Editorial

Planetary Necropolitics: Ecological and Social Challenges and Conflicts Across the World

Marcelo Lopes de Souza

Rosie R. Meade

AMBIENTES: Journal of Geography and Political Ecology is published by a network of Brazilian researchers dedicated to environmental geography and, at an interdisciplinary or even transdisciplinary level, to political ecology. However, since the publication of its first issue in June 2019, the editors of ***AMBIENTES*** have made clear their commitment to international dialogue, which was symbolically expressed on the cover of that inaugural issue (a satellite image capturing a night view of South America).

The objective of 'internationalisation' has always been understood by those responsible for the journal in a different way than it is usually understood by bureaucrats in higher education and scientific research in Brazil, who generally seem to understand 'internationalisation' as a more or less passive adaptation to the quality assessment standards and research traditions (and even agendas) of the Global North, and notably the Anglo-Saxon cultural universe. It is no coincidence that 'internationalisation' is very often confused with 'publication in English-language journals' (generally published by large private publishing conglomerates, within the framework of a commercial logic,

regardless of the academic standards and reputations involved), as well as with 'exchange with the United States and Western European countries,' often within a logic where the asymmetries and hierarchies between North and South are rarely problematised and almost never challenged. For those responsible for ***AMBIENTES***, internationalisation is about *dialogue*, not subordination; about *exchange and mutual respect*, and not about a unilateral and colonial 'master'/'disciple' relationship. Hence, our priority has always been exchange with our Latin American neighbours – who have, incidentally, greatly supported our journal.

Given this, how can we understand an edition entirely in English? We believe it is necessary to mention two facts: **1)** English, despite being the main 'imperial language' of today (the 'Latin' of the new 'Empire'), is an official language spoken in dozens of countries around the world (especially in Africa), in addition to being a *lingua franca* used for communication by hundreds of millions of people (researchers, activists, tourists, etc.) worldwide; **2)** Portuguese and Spanish are also languages introduced amidst a brutal process of colonisation, even though the colonial powers that originally introduced them have, for some centuries now, moved to a completely secondary position in the capitalist world system. What is most worth highlighting, based on the experience of the Global South that has accompanied the life of one of the editors of this special edition, is the following point: the Global South itself, and Latin America in particular, needs to appropriate, in its own way – that is, prioritising autonomously conceived research agendas and adopting styles and standards in accordance with its needs – this *lingua franca* of contemporaneity. Without this, several risks are run, one of which is losing (or continuing to lose) control over narratives of theoretical and strategic scope.

The English that readers will find here is not purely British or American English, but rather English with various accents and peculiarities, which are indicators of the multiple origins of the authors of the contributions gathered here. The origins of the editors of this special edition, incidentally, have strong symbolic significance: a Brazilian (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro) and an Irish (University College Cork) academic. Therefore,

respectively, someone from a (semi)peripheral country of the Global South – the result of a complex colonisation process that began five centuries ago and metamorphosed into ties of dependence that were partially and repeatedly redefined after formal political independence in 1822 –, and someone from a European country that was itself the target of an extended, dramatic and bloody colonisation by England, resulting in countless deaths, land theft, famine, cultural oppression (for example, of the Gaelic language, *an teanga Gaeilge*), and massive emigration (mainly to the United States). Although in a very different way from Brazil, Ireland also suffered from imperialist processes and, to some extent, even a certain type of 'cultural racism.' In the light of this, the editors find themselves in an interesting position to help build bridges of dialogue between the Global North and the Global South.

The starting point for this dialogue is a contribution associated with the name of an intellectual from the Global South: Cameroonian historian and political theorist Achille Mbembe, currently a professor at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa. This contribution, the axis around which the contributions to this special issue gravitate, is the concept of *necropolitics*, which he introduced.

