

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

Jürgen Poesche

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper contains relevant examples of the challenges in attempts to deal with the ongoing and worsening climate crisis. The broadening of Foucault's biopower concept with the necro-politics and necro-ecology concepts is both interesting and it offers a prospect for new insights.

I was left missing a discussion of the works of Enrique Dussel (Philosophy of Liberation), Leonardo Boff (Liberation Theology) and Aníbal Quijano (Coloniality), among others. Including their work would improve the paper. Their work is essential for the understanding the strengths and weaknesses of "the climate environmental politics in the Americas", and at a philosophical and conceptual level they deliver several ideas for breaking the impasse.

In terms of minor housekeeping issues there are three I want to draw the authors' attention to. First, the authors are inconsistent in the use of "American continent" (singular) and "Americas" (plural). There certainly are two continents (tectonic plates) and the use of the plural form is also supported by the habitual inclusion on areas that are *stricto sensu* not part of the two continents, e.g., the Lesser Antilles.

Second, I would say that "Tierra de Fuego" instead of "Land of the Fire" can be used even in the English language.

Third, I think that the use of colonialistic names like "America" should be discontinued and, simultaneously, names rooted in the traditions and languages of the Indigenous Nations (the nationhood follows necessarily from the eruditions of the founder of international law, Francisco de Vitoria) should be used in scientific writing. I would therefore encourage the use of, e.g., *Ixachitlān* or *Abya Yala*.