



# Introduction:

## The Necropolitics of Environmental Decline

NICOLE GRIMALDI

New York University

---

### Ecological Death

In the biological sciences, “ecological death” has been defined as an organism’s inability to function as usual in a particular ecological context due to sustained (rather than acute) toxic exposure (Scott and Sloman 2004: 370). Unlike “physiological death (i.e. mortality),” ecological death indexes how, even if organisms are not immediately harmed by environmental toxins, lower-level contaminant exposure nevertheless profoundly impacts the larger environment and—by extension—the social, physiological, reproductive, foraging, agonistic, and predatory behaviors of organisms within that environment (2004: 370). While Scott and Sloman focus on the impacts of aquatic toxicity on the behavior of fish populations, their distinction between “physiological death” and “ecological death” can be considered and applied much more broadly. The latter concept was developed to better assess what the scientific literature had often overlooked: how less overt and more diffuse forms of environmental damage similarly determine how and how well organisms live through time. Even if animals continue living in and through diminished conditions, their “sensory, hormonal, neurological, and metabolic systems” are affected; they are therefore subject to life-limiting and behavior-modifying hazards that are often lethal in the long-term (378).

Registering these more minor but accreting forms of injury among animal populations is comparable to analyzing what Laurent Berlant called, in the context of human populations, “slow death”—the condition whereby certain populations are gradually and disproportionately “worn out by the activity of producing life” due to depreciating structural conditions (2007: 759)—or what Rob Nixon, attending to both human and non-human forms of calamity, termed “slow violence”: incremental and often invisibilized violence that results in “staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties, both human and ecological” (2011: 2). Relatedly, anthropologist Nicholas Shapiro has considered the behavioral and physiological impacts experienced by humans upon exposure to chemical atmospheres. Not unlike Scott and Sloman’s analysis of how toxic environments contribute to the alteration of complex fish behaviours, Shapiro documents how “conventionally insensible domestic chemical exposures”



disrupt human physiological and psychogenic functions. Toxicity is often detected by the porous and sensate body, through “sustained attention to barely perceptible alterations of somatic function and atmosphere” (2015: 369), and not only by human bodies. Nonhuman lives are often more receptive to—and are even used to identify (as in the case of gas leak detection dogs, rats used to locate explosive materials and environmental toxins, and slime molds used to chart efficient, safe, and stable transit pathways)—how changes in the environment influence living organisms and shape the conditions of habitability.

Some may scoff at the insistence that we consider fish populations alongside human populations when it comes to environmental toxicity and its myriad downstream impacts. And yet, to view either in isolation is to miss the deep interrelatedness of these concomitant forms of decline. Zoe Todd, in their discussion of human-fish relations in Canada’s Northwest Territories and among the province of Alberta’s Indigenous communities, reminds us that “humans and fish alike work to navigate the complexities and paradoxes of colonialism,” stressing “the urgency and necessity of centering human-fish relations, alongside other fleshy engagements, in contemporary and future political struggles” (2018: 62). Increased toxicity rates often indicate political abandonment and precarity, concentrated in extractive zones and among marginalized and neglected environments and communities. Indeed, in juxtaposing these scientific, philosophical-sociological, and ethical-relational frameworks, one comes to recognize the similar environmental perils and shared fate of human and non-human beings alike, similarly enmeshed within and subject to environmental deterioration that takes a considerable toll on the whole “web of life,” that is “*nature* with an emphatically lowercase *n*... nature as us, as inside us, as around us” (Moore 2015: 3).

In an effort to explore the impacts of environmental decline on both human and non-human populations and how the exploitation of both also hastens and exacerbates environmental decay, this special issue interprets the exposure to “contaminants” or “toxins” more broadly to include not only environmental pollutants (such as greenhouse gases, pharmaceutical toxicants, particulate matter, and polyaromatic hydrocarbons)—which contribute to what James Reath calls in this issue “necromolecular chemospheres”—but also the exploitative and extractive social, economic, and political systems that incentivize environmental degradation while curtailing the quality and breadth of life that can be enjoyed, the ways in which divergent beings may freely flourish. Our late industrial techno-capitalist present is, as Shapiro points out, “marked by deteriorating sociotechnical systems and economic, climatic, and infrastructural instability” (2015: 370). In broadening our understanding of toxic environments to include corrosive social and political systems and their economic, discursive, material, and necropolitical dimensions, we begin unfurling the systematic nature of lethal exposures that perforate biological, affective, political, and social life. Understanding the



varied forms of life implicated in these systems helps us to think solidarity anew, as inter-species struggle mutually poised against the voracious and extractive logic of capital.

Connecting the prevalent view of the earth as a limitless bounty from which infinite capitalist accumulation can be extracted with *necropolitics*, which explores the “subjugation of life to the power of death” (Mbembe 2019: 91), this special issue unravels the political ecology of death and its attendant violences as they relate to environmental and social decline, as well as the vast sprawl of species implicated in this deterioration. It proposes that environmental necropolitics should tarry with slower-moving forms of aggregative damage that cannot necessarily be voiced by the peripheralized (and sometimes human-scarce) ecosystems that endure it. This approach compels us to interrogate the politics of death, or necropolitics, anew—in an expanded, multi-species, and multi-scalar fashion.

### **Necropolitical Frontiers**

This collection of articles thus thinks through environments of death or death-as-environment—what Achille Mbembe calls “*death-worlds*, new and unique forms of social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon them the status of *living dead*” (2003: 40)—in ways that overflow, exceed, or direct away from exclusively human death and toward the death of diverse forms of life.

Given the weddedness of the extractive economy to varied forms of violence, necropolitical considerations that decode how death is directed, monetized, politicized, and normalized by actant powers is part and parcel of conducting environmental criticism in the era of anthropogenic climate change. Of course, necropolitical interventions have evolved considerably in the two decades since Achille Mbembe suggested we revise Foucault’s discussion of biopower by placing death at the centerfold of our political analyses to better negotiate the imperialist past and the still-colonial present. While Foucault illustrated the plurality of techniques through which sovereign power manages biological life, Mbembe asked about the right to kill, and the way the political “makes the murder of the enemy its primary and absolute objective” (Mbembe 2003: 12). We would distinguish between—while correlating the two under the same necropolitical banner—murder premised on blatant enmity and the surplus of death resulting from less direct violence that is similarly murderous in its effects, and which equally serves a well-grooved system of power that has divided the world into that which must be preserved and that which must be sacrificed for the purpose of this selective preservation. While Mbembe sees “the murderous functions of the state” (2003: 17) as the decisive work of modern politics, “letting die” or permitting one’s exposure to the slow drip of death without intervening in or expediting that death, as Warren Montag reminds us, “should not be taken as an alternative to necropolitics as



understood by Mbembe but... as its complement” (2005: 11). This is especially important when considering ecocide, which is too often a passive enterprise—one in which nonhuman life is similarly deemed less valuable than the profit that can be wrung from its demise.

