions will remain hidden when the rich do not display their wealth. Moreover, we clearly see in those lines that the biggest fear of capital is to be subjected to the anger of the working class, the unemployed, the poor, and environmentalists (Schwab and Malleret, 2020: 368-9). The climate struggle can be developed by fueling capital's fear of the workers with the tools of class politics.

The carbon tax, being among the many suggestions displayed in the hegemonic climate policy, has a feature that maintains/sustains existing social inequalities. Gasoline and diesel filter prices or a carbon tax on airfare do not mitigate current social inequality. While it certainly does not impose a financial burden that will lead the rich who already have a large budget (so it will not discourage the rich to reduce their consumption, and consequent carbon dioxide emission rates), the increasing price of the product owing to the tax puts an extra burden on the budgets of workers. On the contrary, the wealth tax as a tool of class policy does not include these drawbacks of the carbon tax. Greenhouse gas emissions happen as wealth of various forms is acquired. Plus, the wealth accumulated in the hands of the wealthy one percent of the population is a financial resource for wasteful, climate-destructive consumption in countless ways, such as air travel, yacht ownership, remodeling of automobiles, etc. which result in carbon dioxide emissions. Therefore, ideological, economic, class and political struggle should be strengthened

with the common demand for a 50 percent wealth tax in order to erode the economic and political effects of the capitalist and rentier sectors. The budget thus acquired should be spent only for purposes of compensating the losses of the working people and of the poor who are affected by climate change, and for improving the ecosystem.

The figures displaying the climate inequalities among the social segments are found in many publications and UN reports. As expected, in those publications the question of the class aspect/side of the climate crisis is never discussed from a perspective of class politics. However, the solution must be sought at the source of the problem. The fact that climate change is a class problem makes it inevitable that the struggle for a solution must be located and consolidated on a class foundation. The solution is achieved by limiting and neutralizing the capitalist class that gives rise to the climate question. The final solution is the abolition of class society.

When the climate question is discussed from a perspective predicated upon class, the search begins for policies that will impose the responsibility on the capitalist class causing the climate inequalities that affect the working classes and the oppressed segments. The problem would not be delayed until the fanciful “carbon offset” of 2050. In this context, in addition to the previous parts of the article, some of the tools that can be used to neutralize capital are the following:

Nationalization or expropriation and commonization of facilities and infrastructures of electricity generation and distribution lines, mines, cement production, automobile companies, housing production, drinking and irrigation water networks. Conducting energy production plans and programs that specifically focus on meeting *needs*. If expropriation is reduced merely to a change of ownership, it will not be sufficient to mitigate climate impacts. Therefore, capitalist social relations and mechanisms must be displaced and done away with. Hence, productive processes should be planned and managed in accordance with ecological principles and the requirements of the climate (that is not to generate profit, but to create use value). The communization of production and management is possible if the producers are the essential/decisive elements of the democratic decision-making process.

Local energy production and localization of energy use. Ensuring local self-sufficiency in energy terms. Thus, preventing regional social inequalities and ecological burdens born out of the energy production process. In case of energy shortage due to physical, geographic reasons, implementation of measures via central budget to improve the ecosystem in the energy producing regions.

Putting an end to the production of property housing, preventing demolition for rent, energy loss, unnecessary cement production, stopping projects of stone, sand, marble quarries, and banning changes in land use in favor of further housing construction. Meeting everyone’s housing needs. Preventing the rent economy in the construction sector from determining the urban sprawl and thus the distance between work and home, which necessitates the use of cars. Taking measures to limit urban growth and sprawl.

Ban of intercity air transport between provinces where alternative means of transport can be used in less than six hours (because alternative public transport vehicles have less ecological burden). Doing away with the fetishistic “need” for an airport in each and every city.

Implementation of policies to discourage automobile use. Closing off city centers to automobiles. Neither electric nor hydrogen cars, but creation of a car-free life. Minimization of extractive activities, energy use, highway and bridge construction, emissions and ecological destruction by automotive sector with strict anti-car measures. Establishing common, reliable, punctual and free public transport systems as part of this. Raising more loudly the demand for the right of free access to transportation in the meetings, in the neighborhood councils, in the municipal councils, urban councils, city councils, in the parliament, and in the streets.

Downsizing the mining sector by prohibiting the use of precious metals like gold, diamond, etc. as investment and jewelry objects.

Limiting land and water use and the number of animals in the factories to end industrial animal husbandry. 32 percent of methane emissions come from the livestock sector and 35 percent from the extraction, processing and distribution of fossil fuels. The climate impact of methane gas is tens of times greater than carbon dioxide. However, the atmospheric life of methane is ten years, while carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere for hundreds of years (UNEP and Climate and Clean Air Coalition, 2021: 9). Therefore, drastically reducing methane emissions in the fossil and livestock sectors will have a positive atmospheric effect in a short time. Setting a monthly upper limit on per capita meat consumption in society is also in line with ecological justice, considering the carnivorous diet of the rich. Measures such as the following can also be considered: implementing a balanced plant-based nutrition policy for all, providing nutritional support to poor households, distributing free seeds, allocating vacant lands for subsistence agriculture and animal husbandry with the principle of communal production and sharing according to needs.