The real-world salience of Mbembe's concept is tragically evident in 2026, a year that brings yet more evidence of the normalisation of genocide, warmongering and the everyday effects of militarisation. Even liberal commentators and politicians, opining from such elite gatherings as the World Economic Forum, now express anxieties that the "rules-based order is fading, that the strong can do what they can and the weak must suffer what they must" (Carney, 2026). International media host debates about the viability of an institutional system – comprising bodies like NATO, the UN Security Council, WTO, European Commission - wherein the USA and certain anointed Western states lay claim to the conjoined moral, economic and political leadership of the globe; and where EU President von der Leyen (2025), apparently without irony, speaks possessively of "Our European values – democracy, freedom, and the rule of law". Unquestionably, we must recognise the real dangers posed by the intensification of both

the threat and actuality of authoritarian (fascistic even) violence globally; the rise of far right or nativist movements and political parties; the apparent universalisation of racist and anti-migrant rhetoric; the resurgence and turbo-charging of patriarchal claims-making; the displacement of neoliberal technocrats by self-regarding demagogues – tendencies embodied and emboldened by Donald Trump and the eagerness with which he seeks to discard "the old legitimation strategies" (Singh, 2026); and the eternalisation of neoliberalism's inequalities, cruelties and pathologies as the price of life in the 21st Century.

But even as we try to process and resist these reactionary and destructive currents, we must not fall prey to nostalgia for a lost era of liberal hegemony or the illusions of Western legal-rational authority. Indeed, recognition of the deadly, life-negating, but often disregarded consequences internationally of so-called liberal projects of security, defence, development or growth has also prompted us to edit this special issue of *AMBIENTES*; to create a shared space for reflection upon the concrete manifestations and specific forms of contemporary necropolitics. The following sections offer an overview of the twin concepts of necropolitics and necropower, discussing how they expose and transcend significant gaps in Foucauldian accounts of biopolitics, while also urging attentiveness to real-world, spatialised, expressions of death-dealing (other contributions to this Special Issue, especially Souza's article, also explore Mbembe's theoretical and conceptual contribution in the context of a dialogue with Foucault and other authors). And we also identify some important themes that have emerged from the wider international scholarship on necropolitics that have particular resonances for and with the content of this Special Issue. Finally, this editorial closes by providing an introductory discussion of the key themes explored in the nine original articles that constitute this shared project of interrogating 'Planetary Necropolitics' and the profound ecological and social conflicts and challenges with which it is associated.

●●●●●

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04

In the *History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault (1978, p. 135) wrote that across much of history "one of the characteristic privileges of sovereign power was the right to decide life and death" or, in a phrase, "the right to *take* life or *let* live" (1978, p. 136, original emphasis). He contended (1978, p. 136) that such forms of sovereign power were primarily expressed and experienced as "deduction" or "seizure", whereupon someone, something, some resource or capacity could be taken from those who were subject to that power. Foucault maintained that, from the 17th into the 18th Century and beyond, the classical form of power ultimately began to be superseded by *biopower* which emphasised instead the "administration of bodies and the calculated management of life" (Foucault, 1978, p. 140). However, as Lauren Berlant (2007, p. 756, original emphasis) explains, the emergence of biopower should be regarded as a *reshaping of* rather than *a replacement for* sovereign power, whereby the former reflects "the authority to *force* living not just to happen but to endure and appear in particular ways."

Concerned as it is with life and the ways by which is it is made liveable, *biopower* has a dual focus. On the one hand it seeks to constitute and ensure the discipline, self-optimisation and efficiency of (individual) human bodies, while on the other it seeks the regulation of what Foucault (1978, p. 139) calls the "species body" as well as the "propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity" of populations. Acknowledging what Lemke (2011, p. 41-42) recognises as a tendency for slippage and variability in Foucault's invocations of the associated concepts, *biopower* can be linked to the emergence of a distinctively 'modern' form of politics: called *biopolitics*, such politics is productive in orientation, working to order and facilitate *living* by people and populations. Oriented toward societal 'well-being,' it encompasses everything from the rollout of the Census or the launch of new digital ID cards to the deployment of literacy courses and Influenza vaccination programmes to the introduction of housing schemes and work activation measures. Through these and other programmes, technologies and processes of data capture "biological existence" is brought within the scope of politics and practical policymaking, demonstrating how

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04

biopower brings "life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations" and makes "knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life" (Foucault, 1978, p. 142-143).