Despite its concern with ecological worlds, environmental necropolitics keeps abreast the many anthropocentric discourses that explore the surplus of necropolitical practices deployed to ensure certain human bodies are cultivated for life while others are marked for death, relegated to the role of expendable biological excess. These discourses range from high-level critiques of colonialism, capitalism, and political institutions to more intimate ethnographies and analyses considering the affective, psychological, and embodied experience of subjects who endure necropolitical violence; all of these approaches are necessary to flesh out the innumerable structural dynamics at play. Mbembe’s necropolitical analysis predominantly operates at the macro-level, tracing necropower’s transmutations from early- to late-modernity, from slavery to late-modern colonial occupation to contemporary warfare, by proffering critiques of the state of exception and siege and evincing how Western sovereignty has been instituted and maintained through terror tactics, the instrumentalization of life, and the destruction of elect populations. Other scholars have focused on the experience of racial subjection and gendered violence by zeroing in on the individuals negotiating convergent power/knowledge systems to better account for what Gilberto Rosas calls “necro-subjectivities” (2019), the rich interiorities of subjects made and unmade under the threat of death. Zakiyyah Iman Jackson, for instance, exploring what she calls the necropolitical “sociogenic production of antiblackness,” contests Mbembe’s “spatialized reading,” which compartmentalizes death and life into colonial, geographic zones (2020: 199). Instead, she corporealizes the zones of necropower as “nomadic, traveling with black(ened) subjects even when they are able to transgress geopolitical-spatialized borders” (2020: 205) to explain how necropolitical weapons are not merely exterior to and acting upon the inert body but interact with and alter somatic processes, thereby unsettling the boundary between the human subject and the larger environment aswirl with necropolitical power through which the subject moves. The subjection to death is thus not confined to geopolitical zones but is anchored within bodies deemed discardable. Jasbir Puar has articulated a queer necropolitics that examines how queer and racialized subjects are implicated in a “bio-necro collaboration,” variously instrumentalized as symbols of life and death to advance nationalist as well as geopolitical agendas (2008). Rosi Braidotti discusses the inseparability of bio- and necro-political regimes and the need to incorporate diverse “situated knowledges” (Haraway 1988) to better understand the interpenetration of life- and death-making assemblages in our contemporary climes (2013). And Alexander G. Weheliye gathers the insights of Black feminist scholars (Wynter, Spillers, Hartman) to critique the universalization of “life” in biopolitical discourses by attending to the stratification of life



into variable degrees of human- and non-humanness, exhibiting how this determination is historically anchored in racialized and gendered bodies disproportionately subjected to death (2014).

And yet, the life deemed expendable for the purpose of economic and political gain is not and never has been limited to human populations, since the death of non-human animals and ecosystems has always been a centerpiece of human world-making. The logic of extermination—which does away with anything that interferes with the geopolitical stability of states, the unmitigated growth of human industry, and the economic pursuit of profit—has never merely been leveled at the human. This insight serves as this special issue’s point of departure.

### **Approaches to the Necropolitics of Environmental Decline**

Mbembe acknowledges that “[t]he extraction and looting of natural resources by war machines goes hand in hand with brutal attempts to immobilize and spatially fix whole categories of people or, paradoxically, to unleash them, to force them to scatter over broad areas no longer contained by the boundaries of a territorial state” (2003: 34). Here we dwell in a more sustained way on the former piece of this dynamic: ecological violence not only as a *means* through which to sequester and subdue human populations, but land and non-human life *itself* as a target of sovereign power, an end in itself whose end may itself be brought about intentionally or indirectly, but is always connected to the destructive and imperial logics of modern sovereignty and its aftermaths. The environment (inclusive of all its complex geospheric, hydrospheric, atmospheric, and biospheric systems) is similarly parceled into disposable and non-disposable zones in ways connected to and sometimes separable from the disposability of human zones, even as our terrestrial home evinces the enmeshment and co-reliance of human and nonhuman life. While environmental destruction and ecocide has, in some cases, been visibilized (i.e. widely publicized) and actively resisted, the exposing of such practices has often hinged upon or been amplified due to the human cost incurred (and occasionally the affiliate impacts on wildlife, especially endangered wildlife as popularized by selective conservation efforts). Many slow forms of ecological decline do not attract sufficient attention or study, and instead insidiously accumulate with severe consequences. This has been the case with the accumulation of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) like PCSs and DDT; plastic and microplastic pollution; groundwater contamination due to industrial waste; ocean acidification; and the proliferation of “forever chemicals” or PFAS chemicals, which are not only an extreme threat to human health but irrecoverably contaminate natural resources and environments (only a handful of a class of thousands of synthetic PFAS compounds has been subject to regulation by the EPA, and only as of 2024).



The effort to extend necropolitical insights to better crystallize pressing environmental challenges and to dwell on invisibilized sites of ecological violence is beginning to proliferate among an array of interdisciplinary thinkers (Rose 2011; van Dooren 2014; Kirksey 2015; Collard 2018; Davies 2018; Liboiron 2021). This approach does not entail downplaying or minimizing the human toll that has long been the focus of necropolitical analyses. In the same way that necropolitics does not leave behind key biopolitical insights but rather analyzes disparately destructive and contingently interacting biopolitical and necropolitical regimes, necropolitical scholarship focusing on non-human environments does not abandon but meaningfully integrates subject-oriented necropolitical negotiations to develop more robust interpretive models. The oscillative movement between biopolitical preservation and necropolitical subjection—between conserving life and enforcing death—is struck differentially and applied unevenly to various populations. These economies of life and death cannot be comprehended by broadly applied theoretical classifications, no matter how circumspective, but mandate analyses conducted on a case-by-case basis (via astute critical and ethnographic methodologies) to consider discrepancies in political and economic intentionality; distinct geographic challenges; varied technologies of war, regulation, and surveillance; and evolving historico-political orientations.

This project thus forges connections between the human populations directly and indirectly suffering due to state- and market-sanctioned violence and the suffering of the larger environment at the hands of ecocidal enterprise in order to understand with greater precision the plight of human populations in relationship to diminished environmental milieus. Such an approach works toward understanding historical and capitalist developments as what Jason W. Moore calls “world-ecology”—the entwining of nature, power, and history as “already co-produced by manifold species, extending even to our planet’s geo-biological shifts, relations, and cycles” (2015: 4).

### **Recent Trends in Environmental and Necro-Economic Thought**

This journal issue cannot be disaggregated from two strains of contemporary thought: 1) the still-burgeoning ontological turn animating contemporary continental philosophy and 2) how prevailing global economic forces shape necropolitical dynamics today. The ontological turn refers to a philosophical reorientation in recent years that—expanding upon the critique of fundamental humanist tenets regarding cultural hegemony; racial, gender, and able-bodied hierarchy; and Western imperial destinies—considers more earnestly inter-species reliance, co-determination, and planetary entanglement. Such scholarship has been instrumental for reframing the climate crisis as a not-merely-anthropocentric threat, even if escalating climate degradation is hopelessly sutured to anthropogenic (or, more aptly, “capitalogenic” [Street 2016; Moore 2016]) activity. Not unlike human beings, lively networks of flora and fauna develop survival instincts in



response to immediate wounding as well as evolve to endure generationally coded distress. As ancient Indigenous knowledges increasingly penetrate academic discourse, contemporary theorists are beginning to attend to the profound interrelatedness of human and non-human life as well as the vast orders of intelligence woven through the biosphere, spawning the question of environmental resilience and multi-species survival while invigorating the critical attention paid to plant, animal, fungal, and microorganic worlds (Alaimo 2010; Kohn 2013; Tsing 2015; Coccia 2018; Sheldrake 2020).

