

## **Revisiting Reconceptualization of Power Relations and REDD+ Scholarship in the Global South**

**Danstan Mukono**

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology,  
University of Dar es Salaam  
mukono5@hotmail.com/mukono.danstan@udsm.ac.tz*

### **Abstract**

*This paper examines power as a conceptual lens for understanding Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation plus (REDD+) scholarship in the Global South. It focuses on the underlying argument that conservation problematization, practices, and execution are complex and variegated in shaping asymmetric power relations. This demonstrates that REDD + power framing is not unilinear but has theoretical commonalities and differences that need systematic documentation, yet scanty and discrete. Thus, it re-examines recent debates and theoretical trends on REDD+ through power approaches. It has shown that analysing the complexity of power relations reveals uneven power structures shaping REDD+ with associated inequitable relations. Also, the paper highlights specific ideas, strategies and initiatives by those powerful actors have produced in extending coloniality for controlling forest-land-dependent communities and their actions to resist it. It showcases how current critical theories and policy debates are crucial for realizing a just and equitable conservation model in the Global South.*

**Keywords:** Power, REDD+, social difference, Global South

### **Introduction**

In the Global South, the implementation of the Reduced Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation plus (REDD+) programme has attracted scholarly attention with diverse theoretical framings. These analytical works explore how power relations unfolds but with little focus on the intersection of coloniality and internal context-specific social differentiation (Collins, 2021). Contrary to popularised success narratives, evidence suggests that REDD+ projects implemented in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean raise political and ethical questions over people's livelihoods. Evidence from Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guyana and Suriname, Indonesia, Tanzania, and Vietnam reveal the persistence of ramifications. The resulting consequences include local conflicts, resistance

and weak enforcement of domestic laws on forests, lack of community participation, and racially induced domination by reinforcing pro-environmentality behaviour through neoliberal rationality (Samndong & Bush, 2017; Boer, 2017; Collins, 2019a; Collins, 2019b; Fletcher et al., 2016; McGregor & McGregor, 2016; Milne et al., 2019). These observations shed light on the conceptual complexities that inform the available scholarship, drawing from a wide range of theories of power to disentangle carbon offsetting in the Global South.

REDD+ supporters emphasize a win-win intervention for enhancing carbon sequestration and community development (Arora-Jonsson, Westholm, Temu, & Petitt, 2016; Corbera, 2012), while, Methmann (2013) and Nightingale et al. (2020a) consider these sets of solutions like REDD+ as "economic repair." This suggests that western capitalist countries continue business as usual by generating more emissions as long as they contribute piecemeal incentives to developing countries. Therefore, it is clear that the colonial conservation system is still in place. It has systematically reproduced another differentiated burden to the Global South for the emission generated in the Global North (Hein, 2019). Thus, there is a continuity of differentiated responsibilities between the global North and South associated with uneven consequences burdening the Global South and marginalized women and men - indeed, extending empire and coloniality (Nygren, Kröger, & Gills, 2022; Sultana, 2022).

Conceptually, emerging theories of power are diverse in examining inequitable implications of colonial, postcolonial, and neoliberal processes shaping climate interventions such as forestry carbon offsets. In this case, the discussion reveals how the production of REDD+ is a political assemblage that serves the interest of global powers, states, NGOs, and international social actors. The losers in these interventions are the less powerful nations and rural communities owning village land forest reserves (VLFRs) with inter and intra social differentiation across class, gender, age, and other social variables (Hausermann et al., 2018; Sultana, 2021). This review essay attempts to reconstruct a link that seeks to go beyond macro/micro binary or material and discursive practices to reveal existing relational power dynamics governing nature and people (cf. Gonda et al., 2021). It maps out emerging studies that unfold multiple dimensions of inequalities, dominations, exclusions, and negotiations that inform the scholarly debates in the political ecologies' prism of everyday life of power relations in governing society and environment.

The paper responds to an invitation by Svarstad & Benjaminsen (2018) and Svarstad & Benjaminsen (2020:6). They have noted a lack in conceptualizing and synthesizing power perspectives in political ecology. Drawing from REDD+ case studies, I conceptualize power and re-examine its complexities as utilized in different contexts that provide theoretical strands and practical lessons. This scholarly undertaking is timely because there is still a little attempt at how REDD+ has re-crafted power theories in its variegated reconceptualization to destabilize colonial-based conservation practices. Despite valuable insights enlightening existing asymmetric power relations, it mostly fails to synthesize the multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary strength of power perspectives illuminating the lifeworld of power practices and conceptual synergies within decolonial thoughts (Asiyanbi et al., 2019; Fletcher, 2007; Svarstad, Benjaminsen, & Overå, 2020). The paper draws on recent critical scholarship on REDD+ to fill this gap. Notably, the data source is directly from existing scholarship; the primary attention is on what Tania Murray Li (2014) calls the "ethnography in governing" (Li, 2014). I reflect REDD+ as an extension of colonial thinking, discourses, and exploitative practices while fixing forest users in the Global South (Gutiérrez-Zamora, 2021).

The current paper addresses the questions once raised by Blaikie (1985:6): "Who wins and who loses from resources and conservation policies?" And "where power lies and how it is used." The paper is structured as follows; in the subsequent section, it reflects on the hegemonic framing of REDD+ as a viable and win-win market mechanism. This proceeded with rethinking REDD+ within power approaches while teasing out how power as an organizing concept informs different studies. This is done by first re-examining how actor-oriented power theories have influenced REDD+ scholarship. Second, review how neo-Marxist power theories are utilized to underscore power practices and green grabbing. Third, it revisits discursive power theories and their environmentality framing (Agrawal, 2005; Fletcher, 2010). They use Michael Foucault's understanding of discourses, governmentality, and biopolitics (Cavanagh, 2014). Then, I provide a detailed case from Tanzania that has uniquely attracted the attention of different scholars with diverse power approaches in illustrating differentiated social and ecological consequences. What follows in the subsequent section is a theoretical tour of power theories with specific attention to conservation practices in the Global South.

### **Rebranding and selling a win-win market-based discourse in REDD+**

Visioning and execution of REDD+ in the Global South has moved from institutional and legal framing and enhancement at a national level towards specific context-based community carbon-sequestering projects with two primary goals; conserving forests and improving people's wellbeing (Corbera, 2012; Mukono, 2021; Turnhout et al., 2017). The core ambitions shaping these discursive and material practices in multi-sited interventions are win-win rhetoric accompanying carbon forestry conservation (Corbera, 2012; Svarstad & Benjaminsen, 2017). The foci of funders, state, and local NGOs implementing projects are to improve community land tenure, local welfare, and restore biodiversity (Samndong & Bush, 2017; Scheba, 2014). Svarstad and Benjaminsen (2017), Lund et al. (2017), Carton and Edstedt (2021), and Edstedt and Carton (2018) reiterate that carbon forestry has produced successive narratives to legitimize the interests of powerful actors. Yet, complex overlapping uneven colonial matrix of power in its variegated framing and structures are still at scholarly margins (Collins et al., 2021; Quijano, 2007; Quijano & Wallerstein, 1992).

