**Notes for Lecture on Environmentalism and Anti-Racist Practice (Lent 2021)**

**Introduction**

In this lecture, we will focus on the topic of environmentalism and anti-racist practice. The lecture will be structured around two main questions, in relation to a host of core readings on the subject. The questions are:

1. How are racism and the Anthropocene related? and
2. What is the relationship between struggles for environmental justice and the struggle for decolonization?

The core readings which we will review in order to bring these questions into focus include Laura Pulido’s 2018 chapter, “Racism and the Anthropocene;” Françoise Vergès’s 2017 chapter, “Racial Capitalocene. Is the Anthropocene Racial?;” Nancy Tuana’s 2019 article, “Climate Apartheid. The Forgetting of Race in the Anthropocene;” Zoe Todd’s 2015 essay, “Indigenizing the Anthropocene;” Linda Álvarez and Brendan Coolsaet’s 2020 article, “Decolonizing Environmental Justice: A Latin American Perspective;” Nick Estes chapter “Liberation,” from his 2019 book, *Our History is the Future. Standing Rock versus Dakota Access Pipeline and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*; and Nnimno Bassey’s 2018 chapter, “The Climate Crisis and the Struggle for African Food Sovereignty.”

**Racism and the Anthropocene**

Laura Pulido begins her incisive 2018 chapter, “Racism and the Anthropocene,” by observing that “[a]lthough there have been heated debates on who, what, and where has caused the Anthropocene, there has been relative silence on the question of race” (p.116). She admits that occasionally the matter of disparities in terms of causes and consequences of climate change does come up, but nevertheless insists that on such occasions, the emphasis tends to be on “the chasm between rich and poor, or ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries, as if the geography of wealth and power was somehow non-racial” (p.116). She further argues that though “almost all leftists acknowledge the unevenness of the Anthropocene, regularly citing colonialism, racism, and gender as important factors contributing to differential vulnerability, they usually treat racism as ancillary to capitalism” (p.117).

In the chapter, Pulido seeks to counter such silence, indifference, evasion, or downgrading of the role of race in the Anthropocene. According to Pulido, not only does “[a]bundant research indicate that … many environmental hazards follow along racial lines, but also many of the meta-processes that have contributed to the Anthropocene, such as industrialization, urbanization, and capitalism, are racialized.” Consequently, she contends, “the Anthropocene must be seen as a racial process” (p.117).

To make the case, Pulido seeks to highlight “the evidence of racially uneven vulnerability and death; the form of racism at work; our general inability to acknowledge it; and the importance of history in coming to terms with the racial dimensions of the Anthropocene” (p.117).

In terms of racially uneven vulnerability and death, Pulido insists, the evidence is legion. Moreover, she goes on to argue that such “racially uneven geography of death from the Anthropocene should be understood as a contemporary form of primitive accumulation” (p.117).

Pulido contends that “when we look at who will pay the greatest cost, in terms of their lives, livelihoods, and well- being, it is overwhelmingly, to borrow a recently revived term from Vijay Prashad, the ‘darker nations’” (p.117). While the “differential vulnerability in terms of the haves and the have-nots is acknowledged by many,” she insists, “the role of racism is generally overlooked” (p.118). But the facts are clear: “it is overwhelmingly places occupied primarily by nonwhite peoples that will pay the highest price for global warming: death” (p.118). What’s more, “[e]ven within the wealthy parts of the world, the spatial distribution of risk, vulnerability, and death follows along pre-existing lines of racial inequality” (p.118).

Pulido emphasises as well the indigenous dimension of this question. She contends: “Disproportionate vulnerability can also be seen in indigenous communities, which are increasingly being called ‘frontline communities’” (p.119). Furthermore, she continues: “[s]cholars such as Kyle Powys Whyte (2017) have argued that indigenous people are already living in dystopia, if one considers the ecological and social devastation of colonization, and that global warming is a continuation of a centuries- long apocalypse” (pp.119-120). She argues: “indigenous communities and their allies are engaged in intense battles across the Américas, from Canada to Peru. These communities not only wish to protect their lands, some of which are sacred, but also realize that continuing to extract and transport fossil fuels will place their communities and the entire planet in a more precarious position” (p.120).

We will come back to this indigenous dimension later, especially in relation to Nick Estes’ work. But for now, let us focus on explicating Pulido’s line of argument. She continues by noting that “global leaders are well aware of the racial geography of the Anthropocene and have chosen not to act” (p.120). To this end, she recounts events that occurred “[a]t the close of the United Nations climate summit in Copenhagen in December 2009,” when “governments agreed to a global temperature increase of two degree Celsius. It was thought that two degrees would prevent global catastrophe. However, it was fully understood that two degrees would eliminate some island states and be absolutely disastrous for much of Africa. This is key: knowingly allowing large swaths of nonwhite, mostly poor people to die” (p.120). She therefore poses the question: “Given that our global leaders have condemned millions of people to death, we have to ask ‘why’? How are we able to make such a decision?” (p.120).

The answer, according to Pulido, is “a particular form of widespread contemporary racism, indifference” (p.118). Indeed, she insists, it is “indifference that characterizes the attitudes, practices, and policy positions of much of the Global North toward those destined to die” (p.121). Such indifference, she insists, qualifies as a form of racism. In this respect, she follows the definition of racism famously advanced by Ruth Wilson Gilmore, who argues that racism is best conceived as “exploitation of group differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death in distinct yet densely interconnected political geographies” (2007, 28). Given such a definition, Pulido contends, “while more than indifference was needed to create the conditions that produced such racially differentiated vulnerability, it is maintained by indifference” (p.121).

One of the main challenges to seeing race in the Anthropocene, Pulido maintains, is the excessively narrow definition of racism espoused by many. Pulido writes: “in much of the world conceptions of racism have been constricted in order to minimize its perceived impact” (p.123). Particularly insidious in this regard is the role of state-promoted anti-racisms, whose power, Pulido contends, following Jodi Melamed, “lies in their ability to convince the general population that meaningful racial progress is being made, while simultaneously masking the violence of the contemporary racial order— which is precisely what is happening in the Anthropocene” (p.124).

Alongside this problem of racial denialism, there is the problem of ahistoricism. According to Pulido: “Those who wish to avoid grappling with the legacies of previous racial formations, especially those based on more overt forms of white supremacy and violence, are deeply invested in ahistoricism” (p.123). However, “one silver lining” of the Anthropocene discourse, which Pulido contends is “less a geological epoch than it is a story,” is that “it forces us to reckon with history” (p.124).