Reducing emissions by abandoning fossil fuels is an important demand. However, the proposal of shifting to renewable energy to reduce emissions in hegemonic climate discourses has been wrapped up by a sectarian content that makes the fighting the sectors outside the energy almost meaningless. The capitalist reliance on fossil fuel as its energy source indicates the importance of an anti-fossil fuel struggle. But, when this struggle takes the form of supporting renewable energy companies to replace the fossil, the capitalist accumulation keeps continuing without interruption. Numerous ecological and social problems arise from renewable energy facilities while this replacement of the fossil with renewables. However, it is necessary to reduce the continuously increasing fossil and renewable energy demand of capital. The ways to do this are also the measures I have previously enumerated. Moreover, **it is possible to convert the fossil fuel dependency of the capital into a crisis for capital**. The path for this is preventing new oil, coal, natural gas extraction projects⁵; preventing electricity generation in thermal power plants, in natural gas power plants; and preventing the renewable energy projects that are turned into a pot of gold for capital, via a democratic struggle.

Armed conflicts and wars lead to people’s death, the losing living and non-living natural entities, greenhouse gas emissions, allocation of energy sources and labor force for armament. This serves

capital and allows arms dealers to dominate the society and governments, silencing any social opposition including the climate struggle. For these reasons, **the establishment of social peace on local, national and international scales should be one of the integral and priority items of the climate struggle.**

Making the climate question a class question should not be understood as “class reductionism”. Although the class is common line, there are also relations of domination and pressure in the capitalist society alongside the relations of exploitation. Inequalities created by these relationships have the effects that increase climate inequalities. For example, peasant women, Kurdish workers, and Syrian refugee children are more exposed to the effects of climate change because they are subjected to these layered social injustices. Capitalism fed on labor exploitation and ecological destruction is also a patriarchal order that enslaves woman. Similarly, behind the pressure and domination on different racial and ethnic identities, there lie reasons such as colonialism, access to natural resources to maintain capital accumulation, employment of laborers in slave-like conditions, marginalization of anti-systemic opposition to block its development. Racial and ethnic discrimination around the world, colonialism and imperialism have ecological dimensions taking the form of mining and plunder of natural entities, the form of spatial distribution of ecological destruction, or the form of hindering the actual subsistence production activities (livestock farming, fishing, agriculture, use of forest, pasture and highland areas) and prohibition of these activities on security grounds, or the form of displacement and forced-migration of the population. For this reason, the ecological ground of freedom struggles against colonialism, imperialism and all kinds of discrimination overlap with the grounds of struggle for the labor, ecology and women’s movements. Concepts such as “intersectionalism” (Crenshaw, 1996) and “transenvironmentalism” (Fraser, 2021) in the relevant literature emphasize the overlapping areas of exploitation and suppression and domination, which increase in orders of magnitude at points of overlap; therefore emphasize the possibilities of common struggles of class, racial, ethnic identity and women’s movements.

Political Question / Struggle for Political Power

The climate crisis is a political question. The capitalist state is the part of the climate question and the obstacle to a solution. Therefore, the solution of the climate question requires the political power of laborers and oppressed sections of society. I can justify this thesis with four bases.

The first basis relates to the role of the state where politics is centralized and intensified under capitalism. The capitalist state takes the side of capital in the labor-capital and nature-capital contradictions. So, the state is on the one side of both contradictions. As the main political apparatus, the state is the partner of capital in ecological destruction. First of all, the capitalist state is organized as a means of domination of the capitalist class on laboring classes and nature. All policies; climate, energy, transportation, mining, industry, construction, land use, agriculture, animal husbandry and other policies of the country are decided at the state’s legislative and executive organs. These policies are made to look out for the interests of the capital, not the benefit of laborers and nature. In almost every country, it is the state that sets and implement

both inadequate and unsuccessful emission mitigation targets, which again, reveals the political dimension of the climate crisis. Similarly, the climate crisis is also political because states have not taken necessary measures to prevent laborers and oppressed sections from adverse effects of climate change, not established organizational structures, not allocated necessary budgets.

The state is the principle actor of the international climate regime. Such that, the state formats the decisions taken on the international scale, adopts or remains outside climate agreements, and implements or does not implement some parts of the agreements adopted, through laws and policies.

State apparatuses comply with capital's demands to loosen laws and policies regarding nature protection and climate. For example, despite the amendment to existing laws via the public pressure after six years postponement, the governmental institutions still condone the operation of thermal power plants without a gas filter in Turkey. Turkey's lack of a climate policy to reduce emissions is deliberately preferred in order to protect the interests of the capital in the sectors of mining, fossil fuel energy generation, cement, industry, steel, construction, automobile, maritime, air transportation. In the newly released IPCC report, the Mediterranean region which also includes Turkey is assigned a higher temperature increase than the global average for the summer, as well as a decrease in the amount of rainfall, consequent decrease in soil moisture, and a predicted increase in fires (IPCC, 2021: SPM-12; TS -51, 75, 77, 90). Despite all this, the AKP government, which have been in power for twenty years, continue to pursue a path without a climate policy.