Languages are being developed to describe the inextricability and co-implication of varied ecosystems in the effort to de-partition persistent humanist binaries such as nature/culture, human/animal, and subject/object and to underscore our reciprocal relationship with earthly materials and creatures that command our attention and responsibility. This has been phrased through critical posthumanisms (Braidotti 2013; Wolfe 2010), object-oriented ecologies (Harman 2002; Morton 2013), “sympoiesis” (Haraway 2016), the “web of life” (Capra 1996; Moore 2015), actor-network theory (Latour 1987), “perspectivism” (Viveiros de Castro 1998), “queer animacies” (Chen 2013), “trans-corporeality” (Alaimo 2010), “decolonial ecology” (Ferdinand 2022), and so on. And yet, such discourses tend to converse only peripherally with necropolitics as methodology, concerned more with expanding human notions of relationality than addressing the shared condition of not-merely-human publics laboring under extractivist necroeconomic regimes.

Recognizing the theoretical lushness of what has been variously called the ontological, posthumanist, new materialist, or ecological turn in contemporary continental philosophy as well as its tendency toward abstraction—which in some cases elides material grapplings with real-world geopolitical violence and divestment—I designed a provocative prompt to spur this special issue forward, which goes as follows. We can consider the connection between environmental decline and necropolitics in at least two senses. First, there are numerous challenges that environmental decline presents for human populations. Rising sea levels (when more than one third of the human population lives within 60 miles of the coastline); the surge of climate migrants fleeing poor weather conditions, heat, flooding, and drought; uncontrollable wildfires sweeping through communities; torrential super storms that devastate human infrastructure; the emptying of the oceans due to overfishing, warming, and acidification; the dessication and desertification of once-fertile soil—these are urgent examples of the perils that afflict human communities in the era of biospheric collapse. At this point, unruly and inestimable forms of environmental production are beginning to escape the management of human systems of power (we can speculate about whether this might eventually deplete altogether the strength of a necropolitical framing vis-à-vis climate change). However, as it stands, different populations are far more at risk than others of suffering due to climatic turbulence, and this differential exposure to death



(cutting, as always, along racial, gender, class, dis/ability, and geographic lines) has traceable historical, social, and political geneses. The socio-political relegation of particular populations to the immediate or downstream effects of climate precarity (whether by restricting movement and migration, forcing the displacement of Indigenous communities, using poor communities as toxic wastelands, etc.) is not accidental or incidental but consistent with the operation of military, state, and corporate bureaucracies. Such an approach considers environmental decline as one more facet or weapon of necropolitical might forcibly imposed (often in service of surplus value production) upon human beings.

There is, however, a second way to consider necropolitics and environmental decline that sees non-human life as similarly targeted by sovereign power, deemed equally inconsequential or else utilized to directed ends. This approach follows more readily from the flurry of anti-anthropocentric ontological discourses detailed above. What is the relationship between the politics of death and the “natural” environment at large (an environment that is intertwined with the human but also inclusive of non-human publics)? We can procure many examples of lethal practices that exact an ecological as well as human toll: forced extinction and ecocide, ecosystem manipulation and mismanagement, agricultural industrialization, pesticidal and nuclear waste toxicity, acute air pollution, incessant oil and gas extraction, wildlife displacement due to human activity and migration, and so on. By challenging the supremacy, the complete sovereignty awarded to human life, we are forced to recognize how the destruction of human- and non-human life is equally implicated in the era of climatic necropolitics. Can necropolitics effectively theorize the politics of life and death as particular to or else inclusive of not-merely-human life?

### **Necroliberalism**

Each article represented in this issue takes for granted that necropolitical analyses are inextricable from capitalist critique and vice versa—we cannot consider the anthropogenic drivers of climate change without attending to the logic of capital. The exposure to death takes on an accelerated status in our neoliberalist era: as a new frontier of economic subjugation (Haskaj 2018) as well as an intensification of necro-capitalist militarized power that functions by way of violence and dispossession (Banerjee 2006). The Salvage Collective argues that capitalist petro-modernity factors in “a certain quantum of acceptable death into its predicates” (2021: 2-3)—human, ecological, and cultural death—such that what is being “mitigated” against today is not climate change, but climate change’s impact on accumulation and the constraints it places on growth as the dominant economic rationality. More recently, Mbembe called “necroliberalism” the prevailing ethos of our contemporary moment, in which the logic of sacrifice becomes not only a political and environmental logic but an economic one





(Mbembe qtd. in Bercito 2020). Building on Mbembe's work, Warren Montag exhibits, through a reading of Adam Smith, how the global market viewed as a meta-human, providential realm—a mechanism that necessarily rations life and death—must build death into its operations; Smith's "necro-economics" requires that some be exposed to death, often dying "in the name of the rationality and equilibrium of the market" (2005: 16-17). Working in concert, societies thus exercise the decisive power of death to prop up the capitalist market that necessitates it—and in a further twist of the knife, society as a whole is ultimately, and often unconsciously, "compelled to accept the rationing of life by the market" (17). This is observable in the language of artificial scarcity and cheap natures, in the myths of progress and development, and it riddles the unyielding logic of infinite growth that underscores moralistic rhetoric regarding human deservingness, justifiable exploitation due to economic "necessity," and the righteous drive to prosperity.

A number of thinkers have advanced necroeconomic critiques. Subhabrata Banerjee focuses on "necrocapitalism," defined as "*accumulation by dispossession and the creation of death worlds* in colonial contexts," and instituted by way of "necrocapitalist practices" such as those leveraged by extractive resource and privatized military industries, and especially those that impact developing nations (2008: 1548, original emphasis). Fatmir Haskaj reads global "crises" in the shape of war, genocide, poverty, famine, and environmental disasters like climate change not as inconvenient accidents, but as borne out of calculated neglect and powered by economic incentives, or "necroeconomies," within which death is seized upon as a profitable commodity in itself (2018: 1149). Kris Manjapra and Beverley Skeggs discuss the turning of destruction or death into profit in order to produce new capitalist value; they call this "necrospeculation" (Manjapra 2019; Skeggs 2021). From the British Empire's insurance industries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which were legitimated by state law to assign a monetary value to the death of certain groups (a prime example being the insuring of enslaved peoples as property), to the "deprivation produced by austerity measures"—wherein histories of institutionalized racism, class, and gender lethally intersect to deprive populations of care and expose them to death in the interest of capital accumulation—necrospeculation reveals how the link between economic valuation and the hierarchical classification of personhood has been institutionalized in legal and financial systems. The logic of empire persists and operates by way of "purposeful disregard in one space to ensure [capital] accumulation elsewhere" (Skeggs 2021: 130). Understanding how human and non-human beings are similarly co-implicated in this necro-economic picture hinges on whether we are willing to understand "life" according to the anthropocentric and Eurocentric logics of earlier biopolitical discourses (Agamben, Esposito) or whether we broaden our definition to include the many forms of life that surround and support human life and are similarly exposed to death as we continue to evolve our bio- and necro-political considerations.



