

The “Greening” of the Americas

Ana Isla, Professor at Brock University, Canada. Aisla@brocku.ca,

Abstract

This paper evaluates global capital's ecological management, and extends the assessment to the ‘green economy’ as developed in the first "green" neoliberal project, in Costa Rica. Costa Rica has been an important ‘laboratory’ for experimentation in environmental governance mechanisms using debt-for-nature financial exchanges and other instruments of the Kyoto Protocol. I explore how “greening” can be understood as a new phase of capital accumulation that entails five aspects

Key Words:

Sustainable Development, green economy, environmental governance mechanisms, ecofeminism, “greening.”

Introduction

This paper evaluates global capital's ecological management as discussed at the Earth Summits (1992, 2002, 2012), and extends the assessment to the green economy as developed in the first "green" neoliberal project, in Costa Rica. It links Federici’s (2004) enclosure by Witch Hunts and Mies’s (1986) housewifization by enclosure to explore the gendered character of the so-called green economy, in which nature is selectively monetized and turned into goods and services, devalued, and traded in global financial markets. Costa Rica has been an important laboratory for experimentation in environmental governance mechanisms using debt-for-nature financial exchanges and other instruments of the Kyoto Protocol. A

key concept in this latest recapitulation of Sustainable Development is ‘natural capital.’ As a result, new areas of global intervention were opened up and nature entered the domain of neoliberal politics. I have called this process “greening” to indicate how the ecosystems of indebted countries are increasingly becoming destabilized, especially through an ever-growing pressure for resource extraction, at the same time that neoliberal pundits advance the language of the more ecologically friendly economic policies and programs.

I draw on ecofeminist perspectives to cast doubt on the overarching mainstream message that Sustainable Development can in any way create social and gender equality, reduce poverty, confront ecological destruction and combat climate change. Instead, I show how “greening” can be understood as a new phase of capital accumulation that entails five aspects:

First, it requires the expansion of credit instruments, such as debt-for-nature exchanges by financial capital, to create economic growth. In this frame, the debtor’s obligation is to allocate domestic resources for financing ecological projects in exchange for extinguishing a limited portion of the country’s foreign debt.

Second, it involves the World Bank licensing big ENGOs to broker the indebted countries’ resources with large corporations involved in economic restructuring and globalization. The role of ENGOs is to establish the monetary values of the ‘global commons’ of the indebted periphery such as biodiversity, air, and scenery, and to export these values in stock exchanges.

Third, it organizes new types of markets – biodiversity for biotechnology and intellectual property rights, forests for carbon credits, and scenery for ecotourism – and encloses them in conservation areas. A conservation area, in this process, is a designated domain where private profit-making activities are sited within public lands, in order to manage and conserve the region's nature for capital accumulation.

Fourth, it results in peasants and Indigenous people acquiring new roles as service providers in new industries such as ecotourism and microenterprises. For instance, in ecotourism, roles are gendered in that they reproduce existing gender discrimination: men work as tour guides while women work in hotels and resorts or as prostitutes.

Fifth, it expands infrastructure for financial extraction, such as Plan Puebla Panama in Central America, and iniciativa para la Integracion de la Infraestructura Regional Sudamericana (IIRSA) in South America.

This paper explores these five aspects within the context of Costa Rica's ecological management.

An Ecofeminist Perspective

From an ecofeminist perspective, in green capitalism, enclosure and housewifization come together when monetary value is assigned to the commons. These are both historical and contemporary phenomena. Enclosure is the fencing of the commons through the elimination of people's customary rights. According to Hobsbawm (1996), enclosure was initiated in

England circa 1500. With the enclosure of the common land, the social aspects of a community and its autonomy were curtailed and even eliminated. Silvia Federici (2004) argues that the witch-hunts and the enclosure of the commons in England and across Europe (1200 to 1700) produced a new sexual division of labour in which women's position as providers in society was redefined in relation to men, to become wives, daughters, mothers, and widows, all of whom "hid their status of workers, while giving men free access to [their] bodies, their labour, and the bodies and labour of their children." (97) Maria Mies (1986) locates the origins of women's oppression in the interconnected systems of capitalism, patriarchy, and colonialism. She uncovered what she called the process of "housewifization" to capture the process whereby hitherto productive (life sustaining) work is captured, confined, devalued, as a free subsidy to monetized production. Mies presents a detailed case for understanding this division as existing on a world scale via colonialism, in much the same ways that it exists in families and households. This ideology defines some human beings and nature as a 'resource' – to be appropriated, exploited, extracted, and destroyed by means of violence (70-171). In this process, human and nature are transformed into colonies of 'extracted commons.'