State bureaucracies under capitalism give all permits and licenses that lead to plunder of nature by capital. In the audits, companies' activities against regulations are ignored. Besides, the president or the government in the parliamentary system as the executive organs control the army, police and gendarmerie, which are the "repressive state apparatuses" in the terms of Louis Althusser. The executive also exercises authority to assign to judicial institutions. Again, as the "ideological state apparatuses", schools, media, yellow unions are also in the control of the executive body although its degree varies from country to country (Althusser, 1989). Moreover, the state apparatus restrains the social opposition's demands to develop environmental protection measures, to prevent capital from destroying nature, and to improve the climate policy. Social demands regarding ecology and climate are attempted to be discouraged with the state's monopoly of violence, police coercion, judicial organs, courts, penalties and media institutions. The organs and institutions of the state also intimidate ecological resistance against the destruction while paving the way for the demolition forces of the capital. The capitalist state ensures the sustainability of the existing order by putting pressure on social sections that are oppressed due to their racial, ethnic and gender identities.

That is to say, all class and domination relations under capitalism are protected and maintained via the enactment of policies in the parliament, the jurisdiction in the courts and the state organs at which mandates of implementation and supervision are concentrated. In this respect, rather than a separation, there is an integrity of powers of the state as legislative, executive, and jurisdiction.

The fact that the state is the political node of ideological, economic and class networks that create capitalist hegemony makes the climate question political. And the solution is **to cut this political node that is the umbilical cord feeding the common life (symbiosis) relationship between the state and capital**. This necessitates a **change of political power** in which laboring classes and the oppressed sections of society seize control of the state and economic activities. Thus, it is possible to create and put into practice climate policies based on scientific and effective measures, and by considering the interests of laboring sections and ecosystems.

The state is part of the climate question due to its capitalist quality. The state continues to create ecological problems along with the companies when left in its existing form. Therefore, the capitalist quality of the state should be terminated. Under the power of labor, the state transforms into a means that quickly prevents the companies' activities that disregard the laboring sections of society and the climate. In this case, the main role cast to the state within the framework of climate politics is to undermine and do away with capital.

In parallel to disabling the capitalist classes, according to the political proposition of Marxism, the process of the withering away of the state, which is the product of the class society, will be completed.

Climate policies cannot succeed by meeting the capital's demands and delaying decarbonization calendar to 2050. On contrary, alternative climate policies achieve success to the degree that the capital, which is the creator of the climate question with its economic activities and political connections, is brought to its knees. Because, as I highlighted, the climate question is an economic and class issue, **the way to undermine the capitalist classes that create the climate question is to end the capitalist quality of the state**. In this way, the democratic conditions of climate politics will be laid out for laborers when the capital which leads us to ecological destruction is politically neutralized.

The second basis of obtaining political power relates to the political deadlock created by the hegemonic climate policies in practice. The abyss between the targets of the climate regime and the application tools show that the climate question is politically deadlocked. The main goal of the international climate regime is to ensure that the global temperature increase is stabilized at a 1.5 degree increase by 2100. However, compared to the 1850-1900 period taken as a basis, the increase in the average surface temperature of the world has already overshoot 1 degree. Moreover, 1.5-degree increase in various parts of the world has already been reached. When the existing increase trends continues, the 1.5-degree threshold in the average temperature increase around the world will be reached, not by 2100, but as early as the 2030s (IPCC, 2021: TS-9).

There are studies showing the mismatch between the policies and the necessary emission reduction target. For example, in accordance with the Paris Climate Agreement signed in 2015, the states party to the agreement should update and upgrade greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for 2030. Because if the temperature rise is to hold at 1.5 degrees in 2100, it is necessary to reduce the emissions of the parties by 55 percent according to their first pledges. However, according to a report that examines the declaration of the 75 states who reported a renovated target, there is only 2.8 percent of additional reduction pledges from these countries compared

to their targets 5 years ago (UNFCCC, 2021: 5; Fransen and Waskow, 2021). This is a mere drop in the bucket.

Besides, the total emissions of the countries have been increasing since 1992 in which the UN Climate Convention was signed. Annual emissions have increased by 60 percent while the global cumulative emission has doubled in the period of 1990-2015 (Oxfam, 2020). Let alone the reduction of emissions, the hegemonic climate policy measures have doubled cumulative output and thus clearly indicate their own ineffectuality.