In his 2003 essay of the same name, Achille Mbembe (2003, p. 39) elaborates on *necropolitics*, which encapsulates "contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death". This conceptualisation seeks to capture the complementary (but typically denied) destructive 'other' of biopolitical regimes or projects *as well as* those actions and interventions that are oriented towards the purposeful negation of life. Responding critically to and reaching beyond Foucault's theorisation, Mbembe's (2003) analysis engages productively with the work of Frantz Fanon, Georges Bataille, Hannah Arendt, Giorgio Agamben and others (see Souza, 2021, and also this Special Issue). Introducing the 2003 essay he asks, "Is the notion of biopower sufficient to account for the contemporary ways in which the political, under the guise of war, of resistance, or of the fight against terror, makes *the murder of the enemy* its primary and absolute objective?" (Mbembe, 2003, p. 12, emphasis added). And he links this provocation to questions about who is or who gets to be constituted as the killable enemy/other; where, in what contexts and how this happens; and about the kinds of power relations within which such (subjection to) death becomes practicable.

Although the spectre of death did feature in Foucault's analysis, Mbembe (2003) confronts the failure of the biopolitics/biopower dyad to capture the scale, scope and colonial geographies of political death-dealing. Indeed Ariadna Estévez (2021, p. 10, emphasis added) positions the concept of *necropower* as "the *postcolonial* interpretation of Michel Foucault's biopolitics"; clarifying that, despite the latter's utility for understanding some aspects of where and how domination is expressed, "in the context of the third world, it proves inadequate because the strategies and technologies used in the relations of domination have very different and radical effects" (Estévez, 2021, p. 13). But Mbembe's (2003; 2019) scholarship also contributes to and inspires a necessary undoing of the sanctimonious self-projections of Western liberal democracy. It demands

attentiveness to how the latter's "racial logic of power gives rise to the 'Indian' reserve, the slave plantation, the native quarter, the Bantustan, the Nazi camp, as well as the slums, prisons and refugee camps proliferating around the world" (Thobani, 2014, p. xv). Here Thobani's words evoke the materiality and spatiality of necropower, how it destroys and encloses bodies, how it involves a colonialist remaking of geographies and of social relations. This is acutely evident in contexts like occupied Palestine, within which Mbembe (2003, p. 27) found the "most accomplished form of necropower", describing how "besieged villages and towns are sealed off and cut off from the world. Daily life is militarized. Freedom is given to local military commanders to use their discretion as to when and whom to shoot" (2003, p. 30).

As is evident from the articles in this collection, there is ongoing debate as to the degree of overlap or oppositionality between biopolitical and necropolitical policies, actions and regimes. This centres around whether even the most ostensibly mundane biopolitical interventions carry within them the threat and actuality of death for some; whether there are clear lines in terms of intensity and intent between policymaking's necro and bio tendencies; or whether and how the necro and the bio coexist and inflect each other (see Dunlap, 2026; Gržinic; Tatlic, 2014; Islekel, 2022; Kotsila; Argüelles, 2024; Kumar, 2020; Ortega, 2020). Illustrative in this regard is Pushpesh Kumar's (2020, p. 165) scholarship, which reflects upon the growing visibility of India's "urban privileged gay" class, which has been legally recognised since 2018 and is regarded as having the potential to be assimilated into a consumerist cultural economy. The biopolitical rolling out of such citizenship opportunities runs parallel to the necropolitical violence and disposability that is conferred upon trans people: "transwomen are assaulted by the state, lacking all cultural, symbolic and economic resources, struggling to survive in a class-dominated, heterosexist and phallocentric world order" (Kumar, 2020, p. 174). Similarly, contributors to this issue suggest that there is close proximity and even a continuum between biopolitics's 'good life' promises to some and necropolitics's 'no-life' for the 'Others'.