Currently, critical scholarly debates and empirics attest that REDD+ governance reproduces market-based rationality and incentives to influence international actors, states, local NGOs, and communities to combat deforestation and forest degradation (Boer, 2017; Collins, 2017; Lai, Leoni, & Stacchezzini, 2012; Mukono, 2021). The paper is inspired by political ecologies of REDD+ in the Global South while reconstructing within the scholarship of power shaping conservation models (Svarstad, Benjaminsen, & Overå, 2018; Fletcher, 2007) and decolonial thinking (Collins, 2019a; Mehta & Harcourt, 2021). The critical question is: what theories of power have shaped the political ecologies of REDD+ in the Global South and beyond? Even though there is criticism of REDD+ for increasing inequality and injustice, it appears there is less theorization and synthesis of the continuity of uneven colonial power and capitalist hegemonic social structure.

### **Reorganizing the political ecologies of REDD+ through diverse power approaches**

Exploration of REDD+ governance in the Global South and Tanzania invites a relational understanding of social, political, and economic practices, power dynamics, and diverse ramifications of governing nature and people (Benjaminsen & Svarstad, 2018). Svarstad et al. (2018:351) suggest multifaceted connected political ecologies and sociological conception of power in its actually-existing configuration of the differentiated social positions of winners and losers. Svarstad, Benjaminsen, and Overå appreciate

ongoing efforts to rethink a broader perspective. Likewise, Eric Wolf (2001) combined Karl Marx and Michael Foucault and apprehended forms of power to embody agentic motives and structural constraints. Svarstad, Benjaminsen, and Overå illustrate through Ribot and Peluso's (2003) neo-Weberian conception of power that appreciates the agency of individual actors and, correspondingly, compliments it with Marxist and Foucauldian power viewpoints.

Peluso and Ribot's (2003:153) power stances bring forward a complex attentive pluriverse of socio-ecological epistemologies and ontologies. First, as "the capacity to some actors to affect the practices and ideas of others and second, [that] power [is] emergent from, though not permanently attached to people. Disciplining institutions and practices reinforce people to act in specific ways without apparent coercion. The internalisation of environmental rules and ideas by subjects (Fletcher, 2007; Olsen & Marger, 1993:2-3) reveals the coloniality of governed social actors (cf. Bhambra, 2020; Quijano, 2007). Building on these theoretical propositions, I envisage REDD+ as a complex environmental governance involving diverse, unequally positioned individuals, practices, and institutions (Asiyanbi & Massarella, 2020). Specifically, it illuminates how the question of coloniality social differentiation in terms of class, gender, and race/ethnicity shapes available theoretical framings (Cavanagh, 2016; Sultana, 2021).

Based on these theoretical problematisations of carbon offsets governance, the paper gazes on the politics surrounding REDD+. It creatively pushes to reconstruct existing understanding from diverse theoretical angles. It explores different dimensions of power theories, including firstly, the actor-oriented power perspective; and secondly, the neo-Marxist power, which focuses on the economic constraints of power practices in the forms of domination and exploitation. A key question here is what would be the theoretical potentials when one forges inherent nexus to inform critical practices to address the uneven implication of these interventions. The third variant constitutes discursive power perspectives drawn from poststructuralism, specifically Michel Foucault's ideas with his discourse's analysis of knowledge/power, governmentality/environmentality, and biopower/biopolitics (Cavanagh & Benjaminsen 2015).

This work analytically shows how each dimension of power epistemic communities and their combinations provide a different or overlapping understanding of the implementation of REDD+ in the Global South. It is crucial to subject these perspectives to a broad prism of unequal world systems of capitalist relations (Sultana, 2021). This is because it subjects the

Global South to the domination of the core with continuity of colonial imperial remains or what Collins reconstructs it as "*colonial residues*" (Collins et al., 2021; Mabele, Krauss & Kiwango, 2022; Aníbal Quijano & Wallerstein, 1992). Subsequently, it provides readers with a short theoretical overview of each power perspective and the ways it surfaces in the REDD+ political ecology thoughts.

***Actor and agency-oriented approaches: micro-practices of power relations***

Rethinking power from an agentic lens considers the constant negotiation of power among actors who seek recognition through tactical positioning (Benjaminsen & Kaarhus, 2018; Mukono & Sambaiga, 2021). For instance, Scott's framing of "everyday resistance" has significantly influenced the political ecology problematization of everyday resistance in colonial-imposed conservation models (Asiyanbi, Ogar, & Akintoye, 2019; Holmes & Cavanagh, 2016; Lund & Saito-Jensen, 2013; Mukono & Sambaiga, 2021; Nepomuceno, Affonso, Fraser, & Torres, 2019; Neumann, 1998). Still, the issues of heterogeneous social positions and distinctions in terms of class, gender, race, or ethnicity as an extension of coloniality in development and conservation across places and within exiting social classifications are less problematised by Svarstad, Benjaminsen & Overå (2018). Such a position obscures approaching a social structure of the community in question as a complex web of uneven social classes, identity, and ownership of resources (Collins, 2021; Mukono & Sambaiga, 2021) as part of a historically conditioned (post)colonial hierarchy of power.

In contrast, Olsen and Merger's (1993) conception of power is an interactive process, signifying an act of Actor A in exercising power over Actor B. When A can get B to perform, B would not be possible. Olsen and Merger's view is similar to Luke's contribution to two and three dimensions of power. Luke's "one-dimension view" intervenes in the behaviour reinforcing decision-making in explicit contestations, while the "two-dimension view" also involves thriving behaviour to contain political agenda. This analytical lens demonstrates how different forms of capital (economic, political, cultural, or social), discursive power resource (p.353), and symbolic power affect actors with differentiation in the social hierarchy of decision-making in environmental governance (Benjaminsen, 2014). However, there is a limitation in the Weberian approach because it inclines much on eclectic idealism that reproduces western 'rationality' as the core analytical benchmark while paying less attention on the materiality and dialectical nature and uneven knowledge production in shaping human subjectivities (Greco, 2022).

This micro-politics worldview illuminates the triumph of the marginalized groups of conservation interventions that reproduce neoliberal conservation logic (Dempsey & Suarez, 2016; Holmes, 2007; Scheba, 2014). By combing Marxists and Foucauldian thoughts and demonstrating that international actors, state, and non-state actors architects produce eco-managerial interventions overrides access and use of forest resources (Adger, Benjaminsen, Brown, & Svarstad, 2001; Massarella, Sallu, Ensor, & Marchant, 2018). Recently, Asiyambi et al. (2019) investigated the complexities of everyday resistance in Cross River REDD+ projects, making actors who depend on enclosed forests struggle to reclaim lost identities and recognition through overt and covert material complexities and discursive technologies of power from below.

Likewise, Nepomuceno et al. (2019) discuss how forest-dependent groups possess subaltern agencies that intentionally and creatively use their lived knowledge to oppose injustices. It is interesting to underscore how the agency of recipients of REDD+ hosting communities reacted, intending to counter exclusions (Asiyambi, Arhin, & Isyaku, 2017; Asiyambi, 2018; Collins, 2019b). These theoretical and empirical demonstrations regarding REDD+ scholarship disclose how individual agency is configured, constrained, and discursively negotiated within REDD+ recipient communities (Benjaminsen & Kaarhus, 2018; Mukono & Sambaiga, 2021).