The fact that emissions are increasing instead of decreasing is open evidence of the inappropriateness and inadequacy of the policy instruments implemented. In other words, the conflict between the emission reduction policy and its application tools cannot be ignored. Ironically, they are presented as emission reduction tools. But in fact, most of them have nothing to do with the blocking or reducing the emissions that are being currently released or will be released to the atmosphere. One of the policy instruments, “carbon trade”, is based not on reduction in the amount of emissions, but on the exchange of them between companies. Similarly, the “clean development” and “common implementation” mechanisms in the Kyoto Protocol allow the country that does not decrease its emissions to trade them with other countries in order to make it look like it achieving its own reduction target. The method of accounting the amount of forests relies upon the carbon suction of the trees in a country from the atmosphere rather than reduction of the actual emissions. “Carbon capture and storage” and “direct air capture” methods are policy tools for which the technology has not yet been developed. With an assertion that the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will be reduced, based on these two technological methods that do not even have any application, and are mostly hypothetical (see Dyke, Watson, Knorr, 2021; Malm and Carton, Knorr, 2021; Malm and Carton, 2021) the emission targets announced for 2050 are tried to be sold to the people as if they are going to be met. Geo-engineering dreams to prevent the sun rays from reaching the earth, also do not intend to reduce the amount of emissions caused by corporate activity, they are merely pursuits to stop the Earth’s temperature increase. The transition program to renewable energy to move away from fossil fuels may result in a reduction of emissions. However, instead of planning the production and consumption of commodities and energy, they are just selling a dream that the climate and ecological degradation problem will be solved in capitalism by just shifting from one energy source to another. The same impudence is also seen in the policy of replacing gasoline vehicles with electric vehicles. The processes of supply of the necessary minerals, metals, elements for the production of electrical vehicle, of batteries and charging stations and of electricity itself all cause greenhouse gas emissions.

The climate policies and tools in practice do not resolve the climate question because they preserve the functioning economic and class apparatuses of the capitalist order. This is why the policy goals and tools are incomplete, irrelevant, insufficient and inappropriate in the first place. It is clear that *the contradiction between the necessity of effective climate policies and the demands of capital* cannot be overcome in the bourgeois political order. This contradiction can be overcome by disabling capital **through ending the relations of private property.**

Private property means the capture of what belongs to all beings and to the earth by an individual. Private property results in domination, enclosure, exclusion, prevention from the use of nature, not only in terms of relations between classes of the property owner and dispossessed, but also in terms of living beings taken under the yoke of private ownership. Therefore, the elimination of private property directly affects the forms of relation to nature by all living beings. But capital will not voluntarily abandon the private property relations. The condition to change property relations by positioning the state, that is the monopoly of coercion, against the property owners instead of siding with them is to take political power. Taken in this way, the solution of the climate question regarding all beings on the earth depends on the political power of the laborers.

Conversion of the means of production into private property provides economic and political power to property owners. Property relations, on the other hand, are legally established, protected and maintained by the state through legislative, executive, judiciary powers. The importance of changing political power lies here. When laborer classes seize state power, they will socialize the means of production, end private property, and break the economic and political power of the capitalist classes. Thus, the barrier put before climate policy by capital and the capitalist state will be removed; abandonment of fossil fuel energy, emission reduction, curtailing away of commodity production, basing the economic planning on ecological principles, organization of production-consumption based on use value in a way that reduces the burden on nature will be possible; thanks to the rational relation with nature, climate change and ecological destruction will be prevented. In other words, ideological, class, economic, structural transformations that I address in this article will leap forward with the transformation in the political structure.

The third basis is related to the functionalization of the antidote of depoliticization. The ideological diversion that I discussed in the first section obscures the economic and political reasons of the climate question. The policy tools that I've just emphasized, on the other hand, create the illusion that the climate question can be solved within the system by financial, technological and geoengineering methods. The problem is passed on to experts in ideological and technical terms. Thus, first of all, the responsibility of political power in the deepening of the problem is left off the agenda. People are prevented from directing their rage at political powers and at state apparatuses (The blame is put on incompetent experts and lack of technology). And secondly, the public is prevented from politicizing the climate question, from discussing the issue on a social scale. The relationship between climate and politics is suppressed by arresting, pressuring and criminalizing those who raise their climate demands by democratic means. In both cases the climate question is depoliticized.

The creation of a language of experts compressed into the technical tools makes individuals from the general public who want to enter political debate on the climate mute. It is very difficult for those wide sections who can't speak the language of expertise to get involved with the political decision-making processes and to affect the policy means. On the one hand, the majority of the population consisting of laborers, who don't have access to the language of experts, are kept outside the political process. And on the other hand, the claim that "everyone is in the same

boat” is promoted vis-à-vis the climate issue via ideological state apparatuses. This claim provides depoliticization a legitimacy ground. Accordingly, climate change will be solved for everyone by measures without getting involved with politics, with a supra-political impartiality, and by technically doing whatever is necessary. Thus, those who hold political power find the opportunity to expand and adopt “measures” to the benefit of the ruling classes and their companies as if these measures are to the benefit of all. Thanks to depoliticization, the class order is maintained without any wounds.