Pulido focuses in on a date proposed by Lewis and Maslin to mark the beginning of the Anthropocene – the year 1610. This is a year that witnessed both “transcontinental range expansion [among food species] and a decline in carbon emissions” (p.124). The latter of these “was due to massive death in the Américas” (p.125). “And though they never mention it,” Pulido adds, “racism is a crucial feature of the events of 1610” (p.125).

Even if “[c]ontemporary Indigenous studies scholars, such as Jodi Byrd (2011), have pointed out that there are important distinctions between colonization and racism,” Pulido nevertheless insists, “there is no escaping the fact that racism informs colonization” (p.125). The sense of entitlement entailed in the appropriation, in the theft of the land, “ultimately rests on a deep sense of superiority” (p.125).

Here Pulido makes recourse to the conceptual apparatus of “racial capitalism.” Pulido follows Lisa Lowe in this regard, according to whom “the term racial capitalism captures the sense that actually existing capitalism exploits through culturally and socially constructed differences such as race, gender, region, and nationality, and is lived through those uneven formations; it refutes the idea of a ‘pure’ capitalism external to or extrinsic from, the racial formation of collectivities and populations” (p.126).

Alongside, and at the birth of “racial capitalism,” Pulido also invokes the concept of “primitive accumulation.” “[R]acism,” she insists, “informs contemporary capitalism and its antecedents, including primitive accumulation” (p.126). Here she quotes Marx himself, towards the very end of the first volume of Capital, where he argues that “[t]he discovery of gold and silver in the Americas, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of blackskins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production” (p.126). “Capitalism emerged, Marx continues, ‘dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt’ (p.126).

According to Pulido, “primitive accumulation was essential to creating the initial surplus that subsequently allowed for the development of industrial capitalism.” And crucially, “proto- capitalists, colonists, and Christians all drew on white supremacy as they went about the business of severing indigenous peoples from their land and labor” (p.126).

The legacy of such primitive accumulation continues to this day. Pulido reminds us that not only did “Eric Williams document how Caribbean slavery helped finance England’s early industrial and financial development” (p.126); so too have “[r]ecent books by Edward Baptist and Walter Johnson … also demonstrated how the profits of slavery contributed to contemporary US capitalism” (p.127). “This is hardly the ancient past,” Pulido insists. To the contrary, “[t]hese are the relations that birthed the modern world and which continue to shape it” (p.127).

Moreover, she continues, “[w]hile primitive accumulation helps explain the role of the past in producing the racial map of the Anthropocene, it is relevant for another reason. While many relegate primitive accumulation to the annals of history, the truth is that it is back with a vengeance” (p.127). Nor should it be forgotten, she contends, that “[b]oth old and new forms of primitive accumulation require enabling ideologies. And though there have been important changes, racism, especially indifference, remains an important one” (p.127).

Which brings her to conclude, in relation to the Paris Accord, that “we cannot overlook the anemic nature of the agreement considering the magnitude of the problem,” that “[i]t will not avoid the death of millions— because they simply do not matter.” (p.128).

**Racial Capitalocene**

Françoise Vergès, in her chapter, “Racial Capitalocene: Is the Anthropocene Racial?,” included in a recent edited volume on *Futures of Black Radicalism*, published by Verso, helps further clarify the connection between racial domination and the domination of humans over nature.

To this end, Vergès quotes the historian Joachim Radkau, who has written that “the chief problem of colonialism seems to have been not so much its immediate ecological consequences as its long-term impact, the full extent of which became apparent only centuries later, in the era of modern technology, and many times only after the colonial states had acquired their independence.” Vergès goes on to argue in favour of an alternative terminology to that of the Anthropocene to refer to the current geological epoch in which the climate catastrophe is unfolding – namely, the racial capitalocene – in a play off Cedric Robinson’s concept of “racial capitalism.” Vergès adds that the elaboration of a “narrative of the racial capitalocene” requires precisely the “integrat[ion of] this long memory of colonialism’s impact and the fact that destruction in the colonial era becomes visible in the postcolonial era.” This means supplementing the often-presentist discourse of environmental racism with a deeper historical consciousness and story about origins.

Such a story, Vergès contends, must also include “an analysis of capital, imperialism, gender, class, and race and a conception of nature and of being human that opposes the Western approach.” In such a vein, she points to the 1991 “Principles of Environmental Justice,” the first principle of which declared that “Environmental Justice affirms the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity and the interdependence of all species, and the right to be free from ecological destruction.”

According to Vergès, such a principle “posits a new understanding of what it is to be human and challenges the international dialogue on climate change that focused on a strategy of adaptation. Adaptation through technology or the development of green capitalism has indeed been presented as a good strategy. Yet,” Vergès contends, “it does not thoroughly address the long history and memory of environmental destruction about which Radkau has written, nor the asymmetry of power.”

Vergès’s story of origins, it turns out, draws explicitly on Jason Moore’s “world ecological” paradigm and account. In Vergès’s articulation, “[i]n the reconfiguration of the world that followed the colonization of the Americas and the Caribbean, nature was transformed into a cheap resource, as endlessly renewable as the bonded workforce.” Moreover, against a certain discourse of the Anthropocene, she adds, “[i]t is human praxis as labor and the global use of a color line in the division of labor that must be studied, and not a ‘human’ death drive.”

She, furthermore, continues, by referencing Moore, in arguing: “To unpack the different levels of racialized environment we need to go back to the long sixteenth century, the era of Western ‘discoveries,’ of the first colonial empires, of genocides, of the slave trade and slavery, the modern world mobilized the work of commodified human beings and uncommodified extra-human nature in order to advance labor productivity within commodity production.” She insists: “Racialized chattel were the capital that made capitalism. Africa was forced to share its social product — human beings — with the Atlantic slave system. But the slave trade consisted of not only the organized deportation of millions of Africans to continents and islands, but also a massive transfer of plants, animals, diseases, soil, techniques, and manufactured goods from Europe.” She concludes: “Capitalism relied for growth on an endless access to nature as excess, as a ‘bounty of extra-human biological systems and geological distribution: plants, silver, gold, iron, coal’.”

