

MURAL OF COLLAPSE

“Mural of Collapse” depicts the triumph of capital over labor, nature, the environment, solidarity, and collective action – and even over reason and rational human action in humanity’s own interest. Capitalist principles have prevailed everywhere: in factories, offices, universities, healthcare institutions, the media, social networks, and as a civilization we are now facing a literal threat of extinction in the coming decades due to climate change, whose consequences are no longer thousands of kilometers and hundreds of years away, but regularly knock on our doors in the form of fires, floods, droughts, extreme heat waves, and devastating storms.

The ruling classes of recent decades have destroyed the social fabric, profited enormously from it, and imposed poverty and extreme inequality across the world, while simultaneously suppressing any alternative that sought change and improvement of material living conditions for the social majority. Such policies paved the way for the rise of the far right, which mercilessly attacks women’s rights and the rights of marginalized social groups. All of this is the result of the failure of the liberal capitalist order to address and resolve the fundamental social and ecological contradictions of the system. Capitalism is inherently undemocratic, and although we nominally live in political democracies, there is not even the slightest illusion of democracy in the economic system. Large corporations, banks, and the richest 1% control the production and use of the planet’s resources, so while we individually recycle and separate plastic from paper, just 100 corporations remain responsible for 71% of global greenhouse gas emissions.

Individual actions are not worthless, and they do serve a purpose, but they also create a false sense that fundamental change can be achieved without addressing the fact that we live in a system based on infinite growth on a planet with finite natural resources.

Although the future does not look bright or optimistic, hope always exists. A different world is still possible, but we must fight for it. Time is running out, yet each of us has the ability to be a small cog in building the different world we strive for.

AT THE END OF HISTORY

The history of societies is not merely a sequence of random events, but the outcome of power relations rooted in material conditions of life. Physical and economic conditions shape human consciousness, social development, and the structure of the system in which we live. If we imagine society as a vast structure, its foundations consist of economic conditions - the ways in which people produce food, clothing, goods, services, and everything necessary for life. These foundations constitute the “material base,” while everything else in society - politics, laws, religion, education is built upon and continuously reshaped on top of them. Material conditions of life therefore shape ideas and perspectives which, throughout history and in the present, come into conflict with one another, and the outcomes of these conflicts determine the direction in which society moves.

Although the material world shapes our ideas, those ideas can in turn transform material conditions of life. For example, the Industrial Revolution, which marked the transition from feudalism to capitalism, was not merely a technological advancement but a fundamental transformation of social relations. During the feudal period, economic life offered little in the way of choice. Those born into the aristocracy would never have considered selling their ancestral land, while those born as serfs were compelled to cultivate that same land without any illusion that they might one day become its owners. In short, neither land nor labor power functioned as commodities. They had no market price, and ownership over them changed primarily through wars, conflicts, or royal decrees.

In the eighteenth century, a turning point occurred as technological advances made international trade in goods such as wool, flax, silk, and spices highly profitable. This led British landowners to enclose common pastures and lands previously used by peasants, transforming them into private property. Through enclosure, serfs and peasants were forcibly removed from the land they had cultivated and replaced by sheep, whose wool was highly valuable on international markets. Those who had relied on this land for survival were expelled and forced to seek work in cities, thereby creating a labor force for rapidly expanding industrial production. Landowners could now choose whether to rent out their land at prices reflecting its potential for wool production, while displaced peasants could ostensibly choose whether to sell their labor power for wages. In reality, this newfound freedom of choice was largely illusory. Former serfs who refused to work for meager wages often starved to death, while members of the nobility who resisted transforming their estates for livestock, agriculture, or industrial use frequently ended up bankrupt. As feudalism disappeared, economic choices emerged - but they were often as unavoidable as an offer from a gangster that cannot be refused.

Leftist ideas that emerged alongside the development of industrial capitalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries focused on liberating various social groups from different forms of oppression. Anti-colonial movements, the struggle against slavery, and suffragettes advocating women’s right to vote all embodied the leftist ideals of freedom and equality. Movements for racial equality in the 1950s and 1960s, as well as the first protests by sexual minorities in the 1970s, continued this tradition by attempting to overcome social

barriers and injustices that restricted individual freedom. Leftist thinkers argued that freedom should not be reserved for privileged groups but should instead be a universal right accessible to all people.