The opposite phenomenon of depoliticization isolating the cause and solution of climate change from the existing capitalist order is **politicizing the climate question and the solution strategy**. Democratic struggle for political power horizontally expands the political field which governments try to depoliticize by making the climate issue a topic of political discussion and action. And through this struggle, the dissident political forces with ecological understanding gather together around the climate demands with the aim of acting together to replace the existing political power.

The fourth basis of the necessity of struggle for political power is related to the interaction of economic and political structures in capitalism. Capitalism is based on the formal separation of economic and political fields. In the economic field where production is done, capitalists do not use political and armed coercion during the process of appropriating surplus value produced by labor exploitation, unlike slavery and serfdom. The worker and boss are considered to be agreed “voluntarily”. Thus, the economic social field where production is done and the political field which also includes the state holding the monopoly of coercion seem to be separate from one another. However, the separation of economy and politics in capitalism is only a formal one (Meiksins Wood, 1981). Because capitalist classes shape the related policies by penetrating political structure through parties, employer organizations, companies, media, and the experts they fund. The state also supports and facilitates capital accumulation with economic, financial, political, ideological tools and with reconstruction, infrastructural and similar tools. Besides, companies interfere in the economic and social relations with political tools by receiving support from the army and police as the forces of coercion of the state in order to discipline laborers and ecological struggles. In this respect, the market economy and the capitalist state are two dimensions of labor exploitation and ecological destruction, that feed and complement each other. Unless the capitalist quality of the state is terminated, the water-carriers of climate-damaging activities of capital, which include political, legal, judicial, financial, ideological apparatuses, and the apparatuses based on coercion or consent cannot be stopped. Unless these water-carriers are stopped, capitalist activities changing the climate cannot be prevented.

This proposition also has consequences in terms of relations between approaches which focus on social, economic, trade union, cooperative, collectivistic (commons), communal and solidarity struggles and approaches of struggle focusing on taking political power. If the separation between civil society/economic structure and political structure were not a formal one, but instead, were an absolute rupture, then in that case, one could claim that the interaction of political and social struggles divided between two separate branches in two different fields is not necessary.

Economic and political fields are separate in capitalism in a formal sense, but since they have an integral relationship, economic and political struggles cannot be independent and detached from one another. Therefore, it becomes an incomplete approach to focus the climate struggle only on the economic field, the private sector, civil society, or only on the political arena and the state. Hence, the approaches to struggle focusing on “social transformation” or “political transformation” in these two fields should not be considered separate from one another, or against one another, or alternatives to each other; on the contrary, both approaches will resolve each other’s shortcomings, improve each other, complement and complete each other. The purposes of both struggles are the same. The goal is to get rid of the exploitation, domination, discrimination, colonialism, pressure and individualism in capitalism, to establish, develop, disseminate rational, ecological and collective relationships with nature, and thus, overcome the climate question. Actualizing these relations in real life in communes, cooperatives and collectives generates an accumulation of social experience which builds the future today. However, the limits of such social experiences cannot be ignored. Firstly, for example, subsistence agricultural production cooperatives are a climate-friendly tool since they are abrasive to capitalist commodity production. However, such cooperatives do not destroy the climate-changing effects of industrial agriculture and animal farming companies, thermal power plants, companies in the cement, steel, mining, airway and maritime transportation sectors. In order to achieve this, it is imperative to break the economic and political power of companies in different sectors, and for that, a change of political power is necessary that will put into practice macro policies such as the socialization of the means of production and ending private ownership, etc. Secondly, capital and the capitalist state strive to strangle, disable and prevent the spread of not only those who demand change of political power, but also these experiences in social life since they are seen as rivals. The way to reverse this effort and to open the path for social transformations is a political transformation that will end the cooperation of the state with capital.

Interaction between different struggles is facilitated by looking to the sections of society which the existing order excludes. Seeing that groups other than themselves are also marginalized helps to translate the demands of particular marginalized identities into a common language. In the case of Turkey, the list of social sections whose demands have long been excluded is long: Kurds, women, Alawites, LGBTI+ people, laborers, peasants, the unemployed, refugees, ecological activists... Discussing the motives for exclusion on the part of the political regime sheds light on the attributes of the existing order, capital against laborers, patriarchy against women, discrimination against ethnic and religious identities, oppression of nature, etc. Since it is not enough to change one of these attributes, one needs to transform the capitalist order beyond all recognition. Achieving this is possible **by forming a political subjectivity from the intersecting opposition of those whose demands are excluded, that aims to take political power.**

The excluded sections of society can build a social and political struggle that does not ignore the other, does not reduce one into another, but, acting together, creates forces of unity in the actions aimed at common targets, forging crosslinks, organizing together, intertwining. The struggle for the climate is suitable for such building. The climate struggle allows us to establish a political and ecological bridge between different social sections, between their struggles taking

various forms. Thus, while struggling for the climate, a path is also opened to create a moment of political gathering, a new political configuration of agents of various struggles including unions, commons, cooperatives, associations, communes, parties, platforms, local environmental resistance movements, and others.