Neoliberal conservation produces structural exclusions and exploitations that are historical, and intersect with racially classed and gendered constructs (Collins, 2021; Scheba, 2014). There is conceptual significance in dialoguing actor-based and another power reframing to understand the complexities that shape the nature-society nexus. It is vital to compliment structural social-ecological variables and micro-politics in forest governance beyond structural determinism and opt for a more objectivism/subjectivism relational analysis that adds value to the connected political ecologies and sociologies of nature/society and agency/structure duality (cf. Bhabra, 2014). In the subsequent section, the paper is reviewing the most hegemonic theoretical strand on the macro power that is informed by the Marxist dialect logic of capitalist accumulation.

### ***Neo-Marxist power perspectives***

Marxist political ecologists and their protagonists have extended multidisciplinary academic acceptance (cf. Nielsen, 2002), taking the intersection of capitalism and domination shaping the climate change crisis (Mehta, Huff, & Allouche, 2019; Ranganathan, 2021; Sultana, 2021a). Likewise, it has influenced political ecology in examining inequalities,

exploitation, and unequal global distribution of power and resources within a capitalist system (Böhm, Misoczky, & Moog, 2012; Fairhead, Leach, & Scoones, 2012). The Marxian political ecology examines class relations inherent in the capitalist society and how it (re)produces spaces to accommodate the endless accumulation of capital (Cavanagh, 2017; Margulies, 2019; Rao, 2018). Presently, there is a call to go beyond class, and examine how complex social classification such as race, caste, and ethnicity has historically reproduced, legitimized, and enacted to govern other races and peripheral spaces for the interest of the western capitalist interests (Carmody, 2019; Collins et al., 2021; Kashwan et al., 2021).

It is crucial to correct the dominant misconception that Marx's understanding of capitalist class relations lacks decentring agency, as highlighted by Svarstad, Benjaminsen, and Overå (2018:354). However, Marx's proposition of human agency is conceived with a broader understanding of historical materialism dynamics (Marx 1852:5). According to Marx, actors produce their history not under their wishes but due to existing social circumstances extending from past conditions. From a decolonial scholarship, Marx's conception of modernity and capitalism suffers much from the lack of extended debate on empire and coloniality as part of Western domination of the Global South (Bhambra, 2020, 2022; Quijano, 2000). Yet, unlike other animals, in Marx's view, human beings think before acting as they labour towards transforming nature. Thus, this provides dialectical possibilities for humans to engage with the material world and knowledge production (cf. Goonewardena, Kipfer, Milgrom & Schmid, 2008; Lefebvre, 1968). Current studies attempt to combine analysis of state power, legitimation, ideology, and the politics of rural resistance within the broader analysis of the political economy of the environment primarily discussed in the politics of forestry (Peluso & Vandergeest, 2001).

Marxist power theory views the human agency as conditioned and produced mainly by historically established differentiated social structures. While structure creates the potential and limits exertion of power, the agency reproduces structure (Svarstad, Benjaminsen and Overå 2018:354). In contrast, Fletcher (2007:6) bridges poststructuralism and Marxism that echo a dialectical nature of the power of resistance as a dimension of human agency. Fletcher sounds closer to Timothy Luke's (1999) understanding that power serves to hide "true interests," echoing Marx's idea of "false consciousness." It is vital to advance perspective(s) that accommodates relation strands in which social structure and agency intersect in governing carbon forestry and people's interactions (Hollander & Einwohner, 2004).



Nevertheless, Fletcher seems to disregard the question of coloniality and capitalist imperial dominations of the Global South. He reconstructs knowledge/power within the dominant western epistemic framing (Böhm et al., 2012) and is shaped through methodological individualism (cf. Windegger & Spash, 2021).

Meanwhile, David Harvey has influenced several political ecologists by using accumulation by dispossession as an analytical concept while analysing the process of capitalist accumulation and the problem of climate change and its rationale. Scholars have utilized Harvey's idea to understand accumulation related to environmental conservation, such as blue grabbing in the case of marine management or green grabbing in forestry governance (Benjaminsen & Bryceson, 2012). For Fairhead et al. (2012:237), green grabbing entails 'the appropriation of land and resources for environmental ends.' Cavanagh shows these tendencies as a continuum of the past invention and colonial and postcolonial accumulation production. Political ecologists following David Harvey acknowledge that commodifying nature to tackle capitalism has dominated the climate change agenda (Benjaminsen & Kaarhus, 2018).

Similarly, Corson, MacDonald, and Neimark (2013); Fairhead et al. (2012), and Scoones (2015) have examined the production of carbon offsets and other processes of commodification of social-natural entities to be a replica of "green grabbing" and specifically "blue grabbing" for marine conservation (Benjaminsen & Bryceson, 2012). John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark (2009) have conceptualized Marx's earlier interest in the capitalist tendency to tarnish nature in the form of what he calls "metabolic rift." This concept is borrowed from the German chemist Justus von Liebig. Marx was much interested in analyzing the ecological crisis caused by capitalism. Forster (1999) counters Marx's counter-critiques who assume that Marx was disinterested in environmental questions and realized a limited sensibility of ecological sustainability under capitalism.

Climate fix has gained theoretical currents in the political economy of environmental governance. For David Harvey, "spatial fix" reveals that capitalism accumulation contradiction is glued through the geographical flow of capital to periphery capitalist localities. Rightly expressed, this social and ecological stitching suggests temporal cures to ruptured socio-ecological relations without overhauling inherent to the community at the margins of Global South with uneven environmental and social consequences (Sultana, 2021b). Thus, this requires both theoretical and practical delinking with western authoritative power structures that erase other diverse knowledge

claims and lived experiences of the people at the margin in the Global South (cf. Kamata, 2020).

In another work, Harvey has equated this tendency drawing from Fredrick Nietzsche as "creative destruction" (Harvey 2007). In contrast, Hall et al. (2011) combine Marxian-Polanyian approaches to study modernization processes in Southern Asia and reveal increasing de-agrarian nations due to displacement practices of state economies and people's livelihood in rural areas. While Borrás et al. (2021); Hall et al. (2015), Bumpus and Liverman (2011), Cavanagh and Benjaminsen (2014, 2017), Büscher, Sullivan, Neves, Igoe, & Brockington (2012), among others, have unfolded inherent colonial conservation tendencies and continuity of dispossession through green grabbing( Cavanagh, Vedeld, & Trædal, 2015; Lund, Sungusia, Mabele, & Scheba, 2017).

These debates reveal a complexity of exclusion and power relations due to land titling reforms, environmental conservation, urban expansion and other changing of agricultural land to non-agricultural use, small holders' exclusions of neighbours and kin, and various forms of resistance (Cavanagh et al., 2015; Murdock, 2021; Sturgeon, 2021). Hall et al.'s (2015) detailed analysis provides a practical classification framework indicating the exclusion network, including licensed exclusions, ambient exclusions, volatile exclusions, post-agrarian exclusions, intimate exclusions, and counter-exclusions along the unequal power line of global North and South. The main question to be addressed here is how REDD+ practices have configured a diversity of exclusions in different project settings (cf. Asiyambi & Massarella, 2020). How green grabbing is crafted in carbon forestry and multi-sited localities? These leading questions are well-captured by the neo-Marxist perspective. It reveals how global capitalist power relations shape the interest of powerful actors that legitimize draconian institutional frameworks for capital accumulation in the name of conservation (Leach & Scoones 2015).