However, in the twentieth century a shift in paradigm occurred. In the East, the pursuit of freedom and emancipation gave way to totalitarian regimes that promoted egalitarianism in ways that completely suppressed personal freedoms and human rights. Representatives of these regimes presented themselves as champions of equality yet ultimately created new forms of repression and control. In the West, freedom was increasingly abandoned in favor of a vaguely defined notion of social justice, while market freedom gradually became the sole and universal measure of freedom itself. The moment we accepted that we must choose between freedom and justice, between a democracy controlled by corporations and mass media, and an imposed false egalitarianism - we lost the struggle. Following the end of the Cold War, the theory of the “end of history” emerged, suggesting that liberal democracy and the free-market economy represent the pinnacle of human political and ideological development, and that these systems constitute the final form of social organization. Yet the “liberated” market is not synonymous with freedom; rather, it signifies the domination of corporations and political elites over the social majority. This domination has led to the erosion of democratic processes and of political organization and engagement among the working class, making nearly every form of resistance today appear futile.

THE QUESTION

Capitalism is not merely a system that efficiently sells goods and services people wish to buy; it also encompasses the ability to manufacture desire for specific products through the manipulation of human attention and emotion. Capitalism relentlessly seeks to assign a price to things that were once free like common land, human labor, and goods that were once produced within households for personal use - from bread and homemade wine to vegetables, fruit, and various tools. If something was communal and valued solely for the experience it provided such as a handmade ornament, homegrown produce, or a beautiful sunset - capitalism found a way to transform it into a commodity, subordinating experiential value to exchange value.

Competition for human attention has existed for a long time; however, it was only in the twentieth century that attention itself became a commodity that could be bought and sold. This revolutionary shift was enabled by the development of electricity and the invention of radio, followed by television. Initially, radio and television posed challenges for large corporations. Although they offered enormous potential for attracting and persuading the masses, no one could force viewers to pay for the content they consumed (at least not before the introduction of cable television). The problem was resolved once it became clear that the program itself was not the true commodity. The real commodity was the attention of the audience. By broadcasting content for free, television and radio station owners secured audience attention, which they could then sell in the form of advertising slots to companies seeking to generate desire for new products.

In the twentieth century, advertising was relatively straightforward. Promotional messages were delivered through television, radio, or billboards, with the goal of capturing attention and encouraging consumption. Advertisers employed various techniques such as nostalgia and emotional associations to appeal to audiences. Although they were crafty at manipulating desires, the process was largely one-way: they offered products, and consumers decided whether to purchase them.

With the development of technology especially today, with the rise of social media platforms that use AI algorithms to curate content in our news feeds - the rules of the game have changed dramatically. Applications on our phones not only execute our commands, but also track our habits, preferences, and daily activities. In doing so, they gain insight into our personal interests, enabling the customization of recommended content to suit our specific profiles. Unlike traditional advertising, which was episodic and one-directional, interaction with modern technologies has become a two-way process. We communicate with applications and websites, and they continuously adapt to our needs and to the interests of advertisers. Through this process, technology gradually steers us toward choices and behaviors, often without our conscious awareness. Apple and Google know better than we do what we watch, read, buy, and where and when we travel. Music streaming services such as Spotify and Apple Music maintain records of our musical preferences that are more comprehensive than those stored in our own memories. Algorithms on Twitter (now X) and Facebook favor polarizing, far-right content and profiles due to their higher viral potential. Behind them stands a vast array of other actors who invisibly collect, monitor, search, and exchange our data and activities. When we use these applications, we initiate a learning process: we teach the applications about our habits, and in return they provide information tailored to our interests. Yet the process does not end there. Applications gradually draw us into an endless feedback loop of learning, in which they not only teach us how to use technology more efficiently, but also shape our desires and needs in ways that serve their owners' interests.