## Big-Tent Environmental Necropolitics

We are not the first to consider ecological or environmental necropolitics today. Meredith DeBoom, for instance, defines “climate necropolitics” as an approach aimed at “revealing the multiscalar processes, practices, discourses, and logics through which Anthropocenic imaginaries can be used to render extractive violence legitimate in the name of climate change response” (2021: 900). In other words, DeBoom focuses on cases where the sacrifice of populations is considered justified *in the name* of climate mitigation. This is a crucial but much narrower understanding of environmental necropolitics as we intend it here. Stambach and Kwayu similarly focus on necropolitical violence in the name of environmental sustainability, illustrating how individuals are “implicated in the political-legal regimes and technologies that dispossess them” and the “social devivification” that results: “the taking apart, piece by piece, of lifeways that integrate communities” (2021: 422, 424). We follow many thinkers who understand environmental necropolitics to entail not only *direct* violence but the *diffuse* fallout that results from prioritizing the life of the economy over the lives of living beings, and the resultant ecosystem destruction in pursuit of capitalist accumulation. The hardwiring of this profit logic is now so pervasive as to be quotidian. The normalization of destruction for the sake of what Julie Livingston (2019) calls “self-devouring growth” has outpaced and overcome the horror it necessitates. O’Sullivan et. al describe necropolitics in the era of climate change as directly imposed by sovereign power as well as indirectly permitted, where the death of some is viewed as an “acceptable sacrifice for maintaining capital accumulation” (2022: 330). And Tony Sandset argues that rather than a state of exception, we find ourselves in a normalized “state of chronic acceptance,” wherein we naturalize the fact that some will die and necropolitical zones will continue to be produced—a logic deepening amid the steady drip of climate-related fallout (2021: 1411-13). “Climate colonialism” is another framework used to identify what Farhana Sultana calls “the hauntings of colonialism and imperialism through climate impacts in the post-colony” (2022: 3). Climate change highlights, in other words, the colonial persistence that structures life. The need to address how environmental injustice connects to the structures of global governance, corporate enterprise, and geopolitical competition is therefore central to developing an operative environmental necropolitical framework, as climate precarity generates the conditions wherein the repeated neglect and disposal of life does not draw ire or rebuke but is written off as inevitable.

However, rather than inscribe any distinct motivation or agenda to environmental necropolitics writ large, which would replicate abstractive methodologies rather than illuminate case-based nuances—as, for instance, defining environmental or climate necropolitics as justified for the sake of climate change mitigation, which is only one species of environmental necropolitics—we are interested in enlarging our understanding of the complex features at play between state and global powers,



economic incentives, human necro-subjection, and ecological death in a way that does not overdetermine the directionality of these dynamics from the outset. Rather, it permits them to unfold by way of varied localized and geopolitical analyses, ultimately unveiling emergent dimensions not yet conceived or uncovered. Insisting on the integration of human- and non-human worlds should not foreclose parsing apart the particularities of death-worlds and the distinct ecosystems implicated therein. Recognizing multi-species co-dependency may direct a politics, it may democratize or expand one's ontological outlook, but to then refuse to make distinctions between how and which communities suffer differently (even if we understand their fates as bound) would be to reproduce the indistinction traditionally assigned to non-human species that such an ethics aims to resist. Human and non-human interchange is varied and scalar and can be phrased in ways that neither insist on species' unbroachable separation nor assumes what I have called the "rabid relationism" (Grimaldi 2021) of a vastly diverse biotic world—which tends to reduce a landscape of rich terrestrial profusion to some kind of indistinguishable relational goo, while overlooking the material persistence of rhetorical and ideological divisions and taxonomies used to justify the necropolitical projects that determine worthy and unworthy life. We thus find that, in many cases, ecological extraction or destruction for the sake of profit indirectly maximizes human subjection to necropolitical suffering. Or that the downstream effects of poor environmental legislation exposes communities, even those earmarked for flourishing and positive biopolitical oversight, to necropolitical injury. Or that environmental necropolitics has evolved differently in different locales throughout history, becoming not only a plight but an affirmed or legitimated ideology, a "necessary evil," or as John Thomure wonderfully illustrates in this issue, an *aesthetic* particular to a certain kind of colonial era that has nevertheless been thoughtfully and thoughtlessly reproduced into the present. And so on.

Work in environmental necropolitics attends to consequences for both human and non-human life in a balanced way, or else dwells specifically on the necropolitics of non-human life—not as ultimately disconnected from human necropolitical subjugation but as itself the focus of any given piece of scholarship. In this way, environmental necropolitics deviates from earlier necropolitical analyses that do not escape modern humanism's classificatory frameworks, those that read ecological death as an unfortunate but peripheral fallout from, a key contributor to, or a driver of the "major" problem of human suffering, which reinscribes the subordination of non-human to human life while withdrawing responsibility and attention from a range of lively systems beyond our own, which are not only necessary to prop up human survival, but are worthy of survival even when considered apart from what humans stand to gain from their endurance. We therefore advocate for multiple approaches and methodologies, a collection of inquiries, or what we might think of as big-tent



environmental necropolitics, assuming we peel away the paltry human politics typically informing such a phrase.

### Death-Worlds

I have made the case elsewhere in this journal's pages that political technologies operate on and unto death in variable and differential ways; there is therefore a continual diversification of forms of death available to us. To suffer due to systemic violence or disenfranchisement, even if it does not result in complete biological cessation, is to endure a concerted culture of death and death-making (Grimaldi 2022). There is the general, age-old woe of our inevitable, looming mortality—an anguish that has defined our species for millennia. The Romantic poet, John Keats, lived his life encircled by the death of his closest loved ones, and haunted by his own. Writing two years before his death from consumption at the age of 25, he reflects on the melancholy that accompanies death, calling it the “wakeful anguish of the soul,” not to be resisted but embraced as a vast, intractable species of sorrow that lends meaning to life. Human life dwells in the shadow of death, just like “a morning rose, /... the rainbow of the salt sand-wave, /... the wealth of globed peonies,” destined to exhaust. (“Ode on Melancholy,” 1819). But beyond the abstracted fear of death, of life’s “[b]eauty that must die,” opined by Keats as a sweet-sad suffering bound up with the beauty and peril of the mortal condition, there is also the way the systematic threat of politicized, premature death—due to poverty, war, the privation of life-sustaining services, state-sanctioned violence, disease, and so forth—haunts life, contorts and directs life, much like Scott and Sloman’s fish populations whose exposure to sustained environmental pressures constitutes “severe implications for survival” (2004: 370).

Lisa Robertson, in her study of Inuit communities in the Canadian Arctic, argues that survival is linked to escape. We can think of this escape broadly as the escape from death, or more variably as the escape from death-making power as distributed through punitive political and economic systems. She reminds us that “survival and the possibility of community entail a sustained relationship with the death of [others]” (2012: 594). Survival is connected, in other words, not merely to living but to *outliving* others; it implicates death by exclusion and therefore carries with it the dead who have been foreclosed from future flourishing while the lives of others fold out beyond them. In this way, we tend to think of “survival” as a more toilsome or reduced form of life, an endangered or subjected form of life, a life of uncertain futures. This calls to mind Giorgio Agamben, who famously introduced the concept of “bare life.” In the context of bio- and necro-political exposure, “bare life” refers to life stripped of political status and reduced to biological life alone, which can be then exposed to state-sanctioned violence and death with impunity, without concern regarding the quality of life lived or the forms of life available to that life (Agamben 1998). I have argued that if the production of “bare



life” (which constitutes “the foundational political event of modernity”<sup>1</sup>) is the action of sovereignty (Agamben 1998: 83), then the foreclosure of *bare death*<sup>2</sup> is also the action of sovereign power. Bare death refers to a condition prior to the foundation of modern sovereignty, a time when death was organized more by the deprivations and needs of the anatomical body (albeit socially construed) than by the bio- and necro-political technologies inflicted upon that body. As soon as subjectifying governing power can “work on the body”—that is, direct energy or resources toward slowing or expediting death—death is no longer a purely biological phenomenon. Death is political, and bare death (that is, pre- or non-politicized death) exists only as a negative or limiting term against which to consider the contemporary motley of deaths, death-worlds, and death-formations available to us. Necropolitics invites us to think extreme deviations from bare death—death as a weapon that not only objectifies life but survives (i.e. acts beyond) biological death and so punishes both the living and the dead. This presents an important challenge to Foucault’s claim that death is the limit of biopower, that death “is beyond the reach of power” (2003: 248), since power works in, on, and beyond death: it works on the dead, on the corpses defiled or disappeared in death, on the community that survives the death of others, and in the persistent death-making inflicted on the living.