Towards the end of her chapter, Vergès broaches the radical emancipatory suggestion that “[w]orld citizenship and humanism must be brought in as decolonializing alternatives.” She concludes with an evocative quote by Fanon, who wrote in 1961 that “Each generation must out of relative obscurity discover its mission, fulfil it, or betray it,” to which she adds, “[w]e are at a critical juncture, a historical moment that sends us into our inheritances to find sources and references for the struggle ahead.” The story of origins, then, is for Vergès but a crucial grounding for a future-oriented fight for freedom, for an end to racial oppression, and for planetary survival.

**Climate Apartheid**

Nancy Tuana, in her 2019 article, “Climate Apartheid. The Forgetting of Race in the Anthropocene,” argues along similar lines against the neglect of race in much of the mainstream discourse on the Anthropocene. Tuana’s “article advocates developing an ecologically informed intersectional approach designed to disclose the ways racism contributes to the construction of illegible lives in the domain of climate policies and practices.” Tuana argues against emphasizing too much the issue of the “differential impacts of climate change.” She insists that while such differential impact is “an important dimension,” it “is ultimately inadequate to understanding and responding to both climate justice and environmental racism. What is required,” she contends, “is a rich understanding of the histories and lineages of the deep incorporation of racism and environmental exploitation” (p.1).

In the article, Tuana sketches the lineages of three such “instances of the intermingling of racism and environmental exploitation: climate adaptation practices in Lagos, Nigeria; the enmeshment of race and coal mining in the post–Civil War United States; and the infusing of precarity and rainforest destruction in Brazil” (p.1).

Tuana begins by acknowledging that “[t]hanks to the work of various activist organizations and feminist scholars, the past two decades have been witness to a growing recognition of the gender dimensions of climate change” (p.2). Nevertheless, like Pulido and Vergès, she goes on to insist that “there is rarely attention to the role of race or racism on issues of climate justice” (p.2).

Tuana calls for an “ecologically informed intersectionality” (p.3), one capable not only of illuminating “how the lineages of oppressions between differences such as sex, class, sexuality, and race can be intermeshed, but can also animate attention to the infusing of such lineages with environmental exploitation” (p.3). Tuana insists, furthermore, that “[w]e need in addition to understand how racism is deeply incorporated into various institutions and social practices relevant to the current climate regime;” to this end, she contends, “ecologically informed intersectional analyses must be accompanied by genealogical sensibilities” (p.3). Her hope being that “[t]hrough the genealogical sensibility of ecologically informed intersectional analyses we animate our desire for new values, for new ways of feeling, thinking, and living” (p.4).

In sum, her call is for ecologically informed intersectional analyses accompanied by genealogical sensibilities. Such a method of analysis, she insists, will allow “for a far deeper understanding of the phrase ‘environmental racism’ than is currently embraced” (p.4).

To open up the space for this type of approach, we must begin by asking such questions as: “When we engage in the work of climate justice, to whom are we speaking and for what purposes? Who remains silent or silenced? What lives have been rendered illegible?” (p.4).

Tuana next introduces a concept articulated by Bishop Desmond Tutu – namely, that of climate apartheid – which she insists “stands as a vivid reminder of the imperative to attend to the practices, habits, legal institutions, discourses, and impacts of anthropogenic climate change from an ecologically informed intersectional lens” (p.5). Apartheid, Tuana emphasizes, “involved deeply held systematic beliefs and dispositions regarding racial superiority that not only impacted individual beliefs and practices, but were infused into and supported by the interactions of various social institutions, such as education, labor, and policing, and the practices and dispositions they authorized” (p.5). By analogy, Tuana continues, “[t]o appreciate the nature and import of climate change apartheid, then, requires attention to the more subtle, normalized, and often muted ways in which systematic, institutional racism circulates in societies, as well as the ways in which it is impacted by other forms of systemic oppression such as those due to gender, sexuality, or class” (pp.5-6). In sum, she highlights, “[c]limate apartheid emerges from complex exchanges between racism and environmental exploitation.” The sensibility that Tuana urges us, therefore, “to develop is one that is attuned to the injustices buried beneath the differential impacts of anthropogenic climate change as well as those that are the unspoken ground of the choices made and ignored on how to adapt” (p.6).

Which leads Tuana, in turn, to raise the difficult questions: “To what are we willing to adapt? What do we see as in need of adaptation and what remains unseen or, if seen, not valued? Who and what gets protected? Who and what is rendered more precarious? Do we see or even care about these types of, perhaps unintended, harms of adaptation practices?” (p.6).

With such questions on the mind, Tuana next turns to the first of her three case studies – the building of the flashy city of Eko Atlantic in Lagos, in response to the “sea level rise and warming oceans [that] are placing Lagos at risk of serious threats from storm surges and flooding events resulting not only in loss of lives and infrastructure, but also intrusion of sea water into freshwater sources and ecosystems” (p.7).

She asks: “Who will live in Eko Atlantic’s gleaming towers?” To which she responds: “It is clear that it will not be the over 60 percent of Nigeria’s population, almost 100 million, who live in extreme poverty” (p.7). Indeed, she contends, “Eko Atlantic’s shiny towers of luxury apartments are targeted to the wealthy, very likely a majority of wealthy foreign business representatives, along with a minority of the wealthiest of Nigerians” (p.7). Furthermore, she continues: “Given income demographics, the majority of the residents of Eko Atlantic are not likely to be Nigerians. And those who are will be the wealthy, living in the equivalent of a walled and fortified community, one with its own energy and water resources” (p.8).

Tuana then turns to sketch the lineages of the current situation, seeking to trace the history behind how “[r]ace and class circulate in complex ways in Lagos” (p.8). She writes: “The complexities of histories of slave holding in the territory that has come to be known as Lagos is one such lineage. But it was a lineage which was transmuted by the rise of the external slave trade at Lagos in the eighteenth century with the rise of sugar plantations in the Caribbean, gold mining in Brazil, and tobacco, rice, and cotton plantations in the Americas” (p.8). Later, she continues, “British annexation of the territory that included Lagos and colonial rule of all of what subsequently became Nigeria rethreaded lineages as British economic interests, in this instance the growing demand for palm oil, intersected with their mid-nineteenth century campaign to end slave trading” (p.8). And yet, she emphasises, “[t]he internal slave trade, yet another thread in this complex weave of lineages that contribute to racism in Lagos, continued without impediment” (p.8). Moreover, “[a]nother thread in this racist lineage are the laws that were set up by the British to prohibit indigenous people from importing or exporting any goods” (p.9). To this end, she points out that “[t]he palm oil production in addition reinforced gender roles in Yorubaland, for men’s labors were limited to harvesting and transporting, while women were responsible for the labor that produced the oil” (p.9).