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04

Laced through with racism, *necropolitics* both constitutes and avails of the proliferation of rationalities, means and methods through which supposed outsiders, opponents and people marked as disposable become killable or liable to death (Mbembe, 2019, p. 38). Addressing the Indian military's occupation of Kashmir, Mohamad Junaid (2018) evokes the often-quotidian character of necropower; the army's deployment of varied tactics of domination, including summary arrest, surveillance, curfews, stop-and-search and beatings. Junaid (2018) thus illuminates how necropower also works on/through space, in this case via diverse technologies, and through "the occupation's material infrastructure" and "architecture of stationary and mobile military establishments". Although necropolitical death-dealing means literal death, extermination, genocide, it also involves oscillations between, and the coexistence of, life/death. Writing about the plantation, Mbembe (2003, p. 21, original emphasis) explains how "the slave is [therefore] kept alive but in a *state of injury*, in a phantomlike world of horrors". Today, racialised, colonised and disregarded bodies are subjected to confinement within zones of erasure, sacrifice, imprisonment and brutality. They are condemned to states of limbo that are often officially sanctioned and operate under the guise of legal-rationality. European countries' increasingly careless and/or punitive treatment of refugees and the ongoing incarceration worldwide of poor and minoritised peoples serve as just two examples of how 'death worlds' are normalised through public policy (Mayblin, Wake and Kazemi, 2020; Lamble, 2013).

Contributions to this collection recognise that contemporary necropolitics is sustained and effected by constellations of actors that include governmental bodies, state agencies, bureaucrats, police and militias, carceral institutions, trans/national corporate interests and lobbyists, among others. Death worlds and death-dealing, while sanctioned, are often invisibilised under the cover of security, economic growth or development. Writing elsewhere about the Indian context, Rishi Jha (2023) usefully theorises the neoliberal state's role in the creation of the dangerous, precarious and dehumanising forms of accommodation to which Mumbai's poor are condemned as they

are forced to make way for new city-building initiatives. And just as it is essential to recognise the necropolitical investments of local, national and transnational state actors, it is also necessary to confront the necro-imbrications of capital, corporations and industry (Ahuja, 2016; Bobby Banerjee, 2008; Dunlap, 2026; Gržinic; Tatlic; 2014). Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee's (2008, p. 1543) coinage 'necrocapitalism' evokes the neoimperialist "practices of organizational accumulation that involve violence, dispossession, and death" that are prevalent across the Global South – although it is perfectly possible to argue that the term 'necrocapitalism' is almost redundant, since the history of capitalism shows that this mode of production has always been based on plunder, violence, expropriation, and the deterritorialisation of entire groups and peoples –, while Marina Gržinic and Šefik Tatlic (2014) point to the deadly harms wrought through the privatisation and marketisation of European social/welfare provisioning. As contributors to this issue demonstrate, opportunities for profiteering and extractivism both rationalise and give momentum to the destruction of bodies, ways of being and ecologies that are viewed as standing in the way of profit and 'progress.' Necropolitics is constituted by diverse practices of accounting, actuarial assessment and cost-benefit analysis that factor in, while rarely admitting to, the sacrifice of those 'others who are not us'.

An important theme in this Special Issue and one highlighted by Andrés Fabián Henao Castro (2016, p. 287-288), is the intertwining of necropolitics and contemporary expressions of neocolonialism, "whose main targets continue to be indigenous communities." This is typically appended by symbolic and discursive violence, the differential and racist apportioning of social or moral worth. The propensity for media outlets to ventriloquise official narratives about the imperatives of economic development, about who constitutes the 'we that matters' and about supposed 'security' threats that must be suppressed has been well documented (Meade, 2008; 2014; Meade; Kiely, 2020). But organs of necropolitical cultural re/production become even more invidious whey they refuse knowledge or censor critique of the very operations of

necropolitics. Judith Butler (2025, p. 10) explains how distinctions are routinely drawn "between those deemed worthy of grief and those who are not" but the necropolitical demand may go further still, denouncing or eradicating the very possibility of public grief for the subjects of necropower. Activists who bear witness to genocide, ecocide or police brutality are themselves being subjected to imprisonment, deliberate murder or to letting die.