Death-worlds, in other words, are not only brought about by fast and slow methods of material infliction (of pain, physical suffering, toxic suffusion, biological death) but entail networks of immaterial subjugation (psychological terror, neglect, the absence or limiting of choice, the structural foreclosure of life-sustaining activity, etc.) and ideological implements that rationalize and naturalize the extirpation of particular life-worlds. Death-worlds are lived in and through each day; they are both survived and not survived. And yet, *the resilience and continuance of life is not synonymous with human survival but exceeds and may even preclude it*. This observation shapes and undergirds this journal issue. Non-human life is equally imperilled by necropolitical implements of power. This means that *homo sacer*, the one who can be killed but not sacrificed (as their ejection from the human community bars them even from sacrificial status) is not limited to the human figures Agamben enumerates—the bandit, the outlaw, the criminal, the blasphemer, the detainee, the refugee (1998). *Homo sacer* is also the Amazon Rainforest, the trawled ocean floor, quadrillions of livestock animals, the Aral Sea, the Great Barrier Reef, the Congo Basin, the Tallgrass Prairies, and their many vanished inhabitants—all easily reducible to bare life and all equally alienated from bare death.

---

<sup>1</sup> The foundational political event of modernity, more precisely, is when *zoē* (the sheer biological fact of life common to all beings and distinguished from *bios*, politicized or qualified life) enters into the political sphere to become bare life.

<sup>2</sup> Bare death is still relational and not trans-historical: bare death is included by exclusion, operable today in the way that *zoē* is arguably unattainable but still theoretically functional as a concept from which we understand forms of *bios* (or politicized life) to deviate. See Grimaldi (2022).



## Contributors

The issue welcomed any number of responses to the above concerns, and the eclectic authors showcased here fruitfully approach the question of necropower and environment from disparate vantage points. While we should not assume that the eight articles represented here settle the matter, they do make a strong case for the rich expansion of necropolitical theory as applied to questions of environment, non-human death, and climatological strife, while retaining a deep concern with the human populations suffering under necropolitical regimes of various stripes (and similarly impacted by the ecological death visited upon the non-human systems within which they are entrenched).

John Thomure's "American Necroecology" focuses on the period of neoimperialist colonial expansion of the late-nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century in the United States in particular. The article attends to the era's expansionist spirit, neatly encapsulated by the still-ubiquitous neoclassical sculptures of James Earle Fraser. Exploring the subversive work of Luiseño artist James Luna and his parodic response to Fraser, Thomure deconstructs the "necroecological aesthetic" and colonial gaze that pervades American art of Fraser's period, laying bare the fantasy of righteous colonial expansion and the myth of extinction; the kitschification of Indigenous identity; and the invisibilization of the violent oppression inflicted upon Indigenous peoples and lands. Concluding that colonial ecology is intrinsically necropolitical, as in "inherently oriented towards death," Thomure exhibits how the necroecological aesthetic of this period "treats Indigenous people and land as one," making both interior to the industrial-expansionist ideology that sees the integrity of both as expendable or inherently violable.

Considering ecological decline in Africa as similarly tied to colonial and neocolonial practices, Tem Edwin Nji dwells on ecological violence in the form of rampant deforestation in Cameroon. Unpacking the theoretical, social, and (geo)political stakes of deforestation and its deleterious downstream impacts, Nji considers the connection "between depleting forest spaces and overcrowding in urban spaces"—or what he calls the "necrocity," characterized by the "slum existence that largely defines the lives of the urban poor"—illustrating the link between colonial extractivism and the logic of production that plagues industrial capitalism, resulting in the making of death-worlds in or near extraction sites. The piece close reads Anglophone Cameroonian poet John Ngong Kum Ngong's work *Blot on the Landscape* (2015), which documents deforestation's far-reaching effects on abiotic and biotic environments and explores the imbrication of the human and nature, exhibiting how necropolitics and ecological decline intersect "as radiated through the poetic medium."



Manu Bazzano's piece considers the necropolitical machinations at the heart of contemporary neoliberalism, arguing that the naturalized political and social agenda of the latter is determinative of who lives and dies in our contemporary era. Targeting the wealth-lords of global capitalism, Bazzano attends to how recent socio-political and ecological developments (deregulation, exacerbated inequality, climate change) have reoriented the attitudes of ruling elites. Provocatively juxtaposing the implosion of the OceanGate *Titan* submersible with the 1912 sinking of the *Titanic*, the spate of private investment in space exploration and settlement, and the burgeoning field of "existential risk studies" (ERS), the article exemplifies how the ultra-wealthy have divested from human futures *on* the earth by planning their escape *from* the earth. The survivalist missions of the ultra-wealthy, argues Bazzano, are giving way to more extreme, hubris-inflected, suicidal undertakings as these individuals attempt to assert power despite being in the throes of the planetary demise that their industries have helped to inaugurate.

Next, Arón Montenegro analyzes the layered and intersecting necropolitical dynamics in a case study of Honduras's northern coast. Honduras was a site of early colonial mining and late colonial timber extraction. In the banana republic era of the late-nineteenth century, the north Honduran coast became monopolized plantation land controlled by U.S. companies like Standard Fruit Company and United Fruit Company in cahoots with local elites, working in tandem to suppress local resistance. More recently, the expansion of palm oil plantations in the mid-to-late twentieth century has made palm oil production a leading extractive industry in the region, and a violent vector for forced land grabs and evictions, which disproportionately affect Indigenous and Garífuna communities. For centuries, Honduras has been caught in the crossfire of colonial appropriation and cutthroat capitalist enterprise in a region bolstered by militaristic, security, and paramilitary forces protecting industry over people. Environmental activists, land defenders, and fieldworker unions/cooperatives live under the frequent threat of murder and dispossession. Highlighting foreign interference in the region, Montenegro paints a robust picture of how Honduras has been penetrated by long-time transnational corporate interests that continue the violent legacy of racial conquest and oligarchic plunder, which is inextricable from questions of land ownership and use. Generating insights applicable not only to Honduras but to extractivist enterprise writ large, we observe how relegating both human lives and living land to murderous practices devalues, depreciates, and destroys both for the sake of enriching an elect and often offshore few.