At first, algorithms help us find what we already like; over time, however, they begin to shape our preferences themselves. In this way, technology not only satisfies existing needs, but actively creates them, guiding us toward behaviors that are profitable for the companies that control these technologies. Digital technology has thus become a powerful tool in the hands of capitalism, transforming our attention and desires into commodities that can be bought and sold. Understanding this process is essential for critical reflection and for questioning the role of technology in our lives, as well as its influence on our decisions and our freedom.

THE MARCH TOWARD DOWNFALL

The neoconservative political scene that has been active in Croatia for years bases its public and political activity on further aggravating the already difficult lives of certain marginalized social groups. Owing to its close ties with the Catholic Church and secret lobbying networks that provide financial support, this scene has gained increasing public visibility year after year, enabling it to present its regressive, medieval ideology to a broad audience.

In recent years, its representatives have most frequently called for the denunciation of the Istanbul Convention, claiming that it introduces so-called “gender ideology” into society through the back door. “Gender ideology” is an empty term devoid of concrete meaning, used to generate fear of an imaginary enemy allegedly threatening traditional Christian values. The text of the Istanbul Convention does not explicitly mention gender ideology; rather, it refers to “gender” and “gender-based violence against women.” The Convention defines gender as socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for women and men, while gender-based violence against women refers to violence directed at women because they are women, or violence that disproportionately affects women. It is evident, for example, that domestic violence disproportionately affects women compared to men, and therefore must be sanctioned more severely, in the same way that hate crimes such as those targeting sexual minorities or racially motivated crimes are punished more harshly than ordinary violent offenses.

What remains is the issue of violence directed at women precisely because they are women - a form of violence conditioned by socially constructed roles, behaviors, and expectations. In the patriarchal society envisioned by neoconservatives, women are expected to fulfill the role of obedient housewives and wives, to sacrifice their careers, fully subordinate themselves to their husbands and families, and function as reproductive incubators for producing religious fanatics, rather than as independent and free individuals with autonomy over their own bodies. When women fail to conform to these prescribed roles, the likelihood clearly demonstrated by available statistics that they will be exposed to violence by men, most often partners or former partners, increases disproportionately. Influenced by dominant patriarchal ideology, these men expect such roles to be fulfilled. The Istanbul Convention provides data that substantiate these claims regarding violence against women: “A review of studies suggests that in countries, between one fifth and one quarter of women have experienced physical violence at least once during adulthood, while more than one tenth have suffered sexual violence involving the use of force. Figures for all forms of violence, including stalking, reach 45%. The majority of such acts of violence are perpetrated by men within the woman’s immediate social environment, most often partners or former partners.”

In addition to relativizing the problem of violence against women, these actors through the political manifestation known as the “March for Life,” held annually in cities across Croatia seek, under the guise of positive slogans, to restrict women’s right to decide over their own bodies. Supporters of this conservative movement advocate and accept only a society in

which one social group seeks dominance and control over women's bodies and reproductive capacities. The colorful procession of "marchers" is neither pro-life nor pro-children; it is fundamentally anti-woman. A society that fails to recognize women as equal and free individuals is marching straight toward collapse.

BLACK RAM

Ideals and ethical life values have, since time immemorial, served as the starting point for achieving positive social change. Throughout history, countless individuals have struggled and often sacrificed their lives to preserve universal values such as human rights, antifascism, freedom, and equality. These values are not merely abstract concepts; they function as guiding principles directing us toward a more just and humane society.

The right to a dignified life, freedom of expression, and the right to difference constitute the foundations of our shared social existence. Preserving these values is essential for the progress and stability of any society. Without them, society can easily become, for segments of the population, a place defined solely by repression, violence, and hatred. Unfortunately, every society contains individuals inclined toward hostility against anything that deviates from what they consider "normal" or "acceptable." Such prejudice may target different cultures, nations, races, beliefs, or lifestyles. This intolerance often arises from fear and ignorance, yet it cannot prevail so long as there are people willing to resist such ideas.

History teaches us that hatred and intolerance are ultimately overcome by the power of solidarity. It is therefore crucial to recognize and support those who stand up for the values we cherish and who, like a "black ram," are sometimes willing to push against dominant social paradigms despite resistance and exclusion. Their courage and commitment are often vital to social progress.

