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Anthropocenic Culturecide: an epitaph

Introduction: Anthropocene culture and the loss of ‘nature’

Culture and nature relations are inseparable. Head and Muir (2007), actively challenge dualistic thinking by recognising a way forward towards sustainability in practice, beyond the perceived dualisms that are habitually reinforced. The Anthropocene for some scholars is the public death of a modern account of ‘nature’ (Lorimer, 2012), incorporating homogenisation (Ellis et al, 2012) and the end of knowable terrain. The conceptual realm of the Anthropocene erodes, erases and denudes the histories and futures for both biotic and human cultures in all their conjoined landscapes and ecologies. This epoch has been borne out of both the annihilation not just of an ‘environment’ or ‘nature’ evoked in a pastoral register, but of cultural life garnered through human/non-human dialogue, practice and a being-in-and-with the world. The provocation here, is then for cultural geography, in its critical academic role (Slaughter, 2012; Palsson et. al, 2013), to be mindful of biological diversity and cultural diversity as being concurrently at risk (Pretty et. al 2009; Hulme, 2008). And thus to witness uneven patterns of cultural annihilation happening in our time. In this age of the Anthropocene there is much focus on the acceleration of ‘loss’, or on the competing anxieties (Robbins and Moore, 2012) about negative landscapes of sterility and infertility, poisoned landscapes, or of islands of plastic debris and plastic geologies (to name but a few). However ‘culture’ and ‘nature’ are coconstituted, coproduced and dynamically codependent; and losses are too interconnected, but they aren’t evenly felt in the world we dwell in. There are variations and patterns of loss that follow the logics of our political-economic dependency on non-renewables and the perpetuation of military action to secure them. These have geographies and patterns that are often flattened when calling
up accounts of geological time and space. It is important to raise empathy and compassion and to call together scholars that recognise that within the conceptual logics of the anthropocene of the domain of naturecide is the flip-side of the very same coin as the phenomenon of culturecide. Historically, when thinking about cultures of race and racism, black bodies are left in a contradictory dichotomous position of being both part of nature and/or outside the realms of human concerns for nature. Agyeman (1978), has termed this cultural practice environmental racism. Writing as a scholar who is firmly embodied in the critical anti-racist and postcolonial practice in the world of cultural geography, my academic interest has been on the excluded, occluded, forgotten and indeed ‘othered’ within the disciplinary repertoire. This provocation is about acknowledging the plurality of ‘loss’ in this political / conceptual call for the Anthropocene, that witnesses the loss of the agency of nature, to witness the scale and patterns of the eradication of majority world cultures both within and outside the ‘west’. Culturecide is at the heart of the geopolitical differentials between accelerations of loss and the drive towards the preservation of some cultural heritages, narratives and practices over others in the anthropocene (see Dalby, 2013a). It is time we made space for empathy for the uneven losses that face the majority world, the geographies of the ‘other’ (Said, 1978), and those often at the edges of our lens. Despite knowing that biodiversity and cultural diversity both intersect, and are both needed to increase resilience and enable societies to adapt and cope with change (Pretty et al, 2008), they are often evoked separately in the imagining of the Anthropocene (Procter, 2013). Therein lies the continuation of an account of ‘nature’ priviledged above the losses of diversity of human cultural life. The accounts of loss privilege the defilement of our Romanticised ‘pristine’ ecosystems, and biodiverse palimpsests (Schimel et al 2013). Embedded in this affective logic is the loss of possibilities, possibilities of human
futures or indeed a ‘human-nature’ equilibrium (Karlsson, 2013). If a future human response to the Anthropocene is to ‘shoulder the mantle of planetary stewardship’ (Procter, 2013) then that stewardship also is about engaging with and preventing the loss of cultural as well as biological diversity. Simultaneously, there are silencings, violent endings, devastating cultural losses and erasures. Overall, the current dominant political forces and their conjoined military technologies that are at play are inherently challenging every organism in the biosphere and the possibilities for dwelling in every eco-cultural niche by accelerating the loss of ‘culture’ in human terms, erased are the potentiality of a diversity of cultures.

**Culturecide: Genealogies, Ontologies**

The anthropogenic transformation is as we know is not about absolute loss. The terrestrial biosphere is causing unprecedented global changes, however Ellis et al (2012) remind us that the sensibilities of loss have us grieving for thinning native species and biotic homogenisation but that . . .“ half of all regional landscapes are enriched substantially by exotic plant species when compared with undisturbed native richness. And while an additional 39% of the biosphere seems without a substantial net change in species richness, this was only because exotic gains offset native losses” (Ellis *et al*, 2012; Jones J.P.G, 2011). However, losses in terms of the diversity of human cultures, niches and the homogenising effect of the very same transformation of the biosphere are difficult to measure and indeed pin down beyond anthropological accounts (Head, 2000).