Tuana concludes that “the protection created by Eko Atlantic is literally built on the devastation of others, both human and nonhuman animal others, as well as communities and ecosystems” (p.9). And she notes as well that “[m]any other previously ‘undesirable’ water-based locations, such as Otodo Gbame, Ilubirin, and Ebute Ikate, are now seen as prime ‘water-front’ real estate opportunities and have suffered similar fates” (p.10).

Which leads her to reflect: “What we see in Lagos is what we saw with apartheid in South Africa. We see a city in which those who are already privileged, enhance their privilege at the expense of those whose inequalities are made even more severe and do so along divisions put into place due to the impact of decades of racist beliefs and institutions. In this instance,” Tuana emphasises, “it is also accomplished by directing and often exploiting climate adaptation practices. The justifying logic is complex and in its whorl of complexity we need,” she concludes, “to take the time to trace the lineages of racism in the contours of the choices and reveal how sedimented, systematic beliefs and dispositions regarding racial superiority are at the heart of decisions about whose lives and lifeways are worth protecting and whose are expendable” (p.10).

She concludes the section by contrasting such developments to the ongoing struggle for self-determination of the Ogoni people, bringing into focus their fight against oil companies like Shell, who were drilling oil on indigenous lands. She quotes the brother of the executed leader of the movement, Ken Saro-Wiwa, who invokes the concept of environmental racism in framing their struggle, and she urges us to “[l]isten carefully, for the circulations of race in the Anthropocene have fleshly lives and lineages” (p.11).

Tuana then turns to discuss her second case study – that of “coal mining and convict labor in the post–Civil War U.S. South” (p.12). The goal of her “ecologically informed intersectional genealogy is” once again “to gesture at the importance of unburying … histories so as to become attuned to how [complex] lineages [of race, class, and gender] permeate and inform contemporary beliefs and practices” (p.12). By doing so, she seeks to counter “the determined forgetting of the fleshly labors that built nations,” in this case by bringing into focus the legacy of “enforced labor in Southern coal mines” (p.13).

Tuana notes that “[h]uman activities such as the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, and agricultural practices are among the largest contributors to climate change. Of them, coal is one of the largest single sources of CO2 emissions” (p.13). However, she also stresses that “[t]he impacts of coal go far beyond the greenhouse gases emitted when it is burned” (p.14). Indeed, she emphasises, “coal’s lineages incorporate racist lineages” (p.14).

To make the case, she begins by referring to studies that have documented the “negative impact of … coal-fired plants as well as the disproportionate negative impact on Black and Latin American communities due to the siting of plants in neighborhoods with high percentages of people from one or both groups” (p.14). But she seeks to go beyond such studies, which she contends do “not mine the deep and long histories of the infusions of racist exploitation and environmental exploitation,” which do “not travel deeply enough into the ways racism was and is often literally incorporated into institutions and social practices, as well as into the flesh.” And she proceeds to “trace some of the paths of this incorporation” (p.14).

Tuana points out that “[t]he war ended chattel slavery as a legal institution in the United States, but it did not end its influence on the hearts and minds of many White Southerners or mitigate its impact on the bodies of many former slaves” (p.15). She goes on to sketch how “a series of willful duplicities created a new system of enforced labor, whether through exploitative sharecropping arrangements or the convict lease system. The bodies of slaves were treated as a source of fuel, something to be put to work and to be consumed into the work of earning a profit. It was the energy of slaves by an only slightly different name” (p.15).

To this end, she highlights “the criminalization of Black life designed to exploit it in coal mines. Vagrancy laws served this purpose” (p.15). According to Tuana, “[t]he broadness of vagrancy laws allowed wide-spread misuse which was used to arrest and fine freed Blacks. Most of these laws had a provision that failure to pay the fine could result in convict leasing” (p.16). The consequences were indeed grim: “unfree labor practices resulted not only in deplorable working conditions, but also in high levels of deaths for those so sentenced. Alabama’s convict lease program fueled the coal industry” (p.16).

Tuana dwells on the significance of the bodily incorporation of coal dust among thos working in the coal mines. She contends that “[t]his bodily incorporation of coal dust was one of the consequences of the incorporation of the bodily labor of Blacks into the flourishing of the post-war economy in the U.S. South and into the wealth of corporations like the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company the profits of which were merged with the United States Steel Corporation in 1907. Racism was,” she concludes, “in this way literally incorporated into the environmental harms caused by coal mining, from the impacts on ground water to the release of methane to acid mine drainage” (p.18).

Which leads her to reflect: “We might all be vulnerable to the unpredictability of fate, but we are not all equally vulnerable to the many types of violence perpetuated by systematic oppression. To ignore how such violence is deeply woven into the textures of environmental exploitation is a form of indifference that is at the heart of the type of environmental racism to which … we [must] become attuned. Not simply the differential impacts, but the layered, habituated disposabilities of certain people and certain ecosystems, and their often complexly intertwined lineages” (p.19).

Tuana then turns to her final case study – namely, “the infusing of precarity and rainforest destruction in Brazil.” She highlights again that “[u]nderstanding the ways in which Brazil incorporates modern slavery into their economy requires a genealogical sensibility, one that brings racism and environmental exploitation together” (p.20). To this end, she begins by noting that “[t]he Global Slavery Index estimates that 155,000 people are currently being exploited by unfree labor practices in Brazil. In the modern landscape of Brazil unfree labor circulates between class and race, for it is the press of poverty that leads men and women into slave labor” (p.21). But she continues by pointing out that “the weave of poverty is inflected with racism and continues as it does in the United States as one of the legacies of the transatlantic slave trade” (p.21).

Tuana writes that “[w]hile it is no longer legal to own another person, control over workers through fear and intimidation is used to force individuals to work long hours under inhumane living conditions” (p.21). And she bears witness to the fact that “[t]hose engaged in deforestation or charcoal production are expected to work ten-hour days with few if any days off. Violence, including brutal murders, are used to control workers and curb resistance” (pp.21-22).

Tuana further notes that “[t]hose studying slavery in Brazil have noted the clear links between it and environmental exploitation” (p.22). To this end, she quotes Kevin Bayles, who in his 2016 book *Blood and Earth: Modern Slavery, Ecocide, and the Secret to Saving the World*, eloquently wrote: “We know that the hidden crimes of slavery and environmental destruction are not just inextricably linked but mutually reinforcing and reach around the planet. We know that slaves are used to destroy the environment, and that when an ecosystem is devastated the people who live within it are pushed closer to slavery” (p.26).