YOUR CHOICE

Women's rights are frequently at the center of political conflicts, while women's bodies have long been used as battlegrounds in these struggles. Wars and ideological battles are most often initiated by men from clerical and far-right political spheres, whose lives are not directly affected by restrictions on women's rights. The absurdity is further compounded by the fact that decisions concerning women's reproductive rights are made in political institutions overwhelmingly dominated by men.

The emergence of groups advocating the re-traditionalization of society, strict patriarchal norms, and restrictions on women's freedoms represents one of the most pressing contemporary social challenges. Although these groups often present themselves as peaceful defenders of traditional values humbly kneeling in prayer in city squares - they in fact promote some of the most extreme forms of social authoritarianism. The example of Poland clearly illustrates the consequences that arise when extremist ideas become dominant in political life: the introduction of a state pregnancy registry, bans on abortion even in cases of rape or serious health risks, and the tragic deaths of women resulting from

these prohibitions highlight the dangers women face when conservative ideologies prevail and seize control over their bodies through the state apparatus.

Such developments are not far removed from Croatia's own reality. An increasing number of men and organizations gathering in central city squares advocate similar ideas. The Polish extremist movement Ordo Iuris, which promotes strict control over women's rights, has found supporters in Croatia as well. This includes priests who publicly claim that women "provoke sin" through their clothing and should cover themselves, and that women's roles should be limited exclusively to those of wives and mothers. Developments in the United States, where conservative organizations have succeeded in overturning abortion rights in certain states, demonstrate how hard-won rights can be revoked with alarming speed. Similarly, in Croatia, conservative parties and associations use terms such as "freedom" and "life" to conceal their true intentions: restricting women's rights, institutionalizing discrimination, and returning society to rigid social frameworks.

Enshrining the right to abortion in the Constitution represents a crucial step in safeguarding women's rights. This would not be merely symbolic, but a concrete safeguard against further erosion of access to healthcare and freedom of choice. In Croatia, approximately 60% of gynecologists currently invoke conscientious objection to refuse performing abortions; constitutional protection would provide a firm barrier against further undermining these rights.

Women's rights to bodily autonomy must be protected in order to ensure the freedom and dignity of every woman. Reinstating the right to abortion in the Constitution would send a clear message that we live in a state that respects and protects women's rights, regardless of pressure from an ultraconservative minority. According to recent surveys, 73% of respondents find a ban on abortion unacceptable, despite aggressive campaigns by clerical associations and political parties. The right to abortion must be enshrined in the Constitution so that a handful of fundamentalists cease harassing women and denying them access to healthcare. Women must have the right to their own bodies and to their own choices.

RED ALARM

Climate change is one of the most important challenges confronting humanity in the twenty-first century. Despite the skepticism found in interest-driven political circles and in the commentary of conspiracy theorists on online portals and social media, the scientific community is unanimous in concluding that climate change is, to a large extent, the result of human activity over the past two centuries.

The scientific consensus on the causes of climate change is grounded in decades of research and data collected throughout this period. As the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere such as carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide has increased - average global temperatures have risen significantly. These gases produce the greenhouse effect by trapping heat in the Earth's atmosphere and thereby driving global warming. This is a fact

that should be as widely accepted and as self-evident as the fact that we breathe oxygen. Ice-core data, which can record atmospheric conditions over thousands of years, show that current atmospheric CO₂ concentrations are the highest in the past 800,000 years, while most climate models indicate that such a rise in temperature would not have occurred without human influence.

Industrialization and the large-scale use of fossil fuels are the primary drivers of this crisis. The fossil-fuel industry, transportation, agriculture, and the petrochemical sector involved in plastic production exert the most significant influence on global warming. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), fossil fuels account for more than 75% of global greenhouse gas emissions and nearly 90% of carbon dioxide emissions. The world's wealthiest individuals also contribute disproportionately to climate change through luxury lifestyles that include private jets, mega-yachts, vast real-estate holdings, and high levels of consumption. According to Oxfam, the richest 1% of the global population emits twice as much carbon dioxide as the poorest 50%.