Both concepts and historical processes, enclosure and housewifization, are fundamental to capital's "greening" concept. "Greening" describes the monetization of nature that requires the devaluing of all other forms of social existence, transforming skills into deficiencies, commons into resources, knowledge into ignorance, autonomy into dependency, and men and women into commodified labour power whose needs require the mediation of the markets. Therefore, viewed through the lens of ecofeminism, these aspects of "greening" come together to wage war

on women, subsistence producers and nature by formulating a new kind of domination based on poverty and unsustainability.

1) Expansion of financial capital

Since the 1960s, deterioration of the terms of trade for Latin American countries, expressed in balance of payments deficits, contributed to the rise of neoliberalism and allowed the world banking system to grow increasingly powerful over the decades of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. The banking system was central to the imposition of neoliberalism with the backing of bloody civil and military dictatorships in Central and South America. In South America, a second round of military intervention was to solidify neoliberal states based on debt burdens (Roddick 1988; Isla 2000) by increasing interest rates at the end of 1970s and beginning of 1980s. The intensification of neoliberalism was accomplished through military dictatorships in Bolivia in 1971, Honduras 1972, Chile in 1973, Uruguay in 1973, Argentina in 1976, and El Salvador in 1979. Between 1963 and 1990, military dictatorships were heavily implicated in disappearances, tortures, and death squads, with more than a million Latin Americans killed (Castañeda 1994). Costa Rica was the only country where riots did not spring as a result of the IMF and the World Bank's Stabilization and Structural Adjustment Programs. This was in large part due to the fact that USAID became a parallel state and pumped a great deal of money in development aid (to equip and train the Civil Guard, created Programa de Estabilizacion y Recuperacion Economica to opening the U.S. markets to Costa Rica's non-traditional export products, and direct aid) to soften the blow of privatization while simultaneously funding the war against Nicaragua (Petch 1988; Sojo 1992).

Following on the publication of the Brundtland Report in 1987, the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, promoted *Agenda 21*, a negotiated plan of action that linked together development and environment. As a result, new financial instruments, such as debt-for-nature swaps, were created. A debt-for-nature swap is a financial mechanism to reduce the burden of debt to Third World Countries, while opening new areas to environmental management. It is based on a negative assessment of the debtor country, meaning that the debt must be considered beyond the country's ability to pay. Since then private debt-for-nature swaps were designed to reap the benefits and to expand the price system in the nature of the indebted countries.

In this framework, the debtor country's obligation is to allocate domestic resources for financing so-called ecological projects in exchange for extinguishing a limited portion of the country's foreign debt. To reshape nature in conservation areas in the indebted periphery, several debt-for-nature investments, both private and bilateral, were contracted. Among them were the US bilateral debt-for-nature transactions under the Enterprise for America's Initiative which were signed with Bolivia (1991), El Salvador (1992), Uruguay (1992), Colombia (1992), Chile (1991-92), Jamaica (1991-93), Argentina (1993), and Peru (1998) (Sheikh 2007).

Here I will focus on the Canada-Costa Rica debt-for-nature exchange, which was a bilateral initiative that implemented so-called Sustainable Development programs in Area de Conservacion Arenal-Tilaran (ACA-Tilaran), now the Arenal-Tempisque Conservation Area. As part of international rules created by the creditors, the Canadian and Costa Rica governments must donate to NGOs. Canada donated to World Wild Life Fund – Canada (WWF-C), and Costa Rica offered to Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (INBio). (Government of Canada and

Government of Costa Rica 1995). Below I explain how enclosure and appropriation that have come with the “greening” agenda of Sustainable Development have resulted in a war against women, peasant, Indigenous people, and nature in Costa Rica.