At present in some countries First Nations people are multiply and differently in situations of eradication, but these are also immeasurable (Bargh, 2007). These erasures are often
unrecognised losses endured even before their self-determination has been fully realised in postcolonial times. Those that are just fighting their rights as being equally human are themselves being eradicated. There are epistemic violences resulting from the Imperialist lens (Code, 2006) which try to position aboriginal cultures and First Nations people as collective and singular. There is no singular common cultural reality for all First Nations people. One example is Brazil, where development projects are erasing regions that were once recognized by the Brazilian government in the 1950s as the nation’s first indigenous territory (Marzec, 2014). The proposed Belo Monte Dam will destroy the complex ecosystem and biodiversity of the Xingu basin, this basin is home to some twenty-five thousand indigenous peoples from eighteen ethnic groups. Marzec (2014) outlines indigenous demonstrations that targeted the (BMD) construction in Brazil in 2012, which is an example of “green” development. The destruction of indigenous lands and damage on the Amazon ecosystem are valued as secondary to the provision of energy. This dam is one small part of an immense project to construct sixty dams in the Amazon basin. The irony here is that countries such as Brazil characterize the dam as a “clean energy” solution (Llanos, 2012).

**Culturecide: The War on Terror and Cultural Genocide**

Genocide is defined in Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) alongside this many commentators have focussed on the proliferation of systemic, cultural genocide. Cultural genocide is the ‘systematic eradication of a group’s cultural existence . . . and fundamental aspects of a group’s unique cultural existence are attacked with the aim of destroying the group’ . The ‘War on Terror’ in its present and recent formation has compounded occurences of cultural genocide. The
eradication of cultures in Iraq, is an example of the ways in which culturecide operates to end cultures simultaneously to the expansionist politics of political control and domination in the Middle East. With a focus on Iraq the eradication of minority cultures such as the Yazidis who have been killed in their hundreds, and the Mandaeans who are solely based in Iraq but have fled as a result of persecution since military actions in the Persian Gulf began in 1993. Iraq is also a site where cultural heritage has been destroyed as part of the military occupation or indeed as some suggest been enabled by the military occupation.

The pillaging of artefacts that mapped the continuous history of mankind has effectively robbed Iraq of the evidence of its place in history, as well as the possibilities for future citizenry pride and self-determination. In more recent months there has been the destruction of architecture and ancient sites, one of which is the Iman Dur Shrine, which Unesco describe as “one of the emblematic representations of Islamic architecture of its time.” These singularly violent eradications are occurring in addition to the devastation of ancient sites of world importance.

In this post-occupation era the cultural control of Iraq is ripped from its people and they feel under attack. Many poets, artists and cultured people in Iraq share the view that “Baghdad being the capital of Arab culture is a big lie. Culture is currently in the hands of people who ignore the meaning of the word and the significance of a cultured person’s role.” Initiated by the Brussels Tribunal, research has clarified the immense crimes against humanity for the US/UK occupation has to take the responsibility for “genocide by other means” and “historical annihilation” (Baxter, et. al. 2010). Culturecide at this level does not stop at the borders of Iraq and the links to occupation. Other sites are being erased as a result of sectarian violence as we have seen in Lebanon in 2014 and Timbuktu in Mali in 2012.
productive generosity that is necessary for (universal) reconciliation (Clark, 2010) is absent too.

In terms of our everyday lives there are aspects of violence that diminish our societal space to be and to dwell. Whether the constraints be about the wrong bodies in the wrong place or that spaces are culturally vetted, homogenised or indeed ‘corporatised’. Part of the fabric of what we are losing and what Stewart (2007) in *Ordinary Affects* argues are public feelings that begin and end in broad circulation. The circulations are hitting cul de sac’s, or indeed widespread destruction. The palate of affects within the possibilities of life are also diminished. As Stewart argues, ‘(T)hings have started to float. It’s as if solid ground has given way. . . as if the possibilities of a life have themselves begun to float’ (Stewart 2007, p61).

These possibilities include a newly sensitised world where new ethical sensibilities too emerge (Gibson-Graham and Roelvink, 2009). As we witness these losses we need to be mindful of our responsibilities and care towards the ontologies we employ. We also need to be mindful of our grammars, vocabularies, genealogies, and versions of historical space-time, through which are we articulating redress. Overall this evocation of culturecide for cultural geography is a call to witness the effects of a geopolitical environment powered by a refusal to swerve a dependency on fossil fuels, that subdue cultures in favour of domination of geological stratum, ending diversity for all biolife and biopolitics.