Large corporations, especially those in the oil sector as well as the wealthiest individuals on the planet, exert a disproportionate impact on climate change compared to the rest of the population. Reports indicate that just 100 corporations have been responsible for 71% of global greenhouse gas emissions since 1988. These corporations include major oil and gas giants such as ExxonMobil, Shell, BP, and Chevron, which remain among the world's leading polluters. Oil corporations became aware of climate change and the threats it posed as early as the mid-twentieth century, and internal documents from companies such as ExxonMobil reveal that their scientists already understood the potentially dangerous climatic consequences of burning fossil fuels in the 1970s. Yet instead of acting, oil companies chose to fund disinformation campaigns and climate denial to protect their business interests - more precisely, extraordinarily high profit rates.

The plastics industry, which relies on petroleum derivatives, further contributes to climate change. Plastic recycling can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but only to a limited extent. Recycling reduces the need to produce new plastic, thereby lowering energy consumption and emissions associated with manufacturing processes. However, recycling alone is insufficient to significantly reduce total emissions. Globally, only about 9% of produced plastic is recycled, while the remainder is landfilled, incinerated, or released into the environment - often in the form of microplastics that today can be found even in the food we consume. For plastic recycling to become truly effective, radical changes are required in the ways we produce and use plastic. This includes, among other measures, a shift toward bioplastics made from renewable materials, as well as reducing overall plastic consumption and replacing it with other renewable material alternatives.

The Paris Agreement, adopted in 2015, represents a key international framework in the fight against climate change. Its primary goal is to limit the increase in average global temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, while pursuing efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C. The difference between 1.5°C and 2°C may appear marginal at first glance, but its consequences for the planet are profound. Limiting warming to 1.5°C is

crucial for reducing the risk of catastrophic outcomes. Numerous studies suggest that warming above 1.5°C could lead to irreversible changes in ecosystems, including mass species extinctions, destabilization of ice sheets, and sea-level rise. Other dangerous scenarios we already experience include more frequent and more intense extreme weather events such as hurricanes, floods, droughts, heat waves, and wildfires. These changes not only threaten human lives, but also destroy infrastructure, damage agricultural land, and undermine food security. The red alarm has been triggered, and urgent action is required to secure a sustainable future for all people on Earth.

COMPASS

The climate crisis is becoming one of the most important and defining issues of our time. It threatens not only natural ecosystems, but also the lives of millions of people worldwide. Environmental changes ranging from rising temperatures to increasingly frequent extreme weather events will have profound consequences for affected communities. This raises an urgent question: what can we do to redirect our course toward a more sustainable future?

In modern society, technology and the accelerated pace of life often distract us from the most important social problems. Although it may seem that we are constantly advancing, in reality we are stuck in a condition of inactivity and denial. While the planet burns and suffers under the impact of climate change, many of us remain absorbed in the trivialities of everyday life. This paralysis is not only an individual problem, but also a systemic one: it characterizes the vast majority of states, whose political structures will not adopt and implement the necessary policies and measures because they depend on powerful capitalists who control production on the planet.

The capitalist system, which promotes endless growth and consumption, often undermines both the environment and human dignity, while also encouraging greed and an insatiable appetite for consumption. Fossil-fuel industries, intensive agriculture, and the mass production of unnecessary goods are only some of the ways in which unsustainable practices deplete natural resources. As a result, some accumulate wealth, while others bear the consequences in the form of poverty, displacement, and environmental destruction.

Climate denial represents a serious obstacle in confronting this global problem. Regardless of scientific evidence, many people and political actors avert their eyes from reality out of comfort, fear, ignorance, or due to the spread of disinformation through the media and social networks. This “head in the sand” mentality only brings us closer to catastrophe, as it delays crucial decisions that could mitigate the consequences of climate change.

Re-examining our economic system - one that drives unsustainable consumption and inequality - is essential for building a more just and sustainable future. If we align our “compasses” and redirect ourselves toward the path of protecting our planet, we still have a chance to secure a better world for ourselves and for generations to come.

THIS MUSIC

Today (at least in mainstream politics and mass media) ideology is most often presented as a pejorative term, frequently used to discredit political ideas and positions that deviate from the liberal-capitalist social consensus that dominates the world. In reality, ideology is a set of views and ideas that we hold and that shapes our actions in society. For this reason, it is almost impossible for a conscious and rational person not to have formed positions on at least those socio-political questions that directly affect them. Such a set of positions and ideas constitutes an ideology that encompasses a broad spectrum of political, economic, social, and cultural attitudes.