●●●●●

Together the articles that are included in this Special Issue interrogate how the actual *and* symbolic *death* of communities, othered-peoples, epistemes, cultures, ontologies, forms of relationality, non-human animals, life-forms and life-worlds are rationalised and effected today. In so doing authors integrate analyses of necropolitics with those of geopolitics and ecopolitics; interrogating injustice at multiple scales from the local to global; exploring how and why social groups, their environments, territories, and places have disposability conferred upon them. Recognising multiple power asymmetries within and between places across the capitalist world system, articles discuss how necropower intersects with racist, (settler-)colonial, class-based, economic, spatialised and hetero-patriarchal oppressions. Crucially, contributors also analyse how peoples and communities contest and resist the negating forms of subjectification that are imposed upon them. They highlight how dignity and justice are claimed for selves and others, through practices of memorialisation and participatory mapping, through online and offline activism, through coalition building and networks of solidarity, and through the assertion of Indigenous cosmologies and cosmopolitics.

Let us now move on to a very brief presentation of our collection of papers. Obviously, the article abstracts already serve as an 'entry point,' but this presentation by the editors serves to emphasise connections and offer context (and, in some cases, some explanations).

The editors have opted for an order of papers in which the first and last are strongly theoretical and conceptual in orientation. The opening article, authored by **Simone Lucatello**, **Luis Fernández Carril**, and **Diana María Siller Contreras**, deals with the problem of necropolitics's conceptual limits, proposing an analytical complement; the closing article, by **Marcelo Lopes de Souza**, revisits the problem (necropolitics) to reflect – also in a theoretical and fairly general way – on alternatives and antidotes, in the form of a 'geographical theory of justice.' Between these two, there is a series of more specific contributions, heavily based on case studies or analyses of more or less particular situations.

Necroecology: Environmental Death in the Age of Climate Collapse and Ecocidal Development, is the opening paper. **Lucatello**, **Carril**, and **Siller Contreras** introduce 'necroecology' as a theoretical extension of necropolitics, exploring how environmental destruction is actually a kind of 'structured mode of governance' and not only an unintended consequence of capitalism. The authors argue that while Achille Mbembe focuses on the governance of human life and death, 'necroecology' expands this framework to include the systematic sacrifice of ecosystems, species, and planetary systems within the logic of economic and political domination.

Some related themes are explored in the Special Issue's second paper, which is authored by **Nicole Grimaldi**. Her article, entitled **Nuclear Half-Lives, Necropolitical Afterlives: The Canadian Nuclear Industry, Western Militarism, and Indigenous Resistance at Chalk River**, takes as its starting point the approved construction of a nuclear waste repository on unceded Algonquin/*Omàmìwininìwag* territory in Ontario, Canada. This situation represents a blatant violation of indigenous land rights; but Grimaldi's contribution goes beyond anthropocentrism in order to highlight and discuss 'nuclear necropolitics' in terms of how indigenous wildlife and natural reserves are targeted by sovereign power and deemed expendable. This has given rise to terrible sacrifice zones, whose astonishing history (dating back to the Manhattan Project of the

Second World War and even the manufacture of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki) is also discussed by the author.

Material Traces of Collective Mourning: Memorial Space-Making of Black Mother Activists in a Rio de Janeiro Favela is the title of the contribution by **Josefa Maria Stiegler**. Her article explores the gendered, classed and racialised impacts of urban necropolitics on Black women in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The author shows that, despite the widespread belief that Black men, who are disproportionately victimized by lethal police violence, suffer the most from necropolitical state violence, necropolitical security governance deliberately targets Black women. Considering that Black mothers are the main caregivers for their children and families, everyday police violence thus affects them in gender-specific ways, destroying family and social ties and fundamentally disrupting their ability to sustain and care for Black life. Although the author does not directly address the *socio-ecological* dimensions of the structural violence affecting the working class living in the *favelas* of Rio de Janeiro – whether Black, 'mixed-race,' or (by Brazilian standards) white –, there is another underlying aspect to these deadly circumstances that is directly related to both the ecological-social metabolism and the tragedies experienced by mothers in *favelas*: the absence or precariousness of basic sanitation, which spreads diseases due to contaminated water and other factors, and which costs countless lives, especially those of children. State negligence in this regard is also a facet of necropolitics, operating alongside the active state violence that is discussed in the article.