2) Establishing the monetary values of the global commons

Since the official recognition of the environmental crisis (Brundtland Report 1987), nature has become increasingly monopolized as the property of global capital. At the Earth Summits (1992, 2002, 2012), capitalist development and the environment crisis were linked; as a result, nature entered the domain of neoliberal politics. Since 1992, the root of the environmental crisis has been identified by the World Bank due to the absence of prices assigned to biodiversity, air, water, scenery and other natural resources (Pierce & Warford 1993; Hamilton 2001). According to this logic, the green economy should resolve this problem through the monetization of nature, meaning the transformation of ecosystem components or processes into products or services that can be privately appropriated, assigned exchange values and traded in markets. In short, nature would be more fully transformed into means of production through the commodification, valuation and trade of ecosystem services.

The 1992 Earth Summit opened the way for capital's direct management of nature and human resource development by giving responsibility for Sustainable Development (SD) to the World Bank. David Pearce and Jeremy Warford (1993), from the World Bank, stressed the importance of economic growth, if poverty is to be reduced and the standard of living improved in developing countries, economic growth must remain a primary objective of the world economy. Twenty years later at the Earth Summit of 2012, again in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, the green economy was unmistakably publicized as the process in which nature is selectively

monetized and turned into goods and services traded in financial markets. Its proponents argue that many goods have no markets at all, and prices must be established for them. That is, the economy requires a fully monetized world in order for nature to be valued and protected. They legitimized the privatization of the commons.

Key concepts in the green economy are natural capital and payment for environmental services (PES). Natural capital refers to the goods and services provided by the planet's stock of water, land, air, and renewable and non-renewable resources (such as plant and animal species, forests, and minerals). A PES is a voluntary transaction in which a buyer from the industrial world pays a supplier for a well-defined environmental service, such as a patch of forest or a form of land use. The supplier, then, must effectively control the service that ensures his supply. The World Bank was in charge of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) to carry out the "greening" program through the environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS). The role of ENGOS has been central in the privatization of the commons as conservation areas. The private land became patrolled by park rangers, when they find community members in designated research areas without permission or without having paid the necessary fee, they confiscate any fish or game these individuals might have obtained and whatever tools they used to do so. They then report the offence to the Office of the Public Prosecutor.

3) The 'Greening' of Costa Rica through Conservation Areas

To monetize nature, the entire landmass of Costa Rica was divided into 11 conservation areas. One of them is the Arenal-Tilaran Conservation Area (ACA-Tilaran). In ACA-Tilaran, the World Wildlife Fund - Canada (WWF-C) and Costa Rica's Ministerio de Recursos Naturales, Energia y Minas (MIRENEM, later

MINAE) developed a Land Plan, or the Plan General de Uso de la Tierra (Costa Rica MIRENEM-Area de Conservacion Arenal-Tilaran 1993). The Land Plan disassembled the natural commons and enclosed 250,000 hectares of land on which people depended for their livelihood. Here, I will discuss two of several types of enclosures named above: the enclosure of the forest for carbon credit, and the enclosure of scenery for ecotourism. I will discuss these two types of enclosure and how these have resulted in neoliberal “greening” meaning a war against nature, peasants, Indigenous people, and women in Costa Rica as it devalues the reproductive labour of these groups.

i) “Greening” of forest for Carbon Credits

Scientific studies have shown that forest vegetation absorbs and stores carbon (CO₂) that might otherwise trap heat in the atmosphere and accelerate climate change. At the Climate Change Convention in Kyoto in 1997, it was argued that altering the use of the soil through reforestation would reduce climate change (Kyoto was the beginning of Payment for Environmental Services that latter evolved into REDD- Reducing Emissions for Deforestation and Forests Degradation). In the Sustainable Development framework, forests were reevaluated in terms of the amount of carbon they sequester, and have become 'natural capital' for sale on Wall Street and other financial markets. The Kyoto Protocol created a framework for certified tradable offsets, in which the environmental benefits that forests and forestry plantations produce should be paid by the beneficiaries, thus increasing the income of those who own the forested land. According to this scheme, countries or industries that manage to reduce carbon emissions to levels below their designated limits would be able to sell their credits to other countries or industries that exceed their emission levels. This type of

solution allows the industrial world to continue polluting as long as it can purchase carbon credits from indebted countries.