In sum, the three case studies which Tuana presents are intended to “illuminate the persistent infusions of racism and environmental exploitation,” through the method of “detailed genealogical tracings of such lineages” (p.22). She ends with an emphasis on method, arguing that “ecologically informed intersectional analyses must be to the detailed, historical, spatial, situated genealogies of the incorporations of racism and environmental exploitations” (p.22).

**Indigenizing the Anthropocene**

In “Indigenizing the Anthropocene,” the Métis scholar Zoe Todd undertakes “an examination of art and the Anthropocene as variations of ‘white public space’— space in which Indigenous ideas and experiences are appropriated, or obscured, by non-Indigenous practitioners.” She does so, first, by “offer[ing] a short exploration of how to use Indigenous philosophy and teachings from Indigenous legal orders, specifically the work of Papaschase Cree scholar Dr. Dwayne Donald, to decolonize and Indigenize the non-Indigenous intellectual contexts that currently shape public intellectual discourse, including that of the Anthropocene.” She furthermore “explore[s] how the Indigenization of the Anthropocene is taking place through Indigenous thought, praxis, and art. This decolonization/Indigenization,” she contends, “is necessary in order to bring Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies, and practices to the fore in a meaningful and ethical way” (p.243).

Towards the beginning of the essay, Todd confesses that, “[a]s a Métis scholar,” she has “an inherent distrust of this term, the Anthropocene, since terms and theories can act as gentrifiers in their own right, and that frequently she has to force herself “to engage in good faith with it as heuristic” (p.244). To this end, she references the “Swedish scholars Andreas Malm and Alf Hornborg, [who] among others, [have] highlight[ed] the manner in which the current framing of the Anthropocene blunts the distinctions between the people, nations, and collectives who drive the fossil-fuel economy and those who do not” (p.244). For, as Todd emphasises, “[n]ot all humans are equally implicated in the forces that created the disasters driving contemporary human-environmental crises.” She adds, furthermore, “that not all humans are equally invited into the conceptual spaces where these disasters are theorized or responses to disaster formulated” (p.244).

Todd poses the question: “What ‘modernist mess’ … characterizes this moment of ‘common cosmopolitical concern’ that is the Anthropocene? And,” she continues, “who is dominating the conversations about how to change the state of things?” (p.244).

Todd seeks to critically interrogate “the Euro-Western academy’s current approach to human-environmental relationships” (p.244). She chastises fashionable “posthumanist theories [for] tend[ing] to erase both location and Indigenous epistemologies.” Instead, she cites approvingly Juanita Sundberg, who “urges scholars to enact the ‘pluriverse’ as a decolonial tool, in her case drawing on Zapatista principles of ‘walking the world into being’, as one locus of thought and praxis to decolonize posthumanist scholarship and geographies” (p.245).

Likewise, she follows Sarah Hunt, who has “outline[d] the epistemic violence inherent in Euro-Western academic treatments of Indigenous knowledge, specifically by analyzing the ways that Indigenous ontologies are reified and distorted in the ongoing colonial structures of the European and North American academy” (p.245). She appeals to Hunt’s evocation of “dance as a way to negotiate the demands of colonial academic institutions and praxis, for it is,” she claims, “through dance that Indigenous ontologies are brought to life.” To the same end, she references Zakiyyah Jackson, who “also problematizes the erasure of race from posthumanist philosophies, bringing the focus back to topics all too often sidestepped by posthumanism, including ‘race, colonialism, and slavery’” (p.245).

Todd goes on to cite the “Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe scholar Vanessa Watts,” who has “operationalize[d] a principle of ‘Indigenous Place Thought, which can stand in place of, or alongside’, discourses such as an ‘ontology of dwelling’, the theoretical position advanced by British anthropologist Tim Ingold, based in part on his close reading of Irving Hallowell’s ethnographic work with Anishinaabe people” (p.245). Todd highlights how Watts “rejects the ‘hierarchies of agency’ imposed by common understandings of Actor Network Theory,” and suggests instead that “if we think of agency as being tied to spirit, and spirit exists in all things, then all things possess agency” (p.246).

Which leads her to pose the question: “What do these critiques of posthumanism have to do with the Anthropocene?” Her reply: “Put simply: both threads of inquiry, posthumanism and the Anthropocene, share a terrain, even if they do not have in common the same central emphasis in their respective discourses” (p.246).

Todd further explains: “the Anthropocene narrative gathers discursive steam, dominating contexts where other discourses struggle to circulate. And, it dominates in what is an undeniably white intellectual space of the Euro-Western academy. It is perhaps unsurprising,” she contends, “for popular thought to be Eurocentric when the institutions and structures within which it is generated continue to be largely heteropatriarchal, Eurocentric, and white” (pp.246-247).

Or posed in the form of the question, she asks: “If the academy’s structures reproduce whiteness, what can we expect of the stories it is telling about the Anthropocene and our shared struggles to engage with dynamic environmental crises on the planet?” (p.247).

Todd refers to the work of J. Martineau and E. Ritskes, who have both “highlight[ed] the ongoing whiteness of mainstream art praxis, positing Indigenous art as a counter-narrative to the heteropatriarchy and white supremacy that informs artistic discourses. They argue that ‘the task of decolonial artists, scholars and activists is not simply to offer amendments or edits to the current world, but to display the mutual sacrifice and relationality needed to sabotage colonial systems of thought and power for the purpose of liberatory alternatives’.” Todd further adds “that the non-human must also be incorporated into this equation” (p.248).

She insists: “[t]here is no way to get around the fact that the business of making knowledge and making art in the European and North American academies is still very much a Eurocentric endeavour” (p.248).

Todd stresses the importance of “ethical relationality,” invoking to this end the work of the Papaschase Cree scholar Dwayne Donald, who has linked the cultivation of such an ethic to “an enactment of ecological imagination.” According to Donald, “[e]thical relationality doesn’t deny that we’re different, so it’s not a way to say we’re all the same. But it seeks to understand more deeply how our different histories and experiences position us in relation to each other. It puts those at the forefront: who you are, where you come from, what your commitments are, what your experiences have been. So, it’s a desire to acknowledge and honour the significance of the relationships we have with others, how our histories and experiences position us in relation to each other, and how our futures as people in the world are similarly tied together. It is an ethical imperative to see that despite our varied place-based cultures and knowledge systems, we live in the world together and must constantly think and act with reference to those relationships” (p.249).