The contribution made by **Elizabeth Kiely**, **Katharina Swirak** and **Rosie R. Meade** brings a profoundly necropolitical theme to the readers' attention: the role of prisons and criminal justice. **Deaths of Despair in Irish Prisons and Beyond: A Necropolitical Analysis** shows that in the Republic of Ireland, the 'official' mission of the Prison Service – "ensuring the safety, security and dignity of the people who are imprisoned within its institutions and with creating an environment that facilitates rehabilitation" – is fundamentally undermined by the necropolitical forces and processes at work in and around Irish prisons. At this very moment, the Irish government is seeking to embark on

a substantial prison expansion project – the largest in Ireland's history. Inspired by abolitionist-ecology and arguing against such a development, the authors analyse "the role played by carceral institutions in both the expression and normalisation of state sanctioned necropolitical violence." From the perspective of a journal dedicated primarily to environmental geography and political ecology, it is remarkable and extremely meritorious that the authors have perceived the socio-ecological dimension present in prison necropolitics, bringing this aspect to the fore for readers as well. From a Global South perspective, this socio-ecological dimension gains particular importance because, compared to the prison system in countries of the Global North, the absolute lack of hygiene, compromising the physical and mental health of inmates, is a crucial aspect of carceral inhumanity, as is the complete absence of prospects for 'rehabilitation.' In this sense, as the final words of the title ('and beyond') suggest, the Irish case can well be seen as a stimulus for in-depth comparative studies, including from a South-North perspective.

The River as a Border of Exclusion: *Quilombola* Territorialities and the Necropolitics of Climate Risk Management in Angra dos Reis (RJ), Brazil is the paper by **João Gabriel M. M. Reis** and it draws upon evidence that has been gleaned through a combination of documentary and ethnographic research methods. Taking the 'climate issue' as a general framework, he analyses how "the development of strategies and initiatives aimed at climate risk management in traditionally occupied territories has been shaped by a technical-scientific perspective on ecology" that materializes "colonial power arrangements." For the purpose of demonstrating how necropower can be expressed through ostensibly neutral or even mundane processes of signifying, diagnosing and controlling territories characterised as 'risk areas' – "ultimately legitimising the selective management of life and death," as he stresses –, the paper critically investigates both the processes and implications of the elaboration of the 'risk' category in the Master Plan of Angra dos Reis, a medium-sized city in the state of Rio de Janeiro, in southeastern Brazil.

Necropolitical Zones in the Jungle: Commodity Flows, Logistic Infrastructures, and Spatial Justice in the Amazon is the title of the article by **Alexandre Gaiser-Fernandes** and **Philippe Zourgane**. Their work examines how the planetary circulation of commodities produces new 'regimes of spatial injustice and disposability', using as a 'laboratory' and concrete example the Amazonian port city of Barcarena, in the Brazilian state of Pará. The paper gravitates around the concept of 'necropolitical zones': which, as the authors elaborate, are "territories where exposure to death is not accidental, but structurally organised through infrastructures, regulations, and economic imperatives." It is certainly useful to question and reflect upon the difference between these 'necropolitical zones' and the already established concept of *sacrifice zones*, since these 'necropolitical zones' are, obviously, spaces of social-environmental sacrifice. The most productive approach, therefore, seems to be to understand sacrifice zones as necropolitical zones (something other authors have also done), bringing the already established concept closer to the theoretical contribution of Achille Mbembe.

The Struggle Against Necropolitical Rationality in the Amazon: Indigenous Peoples in Movement and Ancestral Territories, by **Rafael Zilio**, emphasizes the fact that the Amazon has historically been treated as a frontier to be "conquered and exploited." The region has also been regarded, as he explains, as a 'frontier of the world' – that is, as a space to be 'discovered' or, from a *colonial* environmentalist perspective, a kind of reserve of 'wilderness' (and as such, to be preserved untouched). Against this state of affairs, indigenous peoples have risen up and attempted to build alternatives, in what can be characterised as a struggle not only for physical survival (in the face of disease, violence, etc.), but also for a dignified life. It is precisely this ongoing struggle of and by the indigenous peoples of the Amazon that is the focus of the author's work. This struggle – radical and creative at the same time – is, in fact, a lesson for everyone, at all levels, including the workers and oppressed of large cities far beyond the Amazon.