The Kyoto Protocol has since become an instrument of dispossession. The Costa Rican government put into effect land expropriation laws (Article No. 2 of Forestry Law No. 7575 in 1996) that enclosed the land of small and medium-sized landholders, in most cases without compensation. It also recognized the conservation area as sellers of carbon credit. One can then imagine why conservation areas are expanded. Since then, acts of dispossession and plunder are reframed as initiatives to advance conservation and sustainable development.

For rural women, peasants, and Indigenous people, the living forest used to provide the means for sustainable food production, basic necessities, nutrition, overall good health, and dignity. In the Indigenous vision, trees and other plant life are essential mechanisms for flood control. Trees are connected directly to each other through the multitude of creatures that depend on them for food, shelter, or nesting places; through their shared access to water, air, and sunlight; through their exchange of genetic material with surrounding populations; and through an underground system of fungi that links all the trees as a superorganism. Rainforest people are also members of this superorganism. For instance, the natural forest of the humid tropics is a highly productive ecosystem. An average hectare of tropical forest has more than three hundred species of trees. Biodiversity means that a forest will have a great number of leguminosae (trees, shrubs, plants) with leaves of different sizes, which lessen the impact of rainfall and prevent erosion.

Neoliberal “greening” introduces new arboreal monoculture species, such as teak, gmelina, and eucalyptus, for commercial purposes and reduces the forest to lumber and pulp for paper. Costa Rican environmentalists argue that arboreal monocultures can be highly damaging to soil carbon, which is important to the

carbon mass existing in the ecosystem. Such monocultures rely upon massive use of chemical fertilizers, with negative effects on soil fertility, water retention, and biological diversity. Subsidized international business-owned plantations such as Precious Woods Ltd., a Swiss corporation, receive payments for environmental services and are exempted from property tax. Tree monocultures transform the rainforest biomass, drastically reducing the diversity of pre-existing ecosystems. For instance, teak trees have far-reaching roots and the shade produced by the leaves obstruct the vegetative growth on the lower forest layer, which could have prevented the soil damage from violent cascades of rain. Its large-sized leaf accumulates great amount of water that then pour unimpeded onto the soil. When water falls from 15 metres or more it forms holes in the soil below, thus increasing soil erosion and degradation.

ii) “Greening” of scenery for ecotourism

For national governments and international lenders, ecotourism enjoys a generally positive reputation in the nature conservation industry. By the early 1990s, under pressure from the IMF and the World Bank, indebted Costa Rica had become the most important ecotourism destination in Latin America, adopting travel and ecotourism as a strategy of sustainable development and as an employment priority, in the hope that it would bring foreign exchange and investment to repay its foreign debt.

Ecotourism is promoted as an activity that contributes toward economic growth and generates income for local communities while purportedly protecting the environment. It is endorsed as an environmentally-friendly activity that promotes visits to relatively undisturbed natural areas to study, admire and appreciate the scenery, wild plants and animals, and other cultural aspects such as medicinal plants. . Ecotourism promoters offer visitors the splendour of rainforests,

parks, sunshine, beaches, mountains and Indigenous knowledge and promise aesthetic and recreational benefits that will restore visitors' physical, emotional and spiritual health. This is a world of leisure, freedom and good taste, risk-free for those with money to spend. Simultaneously it is supposed to be politically-empowering and economically- advantageous for some of the most disadvantaged groups in society, namely poor peasants, rural women, and Indigenous peoples.

Instead, agricultural areas were re-designated as wild areas, which ENGOs proposed to market to (mostly) Northern consumers for recreation. Hotels, cabins, bed and breakfasts, and ecotourist lodges were built to sell views of birds, volcanoes, mountains, rivers, forests, and woodlands. They were packaged, branded, marketed, and ultimately sold as recreational products. The local community has simultaneously also been turned into a branded product for sale to tourists in a variety of forms. Some community members have become ecotourism specialists in bird-watching and guided adventures, while others have become waitresses serving liquor, as servants making beds in hotels, or as prostitutes.

