

Review of: "From Necro-Politics to Necro-Ecology: framing the current climate environmental politics in the Americas"

Mark Howard¹

¹ University of California, Santa Cruz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors' article is a novel contribution to the field of necropolitical studies that highlights a dimension often forgotten in political theory and political economy: ecology. Of course, there are studies dedicated to ecology that bring its important features into focus, but much of the focus in other disciplines focuses on the promotion of a healthy society, and in doing so, tends to reproduce the kind biopolitical thinking that leads to necropolitics. It does this by arguing for the promotion of certain modes of life – in this context *human* life – at the unfortunate neglect of other forms of life such as the living planet that we all inhabit.

The author's contribution, then, is to add a new dimension to the manifold modifications of necropolitics that already exist, including necroeconomics, necrocapitalism, necropolicing, and so on.

Where the article might sharpen its theoretical focus is on paying attention to the idea that necro-ecology (as with necropolitics) is, at least in part, a logical *consequence* of biopolitical sovereignty. That is, it is precisely the mode of power that promotes certain norms for living that in turn also exposes all others to death. In a set of ABCD, if we say that A and B are to be biopolitically promoted, then C and D are the necropolitical remainder.

Thinking this way, I think, may allow the authors to see the full scope and importance of the argument they are making. What might be useful is to consider the arguments of authors such as Donna Haraway (*Staying with the Trouble*) and Anna Tsing (*Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*) who both recognize the embeddedness of promoted forms of life within the broader ecology of our planet. The author's in this article I think sell their argument short by tending to speak of, and use as examples, the negative effects of necro-ecology on societies around the globe. While this is a crucial and important topic, it is already addressed I think by a number of authors working in both necropolitics (and necroeconomics) and ecology. Where the authors might have truly been innovative is in thinking about necro as the death of our planet – the death of everything that Haraway call a "critter" but that we might expand to include forests and oceans and atmospheres and so on. All of this ecological death is a result of promoting certain types of life--capitalist, Western, and modern.

The authors appear aware of this dimension of their argument, but stop short of pursuing it to its full implications, as I say drifting more towards a social critique that I think, although useful, is less exciting an intellectual and critical exercise in political scholarship as would be the full ecological critique of a necro-ecology.

As things stand, this is an interesting and provocative article that needs merely to explore its own implications in order to make a more radical and novel intervention.