The article by **Allan Rodrigo de Campos Silva**, entitled **Guarani *Teko Porã versus* Agribusiness *Ma'etirõ*: Fighting Necropolitics, Retaking Territories**, represents an

important and timely attempt to examine how the COVID-19 pandemic "exposed and intensified a regime of necropolitical spoliation of Guarani-Kaiowá body-territories" in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil. His paper articulates the dynamics of meatpacking plants (which work as hotspots of contagion) and the territorial expansion of agribusiness (soybean) through illegal land leases, and in so doing his study demonstrates "a structural convergence between the state and the market that transforms indigenous territories into sacrifice zones." The article's title features two expressions in Guarani that are emblematic of the gravity of what is at stake in the reality and context being analysed: *Ma'etiro* (malevolent smoke), which corresponds to a critique of the soy-meat chain, and *Teko Porã* (good living), representing the pole of resistance.

The Special Issue concludes with the article **Towards a Geographical Theory of Justice: The Right to the Planet**, by **Marcelo Lopes de Souza**. The author engages intensely with the ideas of Achille Mbembe, but the article's objective is not to limit itself to an analysis of problems – in a nutshell, necropolitics –, but rather to start from these problems to reflect on alternatives and, notably, the concept of the *right to the planet*, which is the antithesis of necropolitics. To this end, the author seeks to introduce and articulate elements towards the construction of a theory of justice that clearly and robustly incorporates the complex and multifaceted spatial dimension of reality. This paper is especially concerned with integrating discussions – which are generally still very separate from one another today – between social justice, spatial justice, environmental justice, and ecological justice. Insofar as necropolitics is very often an *eco*-necropolitics – as has been documented and analyzed across the contributions to this Special Issue - this theoretical and conceptual integration proves crucial.

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04

References

AHUJA, Neel. **Bioinsecurities**: Disease Interventions, Empire, and the Government of Species. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2016.

BERLANT, Lauren. Slow Death (Sovereignty, Obesity, Lateral Agency). **Critical Inquiry**, v. 33, n° 4, pp. 754–780, 2007.

BUTLER, Judith. Grievability of the Living. **Cultural Critique**, n° 1129, pp. 9-27, 2025.

BOBBY BANERJEE, Subhabrata. Necrocapitalism. **Organization Studies**, v. 29, n° 12, pp. 1541–1563, 2008.

CARNEY, Mark. **Prime Minister Carney delivers remarks at the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting**. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sFBkNX1-cbg>, 2026.

CASTRO, Andrés Fabián Henao. From the 'Bio' to the 'Necro': the Human at the Border. *In:* WILMER, Stephen.; ZUKAUSKAITĖ, Audronė (eds.). **Resisting Biopolitics**: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2016, pp. 281-301.

DUNLAP, Alexander A. Necropolitics to whom? Recognizing positionality, politics, and extractive intensity. **Progress in Human Geography**, v. 50, n° 2, pp. 264-266, 2026.

ESTÉVEZ, Ariadna. The Management of Death in North America: From the Necropolitical Governmentalization of the State to the Rule of Law Necropower. *In:* ESTÉVEZ, Ariadna (ed.) **Necropower in North America**: The Legal Spatialization of Disposability and Lucrative Death. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 9-33, 2021.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **The Will to Knowledge** – The History of Sexuality: 1. London, Penguin, 1978.

GRŽINIC, Marina; TATLIC, Šefik. **Necropolitics, Racialization, and Global Capitalism**: Historicization of Biopolitics and Forensics of Politics, Art, and Life. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2014.

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04

HARITAWORN, Jin, KUNTSMAN, Adi; POSOCCO, Silvia. Introduction, *In:* HARITAWORN, Jin; KUNTSMAN, Adi; POSOCCO, Silvia (eds.). **Queer Necropolitics**. Oxon: Routledge, 2014, pp. 1-27.

ISLEKEL, Ege Selin. Gender in Necropolitics: Race, Sexuality and Gendered Death. **Philosophy Compass**, v.17, n°5, pp. 1–20, 2022.