Todd further cites Donald’s indigenous understanding of ecology. In Donald’s words: “ecology, the way I think of it—the way I’ve been taught to think about it—is: paying attention to the webs of relationships that you are enmeshed in, depending on where you live. So, those are all the things that give us life, all the things that we depend on, as well as all the other entities that we relate to, including human beings” (p.250).

Todd goes on to introduce Donald’s concept of “[i]ndigenous Métissage, which he defines as ‘a place-based approach … informed by an ecological and relational understanding of the world” (p.250). Todd contends that “in order to mobilize Indigenous Métissage, there must be an “ethic of historical consciousness” (p.250). To this end, she again cites Donald, who argues that “[t]his ethic holds that the past occurs simultaneously in the present and influences how we conceptualize the future” (p.250).

In sum, for Todd, “[a]n orientation towards Donald’s philosophical framework helps to address the shortcomings that Malm and Hornborg identify in the current framings of the Anthropocene, which currently acts as white public space and erases the differential histories and relationships that have led to current environmental crises. Historical consciousness, ethical relationality, and Indigenous Métissage,” she insists, “—rooted in reciprocity, relationships, and responsibility—are among many principles the Eurocentric academy struggles to address in current framings and responses to the Anthropocene. Donald offers a philosophy rooted in the things he has learned from Cree and Blackfoot legal orders and his experiences in the world. His ethical relationality and Indigenous Métissage,” she continues, “are processes through which to move away from human-centric discourses about the Anthropocene, and to envisage ourselves as rooted in reciprocal, ongoing, and dynamic relationships that are informed by Indigenous legal orders and our embeddedness in the meshworks that connect us through an ecological imagination. Such relationality,” she concludes, “can inform decolonizing approaches to both art and anthropology in the Anthropocene” (pp.250-251).

Todd further emphasises that “[d]ecolonization requires that we change not only who is spoken about and how, but also who is present in intellectual and artistic ‘buildings’. This is because,” she contends, “there are so few Indigenous bodies within the European academy. Even when [they] are present,” she insists, “[they] are often dismissed as biased, overly emotional, or unable to maintain objectivity over the issues [they] present” (p.251).

Todd concludes her essay by insisting that “[t]he Anthropocene, like any theoretical category at play in Euro-Western contexts, is not innocent of [epistemic] violence. Exploitative patterns, when they manifest, in turn concentrate the voice of Indigenous issues in white hands” (p.251). She urges that “[r]ather than engage with the Anthropocene as a teleological fact implicating all humans as equally culpable for the current socio-economic, ecological, and political state of the world, we should turn to examining how other peoples are describing ‘ecological imagination’ (p.252).

Furthermore, she insists that “[a]rt, as one mode of thought and praxis, can play a role in dismantling the condos of the art and academic world and help us build something different in their stead” (p.252). And to this end, she points to “[i]ndigenous artists, [who] offer an important perspective on the intertwined and relational connections between people and land, and through their art can craft concrete responses to the mess and violence of the economies operating in the Anthropocene” (p.252).

**Decolonizing Environmental Justice**

Linda Álvarez and Brendan Coolsaet, in their 2020 article, “Decolonizing Environmental Justice: A Latin American Perspective,” draw on the tradition of decolonial theory to “analyse the problems which arise when Western concepts are used as the main organizing principles of non-Western environmental justice movements” (p.50). Their focus is on the call for environmental justice, which “[o]ver the last three decades … has become a rallying cry for communities and social movements across the world struggling to protect their environment and ways of life against the appropriation, transformation and dispossession of nature” (p.50).

Álvarez and Coolsaet cite Joan Martínez Alier’s *The Environmentalism of the Poor*, in which he “argued that ‘the environmental justice movement is potentially of great importance [for the global South], provided it learns to speak … for the majorities outside the USA’” (p.51). Nevertheless, they insist, “conceptual EJ work has … remained largely a Western endeavour” (p.51). According to Álvarez and Coolsaet, “there is a tendency to transpose Western concepts and frameworks to the global South, running the risk of being ineffective at best, and of producing (environmental) injustices, at worst.” (p.51). Moreover, “there has been surprisingly little engagement with decolonial theory” (p.51).

Álvarez and Coolsaet “identify and discuss some of the colonial pitfalls an environmental scholar may encounter when addressing justice concerns.” They “show that using Western-centric concepts as the main organizing principles of non-Western EJ movements – at the expense of other, pre-existing conceptual formations – creates new processes of subjugation, which [they] gather under the new term ‘coloniality of justice’” (p.51).

The tradition in which Álvarez and Coolsaet situate themselves is that of decolonial theory, whose main postulates they sketch at the beginning of the article. In Álvarez and Coolsaet’s words: “[d]ecolonial theory draws on social sciences and theories produced by scholars and social movements of and in the global South, mainly Latin America (e.g. the theology of liberation, the active participatory research or the theory of dependency). It argues that theory needs to be grounded in the lived experience, thinking, places and locations of those communities that have suffered from colonialism” (p.52). Moreover, they continue, “[d]ecolonial theorists establish a difference between colonialism and coloniality, a term originally coined by Aníbal Quijano” (p.52).

Coloniality, in turn, has three faces, or dimensions. Its first face, coloniality of power, “is organized around two fundamental axes: (1) the codification of racial difference between Europeans and non-Europeans, aimed at making the latter appear naturally inferior; and (2) the use of Western/modern institutional forms of power (like the nation-state) in non-Western societies to organize and control labor, its resources and its products” (p.52).

The second face, or dimension of coloniality, “[c]oloniality of knowledge, refers to the difference made between European and non-European knowledges and symbolic systems … Coloniality of knowledge is given shape through scientific and philosophical discourses that depict themselves as being neutral, impartial and detached from geo-historical conditions, producing an “epistemology of point zero” (p.53).

Finally, the third face, or dimension, of coloniality, “coloniality of being, makes reference to the ‘lived experience of colonization and its ontological impact … its effectiveness lies in its capacity to distort the self-image of the colonized and the perception of their world’” (p.53).

For Álvarez and Coolsaet, “[i]f coloniality dehumanizes humanity and objectifies nature, then decoloniality refers to ‘efforts at re-humanizing the world, to breaking hierarchies of difference that dehumanize subjects and communities and that destroy nature’” (p.53).