Reminding us that "environments" are not only forests and fields, aquatic basins and mountains—but also homes, hotels, office buildings, restaurants, shops, factories, and countless other built environments that are co-produced with the "natural world"—James Reath's article can only be described, not unlike the materials it discusses, as a



funky, rhythmic, combinatorial, heterodoxic playscape attesting to a particular chemico-molecular aesthetic of the late-twentieth century avant-garde. Attending to the suffusion of carcinogens, toxins, and other synthetic chemicals that saturate the physical and aesthetic universe of the 1990s, Reath considers how chemical atmospheres inform and infect aesthetic worlds by attending to a medley of art objects from the era (sculptures, poems, plays, LPs, novels, theory-fictions). Moving between different chemical regimes, Reath addresses micro-molecular toxicity and the invisible hazards of everyday synthetic material commodities as well as large-scale chemical outputs tied to product industries and late-industrial production processes. Tracing the profusion of molecular chemical spheres or “chemospheres” lays bare how amorphous necrochemical exposures infiltrate middle-class society while disproportionately impacting peripheralized, low-income, and racialized communities. However, Reath importantly insists on the ambivalent nature of the molecular-as-medium—the fact that necrochemical exposures can be lethal, while intimate “pharmacopornographic infrastructures function[ing]... through a *soft* arsenal of gels, lubricants, creams, silicone sex toys, and synthetic drugs” can also be a vibrant medium for both sexual agency and political resistance. Following Paul B. Preciado’s discussion of the “pharmacopornographic era,” the mid-twentieth century convergence of pharmacology and pornography that gives way to new forms of biopolitical control acting on sexuality, the body, and subjectivity, we are encouraged to consider how “power acts through molecules” in the late-twentieth century (Preciado 2013: 78). By dwelling on the subjective, interpersonal, low-level, invisibilized, embodied, domestic, and intimate spaces wherein necropolitical arrangements persist but are often overlooked, the article exhibits how chemical infrastructures and environments both “enable new possibilities for ‘molecular revolution’” while also producing “new societies of necropolitical control.”

Tristan Burke takes us to another pivotal moment in history, to England during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century, in the midst of the first Industrial Revolution, when artist and poet William Blake was penning and illustrating *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (1790-3) and his Continental Prophecies series (1793-5). Rethinking Blake’s relevance to questions of contemporary ecocriticism as well as necropolitical theory (including questions of sovereign power, colonialism, ecological degradation, the systemization of nature, and possibilities for resistance), Burke argues for Blake’s status as a nuanced and prescient ecological thinker that recognized, *avant la lettre*, the “necropolitical organization of the environment [as] directly linked... to colonial war, slavery, and Indigenous genocide.” Against critical misconceptions about Blake’s status as a (pre-)Romantic figure harboring an idealist outlook and an anthropocentric hostility toward nature, the article traces Blake’s visionary awareness that biological warfare, disease, and agricultural destruction are part and parcel of the “instrumentalization of nature” that tries to produce nature as knowable while





furthering the aims of necropolitical tyranny bent on ordering agricultural and human life.

After becoming familiarized with the environmental necropolitical landscape as viewed by the featured contributors, Jacob Vangeest provides a high-level theoretical analysis, challenging prominent ontological discourses (many of which are connected to the contemporary “ecological turn” in continental philosophy informing this issue). Deftly navigating dense theoretical terrain and providing an “oblique” analysis—one that “refus[es] to assume the sufficiency of the engaged”—the article focuses on feminist philosopher and physicist Karen Barad’s influential ontology, which stresses “intra-action” or “entanglement,” a primordial ontological condition that understands entities not as pre-existing their interactions but as constituted through their relationships. By way of detours through Black studies and Afro-pessimist scholarship, Vangeest illustrates how Barad’s attempt to promote a relational ethico-onto-epistemology founded on “nonrepresentational methodological approaches” (Barad 2007: 88) stressing relationality rather than passive forms of (often violent) observation, ends up reproducing representational modalities prevalent in humanist projects of yore. Barad ultimately relies on an ethical imperative to promote their intra-active ethics, argues Vangeest, thus returning to “the purview of rationality, recognition, and representation.” Necropolitical considerations inevitably follow, since, if one concedes entanglement as ontologically given, entanglement constitutes the structure of exclusion, becoming the foundation for, rather than a way to dismantle or circumvent, the necropolitical relations of domination that flow from it (namely the exclusion, fungibility, and dispossession of Black life, with which a number of critical posthumanist discourses fail to sufficiently grapple).

Keith Morrison’s similarly ambitious theoretical article inventively brings together Samoan and Aotearoa Māori cultural traditions, anticipatory systems theory, and insights from continental philosophy to investigate the deep connection between environmental and social decline in the South Pacific, as well as strategies among Pacific peoples working to repair and revitalize both the land and the local communities who care for it. Illustrating how environmental degradation is tied to coloniality and capitalism as well as being a powerful determinant of physical, mental, spiritual, and community health, Morrison meaningfully extends the necropolitical literature to consider necropower as inflected by South Pacific communities’ distinct exposure to social, political, and ecological violence. Highlighting vibrant resistance factions led by “Indigenous communities, children, teenagers, the rainbow community, and the neurologically diverse,” the article ultimately works to provoke a paradigm shift regarding how to understand holistic well-being, community, and resilience in an era of environmental turbulence that contests and rethinks privileged, Western formulations.



## A Note on the Anthropocene

In some respects, this issue is a project loosely gathered beneath the dreaded and much-debated moniker, “The Anthropocene”—a tractor-term in a slag-heap that has been tasked with symbolic and material labor no quadrisyllabic semiological construct should be expected to support—that is, it serves as an overarching diagnostic meant to assign blame to a particular species (the human one) for the irreversible and immeasurable recalibration of earth’s complex systems now hurtling us toward an epoch of ills. The term presupposes that this fate might have been avoided had we not exercised such a degradative influence on the planet whose relative “stability” we have long enjoyed, such that we have sown the seeds for inhabitability (not the planet’s itself, which is more inhabited than inhabiting, but the inhabitability, at least, of the planet *as it is for us* and countless other terrestrial life-forms). Alas. Insofar as the Anthropocene as both designation and discourse is an inevitable fact of our late global-techno-capitalist milieu, and insofar as it has prompted much kindred literature that informs and shall be informed by this issue, it is undeniably relevant to the tenor, tone, and topicality of the issue at hand.

To settle the matter, let us simply say that built into an eco-necropolitical vantage point is the awareness that human populations contribute unequally to climate depreciation, suffer the consequences incommensurately, and are subjected diversely to climate-related death as directed or overseen by lethal governing powers. The apportionment of blame is in no way an insignificant enterprise, as it has become one of the only viable political paths to calculating the monetary cost owed by historically high-emitting nations as reparations and to provide climate mitigation and adaptation funds to developing nations most impacted by climate fallout (as remediated by the U.N., particularly through the Loss and Damage Fund founded in 2022 at COP27). However, this issue is concerned with the centrality of the politics of death to the histories, geologies, and aesthetics of imminent ecological decline, and is less interested in legislating the value of the Anthropocene as descriptor or category. Dissatisfaction with the term has already been sufficiently exhibited by its splintering into countless new neologisms<sup>3</sup> posited to shift the emphasis from the Anthropocene as itself an unparsable and painfully abstracted “hyperobject” (Morton 2010) to the myriad critical sites that invaluably illustrate the geo-political, racial, gendered, and class dynamics concealed under the Anthropocene banner. Such discourses illuminate the often-invisibilized horizons of human necro-subjection, which we here hope to connect more directly to the ecological violence inherent in anthropogenic climate depreciation. The stories of forced animal extinction, overconsumption, and ecocide must be included as we think

---

<sup>3</sup> Such as “Capitalocene” (Moore 2013); “Econocene” (Norgaard 2013); “#Misanthropocene” (Clover and Spahr 2014); “Chthulucene” (Haraway 2015); “Technocene” (Sloterdijk 2015); “Plantationocene” (Haraway 2015); “Anthrobscene” (Parikka 2014); “Necrocene” (McBrien 2016); “Anthropo-obscene” (Swyngedouw and Ernston 2018).



practically about climate reparations and envision a shared public beyond an exclusively human public.