Criticisms levelled against Marxists for being structural deterministic are addressed well through a combination of actor-based theories of power. The mixture is illustrated through soft governing technologies to configure actors' subjectivities and micro-practices of capitalist systems. In other studies, the Gramscian conception of hegemony (Stephan, 2012) has helped deconstruct how consent and ideologies are vital in dominating marginalized groups (Calvário, Velegrakis & Kaika, 2017; Ekers & Loftus, 2008). These complicated subjects' complexities comprehensively open theoretical possibilities to explain the intersection of structural and superstructure

practices shaping conservation. There is an attempt to bring forth academic dialogues between Hegelian, Heideggerian, and other post-structural thoughts to problematize the spatial, social, and political questions in the production of capitalist modernity with little concern with unequal power relations (Brenner & Elden, 2009; Elden, 2007; Smith, 2020).

It is emphasized that without forging a conceptual dialogue with decolonial thought, such an attempt reproduces a similar modernity/rationality status quo without providing direction for decolonizing conservation with inherent coloniality of power, knowledge, and subjectivities. For instance, Svarstad and Benjaminsen (2020:4) touch little on the importance of radical decolonial environmental justice, and critical knowledge production, injustice as recognition grapples with misrecognition amongst multiple social categories including gender, race, religion, or state. Yet, depths engaging with scholarly thoughts from the global South remain at the margins.

Asiyanbi (2016) combines the Marxian-Foucauldian approach to understand how embedded political dynamics have shaped property rights, militarized protectionism, and carbonized exclusions in Cross River, Nigeria. He argues that initiatives for securing property rights and sustaining REDD+ forests fit with the state's economic, ecological and ideological ambitions and non-state actors to establish a militarized and market-based protectionism regime. Asiyanbi illustrates the political ecologies of REDD+ through a dialectical view of material and symbolic formulation underlying carbon forestry economy militarized protectionism. This socio-ecological symbiosis constitutes a frontier of exclusion with other intentions beyond carbon forestry and facilitates elites' capital accumulation.

On the other hand, Cavanagh (2017) examines the internal displacement process in Liberia and Sierra Leone is associated with enclosure, dispossession, and the green economy. Cavanagh observes that land acquisitions for conservation and commercial agriculture are critical factors driving internal displacement. Despite interested theoretical nuances, these debates need to be in conversation with a colonial matrix of power with continuity of materially and epistemic/discursive domination (Bhambra, 2022; Collins et al., 2021).

### ***Discursive turn and poststructuralist power perspectives***

The post-structuralism perspective has significantly influenced current discussions across a broader theoretical spectrum, including understanding how environmental governance is materially and discursively produced and legitimized (Agrawal, 2005). Inspired by Michael Foucault's thinking,

political ecology studies have explored how knowledge production, circulation, and dissemination act as the power to shape actors' behaviour, mentality and interaction with nature and resources (Fletcher, 2010, 2020; Gutiérrez-Zamora, 2021). Svarstad, Benjaminsen, and Overå (2018:356) have differentiated three post-structuralist power perspectives, namely discursive power, governmentality, and biopower/biopolitics appropriated differently in the political ecology. It draws its theoretical influence from Maarten Hajer (1995) and John Dryzek (1997) for discursive power. Expressly, discursive power signifies the ability to deconstruct narratives and storylines inherent in specific encounters of mainstream environmental scholarship and policy formulations.

Discursive understanding of power as a socially shared perspective is crucial. Discursive power is produced when actors, including organizations, state agencies, or non-governmental organizations, govern to make other actors by instilling green subjectivities (Nielsen 2014). Its central foci are the material and discursive practices shaping environmental narratives. Scholarly works that combine critical realism in underscoring environmental discourses include Adger et al. (2001). This approach has provided empirical-based implications observed in dominant environmental managerial narratives. They have revealed how powerful claims have established historical and conceptual lineage from the colonial conservation framing, which continues to influence contemporary conservation discourses, and considers Global South as a pristine nature (Gutiérrez-Zamora, 2021; Mehta & Harcourt, 2021).

Luke (2005) connects the Foucauldian conception of power with agency problematization. There is a concern that Foucauldian framing power leaves little chance for active individuals to confront subjectification (Collins, 2019b; McGregor et al., 2019) due to its limitation on methodological individualism (Windegger & Spash, 2021). However, Foucauldian scholarship addresses that concern by indicating that actors have always resisted top-down power mechanisms despite the hegemonic influences of governmental power in conserving orderly constraints (Bluwstein, 2017; Cepek, 2011; Fletcher, 2017). Existing literature suggests the existence of governmentality and environment from below in which it rediscovers simple forms or technologies of resistance against neoliberal conservation (Rocheleau, 2007:22). It is further argued that "yet there is resistance to governmentality at this price which consequently conducts themselves in ways that appropriate, subvert, or challenge ordering risks." (Bishop

2014:213). Thus, fluidity of power implies dynamic relations of power constraints, negotiations, and resistance to external impositions.

Other scholars have noted that the above tendency has degraded other forms of knowing, constructing other practices within the image of western rationality (Hope, 2021; Massarella et al., 2021). Similarly, the question of "otherness" or indignity has preoccupied political ecologists, such as Tania Li, to fix non-market subjects (Li, 2014). For instance, Cavanagh (2016) reveals how colonial administration attempts in Kenya to engage with governing forest-dwellers or the "Dorobo question," signifying the Maasai idea of "for the poor, the sinful - and hence-the cattle less." Cavanagh illustrates that efforts to control such communities underscores the historical and geographical aspect of the late Imperial Britain's seemingly 'liberal' biopolitics, which denotes not the 'abandonment' of populations. Consequently, it leads to the elimination and subsequent transformation of livelihoods, ontologies, and sustainability conceived as costly or contrary of importance to the colonial state. Thus, environment subjective otherness in this view is relationally conceptualized with race, class, tribes/indigenous binaries.

Also, the post-structural power perspective draws from Foucault's conception of knowledge and power in altering actors' behaviour towards environmental ends. Political ecology studying community participatory environmental intervention such as Arun Agrawal (2005) attempts to reframe such attempts as "environmentality." Other scholars have utilized Foucault's concept of governmentality to understand the hybrid of materiality and discursive practices of environmental governance, including Andrew et al. (2015), Boer (2017), Fletcher (2020), Mukono (2021), Rutherford (2007, 2017) and Cepek (2011), to mention but a few. The Foucauldian dimension of power involves sovereign, disciplinary, and biopower. In environmental governance, neoliberal environmental management is theoretically advanced by Rob Fletcher (2010) who explains that ecological management is controlled under complex power configurations of environmentality. Fletcher observed that the "disciplinary form" denotes the power of the state to conduct populations with specific subjectivities or "mentalities" following uniform ethical and social norms (Fletcher, 2017). Fletcher's works have accumulated scholarly attention and multiple environmentality frameworks. Still, it has limitations to exclude other critical and decolonial scholars who see the relations between the Global North and Global South as indeed continuity of producing and reproducing accumulation by dispossession or restoration (Collins, 2021;

Greco, 2022; Montefrío & Dressler, 2016; Quijano, 2007; Srivastava & Mehta, 2021).