The concept of environmental justice, Álvarez and Coolsaet argue, “has its origins in the inequalities of power and the way those inequalities have distinctive environmental consequences for the marginalized and the impoverished, for those who may be freely denigrated as ‘others,’ or as ‘people out of place’” (p.53). According to them, “[t]he concept dates back to the 1980s, with the confluence of a large set of political movements in the United States, increasingly aware of the unequal distribution of environmental degradation along class, racial, cultural and gender divides (p.54). More recently, EJ “work has started refining the racial roots of environmental injustices in the global South” (p.54). Nevertheless, they lament, “even these more critical approaches have largely left aside decolonial theory” (p.54).

According to Álvarez and Coolsaet, one of the advantages of decolonial theory is that it can help “push our analyses and actions beyond the human, the state and capital” (p.55). Too often in the EJ movement and literature, they insist “solutions to injustices are conceived within the realm of the state.” This tendency they term the “coloniality of justice” (p.55).

Álvarez and Coolsaet warn against “transposing the idea of environmental equity, a claim originally made by communities of African descent in the United States, from its original context to other minority groups in both the global South (e.g. Afro and Indigenous groups of Colombia, Peru or Bolivia) and North (e.g. native peoples in developed countries). They contend that such transposition “may render claims conflicting with the very idea of environmental distribution invisible” (p.55).

Indeed, the notion of environmental equity implies that “exploitation does not necessarily need questioning as long as its most harmful effects are being distributed equitably within society” (p.55). Such an approach carries with it two dangers: “(1) it may entail a misrecognition of other modes of life that are incompatible with a capitalist mode of production and/or with anthropocentric ways of understanding justice; and (2) it sets aside the fact that even the requests of minority groups may be the expression of a desire that has been captured by coloniality” (p.56).

Álvarez and Coolsaet distinguish between two modes of life – the first, “characterized by dualist divisions (human/nonhuman, nature/culture, mind/body, individual/community, reason/emotion, “we”/“them,” etc.) and is centered on linear time and development;” the second, “relational” (p.56). The environmental equity approach, they insist, is biased in favour of the first of these. Indeed, they argue, “[d]istributive equity implies that nature can be objectified, exploited and turned into a distributable good, a conception challenged by relational modes of life” (pp.56-57). In this vein, they continue: “[i]n this light the very idea of environmental distribution appears to be incompatible with Indigenous, Afro-Colombian, and Indian peasant modes of life” (p.57).

The fact that demands for environmental equity have been made by marginalized groups in the Global South does not phase them. To the contrary, they contend, “claims raised by those who are marginalized and racialized are not necessarily free from the risk of coloniality” (p.57). To this end, they remind us, that one of the “characteristic[s] of coloniality, described by Achille Mbembe,” is “the subjugation of the indigenous through his or her desire” (p.57).

Álvarez and Coolsaet go on to contend that “even if the distribution of environmental impacts and risks may, in certain cases, serve to temporarily and locally address environmental injustices, in a global context it may legitimize and deepen some of the problems of the capitalist economy” (p.58).

Álvarez and Coolsaet are adamant that “[t]he location of where one speaks from – whether defined geographically, culturally or philosophically – not only has epistemic significance, but can also be discursively dangerous” (p.62). To this end, they lament that, “[w]hile asking the necessary questions on how to acknowledge diversity within the EJ movement, and going a long way into theorizing this plurality for US-based movements, the discussion of EJ in other parts of the world does not trigger the same theoretical conceptualization” (p.62).

EJ scholars, they contend, “seem to think that a theoretical framework developed in the context of US EJ movement can serve the empirical observation of justice claims regardless of the context, the object and/or the subject” (p.62). And so, they point out, “when applied to the global South, the transfer of knowledge is surprisingly unidirectional” (p.63). In fact, they argue, “[n]on-Western communities are attached to the ‘empirical’ or the material, while Western societies are able to provide the theoretical framework to conceptualize such practices” (p.63).

An engagement with the tenets of decolonial theory, they suggest, can help to correct these unfortunate tendencies. This for three reasons. First, “at the epistemological level,” it can “help identify how certain theoretical ideas or practices may reinforce or contribute to environmental injustice.” Second, it “requires an active participation of communities in and of the global South not only as subjects of study but as knowledge-holders capable of reimagining the meaning of EJ and its underlying concepts.” And third, “decolonial EJ demands a detachment from the false idea of scientific neutrality” (p.63).

In sum, Álvarez and Coolsaet contend that if it wishes to make good on its promise “‘to speak…for the majorities outside the USA’, EJ research will need to engage more thoroughly with the colonial difference” (p.64). This means, for them, “[e]pistemologically, that researchers need to question the universal relevance of their theoretical frameworks and develop a ‘victim-centered’ justice.” Likewise, they claim, politically, a decolonial EJ must “take the ‘differentiated responsibilities’ principle to the local level” (p.64).

Nevertheless, Álvarez and Coolsaet end their article by noting that “[t]he divergences between Northern and Southern conceptions of EJ should not lead to a dualist distinction between human societies, and therefore of an irreducible gap between modes of life. On the one hand,” they insist, “internal colonization of Southern communities must be critically addressed and deconstructed. On the other,” they contend, “the global North comprises a great variety of movements struggling for life through relational political ontologies and against capitalism” (p.64).

**Our History is the Future**

In the chapter on “Liberation” in his 2019 book, *Our History is the Future. Standing Rock versus the Dakota Pipeline and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*, Nick Estes documents the grassroots indigenous-led movements against the Dakota Access oil pipeline project, a project that constitutes a serious threat to the region’s water. Estes contextualizes this indigenous-led environmental struggle by relating it to the long history of indigenous resistance to U.S. settler colonialism. He begins by noting that “[t]he perpetual threat of Indigenous nations is that they are a reminder of the settler's own precarious claims to land and belonging” (p.248). He insists: “Ancestors of Indigenous resistance didn't merely fight against settler colonialism; they fought for Indigenous life and just relations with human and nonhuman relatives, and with the earth” (p.248). Indeed, according to Estes, “[i]ndigenous resistance … defines freedom not as the absence of settler colonialism, but as the amplified presence of Indigenous life and just relations with human and nonhuman relatives, and with the earth” (p.248).

Estes contends that “the planners of the Dakota Access Pipeline imagined building a pipeline in a world where Native people did not exist” (p.249). To this end, “DAPL's trespass through unceded treaty territory and the militarized crackdown on Water Protectors was made to look like self-defense—settlers in the fort, surrounded by hostile natives” (p.250).