Within the basic ideological division between left and right, the left nominally represents the interests of the working class, systemic critique, the separation of church and state, participatory democracy, the rights of socially vulnerable groups and minorities, wealth redistribution, public services, collective bargaining, cooperatives, and more - whereas the right represents the interests of the capitalist class, the preservation of systemic arrangements, traditional religious values, pyramidal hierarchies in decision-making, restrictions on minority rights, flexible labor legislation, privatization of public services, and so on. In mainstream politics, many political options exist that are not ideologically coherent and that adjust and modify their positions to achieve better electoral results without threatening the systemic status quo. This gives rise to various “anti-system” or “non-ideological” options, which are often later revealed after some time has passed to be ideological combinations of economic liberalism and (extreme) right-wing populism.

When we speak of the DIY (Do It Yourself) hardcore punk scene, we are referring to a distinctive subculture that is not merely a musical genre, but also an ideological movement with clear positions and principles. The hardcore punk scene has traditionally upheld ideas grounded in resistance to the system, social norms, the establishment, and traditional social values. The unwritten rules of the scene include, among other things, a critique of consumerism, radical freedom of expression, inclusivity, solidarity, and organizing according to self-managed democratic principles. At the core of these ideas lies the desire to create musical and other artistic content that can be consumed in autonomous spaces where people can express themselves freely and support one another without commercial interference. The foundational tenets of the DIY hardcore punk scene and its ideology are close to and compatible with leftist ideologies such as anarchism, socialism, and Marxism, which were theoretically articulated long ago yet remain coherent and useful tools for interpreting systemic social relations and practices of self-organization.

How does this function in practice within the DIY scene? A good example is the organization of DIY festivals. Such festivals are not commercial ventures, but events organized out of love for music and the subcultural community. Everything is done on a non-profit basis, and organizers and volunteers engage independently across all aspects of the event, from logistics to promotion. These festivals are living examples of self-managed organization in which the primary motivations are camaraderie, cooperation, solidarity, and friendship - rather than profit. The realization of such a festival requires enormous energy, effort,

commitment, coordination, and people willing to perform a great deal of work voluntarily. Setting up tents and equipment, designing and selling merchandise, producing banners, working at the bar, preparing food, organizing accommodation for bands - everything listed is only part of what must be done so that festival-goers can enjoy themselves and experience the music they love.

Fanzines and webzines operate in a similar manner; the only essential difference is that they involve a different type of content, while the core principles of cooperation and self-organization remain largely the same. Of course, this organizational form should not be idealized entirely, since functioning exclusively on voluntary labor can lead and often does lead to burnout among those most involved and those who invest the most time in producing content. Nevertheless, if a collective achieves a good balance in the distribution of responsibilities and gradually attracts new members willing to assume part of the workload, longevity and continuity become possible.

Let us imagine a society that functions in a similar way, one in which profit is not the primary motive, and collective well-being and the satisfaction of social needs come first. In such an environment, people support one another and cooperate on the basis of solidarity, mutual aid, and shared interests. Individual and collective interests reinforce one another, creating a strong and interconnected community. It is precisely this ideological cohesion that makes the DIY hardcore punk scene attractive and enduring, regardless of changing musical trends. Solidarity and cooperation are the foundations of DIY punk culture, and it is essential that participants and actors involved in building the scene can rely on one another in both good times and difficult ones. This culture of mutual aid reflects a broader desire to build a more just society grounded in the principles of equality, solidarity, and comradeship where no one is left behind or forgotten.

The DIY hardcore punk scene therefore represents far more than a musical genre: it is a living example of an alternative social model based on the principles of solidarity and mutual aid. Through its activities - from organizing festivals and concerts to publishing fanzines - the scene demonstrates that it is possible to create and share alternative cultural content beyond the framework of commercial interests and hierarchical structures. It is important to emphasize that, although often perceived as marginal, the DIY hardcore punk scene has the potential for broader social impact, especially in the contemporary context in which the boundaries of subcultures are far more fluid than they were twenty years ago or more. Its core values offer a much-needed alternative to the dominant capitalist narrative that seeks to commodify every aspect of life. In a time of growing social inequalities and existential systemic crises, the principles upheld by the scene are becoming increasingly relevant, as they provide at least a mental refuge and a partial alternative to capitalist selfishness and alienation.