Fletcher discusses another dimension of power as "truth" environmentality, produced to govern the population according to religious or indigenous precepts. An excellent example of the latter is traditional spirituality and cosmology that sanctions that attach sacredness to nature (Fletcher, 2020). He pinpointed another classical power as a "sovereign" environmentality that conducts the population through clear established rules and sanctions stipulating good or destructive behaviour. McGregor et al. (2015) ethnographic study in Indonesia indicates the complex utilization of different forms of governmentality, including "truth" environmentality shared by REDD+ Agency and AMAN project that considers indigenous people as homogenous communities internalized with social norms and beliefs supporting conservation. Conversely, specific studies have deconstructed this notion and revealed that traditional values, standards and indignity are produced for the interest of capital, which Tania Li portrays as a technology of "fixing non-market subjects" for enhancing neoliberal accumulation in the name of conservation and improvement (Dell'Angelo, D'Odorico, Rulli & Marchand, 2017; Li, 2014).

The last on the list is a "neoliberal" environmentality or differently expressed as "biopower," signifying the tendencies modifying economic and social incentive structure to accrue maximum outcome based on economic logic. Fletcher has emphasized that these forms might work independently or in tandem, shaping each other. Studies by Bluwstein (2017) and Fletcher (2017) have shown that established rules sanction forest-dwellers living in the nearest protected areas. Fines and imprisonment are used to shape them towards conservation ends. In explaining this, they have argued that the rationality underlying the establishment of forest reserves and parks resembles the western view of pristine nature that assumes the exclusive frontiers of wildness without human habitant. In this sense, the sovereign environmentality produces a governable space for confining human movements through positive guidance and circulation of laws.

Currently, neoliberal rationality is dominantly shaping conservation governance and specifically REDD+. Interestingly, Asiyanbi et al. (2019), Boer (2017), and Astuti and McGregor (2015) have re-examined the dominance of market-based mechanisms in governing presumed forest-dependent population degrading behaviours. Likewise, Oels (2005) and Stephen (2014) demonstrate that forestry knowledge enhances the production of calculative and measurable plans in designing and governing forests as

economic entities. However, looking at this neoliberal conservation is nothing new but an extension of capitalist expansion in the Global South propelled by states, international institutions, civil society organizations as champions of creating exchange values and commodification nature (Lima & Kmoch, 2021; Edstedt & Carton, 2018; Kaika et al., 2017).

Concerning climate change discourse, Cavanagh (2014) documents the growth of the biopower framework that focuses on Foucault's theoretical shifts towards viewing biopower as the tool to "make life or die." Biopolitical reveals that this shift intends to improve lives by investing in different dimensions, including health and other developmental aspects. Cavanagh explains that the anthropogenic question related to human activities further threatens the management of the population's welfare. He observes that the environmental and welfare crises as matters of securitization reveal that conservation interventions grapple with ecological modernization of resource access and use, such as the domestication of animals (Nielsen, 2014). These ethnographic studies by Cavanagh and Asiyambi reveal the problematic concerns of ramifications of neoliberal conservation leading to dispossession and displacement of marginalized populations (Asiyambi, 2016; Cavanagh, 2018).

Boer (2017) analyses biopower tendencies underlying REDD+ interventions in Central Kalimantan Province, Indonesia, and relates this power as "Welfare Environmentality." Boer demonstrates that neoliberal incentive mechanisms under project programming include the deliverance of social services and employment schemes intending to improve community livelihoods. Except for Asiyambi, Cavanagh, and Collins, who seriously take capitalist social systems' central concern, other scholars such as Boer reproduce the status quo. They take REDD+ as an analytical starting point independent of past colonial practices. Thus, biopolitics as an extension of coloniality is significant in understanding capitalism to intersect with colonialism, class, race, and gender to produce historically differentiated nature-society ramifications in the Global South. What follows in the next section is a brief theoretical and empirical synopsis of different practical case studies in Tanzania while contrasting it with a broader discussion elsewhere in this paper.

### **Struggles, resistance, and (re)negotiation of exclusions in Uganda, Tanzania, Guyana, and Suriname**

Implementing REDD+ in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean has created frictions and ruptures within forest-dependent communities due to unequal relations among conservation winners and losers. These conflicts have taken

different modalities and practices, both in the form of overt and covert tactics. Studies in Nigeria, Uganda, and Tanzania have observed variances in how existing heterogeneous social differences, for instance, women, pastoralists, charcoal makers, fruit correctors, timber makers, and others at the margin have resisted these enclosures (Asiyanbi et al., 2019; Benjaminsen & Kaarhus, 2018; Cavanagh et al., 2015; Scheba, 2018). For instance, Benjaminsen & Kaarhus (2018) and Scheba (2018) in Tanzania; and Asiyanbi et al. (2019) in Cross Niger, Nigeria, highlight the recurrence of resistance because of transforming customary and land relations that dislocate existing social organization and structure.

Therefore, findings from Tanzania and Nigeria reveal diversely contested dislocation of locally situated socio-political practices, meanings, identities, and relations with a single economic denominator (Asiyanbi et al., 2019; Mukono & Sambaiga, 2021). For instance, Scheba (2018) observes an increase in complex local politics, power, struggles, and underlying structural constraints regarding Southern Tanzania land ownership and boundaries contestations. These contestations and negotiations by different forest-dependent communities remind the fruitfulness of exploring what Althorpe & Horak (2021) call "*solidarity-in-difference*". In the context of REDD+, we see the emergence of solidarity of dispossessed, excluded, and displaced marginal groups bounding together through their shared experiences of dispossessions as powerful forces to resist enclosures. These are notable in different parts of the Global South, such as Guyana, Suriname, and Uganda (Cavanagh & Benjaminsen, 2014; Collins, 2019b). For example, Collins (2019b) illustrates that Suriname's REDD+ is continuing claims for recognition of their land rights. In comparison, Mukono and Sambaiga (2021) explore the everyday experiences of resistance deployed by people at the margins in Southern Tanzania.

### ***Dispossession and contestations in the enactment of REDD+: 'Tanzania's experiences***

Neo-Marxism has informed some studies exploring the actual practices of REDD+ governance in Tanzania. Marxian thoughts have received theoretical significance in analysing the asymmetrical social processes and relations underlying carbon forestry that sustain capitalist tendencies for furthering accumulation. For instance, Benjaminsen and Bryceson (2012) indicate that conservation interventions in Tanzania targeting climate mitigations, wildlife, and marine conservation have reproduced some 'green/blue' grabbing. This is conceptualized through the dispossession of local people's land through soft



mechanisms in community-based approaches and other incidences using violent means.

Existing scholarship has extended Marx's ideas of primitive accumulation by revealing a process of commodification and privatization of land in which communal property is reconfigured into private property while restricting access rights of commons. Benjaminsen and Bryceson tie this process with David Harvey's (2003) reframing of the continuity of these processes as 'accumulation by dispossession.' Focusing on Tanzania, Benjaminsen and Bryceson observe that by 2007, around 36 percent of the country's total area is subjected to quasi-fortress protection. Since then, more land has been incorporated into market-based models by co-producing 'community-based narratives (Mabele, 2020). They reveal that accumulation by dispossession and enclosures/fortress conservation in wildlife and coastal conservation is moved by capital accumulation by some powerful actors from rent-seeking state officials, international conservation organizations, tourists companies, and the State Treasury (Cavanagh, 2017; Huff, 2021).

