



**Holmgren Design**  
permaculture vision and innovation

# “Crash on Demand” A concise version

*Crash on Demand, a concise version*



1. Following permaculture ethics and principles inevitably results in progressive disconnection from global destructive systems.
2. Likelihood that active disconnection by some minority of global middle class could accelerate inevitable failure of financial system (rather than resulting in a simple proportionate reduction in resource depletion and environmental impact).
3. Ethical motives, enlightened self-interest, insurance value, and desire to create replicable models are motivations for most following this path.
4. When the politically active people lose faith in top down change, I think many will become disempowered and isolated, some will join the positive bottom up strategy for various reasons and a few will move towards more violent direct action.
5. My intention is to help minimise the loss of human potential represented by the first group, maximise the flow of energy to invigorate and spread the positive responses and avoid the severity of state retaliation that will flow from even limited cases of desperate eco-terrorism.
6. Conventional political activists dismiss the positive bottom up responses because they believe these responses are ineffective (lack power). By showing how (simply as a byproduct) positive bottom up self and collective reliance could precipitate an early (rather than too late) crash of the financial and thus economic system, I am identifying how these benign activities could have powerful, if unintended, consequences. For those who remain steadfastly committed to top down reform, this argument will only reinforce their belief, but they are unlikely to read it in any case.

I think disillusioned political activists want to believe there is something effective that can be done when all else fails. Psychology and history suggest the last resort is always desperate act of violence. But between the failure of reform and the apparent option of violence, is that of the strike and civil disobedience (a strategy with a long political lineage that I did not explicitly invoke in the essay). Essentially I am suggesting a combined work and consumption strike by some proportion of the best educated and informed participants in the system is more likely to be effective than old style workers strikes or boycott of selected products and services. This is just a way to help politicians make a connection to forms of activism that they previously dismissed. In some places and for some people the culture of resistance will be more effective and attractive (eg permaculture projects in Palestine generally frame the strategy of self and collective reliance to resist Israeli occupation).

Conventional logic (eg Rob Hopkin's response) suggests this could drive (ordinary folks) away from the positive path for fear of unintended consequences. Maybe, but I am not suggesting to use crashing the global financial system as motivation to attract people to participate in transition groups, permaculture or starting a CSA (even if in private discussions this may show up as a motive for a small minority).

In the end "Crash On Demand " was a play on words (Cash on Demand) selected after the essay (with all its nuanced discussion) was written. It could more correctly be called "Crash (due to shortage) of Demand" rather than some pointless demand for the system to crash.

*Crash on Demand, a concise version*