At the same time, a key challenge for the DIY hardcore punk scene remains as to how to expand its influence without compromising its fundamental principles. Openness toward the broader community and participation in wider social movements while maintaining autonomy and integrity are crucial for long-term relevance and for the scene's positive

influence on younger generations. Ultimately, the DIY hardcore punk scene reminds us that an alternative to the existing system is not only possible but is already being lived and practiced in small yet powerful communities around the world. This music offers inspiration to all who strive for a more just, more solidaristic, and freer society, demonstrating that change begins with ourselves and with our everyday practices and relationships.

MEMORIES

Each of us, at some point in life, must confront the loss of a loved one. This experience often leads us on an emotional journey in which we grapple with the consequences of that loss and the changes it makes in our inner world. Life sometimes invites us to reflect on our own memories and internal struggles, and on how we might overcome them to continue moving forward. The loss of a loved one is not the end of the world; it is simply a new phase of life that we must learn to live.

MAYBE I SHOULD HAVE

Contemporary research suggests that the world already possesses sufficient productive capacity to eradicate poverty permanently and to secure a dignified life for all eight billion people on the planet. Moreover, this could be achieved with lower resource and energy consumption than current levels, thereby also meeting the ecological requirements of a sustainable future. However, for this to be possible, a crucial shift is needed: the reorganization of the capitalist mode of production. In other words, instead of producing for profit, we must orient production toward meeting human needs.

The changes required to achieve this goal must be revolutionary rather than merely reformist. Revolution, above all, requires the liberation of our imagination so that we can envision a world beyond the constraints of the current economy and its accompanying ideologies. Yet it is equally important to organize and to struggle for changes we wish to see.

If we want all people to have access to the basic resources necessary for a decent life, we must establish solid social foundations. Universal rights to healthcare, housing, education, public transportation, water, energy, and internet access must be guaranteed to everyone. In addition, we should move toward shortening the working week and ensuring access to decently paid employment for every worker, while a basic income would support those who cannot work due to justified life circumstances, as well as pensioners who are on the edge of survival with pensions whose value is continuously eroded by galloping inflation. Financing these social guarantees is possible through the issuance of national currency - similar to the quantitative easing ("money printing") through which central banks in the wealthiest countries finance corporations when they wish to stimulate investment - except that this time the money would be for people and for the planet, rather than for bonuses and profits paid out to financial directors and shareholders. To avoid inflation, it is necessary to reduce the purchasing power of the wealthy through progressive taxation. Taxing the richest layers of society is essential for reducing excessive energy consumption and greenhouse gas

emissions. By introducing wealth taxes and maximum income thresholds, we could encourage the redistribution of resources and reduce inequalities. These funds could then be used to invest in renewable energy, faster and more efficient public transport, energy-efficient buildings, and ecosystem restoration.

A controlled reduction of fossil fuel production according to scientifically grounded plans, along with placing oil and energy companies under social control and ownership, could render conflicts with the interests of fossil capital a relic of the past. At the same time, reducing consumption in sectors such as luxury SUV production, private aviation, mega-yachts, and fast fashion would allow resources to be redirected toward what is genuinely necessary for human well-being and ecological stability. This approach, although demanding and “radical,” has the potential to transform our economy and society. Instead of endless growth and the accumulation of wealth for the richest one percent, production would be oriented toward meeting human needs and safeguarding the planet. Greenhouse gas emissions would decline, and the world could begin to recover from ecological disasters. Yet such changes will not occur by themselves. Global coordination and a determined struggle against those who profit from the status quo are required. Only through solidarity and collective action can we build a better and more just world. Perhaps hope, defiance, resistance, and a vision of a more just future and a new society are precisely the key values we must pass on to future generations.

“Reality cannot be ignored except at a price; and the longer the ignorance is persisted in, the higher and more terrible becomes the price that must be paid.”

- Aldous Huxley