Although there are attempts to use the Marxian conception of accumulation by dispossession as a form of green grabbing, there is a gap to the extent its relational lens unfolds more complex context-specific existing social differentiation in terms of class, gender, race, or ethnicity (Kashwan, Mudaliar, Foster, & Clement, 2021; Nightingale, 2011; Rao, 2018). Discursive power and green grabbing processes provide theoretical and empirical breakthroughs to analyse these asymmetrical social relations and how they configure the everyday interaction of people and forest resources. There is less discussion on existing capitalist uneven power influencing social and spatial-fix of climate crisis (Bryant, Dabhi & Böhm, 2015; Scheba, 2014; Thakholi & Büscher, 2021).

### ***Discourses, power, discursive turn, and REDD+ practices in Tanzania***

Various studies have examined discourses, narratives, and storyline encounters shaping REDD+ inception and implementation in Tanzania (Asiyanbi & Lund, 2020; Asiyanbi & Massarella, 2020; Benjaminsen, 2017; Koch, 2016; Lund et al., 2017; Svarstad & Benjaminsen, 2017). Some studies have indicated the dominance of improvement discourses and narratives to be discursively marketed in the entire REDD+ making in Tanzania. There is an emphasis on the triple wins to conserve forests, biodiversity, and people's wellbeing. Such an attempt indicates several mechanisms, strategies, and ideas deployed in producing environmental subjects out of forest-dependent communities with insights from Kondoa, Lindi, and Zanzibar in Tanzania, to mention but a few (Mukono, 2021).

These discursive analyses have revealed powerful narratives that conceal exclusionary actions that frame forest-dependent communities as villains needing modernization (Lohmann, 2008). For instance, Benjaminsen & Kaarhus (2018) signify REDD+ co-production as commodification practices in Zanzibar to be amenable to the global carbon market. Informed by the Polanyian lens, they unfold the social and cultural contradictions emanating from the entire process of producing and reproducing environmental subjects in Zanzibar. They claim that it has fragmented local norms, practices, and social identities while creating new uncertainty and relations of dependencies. Closely related to the Marxian conception of abstracting value from nature, Benjaminsen and Kaarhus reiterate that REDD+ has reduced the value of the forest for people at the margin with exchange value while erasing traditional values of knowledge/rationality that have historically served to conserve forests. Thus, making REDD+ entails several processes, including privatization, alienation, individuation, abstraction, valuation, and displacement of forests with envisioned carbon commodities.

Discursive scholarship raises similar concerns and indicates how governments, multinational organizations, and international conservation initiatives widely frame nature through technical, managerial, and economic logic of valuation nature while producing environmental and market subjects (Benjaminsen & Kaarhus, 2018; Scheba & Mustalahti, 2015). The main argument that cut across REDD+ discourses in Tanzania is another failure project that continues business and frames it as "conservation fads" (Benjaminsen, 2017; Koch, 2016; Lund et al., 2017; Svarstad & Benjaminsen, 2017). In other words, both authors agree that REDD+ is highly politicized and negotiated at the macro and micro levels, where different actors struggle to recognize (Benjaminsen, Svarstad & Shaw of Tordarroch, 2021).

### ***Conclusion***

The current paper has laid out a broad conceptualization of political ecologies of power but with common convergence on the issues of inequality, injustice, recognition, and asymmetric relations in the governance of REDD+ in the Global South. The process of these uneven power relations has revealed that conflicts and contestations have erupted around forest resource use and control in Tanzania and Global South. Through these multiple power framing, the Global South as a compelling case has illuminated several visions and practices responsible for concealing the residue of coloniality institutionalized through neoliberal logic. Studies reveal that in numerous ethnographies and encounters, REDD+ has transformed property relations

through dispossession, exclusions, and soft means of self-governing community mechanisms.

A review of different papers by scholars from Guyana and Suriname, Nigeria, Uganda, Tanzania, and other parts of the Global South has shown the importance of exploring the intersection of coloniality, class, race, and gender continues to shape the political economy and ecology of the Global South. For instance, the case of Guyana and Suriname has revealed how racially induced discourses and practices have enacted historical narratives and practices that affect the specific classes and races at the margins differently. Data from Uganda, Nigeria, and Kenya suggest continuity of fortress conservation models linked to militarization and securitization narratives and practices as bases for forest protection against harm. Across these scholarships, one clear message is that these processes have constrained communities under the Western saviour with the dependency of western funders and other civil society organizations acting as middle brokers in the marketization of carbon offset. Scientists and experts have obscured multiple epistemic engagements beyond economic logic and carbon measurement. More importantly, REDD+ has continued to restore failure as technology for continuity (Asiyanbi & Massarella, 2020; Massarella et al., 2018) used as means to legitimize another conservation fad.

The paper has provided detailed rethinking and encounters of differentiated social and ecological entanglement, specifically REDD+ discourses and practices in the Global South. The paper has attempted in drawing attention to growing interest in political ecologies of conservation in Africa and providing readers with a combination of the critical hybrid analytical lens to broaden our understanding of the contemporary African greening discourses and practices. These interdisciplinary theoretical approaches to power have much to offer in understanding complexity in existing colonial-based conservation mechanisms and knowledge production. It has provided heterogeneity of alternative perspectives with room for productive dialogue between power approaches in political ecology and REDD+.

From political ecology and sociological standpoints, such steps help to push for an understanding: of what socio-natural processes are amenable if one takes on the geopolitics of social differentiation from hybrid theorization. Future studies could advance hybrid/polyvalent theorization in attending to these concerns on the existence of matrices of power in social and natural resource governance. Besides these hybrid approaches to power, its analysis might benefit from an intersectional lens to the research of carbon offsets in the Global South to how it is classed and gendered; land grabbing and

dispossession; coloniality; uneven consequences, the hegemonic influence of western blocks, and institutions to dictates for the rest through capitalist processes.

## References

- Adger, W. N., Benjaminsen, T. A., Brown, K., & Svarstad, H. (2001). Advancing a Political Ecology of Global Environmental Discourses. *Development and Change*, 32(4), 681–715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00222>
- Agrawal, A. (2005). Environmentality: Community, intimate government, and the making of environmental subjects in Kumaon, India. *Current Anthropology*, 46(2), 161–190. <https://doi.org/10.1086/427122>
- Althorpe, C., & Horak, M. (2021). The End of the Right to the City: A Radical-Cooperative View. *Urban Affairs Review*. (First Published Online), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10780874211057815>
- Andrew, M., Challies, E., Howson, P., Astuti, R., Dixon, R., Haalboom, B., ... Afiff, S. (2015). Beyond carbon, more than forest? REDD+ governmentality in Indonesia. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(1), 138–155. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a140054p>
- Arora-Jonsson, S., Westholm, L., Temu, B. J., & Petitt, A. (2016). Carbon and Cash in Climate Assemblages: The Making of a New Global Citizenship. *Antipode*, 48(1), 74–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12170>.
- Asiyanbi, A.P, & Lund, J. F. (2020). Policy persistence: REDD+ between stabilization and contestation. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 27(1), 378-400. <https://doi.org/10.2458/V27I1.23493>
- Asiyanbi, A., & Massarella, K. (2020). Transformation is what you expect, models are what you get: REDD+ and models in conservation and development. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 27(1), 476-495. <https://doi.org/10.2458/V27I1.23540>
- Asiyanbi, A.P. (2016). A political ecology of REDD+: Property rights, militarised protectionism, and carbonised exclusion in Cross River. *Geoforum*, 77, 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.10.016>