“Greening,” contrary to its association with the protection of nature, created a crisis of nature through deforestation, as resorts and hotels expanded, endangering wildlife habitats, and contributing to biotic impoverishment and the forced migration of animal species. Massive use of chemicals to clean swimming pools, washrooms and other tourism-related facilities forced the animals to leave the surrounding areas (e.g., harlequin and golden toads). Crises of human communities also began as ecotourism transformed people's livelihoods. Communities had long used their ecosystem as part of their daily life. The forest was used in a shared way, which provided material and cultural wealth. Subsistence hunting and fishing were integral elements of their relationship with nature. Ecotourism eliminated community recreational spaces and built internal boundaries that separated local people from volcanoes, rainfalls, rivers, hot springs, howler monkeys, and turtle

spawning grounds, while simultaneously opening these areas to eco-adventurers with money to spend.

Until 1990, the majority of rural communities in the area worked in agriculture. The soil is very rich due to volcanoes, which produce scorch, rich in minerals and nutrients. The deregulation of the traditional instruments that protected agriculture caused a decline in agricultural production and transformed agriculture skills into deficiencies. The theft of the forest from local communities has become a death sentence for small-and-medium-sized landholders. Through “greening,” ecotourism has affected women and children in an especially acute way. Denied access to their former means of subsistence, many rural women migrate to ecotourism areas in search of jobs. In the cash economy their agricultural skills are devalued, and many have little option but to earn all or part of their living from prostitution.

Hidden beneath the veneer of ecotourism, sex tourism offers women’s and children’s feminized bodies as commodities that are pure, exotic, and erotic. This image of Costa Rica entangles two aspects of capitalist patriarchal economics: the domination of creditors (core countries) over debtors (the periphery); and the domination of men over women. The two are related: as Costa Rica is increasingly impoverished by foreign debt and the enclosure of the commons, the mark of international gendered power relations is stamped on the bodies of Costa Rican women and children. Most of the pimps who profit from the organization of sex tourism are men from countries of the Global North, such as the US, Canada, Spain, Germany, Italy, among others. In 2007, Jacobo Schifter (2007) estimated that there were between 10,000 and 20,000 sex workers in Costa Rica, and between 25,000 and 50,000 sex tourists. He calls them ‘whoremongers,’ meaning regular clients who visit each year. The vast majority – 80 per cent of them - are US citizens (pp. 43). Rogers (2009) reports that the US has become Costa Rica's pimp, as crack

cocaine and sex with prostitutes helps male tourists and old retirees affirm their masculinity and ‘escape reality’ from their dissatisfied financial and social decline back home. At *Tico Times*, an English language weekly newspaper in Costa Rica, agencies advertise various types of prostitution, such as mail order brides, and dating and escort agencies, available specifically to tourists and expatriates. On the Internet there are hundreds of websites selling Costa Rican women and children. Prostitution has become a strong component of the country's GDP. The following section critiques that ways that early liberal feminists critics (Boserup 1970), who saw women as active agents of development, were incorporated in insidious ways into the agenda of the World Bank. Under the Women in Development (WID) framework, women's microenterprises were organized to advance gender equity as well as sustainable development, by commodifying women's time and resources.

4) New Roles for women as Service Providers

“Greening” microenterprise

The stated objective of the World Bank in the microenterprise model is the reduction of disparities for women and the enhancement of women's participation in their countries' economic development. Since the 1992 Earth Summit, in Costa Rica, every project of international cooperation has included both sustainable development and women in development (WID) components. But in Costa Rica, women's programs have no government support, and as a result NGOs have used debt-for-nature swaps as a microcredit source to initiate income-generating activities in the sector of the economy where women predominate.

Organic medicinal plant production is one example of a sector that has been promoted as a sustainable development activity. It centres on production of plants indigenous to the region and avoids the use of agrochemicals and is promoted as a source of income for many women, who have been encouraged to develop

microenterprises to grow and market them. The Abanico micro-enterprise was established by ANDAR, a NGO that benefited from the Netherlands-Costa Rica debt-for-nature fund and the Fundación para el Desarrollo del Area de Conservación Arenal (FUNDACA), an organization that provides loans for microenterprises using the Canada-Costa Rica debt-for-nature funds. ANDAR in conjunction with Grupo Ecologico de Mujeres de Abanico (GEMA), is a group of nine local women organized specifically for this activity. The women planted what ANDAR was interested in buying, to produce commodities originating in the areas of biodiversity. The land holding of the women's families varied from two to ten hectares, and the amount of land used by women for their projects varied from five hundred to fifteen hundred square metres. GEMA members grew organic crops on these small plots, situated in the middle of the agrochemical-based farms of their fathers, husbands, and in-laws. Previously, the women had used these small plots to produce the food needed for themselves and their families.