### **Futural Speculations**

While not considered in a sustained way in this issue, some thinkers have ventured even further along the anti-anthropocentric spectrum to consider environmental calamity, annihilation, extinction, and resurgence prior to the human. This frontier of study should not be overlooked. Political scientist Jairus Grove, for instance, discusses environmental apocalypse in terms of large-scale extinction events that populate both planetary as well as human history. In his book *Savage Ecology* (2018), Grove documents various apocalypses, including those that precede human history, such as the “oxygen apocalypse” roughly two billion years ago; the Great Dying at the end of the Permian era (earth’s most severe extinction event to date, which resulted in the extinction of over 90% percent of marine species and 70% of terrestrial vertebrates); and the hominid apocalypse 30,000 years ago when Neanderthals and Denisovans were wiped from the planet. Grove’s effort to contextualize and de-sensationalize apocalyptic emergence is an attempt to turn us from an anthropocentric vision of human demise and toward a multi-speciated understanding of life and death as it has unfolded throughout earth’s long history. The history of humans-as-species carries alongside baffling geological and cosmological timescales that precede and exceed the human. While vast permutations in environmental stability and the resultant death cannot be lumped under the banner of modern “necropolitics” (a wildly recent human-historical development relative to deep time and the over 4.5 billion years of our planetary history), the appeals to the evolution of and fluctuations in “natural systems” (both ecological and economic) have nevertheless long been invoked to justify both the continued exploitation of human populations as well as the continual degradation of the planet (climate change denialism being a chief example). Necropolitical investigations, temporally limited as they are to modernity and beyond, can never sufficiently exhaust questions of life and death on this uncanny terrestrial orb, as life-worlds and death-worlds must also be considered from the perspective of geological time—an expansive perspective that thinks the pre-human, recontextualizes escalating human impacts on the environment over millions of years, and even imagines a world that may persist past the human epoch.

Questions regarding ecological decline are thus complicated greatly when set alongside questions of scale. Questions of scale are also relevant to how we tackle climate change mitigation efforts and at what level, which conservational efforts we prioritize, how we institute global climate goals, and to what extent we experience affective eco-dread in the face of climatological collapse. From toxic microplastics found in breast milk and concentrated in aquatic creatures to hazardous airborne pollutants, environmental damage is precipitating lethal conditions and, alongside it, micro- and



macro-anxieties. And yet, keeping abreast a non-anthropocentric outlook considerate of deep time better grounds our necropolitical investigations (especially those attentive to nonhuman species), as it cultivates an awareness of non- and pre-human ecologies as well as the protracted evolution of terrestrial life. Eco-necropolitics thus operates by way of a *parallax view*, which keeps abreast ecological transformation from the perspective of geological time as well as what Lucas Bessire calls “the lived intimacies of decline” (2021: 177)—the particularities of suffering felt by climate-affected populations today.

Some final remarks on a de-humanized perspective that might reach not only into the pre-human past but into the post-human future. Setting aside the cause of future climatic collapse, its effects may be such that we are similarly unmoored from the traditional bio- or necro-political paradigm that has accompanied us at least since modernity. There is a loosening ability of human societies to manage the effects of acute climate change in ways that align with the deeply grooved channels of power as wrought and policed in our contemporary era. Environmental calamity is an unruly fact of our current moment that cannot be wholly tamped down by the incisive levers of human organization or innovation, even if it has been powerfully influenced by them. Is it the case that environmental production will have ramifications so torrential and ungovernable that it begins to short circuit the imperatives of social and economic production? If so, what will be the impacts on sovereign power as working through the channels of bio- and necro-power? It is likely that necropolitical violence would, in light of such developments, radically intensify, at least at first. Wainwright and Mann speculate that we are entering a moment of planetary sovereignty—where climate disaster will escalate to the degree that a collection of hyper-powers will determine the measures taken and the sacrifices made “in the name of preserving life on Earth” (2018: 15). In other words, biopolitics and necropolitics as usual, but with a globalized state of exception and the exercise of complete sovereign authority under the banner of environmental protection for all. But if we are already beyond the scope of correction or endurance, what then? Does the world await an age where not only necropolitical machinations but human affairs are altogether ejected (to space, perhaps) or else disappeared? Will we live to witness our species’ sudden or steady disappearance? Should we, as Grove suggests, make an earnest project of understanding our slow demise in a way that acknowledges the shared fragility of both humans and our age-old terrestrial world by preparing for our “slow” and “sober” apocalypse, one that practically readies us for our perishing (2018: 280)?

I have elsewhere made the positive case for harboring an eco-apocalyptic imaginary, a suggestion that tends to affront both commonplace and scholarly sensibilities (Grimaldi 2024). While I will withhold my extensive rationale for a more expansive forum, it is not clear to me that climate realism framed by way of apocalyptic rhetoric



and the rejection of environmental optimism necessitates the sublation of positive revolutionary action seeking to dismantle ecologically destructive technologies, policies, and incentives for the sake of ecological well-being. We can hold our myriad and pending deaths close, even as we attempt to imagine, enliven, and embody sunnier ulterior endings. The contributors in this issue do just this: they take stock of necropolitical vortices while powerfully gesturing to actionable ways forward, highlighting ecosystems' resilience and resistance—the powerful persistence of life in the throes of death.

## Conclusion

This introduction has offered a loose bouquet of thoughts, rather than a single bloom. Though gesturing at points beyond the scope of this issue and toward potential future avenues for eco-necropolitical investigations, the central objective of this issue is to test the durability, pliability, and reach of existing necropolitical frameworks when applied to acute environmental pressures hastened by capitalogenic activity and the resulting climate distress being experienced today. It also fosters connections between the land and its diverse dwellers, their mutual imbrication in lively systems of co-dependency and resilience as well as systems of degradation and endangerment as hastened by political and economic systems in particular. Since the logic of sacrifice pervades not only human relations but indexes the historical treatment of non-human species and ecosystems, we ask whether necropolitics can be thought beyond its habitual anthropocentrism to consider the unique politics of death encapsulating animal genocide, ecocide, mass deforestation, aquatic depreciation, and so on.

## Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Hellen Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Alaimo, Stacy (2010). *Bodily Natures: Science, Environment, and the Material Self*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby (2008). "Necrocapitalism." *Organization Studies* 29.12: 1541-1563.
- Barad, Karen (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bercito, Diogo (2020). "'The Pandemic Democratizes the Power to Kill': An Interview with Achille Mbembe." *European Journal of Psychoanalysis*. <<https://www.journalpsychoanalysis.eu/the-pandemic-democratizes-the-power-to-kill-an-intyerview/>>. [accessed 05 Dec. 2021]
- Berlant, Lauren (2007). "Slow Death (Sovereignty, Obesity, Lateral Agency)." *Critical Inquiry* 33.4: 754-780.