Estes emphasises the settler-colonial violence of the militarized crackdown on the environmental protests. He remarks how “officers shared a Federal Emergency Management Agency ‘Field Force Operations’ manual, which guided police officers in correct ‘crowd control’ methods, ‘pain compliance’ techniques, and application of ‘riot control agents’, including chemical weapons and projectiles such as rubber bullets and beanbag rounds” (p.250). Indeed, he contends that “local law enforcement and private security imagined themselves participating in a global counterinsurgency against civilian populations that extended from Palestine to Baltimore, Ferguson, the US — Mexico border, and now Standing Rock. The war was against Black life, Palestinian life, migrant life, and Native life” (p.251).

According to Estes, “[t]he tactics employed by TigerSwan, the murky mercenary security contractor hired by DAPL, were also confirmation that this was a global war” (p.251). Indeed, “TigerSwan went so far as to describe the Indigenous uprising as a ‘jihadist insurgency’” (p.251).

In striking contrast, the #NoDAPL campaign and camps “offered a brief vision of what a future premised on Indigenous justice would look like … Free food, free education, free health care, free legal aid, a strong sense of community, safety, and security were guaranteed to all” (p.252). Estes therefore contends: “Capitalism is not merely an economic system, but also a social system. And it was here abundantly evident that Indigenous social systems offered a radically different way of relating to other people and the world” (p.252).

Estes continues: “[t]he #NoDAPL camps didn't just imagine a future without settler colonialism and the oppressive institution of the state, but created that future in the here and now. They were a resurgent geography that reconnected Indigenous peoples with the land” (p.253). The ethos of the camps, Estes stresses, served to effectively “center the core of an Indigenous lifeworld—relationality” (p.253), a point reminiscent to one made by Álvarez and Coolsaet in their article on “Decolonizing Environmental Justice.”

Estes stresses that “[c]ountering settler colonialism's own physical infrastructure— trade routes, railroads, dams, and oil pipelines— is the infrastructure of Indigenous resistance, its ideas and practices of solidarity. The resistance camps may have been temporary,” he contends, “but the struggle for Native liberation continues, and the fort,” he insists, “is falling” (p.254).

Estes argues that “[i]ndigenous resistance is animated by our ancestors' refusal to be forgotten, and it is our resolute refusal to forget our ancestors and our history that animates our visions for liberation. Indigenous revolutionaries,” he claims, “are the ancestors from the before and before and the already forthcoming” (p.256).

Estes ends the chapter with some evocative questions. He asks: “What does water want from us? What does the earth want from us?” To which he replies: “Mni Wiconi— water is life.” Such an ethic “exists outside the logic of capitalism. Whereas past revolutionary struggles have strived for the emancipation of labor from capital,” he contends, “we are challenged not just to imagine, but to demand the emancipation of earth from capital. For the earth to live,” he concludes, “capitalism must die” (p.257).

**The Climate Crisis and the Struggle for African Food Sovereignty**

If Estes documents a decolonial environmental struggle in the heart of the United States, Nimno Bassey focuses on a concurrent struggle against neo-colonialism and for environmental sustainability on the African context, in his 2018 chapter, “The Climate Crisis and the Struggle for African Food Sovereignty. Bassey highlights that, “[a]s powerful as the forces pushing false climate solutions are, the people at the receiving end have been organising and mobilising arguments and actions to show what the real solutions are” (p.204). He laments that, “rather than seeing the climate crisis as requiring urgent systemic changes, policy makers and others with vested interests work to entrench the systems that caused the problems in the first place.” Nevertheless, he stresses that “there is hope in the activities of smallholder farmers, whose practices work in sync with nature and do not depend on artificial inputs that degrade soil and biodiversity” (p.204).

Bassey insists: “We have centuries-old knowledge, new knowledge and evolving knowledge that needs to be transformed into practical tools for actions that align with nature’s cycles. This calls for a clear rejection of false technologies and the building of solidarity economies. The real solution,” he contends, “is a low-hanging ripe fruit clearly within our grasp. Peasant farmers led by *La Via Campesina* and other social movements are vigorously promoting this low-hanging fruit – food sovereignty” (p.204).

Bassey goes on to explain: “Food sovereignty stresses the human right to food and prioritises local food systems and local markets. It is against food dumping and promotes culturally appropriate and wholesome foods. Food sovereignty goes beyond the provision of wholesome food, however, and fundamentally fights hunger by ensuring that local farmers maintain control of their farming and food systems. This approach reduces the use of artificial and chemical inputs and has direct implications for food pricing. Moreover, through food sovereignty, farmers and other defenders of local food systems, such as the continental AFSA and the South African Food Sovereignty Campaign, directly resist the neocolonial narrative and systems that suggest that Africa cannot feed itself and must depend on food aid and genetically engineered crops as the only means of combating hunger and malnutrition. The false solutions package should remind us of the survival diets that were forced on slaves a few centuries ago, to keep them supplying needed plantation labour” (pp.204-205).

Bassey concludes: “This is a critical moment to intensify the struggle for the decolonisation of African agriculture and food systems, as corporations and imperialist systems fight with gloves off to shove mercantilist products in our faces. Among the countries that have made food sovereignty part of their national food policy are Mali and Senegal. Other countries in the world to have done so are Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela” (p.205). He insists: “The African Union should take a leaf from the book of these nations and take this up as a key tool to regain total independence and set the continent on such a path. We can only secure food sovereignty,” he claims, “by supporting the majority of our farmers in their small-scale agro-ecological farming. With sufficient support, including through extension services,” he promises, “agro-ecological farming can produce more than industrial agriculture, reduce the gender gap, increase employment, increase income, protect agricultural biodiversity, promote health and nutrition and mitigate global warming” (p.205).

**Conclusion**

Let us, therefore, conclude. In this lecture, we have focused on the topic of environmentalism and anti-racist practice. We began with a review of arguments by Laura Pulido, Françoise Vergès, and Nancy Tuana about the relationship between racism and the Anthropocene. We then turned to focus on Zoe Todd’s related argument about the need to indigenize the Anthropocene, as well as Linda Álvarez and Brendan Coolsaet’s plea for decolonizing the Environmental Justice movement. We concluded by centring two simultaneously environmental and anti-colonial cum anti-racist struggles – first, Nick Estes’ account of the indigenous-led resistance to the Dakota Pipeline, and second Nnimno Bassey’s account of the struggle for African food sovereignty.