KOTSILA, Panagiota; ARGÜELLES, Lucía. The necropolitics of expendability: Migrant farm workers during COVID-19. **The Journal of Peasant Studies**, v. 51, n° 2, pp. 441-465, 2024.

JHA, Rishi. Necrosettlements. Life-threatening housing, necropolitics and the poor's deadly living in Mumbai. **Political Geography**, v. 100, pp. 1-12, 2023.

JUNAID, Mohamad. Disobedient bodies, defiant objects: Occupation, necropolitics and the resistance in Kashmir. **The Funambulist**, 21 December 2018. Available at: <https://thefunambulist.net/magazine/21-space-activism/disobedient-bodies-defiant-objects-occupation-necropolitics-resistance-kashmir-mohamed-junaid>. (last accessed 16 February 2026)

KUMAR. Pushpesh. Mapping Queer 'Celebratory Moment' in India: Necropolitics or Substantive Democracy? **Community Development Journal**, v. 55, n° 1, pp. 159–76. 2020.

LAMBLE, Sarah. Queer Necropolitics and the Expanding Carceral State: Interrogating Sexual Investments in Punishment. **Law Critique**, v. 24, pp. 229–253, 2013.

LEMKE, Thomas. **Biopolitics**: An Advanced Introduction. New York, New York: University Press, 2011.

MAYBLIN, Lucy; WAKE, Mustafa; KAZEMI, Mohsen. Necropolitics and the Slow Violence of the Everyday: Asylum Seeker Welfare in the Postcolonial Present. **Sociology**, v. 54, n° 1, pp. 107-123, 2020.

MBEMBE, Achille. Necropolitics. **Public Culture**, v. 15, n° 1, pp. 11–40, 2003.

MBEMBE, Achille. **Necropolitics**. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2019.

MEADE, Rosie R: Foucault's Concept of Counter-Conduct and the Politics of Anti-Austerity Protest in Ireland. **Concept, The Journal of Contemporary Community Education Practice Theory**, v. 5. n° 3, pp. 1-14, 2014.

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04

MEADE, Rosie. Mayday, Mayday! Newspaper framing anti-globalizers!: A critical analysis of the Irish Independent's anticipatory coverage of the `Day of the Welcomes' demonstrations'. **Journalism**, v. 9, n° 3, pp. 330-352, 2008.

MEADE, Rosie R. and KIELY, Elizabeth. (Neo)Liberal populism and Ireland's 'squeezed middle'. **Race & Class**. v. 61, n° 4, pp. 29-49, 2020.

ORTEGA, Arnisson Andre C. Exposing Necroburbia: Suburban Relocation, Necropolitics, and Violent Geographies in Manila. **Antipode**, v. 52, n° 4, pp. 1175-1195, 2020.

SINGH, Nikil Pal. **Homeland Empire**. Equator, 2026. Available at: <https://www.equator.org/articles/homeland-empire-trump-ICE>. (last accessed 18 February 2026)

SOUZA, Marcelo Lopes de. 'Sacrifice zone': The environment–territory–place of disposable lives. **Community Development Journal,** v. 56, n° 2, pp. 220–243, 2021.

THOBANI, Sunera. Prologue. *In:* HARITAWORN, Jin; KUNTSMAN, Adi; POSOCCO, Silvia (eds.). **Queer Necropolitics**. Abingdone: Routledge, pp. xv – xviii, 2014.

VON DER LEYEN, Ursula. **Press remarks by President von der Leyen on the first 100 days of the 2024-2029 Commission**. European Commission, 2025. Available at: <https://enlargement.ec.europa.eu/news/press-remarks-president-von-der-leyen-first-100-days-2024-2029-commission-2025-03-10_en>. (last accessed 18 February 2026)

Marcelo Lopes de Souza is a professor of environmental geography and political ecology at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. **Email:** mlopesdesouza@terra.com.br

Rosie R. Meade, School of Applied Social Studies, University College Cork, Cork City, Ireland. **Email:** r.meade@ucc.ie

AMBIENTES. Volume 8, Número 1, 2026, pp. 06-23. ISSN: 2674-6816
DOI: https://doi.org/10.48075/xg2mhp04