The climate struggle provides a moment of social, ecological and political clustering among various struggles. Because, as we have seen under the topics above, various social sections who are victims of unemployment, poverty, social inequalities, discrimination, oppression, domination and labor exploitation which capitalism creates and owes its existence to, are also social sections which are exposed to the most condensed, most unequal, deadliest impacts of climate change and ecological destruction. In this sense, organizing the struggle for the climate is the cement for organizing those whose demands are excluded under the capitalist order together for its overthrow.

Although the proletariat and its organizations have for some time fallen in the esteem of popular consciousness, Marxism still considers it is the working class that will emancipate humanity along with itself by eliminating classes. Considering the findings obtained throughout the article, this proposition has two implications with regard to the climate debate. The first is, the working class being the opposite of the capitalist class, that the working class has the capacity to undermine capital is critical since the capitalist class and the order it shapes are the cause of climate change. Capital is undermined both from below through political-economic and ecological-class struggles and from above via expropriations which are carried out as soon as political power is taken.

The second result is related to the concept of hegemony, including political, economic, ideological and cultural elements. I discussed above the elements of the hegemonic climate politics of the capital. The role of the working class for humanity and the climate is important in terms of the establishment of a counter-hegemony against the hegemony of the capital. Thinkers such as Lenin, Gramsci and, despite his different understanding, Trotsky consider that the proletariat should undertake the hegemonic routing function among the various classes, social sections and movements that come together (Yetiş, 2013: 87). Due to their roles in the production process, only the main classes under capitalism, the bourgeoisie and proletariat, have the ability to build hegemony. It is exactly for this reason that the working class has to stand out in the struggle, rather than from notions such as “essentialism”, “class reduction” or similar views. The selection of practices of ideological, class, economic and political struggles throughout the article gave shape to a framework of a people’s climate politics, the alternative to the climate politics of capital. There is no obstacle to upholding the struggle starting from today to realizing the elements of such politics exemplified in the article, one by one, or indeed all at once. Crystallization of counter-hegemony and its completion by seizing political power and taking state institutions under its control, on the other hand, depends on one condition. In order to settle on the climate strategy as counter-hegemonic climate politics, a leadership, a backbone with a capacity to establish hegemony is needed. The proletariat must raise its class consciousness so that it can gather a variety of movements, struggles and tendencies in a hegemonic bloc. The principle current problem that delays the process of establishing this hegemony both in Turkey and in the world is that the working class stays away from this role

under these circumstances. This is a serious problem because bringing the climate and ecology, labor, Kurdish liberation, women's liberation, the rights of Alawites, LGBTI+ people, trade unions, cooperatives, communes, animal rights, peace and similar social movements all together in a joint climate struggle bloc is a greater task than adjoining forces physically, organizationally, ideologically and morally. A more important task is the establishment of the hegemony of the workers and all oppressed with this joint struggle, which is only possible with the leadership of the proletariat as many thinkers emphasize. In this respect, the climate struggle is a biophysical update for the proletariat's historical role that lays groundwork for the future of humanity.

Conclusion

The fact that the climate crisis has been increasingly deepening for the last thirty years is clear evidence of a stalemate created by the hegemonic climate politics of the capitalist order. Hegemonic climate politics conceals that capitalism's structural contradictions cause climate change, either articulating itself without confronting such contradictions or offers solutions which bring new equally sharp contradictions to the fore instead. I elaborate on the following contradictions throughout the article: capital and nature; capital and labor; time of capital and time of nature/climate; time of capital and time of labor; the necessity of effective climate policies and the demands of capital; the urgency of climate measures and postponement of targets to 2050; the climate commitments which pin its faith upon the order of capitalist economy and upon market mechanisms and emission reduction targets and the actual climate policies under operation; mitigation policies and application tools that do not have a feature for mitigation.

I tried to identify the framework of the people's climate politics against the hegemonic climate politics, which is full of sharp contradictions and doomed to fail, by putting forward five theses. In these five theses, I opened up for discussion the main elements of an anticapitalist climate politics that focuses on the root causes of climate question and offers policy proposals to remove those causes.

Since the climate question is a problem of global scale, I spoke in very broad terms, but I did not leave Turkey out of these terms. Since Turkey's official climate policy is actually a lack of climate policy, some environmentalist NGOs, some left circles, trade unions, political parties, etc. give voice to the demands of hegemonic climate politics, which have been absent and not adopted in Turkey. The examples of this can be seen in the media almost every day. Yet resorting to the hegemonic climate politics in Turkey will be waste of time and breath due to the contradictions I have enumerated above. It is possible and necessary to find another way forward without resorting to this. The findings obtained from the discussions in the article show that anticapitalist climate politics is a necessity in order to simultaneously realize the interests of nature and laborers composed of those social sections who are exploited and oppressed, a necessity in order not to reproduce the hegemonic climate politics, and a necessity for the requirements of climate policies that actually resolve the problem. I hope that in this article, the people's climate politics attains a clear framework with the possibilities offered by it, its concrete policy proposals and application tools, and the frequently converging paths of agents of struggles. Even this

framework of people's climate politics, which are open to be developed, is sufficient to reveal the existence of way forward to solving to the climate question, with its ideological, spatial-temporal, economic, class and political dimensions, in the face of deadlock into which the hegemony of capital has dragged humanity.