- Bessire, Lucas (2021). *Running Out: In Search of Water on the High Plains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Capra, Fritjof (1996). *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Chen, Mel Y. (2012). *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Clover, Joshua, and Juliana Spahr (2014). *#Misanthropocene: 24 Theses*. Oakland, CA: Commune Editions.
- Coccia, Emanuele (2018). *The Life of Plants: A Metaphysics of Mixture*. Trans. Dylan J. Montanari. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Collard, Rosemary-Claire (2018). "Disaster Capitalism and the Quick, Quick, Slow Unravelling of Animal Life." *Antipode* 50.4: 910-928.
- Davies, Thom (2018). "Toxic Space and Time: Slow Violence, Necropolitics, and Petrochemical Pollution." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108.6:
- DeBoom, Meredith J. (2021). "Climate Necropolitics: Ecological Civilization and the Distributive Geographies of Extractive Violence in the Anthropocene." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 111.3: 900-912.
- Esposito, Roberto (2008). *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Trans. Timothy Campbell. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Ferdinand, Malcom (2022). *Decolonial Ecology: Thinking from the Caribbean World*. Trans. Ashley J. Clark. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Foucault, Michel (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2003). *Society Must Be Defended*. Trans. David Macey. New York: Picador.
- Grimaldi, Nicole (2024). "In Defense of an Eco-Apocalyptic Imaginary." *Unredeemable Worlds: Environmentalism Beyond Salvation* 05 Mar. Seminar Presentation. Montréal: American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA).
- (2022). "Bare & Myriadic Death: Necro-Subjection and the Pandemic Era." *Coils of the Serpent: Journal for the Study of Contemporary Power* 10: 1-33.
- (2021). "Othering Ecology." *Alienocene: Journal of the First Outernational* 9: 1-18.
- Grove, Jairus Victor (2018). *Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics at the End of the World*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Haraway, Donna (1988). "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14.3: 575-599.
- (2015). "Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin." *Environmental Humanities* 6.1: 159-165.
- (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.



- Harman, Graham (2002). *Tool-Being: Heidegger and the Metaphysics of Objects*. Peru, IL: Open Court.
- Haskaj, Fatmir (2018). "From Biopower to Necroeconomies: Neoliberalism, Biopower and Death Economies." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 44.10: 1148-1168.
- Jackson, Zakiyyah Iman. *Becoming Human: Matter and Meaning in an Antiracist World*. New York: New York University Press.
- Keats, John (1900). "Ode on Melancholy (1819)." *The Complete Poetical Works of John Keats*. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 220.
- Kirksey, Eben (2015). *Emergent Ecologies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kohn, Eduardo (2013). *How Forests Think: Toward an Anthropology Beyond the Human*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Latour, Bruno (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Liboiron, Max (2021). *Pollution Is Colonialism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Livingston, Julie (2019). *Self-Devouring Growth: A Planetary Parable as Told from Southern Africa*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Manjapra, Kris (2019). "Necrospeculation: Postemancipation Finance and Black Redress." *Social Text* 37.2: 29-65.
- Mbembe, Achille (2003). "Necropolitics." Trans. Libby Meintjes. *Public Culture* 15.1: 11-40.
- (2019). *Necropolitics*. Trans. Steven Corcoran. Durham: Duke University Press.
- McBrien, Justin (2016). "Accumulating Extinction: Planetary Catastrophism in the Necrocene." *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism*. Ed. Jason W. Moore. New York: PM Press, 116-137.
- Montag, Warren (2005). "Necro-economics: Adam Smith and Death in the Life of the Universal." *Radical Philosophy* 134: 7-17.
- Moore, Jason W (2015). *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. London: Verso Books.
- (2016). "Name the System! Anthropocenes & the Capitalocene Alternative." <[https://jasonwmoore.wordpress.com/2016/10/09/name-the-system-anthropocenes-the-capitalocene-alternative/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://jasonwmoore.wordpress.com/2016/10/09/name-the-system-anthropocenes-the-capitalocene-alternative/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)>. [accessed 20 Dec. 2024]
- (2017) "The Capitalocene, Part I: On the Nature and Origins of our Ecological Crisis." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44.3: 594-630.
- Morton, Timothy (2013). *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nixon, Rob (2011). *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Norgaard, Richard B. (2013). "The Econocene and the California Delta." *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science* 11.3: 1-5.



- O'Sullivan, Aidan, Jessica Omukuti, and Stacia S. Ryder (2022). "Global Surpluses of Extraction and Slow Climate Violence: A Sociological Framework." *Sociological Inquiry* 93.2: 320-340.
- Parikka, Jussi (2014). *The Anthroscene*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Preciado, Paul B. (2013). *Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era*. Trans. Bruce Benderson. New York: The Feminist Press.
- Puar, Jasbir (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Robertson, Lisa (2012). "The Psychic Life of Biopolitics: Survival, Cooperation, and Inuit Community." *American Ethnologist* 39.3: 592-613.
- Rosas, Gilberto (2019). "Necro-Subjection: On Borders, Asylum, and Making Dead to Let Live." *Theory & Event* 22: 303-324.
- Rose, Deborah Bird (2011). *Wild Dog Dreaming: Love and Extinction*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Salvage Collective, The (2021). *The Tragedy of the Worker: Towards the Proletarocene*. London: Verso.
- Sandset, Tony (2021). "The Necropolitics of COVID-19: Race, Class and Slow Death in an Ongoing Pandemic." *Global Public Health* 16.8-9: 1411-1423.
- Scott, Graham and Katherine Sloman (2004). "The effects of environmental pollutants on complex fish behaviour: integrating behavioural and physiological indicators of toxicity." *Aquatic Toxicology* 68.4: 369-392.
- Shapiro, Nicholas (2015). "Attuning to the Chemosphere: Domestic Formaldehyde, Bodily Reasoning, and the Chemical Sublime." *Cultural Anthropology* 30.3: 368-393.
- Sheldrake, Merlin (2020). *Entangled Life: How Fungi Make Our Worlds, Change Our Minds, and Shape Our Futures*. New York: Random House.
- Skeggs, Beverley (2021). "Necroeconomics: How Necro Legacies Help Us Understand the Value of Death and the Protection of Life During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Historical Social Research* 46.4: 123-142.
- Sloterdijk, Peter (2015). "The Anthropocene: A Process-State at the Edge of Geohistory?" Trans. Anna Sophia Springer. *Art in the Anthropocene: Encounters Among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments and Epistemologies*. Ed. Heather Davis and Etienne Turpin. London: Open Humanities Press, 327-339.
- Stambach, Amy Elizabeth and Aikande Clement Kwayu (2021). "Witness to a Passing: The Silent Death of Local Water Management and the Quiet Hand of Government." *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 11.2: 412-427.
- Street, Paul (2016). "How to Stop Capitalism's Deadly War with Nature." *Truthdig* 14 Sep.: 1. <<https://www.truthdig.com/articles/how-to-stop-capitalisms-deadly-war-with-nature/>>. [accessed 28 Dec. 2024]
- Sultana, Farhana (2022). "The Unbearable Heaviness of Climate Coloniality." *Political Geography* 99: 1-14.





- Swyngedouw, Erik and Henrik Ernstson (2018). *Urban Political Ecology in the Anthropo-Obscene: Interruptions and Possibilities*. London: Routledge.
- Todd, Zoe (2018). "Refracting the State Through Human-Fish Relations: Fishing, Indigenous Legal Orders and Colonialism in North/Western Canada." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 7.1: 60-75.
- Tsing, Anna (2015). *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.
- van Dooren, Thom (2014). *Flight Ways: Life and Loss at the Edge of Extinction*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo (1998). "Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism." *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia* 4.1: 115-144.
- Wainwright, Joel and Geoff Mann (2018). *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future*. New York: Verso.
- Weheliye, Alexander G. (2014). *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wolfe, Cary (2010). *What is Posthumanism?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.