My research showed that although they had experienced some increased status and sense of agency in the community, the Abanico Project members had suffered serious negative effects. Since the 1990s, neoliberal policies dictate that credits must be sustainable, that is, credits to microenterprises must cover operation costs. As a result, women became indebted to NGOs. For instance, each stage of the Abanico project was built on loans from NGOs acting as banks. Funding from FUNDACA, provided a loan at an annual interest rate of 20%, while ANDAR lent the money at an annual interest rate of 33%.

The women's working time expanded, decreasing the time they could spend on activities important to the community and their families. Their work was time-intensive and labour-intensive as they use machetes to cultivate, and natural pesticides to reduce pests. Despite working nine hours in the medicinal plant plots, the women also worked many more hours at home, engaged in cleaning, cooking,

washing, ironing, caring for their elders and rearing children, and doing community work. The women's increased workload was destined to lead to an intergenerational transference of poverty, as household duties were passed to daughters, which limited their educational opportunities.

To develop a microenterprise, families had to convert a substantial part of their land from food production to the production of medicinal plants. Yet the financial return to the women was not sufficient to buy food for the family's subsistence needs, because they no longer owned plots of land for personal use. In this way, women's autonomous subsistence work was eliminated in favour of poorly paid work that exploited their labour. In the face of daily inflation and devaluation imposed by the IMF and the World Bank Stabilization and Structural Adjustment Policies respectively, wages were inadequate. Working for less than the minimum wage and exhausted by a never-ending competitive spiral of reduced real wages, women's labour power was housewifized.

The next section informs about infrastructure projects that served as vehicles for capital accumulation. For that purpose, Banks have created Public-Private Partnerships and put in place special legislation. Here I include Central and South American infrastructure projects for financial extraction as they have continental ramifications beyond anybody could have imagined.

5) The “greening” of Infrastructure for financial extraction

Since most of the material resources and cheap labour for industry are located in the global South, the Earth Summits proposed full corporate capture of them. Through debt-for-nature financial exchanges, new resources and labour were expropriated. But, the resources extracted and the wealth expropriated had to be moved to the industrialized countries where the global consumers live, therefore

infrastructure for transportation and communication become a priority (IFC 2017). According to Hildyard (2016), financial infrastructure is wrapped in multiple guarantees that bind governments to bail out projects if they fail. Other guarantees are: rates of return; minimum revenue; and compensation for changes in laws or regulations that adversely affect a project's revenue. Investors include pension plans, insurance companies and philanthropic foundations from the global North, among others. So what are the platforms that are being constructed in Central and South America under public-private partnerships?

In Central America, the Plan Puebla Panama arose from Agenda 21, and was regarded as the principal initiative for Sustainable Development, aimed at identifying and quantifying the biodiversity of the area and organizing transport corridors. The Plan was put forward with the justification that it would contribute to poverty reduction and environmental reparations (World Bank 2003). Eight governments of Central America (Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama) accepted the Plan, which involves infrastructure projects over an area of 1,026,117 square kilometres and effects some 62,830,000 inhabitants. The Plan Puebla Panama complemented the neoliberal programs for privatizing public resources, such as water (for mining), scenery (for ecotourism), biodiversity (for Intellectual Property Rights), forests (for carbon credit) and public services, coupled with the expansion of commercial markets, highways, other transport infrastructure, hydroelectric production, direct investment in *maquiladoras* (sweatshops), promotion of ecotourism and other transnational businesses (Ornelas, 2003). For women and men who depend on their local commons for their livelihoods, the Plan amounted to a full blown assault on their surroundings and meant loss of dignity, independence, security, livelihood, health and sometimes loss of life (see “The River Told Me” in this issue).