Notes

1. In Turkey, the climate report of the Grey Wolves, a fascist organization tied to the Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) bypasses the responsibility of capital and the State.
2. Freedom of organization has always been limited in Turkey. But for the past year, suppression and crackdown on associations with the change of law that obliges professional associations, public benefit associations, trade unions, cooperatives, and foundations to provide the Governorships with member information, enabling blacklisting (Official Gazette, 26 March 2020), by putting them within the scope of audit of the State Supervisory Council (Official Gazette, 20 August 2021), as well as imposing punitive fines on ecology watchdogs, trade unions, and activists struggling for the rights of women, LGBTI+ and other human rights activists by intimidating and terrorizing unionization and union activities.
3. For the multifaceted effects of the climate change on laborers in interaction with economic and political inequalities, and injustices of access to information and health system, see Çoban 2016.
4. One of the final examples is the regulation that comes into effect on 1 July 2021 regarding the production and sale of tobacco. With the regulation change published in Official Gazette (of Turkey) on 31 December 2020, tobacco production and sales are stipulated on the condition of receiving an authorization certificate from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. For that, farmers are forced to set up a cooperative requiring at least 250 tobacco producers. Thousands of smaller producers could not satisfy these requirements and could not sell the tobacco they produced. Consequently, producers protested with the slogan "no to the 'tirşikçi' capitalists" (*tirşikçi* means deadbeat or sycophant). Through ministry regulation, small tobacco producers are disposed of, while the sovereignty of large tobacco companies are reinforced.
5. Apart from the examples of "leave the fossil fuels underground" around the world, there is the Don't Dig Campaign in Turkey worth mentioning.

References

- "A Net Zero Climate-Resilient Future – Science, Technology and the Solutions for Change," 31 Mart 2021, <https://royalsociety.org/-/media/about-us/international/g-science-statements/G7-net-zero-climate-resilient-future-31-03-2021.pdf>
- Adler-Bell, Sam, "Why White Supremacists Are Hooked on Green Living," *The New Republic*, 24 Eylül 2019, <https://newrepublic.com/article/154971/rise-ecofascism-history-white-nationalism-environmental-preservation-immigration>
- Althusser, Louis, *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*, çev. Y. Alp ve M. Özışık, İstanbul, İletişim, 1989.
- Altwater, Elmar, "Ecological and Economic Modalities of Time and Space," *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 1(3), 1989, 59-70.

Angus, Ian, *Antroposen'le Yüzleşmek: Fosil Kapitalizm ve Dünya Sisteminin Krizi*, çev. Nuray Onuk, İstanbul, Marx21 Yayınları, 2021.

Barca, Stefania, "On Working-Class Environmentalism: A Historical and Transnational Overview," *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements*, 4(2), 2012, 61-80.

Compton, Caroline, "The Temporality of Disaster: Data, the Emergency, and Climate Change," *Anthropocenes – Human, Inhuman, Posthuman*, 1(1), 2020, <https://www.anthropocenes.net/article/id/667/>

Crenshaw, Kimberlé W., "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color" K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Pellar, K. Thomas (eds) *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, New York, New Press, 1996, 357–83.

Çetin, Nebile Irmak, "Sendikalara Üye İşçilerin Yalnızca Yüzde 6'sı Kadın," Semra Turan'ın yaptığı söyleşi, 6 Mart 2021, <http://yeniyasamgazetesi2.com/sendikalara-uye-iscilerin-sadece-yuzde-6si-kadin-taleplerimiz-gorulmuyor/>

Çoban, Aykut, *Çevre Politikası: Ekolojik Sorunlar ve Kuram*, Ankara, İmge, 2021.

_____, "Ekolojik Ortaklaşım (Müşterekler) ve Türkiye'de Uygulanan Çitleme Politikaları," E. Erdoğan, N. Yüce, Ö. Özbay (Eds), *Teoriden Mücadeleye Müşterekler Siyaseti*, İstanbul, SEHAK Derneği ve Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, 2018, 27-47.

_____, "Toplumsal ve İklimsel Adaletsizlik Sarmalında İklim Siyaseti," F. Özlüer, A. Çoban (ed) *Doğa ve Kent Hakları İçin Siyasal Stratejiler*, Ankara, Ekoloji Kolektifi Derneği Yayını, 2016, 13-41.

Doğan, Adile, "Emine Erdoğan: 'Porsiyonlarınızı Küçültün'; Yurttaş, 'Lokmalarımızı Sayıyoruz' Diyor," *Evrensel Gazetesi*, 3 Temmuz 2021.