- Asiyanbi, A.P., Arhin, A. A., & Isyaku, U. (2017). REDD+ in West Africa: Politics of design and implementation in Ghana and Nigeria. *Forests*, 8(3), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f8030078>.
- Asiyanbi, A.P, Ogar, E., & Akintoye, O. A. (2019). Complexities and surprises in local resistance to neoliberal conservation : Multiple environmentalities , technologies of the self and the poststructural geography of local engagement with REDD +. *Political Geography*, 69, 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.12.008>
- Asiyanbi, A.P. (2018). A political ecology of REDD + : Property rights , militarised protectionism , and carbonised exclusion in Cross River, (December 2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.10.016>.
- Benjaminsen, G. (2017). The *bricolage* of REDD+ in Zanzibar: from global environmental policy framework to community forest management. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 11(3), 506–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2017.1357103>.
- Benjaminsen, G., & Kaarhus, R. (2018). Commodification of forest carbon : REDD + and socially embedded forest practices in Zanzibar. *Geoforum*, 93, 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.04.021>.
- Benjaminsen, T. A., & Svarstad, H. (2018). *Political ecology*. *Encyclopedia of Ecology*. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.10608-6>.
- Benjaminsen, T.A.; Svarstad, H. and Shaw of Tordarroch, I. (2021) ‘Recognising Recognition in Climate Justice’, IDS Bulletin, Online First, DOI: 10.19088/1968-2021.127.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2014). Postcolonial and decolonial dialogues. *Postcolonial Studies*, 17(2), 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2014.966414>.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2020). Colonial global economy: towards a theoretical reorientation of political economy. *Review of International Political Economy*, 28(2), 307–322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2020.1830831>.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2022). Relations of extraction, relations of redistribution: Empire, nation, and the construction of the British welfare state. *The*

*British Journal of Sociology*, 73(1), 4-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12896>.

- Bishop, E. (2014). Neglecting resistance: counter-conducts and neoliberal governmentality through risk in International Relations. *CISD Yearbook of Global Studies*, 1(1), 229–251.
- Boer, H. (2017). Welfare environmentalism and REDD+ incentives in Indonesia. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 19(6), 795–809. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2017.1292872>.
- Böhm, S., Misoczky, M. C., & Moog, S. (2012). Greening Capitalism? A Marxist Critique of Carbon Markets. *Organization Studies*, 33(11), 1617–1638. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612463326>.
- Borras Jr, S. M., Scoones, I., Baviskar, A., Edelman, M., Peluso, N. L., & Wolford, W. (2022). Climate change and agrarian struggles: an invitation to contribute to a JPS Forum. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 49(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.1956473>.
- Brenner, N., & Elden, S. (2009). Henri Lefebvre on state, space, territory. *International Political Sociology*, 3(4), 353–377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-5687.2009.00081.x>.
- Bryant, G., Dabhi, S., & Böhm, S. (2015). "'Fixing' the climate crisis: capital, states, and carbon offsetting in India. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(10), 2047–2063. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a130213p>.
- Büscher, B., Sullivan, S., Neves, K., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2012). Capitalism Nature Socialism Towards a Synthesized Critique of Neoliberal Biodiversity Conservation Towards a Synthesized Critique of Neoliberal Biodiversity Conservation. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 23(2), 4–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2012.674149>.
- Calvário, R., Velegrakis, G., & Kaika, M. (2017). The Political Ecology of Austerity: An Analysis of Socio-environmental Conflict under Crisis in Greece\*. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 28(3), 69–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2016.1260147>.
- Carmody, P. (2019). *Development theory and practice in a changing world*. *Development Theory and Practice in a Changing World*. New York:

Taylor and Francis.

- Carton, W., & Edstedt, K. (2021). Making, and remaking, a world of carbon: Uneven geographies of carbon sequestration. *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Resource Geography*, 401–411.
- Cavanagh, C., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2014). Virtual nature, violent accumulation: The 'spectacular 'failure' of carbon offsetting at a Ugandan National Park. *Geoforum*, 56, 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.06.013>.
- Cavanagh, C. J. (2017). Resilience, class, and the antifragility of capital. *Resilience*, 5(2), 110-128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2016.1241474>.
- Cavanagh, C. J. (2018). Enclosure, dispossession, and the green economy: new contours of internal displacement in Liberia and Sierra Leone? *African Geographical Review*, 37(2), 120-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376812.2017.1350989>.
- Cavanagh, C. J. (2018). Political ecologies of biopower: diversity, debates, and new frontiers of inquiry. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1), 402-425.
- Cavanagh, C. J., Vedeld, P. O., & Trædal, L. T. (2015). Securitizing REDD+? Problematizing the emerging illegal timber trade and forest carbon interface in East Africa. *Geoforum*, 60, 725–745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.01.011>.
- Cepek, M. L. (2011). Foucault in the forest: Questioning environmentality in Amazonia. *American Ethnologist*, 38(3), 501–515. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2011.01319.x>.
- Clark, B., & Foster, J. B. (2009). Ecological imperialism and the global metabolic rift: Unequal exchange and the guano/nitrates trade. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 50(3-4), 311-334. DOI: 10.1177/0020715209105144.
- Collins, Y. A. (2017). *REDD + Unravalled: A discursive analysis of neoliberal forest conservation efforts in Guyana and Suriname*. Central European University.

- Collins, Y. A. (2019a). Colonial residue: REDD+, territorialisation and the racialized subject in Guyana and Suriname. *Geoforum*, 106, 38–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.07.019>
- Collins, Y. A. (2019b). How REDD+ governs: Multiple forest environmentalities in Guyana and Suriname. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 2(3), 323–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619860748>
- Collins, Y. A. (2021). Racing climate change in Guyana and Suriname. *Politics*. (First Published Online),1-15.<https://doi.org/10.1177/02633957211042478>.
- Collins, Y. A., Maguire-rajpaul, V. A., Krauss, J. E., Asiyanbi, A. P., Jimenez, A., Mabele, M. B., & Mya, A.-O. (2021). Plotting the coloniality of conservation. *Journal of Political Ecology*, (First Published Online), 1–22.
- Corbera, E. (2012). Problematizing REDD+ as an experiment in payments for ecosystem services. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 4(6), 612–619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2012.09.010>.
- Dell’Angelo, J., D’Odorico, P., Rulli, M. C., & Marchand, P. (2017). The Tragedy of the Grabbed Commons: Coercion and Dispossession in the Global Land Rush. *World Development*, 92, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.11.005>.
- Dempsey, J., & Suarez, D. C. (2016). Arrested development? The promises and paradoxes of “selling nature to save it”. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 106(3), 653-671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2016.1140018>.
- Edstedt, K., & Carton, W. (2018). The benefits that (only) capital can see? Resource access and degradation in industrial carbon forestry, lessons from the CDM in Uganda. *Geoforum*, 97, 315–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.09.030>
- Ekers, M., & Loftus, A. (2008). The power of water: Developing dialogues between Foucault and Gramsci. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26(4), 698–718. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d5907>.