Under the framework of public-private partnerships, another project, Iniciativa para la Integración de la Infraestructura Regional Sudamericana (IIRSA) (The South American Regional Infrastructure Integration Initiative), is a plan to link South America with the Northern markets. South American Amazonia and its resources are in demand and have become one of the most profitable frontiers for global capital's accumulation purposes. It represents an area of 8,187,965 km² of natural resources, distributed among eight countries - Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, and Venezuela. Presidents of these countries met in Brasilia in 2000 to discuss credits for governments interested in the construction of large infrastructure for ports, airports, highways, hydro-electrical dams, railways, gas pipelines, and telecommunications. IIRSA has since become a continent-wide infrastructure fiasco.

By reshaping the continent to serve the demand of the world markets, Plan Puebla Panama and IIRSA threaten the subsistence economies, societies, and ecologies of Central and South America. For Indigenous communities these infrastructure projects are neocolonial initiatives that affects their livelihood with violence, and benefits only corrupt politicians, and financial corporations. The most severe concerns for Indigenous people are coming from the introduction of financial market mechanisms into their ecosystems. The effects of this mixing of fictitious and real value are translated into natural resource conflicts. In addition, IIRSA threatens the rain forest of the entire world by endangering the Amazonian ecology. The Amazon regulates climate by generating dependable amounts of rainfall. Trees take up moisture from the soil and transpire it, lifting it into the atmosphere. Their rainforest continually pumps moisture from the Atlantic Ocean, through the forest canopy and sends up to 20 billion tons of water vapor a day into the atmosphere. This air does not stay stationary over the borders of Brazil or any other country; the Amazon is the lungs of the world. Because global capital

accumulation is cutting down the rainforest and thus reducing rainfall, eventually it will alter weather patterns globally (Robbins 2015).

Conclusion

Since the recognition of the environmental crisis, nature has become monopolized as a property of global capital. The term green capitalism includes all the present intensifications of capitalism that prioritize a model of large NGOs and multinational corporations engaged in enormous projects, which are beneficiaries of governments' debt-for-nature and cheap credit. For ecofeminists, it is obviously not the green capitalists' *stated aim* of making production more 'eco-friendly' with which we disagree; rather it is capital's hierarchical and exclusionary, top-down implementation of policies that are cause for real grievance. These policies not only look bad when looked at through ecofeminist lenses; such policies have actually drastically exacerbated eco-social problems, as detailed herein. By ignoring (e.g., in balance sheets) the local reproductive labour of women, peasants, Indigenous People, and nature, the "greening" of capitalism is transforming the water we drink, the food we eat, and the air we breathe, into paper money. When these planetary commons are enclosed by capital, they are taken for free or at a deep discount. Entered into global capitalist "value chains," these same free goods and services (as people and nature become in this linear model) command all the more consumer dollars, the more natural and wild the better. The sexualization of Indigenous women is not new, but rather repeats Christopher Columbus' initial acts of rape and pillage. It can readily be understood by the cosmopolitan 21st century thinker that these continuing atrocious conditions are unacceptable consequences of official economic policy. It should also come as no surprise that the untenable conditions have consequently sparked resistance in Central and South America (Sandoval and

Salazar 2003; Isla 2015; Rodriguez 2009). Those most centrally affected, peasant women and Indigenous peoples, are fenceline communities who've faced these problems for decades. However, in the 21st century, new global crises of capital and climate are converging to indicate a new direction and manifestation of longstanding local resistance, now within local and regional networks of solidarity and global 'movements of social movements. ' The Costa Rican case gives a core sample by which to assess specific forms of damage and dramatize the need for change, not only to one policy but to the logic behind policies that value money (capital accumulation) over lives (of whomever should happen to be in the way of the profit-seeking operations). The colonial moment, that some still think has passed, re-emerges with a vengeance in policies for the 'greening' of capitalism. The problems associated with these policies, detailed above, are presented for the consideration of scholars especially interested in socio-ecological questions in the Americas. In detailing the gendered processes of enclosure and housewifization, I have tried to expose some of the fallacies of green capitalism and corporate-defined sustainable development. It is hoped that this will contribute to others' further inquiries, by providing an ecofeminist methodological framing within which local (and global) forms of enclosure, resistance and transformation might be better understood.

Bibliography

BBC. 2017. 18 meses de prisión preventiva para el expresidente de Perú Ollanta Humala y su esposa Nadine Heredia por el escándalo Odebrecht <http://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-america-latina-40603502>

Boserup, Esther. 1970. *Woman's role in Economic Development*. London, England: Allen & Unwin.