Dyke, J., R. Watson, W. Knorr, "İklim Bilimciler: 'Net Sıfır' Tehlikeli Bir Tuzak," çev. Onur Yılmaz, 24 Temmuz 2021, <http://www.abstraktdergi.net/iklim-bilimciler-net-sifir-tehlikeli-bir-tuzak/>

Elhacham, E., L. Ben-Uri, J. Grozovski, Y.M. Bar-On, R. Milo, "Global Human-made Mass Exceeds all Living Biomass," *Nature*, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-3010-5>

FAO, Food and Agriculture Organisation, *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020: Key Findings*, Rome, 2020.

Fransen, T. ve D. Waskow, "How Do Countries' New Emissions-reduction Plans Stack Up?" 26 Şubat 2021, www.wri.org

Fraser, Nancy, "Climates of Capital," *New Left Review*, Sayı 127, Ocak-Şubat 2021.

Gazete Duvar haberi: "Türkiye'de 14 Milyon İşçinin Sadece Yüzde 14'ü Sendikalı," 31 Ocak 2021, <https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/turkiyede-14-milyon-iscinin-sadece-yuzde-14u-sendikalı-haber-1511908>

Giddens, Anthony, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, Polity, 1990.

Glasgow Agreement, 2020, <https://glasgowagreement.net/en/agreement/#fn:1> Türkçesi: <https://www.polenekoloji.org/glasgow-anlasmasi-halkin-iklim-sozlesmesi/>

the Guardian, "1% of People Cause Half of Global Aviation Emissions – Study," 17 Kasım 2020, https://www.theguardian.com/business/2020/nov/17/people-cause-global-aviation-emissions-study-covid-19?CMP=tw_t a-environment b-gdneco

Harribey, Jean-Marie, "Ekolojik Marksizm mi Marksist Siyasal Ekoloji mi?" J. Bidet ve S. Kouvelakis (eds) *Çağdaş Marksizm İçin Eleştirel Kılavuz*, çev. Ş. Alpagut, İstanbul, Yordam, 2014.

Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Cambridge, MA, Blackwell, 1990.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, *Global Report on Internal Displacement*, Geneva, 2020.

IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*, 2021.

Malm, Andreas ve Wim Carton, "Seize the Means of Carbon Removal: The Political Economy of Direct Air Capture," *Historical Materialism*, 29(1), 2021, 3-48.

Massey, Doreen, "A Global Sense of Place," *Marxism Today*, Haziran 1991, 24-29.

Meiksins Wood, Ellen, "The Separation of the Economic and the Political in Capitalism," *New Left Review (I)*, Sayı 127 (Mayıs-Haziran), 1981, s.66-95.

Oxfam, *Confronting Carbon Inequality*, 21 Eylül 2020, <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621052/mb-confronting-carbon-inequality-210920-en.pdf>

Pepper, David, *Eco-socialism: from Deep Ecology to Social Justice*, Londra ve New York, Routledge, 1993.

"Reversing Biodiversity Loss – the Case for Urgent Action," 31 Mart 2021, <https://royalsociety.org/-/media/about-us/international/g-science-statements/G7-reversing-biodiversity-loss-31-03-2021.pdf>

Schwab, K. ve T. Malleret, *Covid 19: The Great Reset*, Geneva, World Economic Forum, 2020.

Stanley, S. K., T. L. Hogg, Z. Leviston, I. Walker, "From Anger to Action: Differential Impacts of Eco-anxiety, Eco-depression, and Eco-anger on Climate Action and Wellbeing," *The Journal of Climate Change and Health*, Sayı 1, 2021.

Thomas, Adrian, "'Heart of Steel': How Trade Unions Lobby the European Union over Emissions Trading," *Environmental Politics*, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2021.1871812>

Turhan, E. ve M. Armiero, "Cutting the Fence, Sabotaging the Border: Migration as a Revolutionary Practice," *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 28(2), 2017.

Turner, J. ve D. Bailey, "'Ecobordering': Casting Immigration Control as Environmental Protection," *Environmental Politics*, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2021.1916197>

TÜSİAD, *Tarım ve Gıda 2020*, İstanbul, 2020.

UNEP, United Nations Environment Programme, ve Climate and Clean Air Coalition, *Global Methane Assessment: Benefits and Costs of Mitigating Methane Emissions*, Nairobi, United Nations Environment Programme, 2021.

UNFCCC, Nationally Determined Contributions Under the Paris Agreement, FCCC/Pa/CMA/2021/2, 26 Şubat 2021.

Ülkü Ocakları, *İklim Krizi ve Türkiye Raporu*, 16 Mart 2021.

World Bank, *Global Economic Prospects*, Washington DC, World Bank, Ocak 2021,
<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/34710>

World Bank, *State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2020*, Washington DC, 2020.

Yetiř, Mehmet, "Hegemonya," G. Atılgan, A. Aytekin (Haz.) *Siyaset Bilimi: Kavramlar, İdeolojiler, Disiplinler Arası İliřkiler*, 3. Basım, İst., Yordam, 2013, 87-98.