**Culturecide**

In this moment of the call for the new ecological era recognising the death or ‘killing’ of nature, this provocation seeks to remember the destruction of niches of humanity, creativity, poetics and aesthetics that are the collateral damage of the contemporary ecologies of war (and responses to them), the imperatives of capitalism and the global
economy, alongside the misplaced cornerstones of the moral economies of ‘living a successful life’. What I argue here is that erasure of systems of organic life and geological violence is occurring at the very same time as the geopolitical phenomenon of *culturecide*. What connects them is that the forces that promulgate 21st century naturecide are the very same as those that power the erasures of culturecide. This provocation is about embedding a critique of both the propelling of inhumane loss as part of understanding the sensibilities that underpin the politics of this ‘catchword in ascendency’ (Castree, 2014). The current focus is to situate the human as perpetrator of these losses, but here, it is the forces of capitalism, and the dependency on non-renewables that produces victims and perpetrators beyond the monolithic account of ‘human’ in the current representations. Castree (2014) for example uses the term ‘a thoroughly humanised earth’ where *human* is a singularly homogeneous species, but what we have at play is a differentiated landscape of powersubsuming differentiated sets of philosophies and values which are not always anthropocentric in their nature or culture.

Culturecide is a site of focus then, on a the power politics of the simultaneous occurrence in the anthropocene of the domination of a cultural forces that remove potentialities of synchronicity between human-nature-centred futures, and in the first wave eradicate humanity at the nexus of access and control of fossil based non-renewables. *Culturecide* is about pausing for thought and placing, *in memoriam*, the eradication of cultures also at the heart of the Anthropocene. Not only are these cultures or niches of culture deadened, but they represent possibilities of alternative ways of living, philosophies and politics. They are part of the of the problematic we face, a world where dominant powers cannot tolerate (bio)diverse sensibilities, societies and cultures.
The possibilities for democratic politics

Shot through the current era of accelerated erasures, the time-space of ‘other’ biopolitics is also under erasure. A new biopolitics is necessary and imminent (Dalby, 2013b). There are stratified systems of politics and power which create an uneven process of erasure, time and terrain. The power, politics and rhythms of thinking through and enacting bio-life are not even; power, non-human, human relations are fused. Grosz (2008) underlines this co-dependency: ‘(G)eopower, the relations between the earth and its life forms, runs underneath and through power relations’. Yusoff (2014) takes this further, argues that ‘this form of geocapitalisation (that is also a historically constituted mineralisation of the human through fossil fuels) is erased from our understanding of biopolitical life. Yusoff is not only arguing for the recognition of non-human agency, but for an awareness and recognition of the politics of biolife (human and non-human) as already being shaped and shot through politics and capitalism with the power/agency of non-human biota. Yusoff (2013a, 2013b) counters Swyngedouw’s lament at the ‘non-political politics’ of climate change. The nature of change is posited as a geopolitical cultural politics where homo and geo are co-produced. However, just as the anthropocene conceptually enables us to think biopower as it produces landscape, it also enables us to see human landscapes ‘in another sense, they are an entirely novel and quite gargantuan trace fossil system, one that extends kilometres deep into older rock in the form of millions of boreholes and mineshafts’, human history must be seen ‘within the deep-time context of the rock record’ (Zalasiewicz, 2013). Ultimately the politics of writing history (de Certeau, 1988), is undermined through an account of thinking geopower (Yusoff et. al. 2012) which seeks to ‘avoid a post-political future and remain open to politics of liberation and justice (in relation to class, race, sexuality, gender etc.) without
Reducing them to matters of secondary or tertiary concern? (Johnson et al., 2014). It is the politics of the anthropocene that is theoretically exciting, that in this new era we can put the geopolitical impetus ‘to domination and control that animates so much politics’ in its place; as an anathema to taking the long-term future of humanity seriously (Johnson et al., 2014).

By attending to the politics of the anthropocene we can architecturally revolutionise our reference points for change and reflection.

This epitaph is about reflecting on the cultural and geopolitical losses that are the excess to current accounts of the domination and control of fossil fuels. This is a reverse look at the death of not just an asocial nature, but hopefully also the death of an anti-human geopolitical project that dominates ‘other’ humans, societies and potentialities of culture, philosophy and creativity, largely in the global ‘south’.
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