Brundtland Report. 1987. Our Common Future: Report on the World Commission on Environment and Development <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>

Costa Rica. Ministerio de Recursos Naturales, Energía y Minas. Area de Conservación Arenal. 1993. *Plan General de Uso de la Tierra*. Vols. I–IV. San José: MIRENEM, Agencia Canadiense de Desarrollo Internacional, and Fondo Mundial para la Naturaleza de Canadá

Castañeda, Jorge. 1994. *Utopia Unarmed: the Latin America Left after the Cold War*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Rodriguez, Javier (2009) *Vienen por el Oro Vienen por Todo. Las invasiones mineras 500 años despues*. Buenos Aires, Ediciones CICCUS

Salazar, Robinson. 2003. “El vinculo militar del Plan Colombia y el Plan Puebla Panama,” in E. Sandoval Forero, & R. Salazar Pérez (Eds.). *Lectura critica del Plan Puebla Panamá* (pp. 153-165). [Buenos Aires] : Libros en Red.

Federici, Sylvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York, NY: Autonomedia.

Government of Canada and Government of Costa Rica. 1995. *Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Republic of Costa Rica concerning the Canadian Debt Conversion Initiative for the Environment*. (n.p): Authors.

Hamilton, K. 2001. “Genuine Savings, Population Growth and Sustaining Economic Welfare.” Paper presented at Conference on Natural Capital, Poverty and Development, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Hobsbawm, Eric. J. 1996. *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848*. New York, NY: Vintage Book

Hildyard, Nicholas. 2016. *Licensed Larceny: Infrastructure, financial extraction and the Global South*. Manchester University Press.

IFC. 2017. (International Financial Corporation -World Bank Group) Financial Infrastructure. Accessed September 15, 2017.

http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/Industry_EXT_Content/IFC_External_Corporate_Site/Industries/Financial+Markets/Financial+Infrastructure/.

Isla, Ana. 2009. The eco-class-race struggles in the Peruvian Amazon basin: An ecofeminist perspective. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 20(3), 21-48.

Isla, Ana. 2000. “An Environmental Feminist Analysis of Canada/Costa Rica Debt-for-Nature Investment. A Case Study of Intensifying Commodification,” Doctoral Thesis.

Isla, Ana. 2015. The Guardians of Conga Lagoons: Defending Land, Water and Freedom in Peru. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 30 (2,3), 25-40.

Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books.

Pearce, W. David and Warford, Jeremy J. 1993. *World Without End: Economics, Environment and Sustainable Development*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Petch, Trevor. 1988. *Costa Rica* in J. Roddick (Ed.) *The Dance of the Millions: Latin America and the Debt Crisis* (pp. 191-215). London: Latin American Bureau.

Robbins, Jim. 2015. “Deforestation and Drought.” NY Times, Oct. 11
<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/11/opinion/sunday/deforestation-and-drought.html>

Roddick Jacqueline. (1988) *The Dance of the Millions: Latin America and the Debt Crisis*. London: Latin American Bureau.

Rogers, Tim. 2009. "Costa Rica's Sex-Tourism Is Growing. Online." Available: <http://ticotimes.com/costa-rica/sex-prostitution-growing> (accessed 15 October 2015).

Sandoval, Eduardo and Robinson Salazar. 2003. *Lectura Critica del Plan Puebla Panama* Mexico: Libros en Red.

Schifter, Jacobo. 2007. *Viejos Verdes en el Paraiso: Turismo Sexual en Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Universidad Estatal a Distancia.

Sheikh, Pervaze. 2007. "Debt-for-nature initiatives and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act: Status and Implementation." Congressional Research Service.
<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31286.pdf>

Sojo, Carlos. 1992. *La Mano Visible del Mercado; La Asistencia de Estados Unidos al Sector Privado Costarricense en la Decada de los Ochentas*. San Jose, Costa Rica: Ediciones CRIES.

World Bank. 2003. "Briefing: Shareholders and Donors of the Mesoamerican Corridor Conference. December 12-13, 2002." Paris, France: World Bank Conference Center.

* This paper is based on my book *The "Greening" of Costa Rica. Women, Peasants, Indigenous People and the Remaking of Nature*, published by The University of Toronto Press, 2015.