- Elden, S. (2007). There is a Politics of Space because Space is Political. *Radical Philosophy Review*, 10(2), 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.5840/radphilrev20071022>.
- Fairhead, J., Leach, M., & Scoones, I. (2012). Green grabbing: a new appropriation of nature? *Journal of peasant studies*, 39(2), 237-261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.671770>
- Fletcher, R. (2010). Neoliberal environmentality: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. *Conservation and Society*, 8(3), 171. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.73806>
- Fletcher, R. (2017). Environmentality unbound: Multiple governmentalities in environmental politics. *Geoforum*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.009>.
- Fletcher, R. (2020). Diverse ecologies: Mapping complexity in environmental governance. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 3(2), 481–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619865880>
- Gonda, N., Leder, S., González-Hidalgo, M., Chiwona-Karlton, L., Stiernström, A., Hajdu, F., ... Arvidsson, A. (2021). Critical Reflexivity in Political Ecology Research: How can the Covid-19 Pandemic Transform us Into Better Researchers? *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 3, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2021.652968>
- Goonewardena, K., Kipfer, S., Milgrom, R., & Schmid, C. (2008). *Space, difference, everyday life: Reading Henri Lefebvre. Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203933213>.
- Greco, E. (2022). Engaging with the non-human turn: A response to Büscher. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, (First Published Online), 204382062210757. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20438206221075704>.
- Gutiérrez-Zamora, V. (2021a). The coloniality of neoliberal biopolitics: Mainstreaming gender in community forestry in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Geoforum*, 126, 139–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.07.023>.
- Hall, R., Edelman, M., Borrás, S. M., Scoones, I., White, B., & Wolford, W. (2015). Resistance, acquiescence or incorporation? An introduction

- to land grabbing and political reactions 'from 'below'. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3–4), 467–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2015.1036746>.
- Hausermann, H., Ferring, D., Atosona, B., Mentz, G., Amankwah, R., Chang, A., ... Sastri, N. (2018). Land-grabbing, land-use transformation and social differentiation: Deconstructing small-scale in Ghana's recent gold rush. *World Development*, 108, 103–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.03.014>.
- Hein, J. I. (2019). *Political ecology of REDD+ in Indonesia: Agrarian conflicts and forest carbon* (p. 230). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Hollander, J. A., & Einwohner, R. L. (2004). Conceptualizing resistance. In *Sociological forum* (Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 533-554). Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11206-004-0694-5>.
- Holmes, G., & Cavanagh, C. J. (2016). A review of the social impacts of neoliberal conservation: Formations, inequalities, contestations. *Geoforum*, 75, 199-209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.07.014>.
- Hope, J. (2021). Conservation in the Pluriverse: Anti-capitalist struggle, knowledge from resistance and the 'repoliticisation of 'nature' in the TIPNIS, Bolivia. *Geoforum*, 124, 217–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.04.006>.
- Huff, A. (2021). Frictional commodities: Virtuality, virtue and value in the carbon economy of repair. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 251484862110150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25148486211015056>.
- Kaika, M., Eriksen, T. H., Nielsen, F. S., Indigenous, I. N., Rica, C., Adger, W. N., ... CROSS, A. L. (2017). Forest preservation in a changing climate: REDD+ and indigenous and community rights in Indonesia and Tanzania. *World Development*, 4(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247816684763>.
- Kamata, N. (2020). Samir Amin and Debates at the University of Dar es Salaam in the 1980s. *Agrarian South*, 9(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2277976019901028>.

- Kashwan, P., Mudaliar, P., Foster, S. R., & Clement, F. (2021). Reimagining and governing the commons in an unequal world: A critical engagement. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability*, 3, 100102.
- Kashwan, P., V. Duffy, R., Massé, F., Asiyambi, A. P., & Marijnen, E. (2021). From Racialized Neocolonial Global Conservation to an Inclusive and Regenerative Conservation. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 63(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00139157.2021.1924574>.
- Koch, S. (2017). International influence on forest governance in Tanzania: Analysing the role of aid experts in the REDD+ process. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 83, 181-190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpo.2016.09.018>.
- Lai, A., Leoni, G., & Stacchezzini, R. (2012). Governmentality rationales and calculative devices: The rejection of a seventeenth-century territorial barter proposed by the King of Spain. *Accounting History*, 17(3–4), 369–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1032373212443226>.
- Lefebvre, H. (1968). *Dialectical Materialism: The Urban Revolution: State, Space, World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Li, T. M. (2014). Fixing Non - market Subjects : Governing Land and Population in the Global South Tania Murray Li , University of Toronto. *Foucault Studies*, 18, 34–48.
- Lima, M. G. B., & Kmoch, L. (2021). Neglect paves the way for dispossession: The politics of “last frontiers” in Brazil and Myanmar. *World Development*, 148, 105681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105681>.
- Lohmann, L. (2008). Carbon trading, climate justice and the production of ignorance: Ten examples. *Development*, 51(3), 359–365. <https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2008.27>
- Luke, T.W. 1999. Environmentality as green governmentality. In Darier, E. (ed.) *Discourses of the environment*. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp. 121-151.
- Lund, J. F., & Saito-Jensen, M. (2013). Revisiting the Issue of Elite Capture of Participatory Initiatives. *World Development*, 46, 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.011>.

[//doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.028).

- Lund, J. F., Sungusia, E., Mabele, M. B., & Scheba, A. (2017). Promising Change, Delivering Continuity: REDD + as Conservation Fad. *World Development*, 89, 124–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.08.005>.
- Mabele, M. B. (2020). In pursuit of multidimensional justice: Lessons from a charcoal "'greening' project in Tanzania. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 3(4), 1030–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619876544>.
- Mabele, M. B., Krauss, J. E., & Kiwango, W. (2022). Going back to the roots. *Conservation & Society*, 20(2), 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.4103/cs.cs>.
- Margulies, J. D. (2019). Making the 'man-'eater': Tiger conservation as necropolitics. *Political Geography*, 69, 150–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.12.011>.
- Massarella, K., Nygren, A., Fletcher, R., Büscher, B., Kiwango, W. A., Komi, S., ... Percequillo, A. R. (2021). Transformation beyond conservation: how critical social science can contribute to a radical new agenda in biodiversity conservation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 49, 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2021.03.005>.
- Massarella, K., Sallu, S. M., Ensor, J. E., & Marchant, R. (2018). REDD+, hype, hope and disappointment: The dynamics of expectations in conservation and development pilot projects. *World Development*, 109, 375–385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.05.006>
- McGregor, A., Challies, E., Thomas, A., Astuti, R., Howson, P., Afiff, S., ... Bond, S. (2019). Sociocarbon cycles: Assembling and governing forest carbon in Indonesia. *Geoforum*, 99, 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.12.003>
- Mcgregor, A., Challies, Howson, P., Astuti, R., Dixon, R., & Haalboom, B. (2015). Beyond carbon, more than forest? REDD + governmentality in Indonesia Beyond carbon, more than forest? REDD + governmentality in Indonesia. *Environment and Planning A*, 47, 138–155. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a140054p>

- Mehta, L., & Harcourt, W. (2021, August 1). Beyond limits and scarcity: Feminist and decolonial contributions to degrowth. *Political Geography*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102411>
- Mehta, L., Huff, A., & Allouche, J. (2019). The new politics and geographies of scarcity. *Geoforum*, 101, 222–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.10.027>
- Methmann, C. (2013). The sky is the limit:1 Global warming as global governmentality. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(1), 69–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066111415300>
- Montefrio, M. J. F., & Dressler, W. H. (2016). The Green Economy and Constructions of the 'Idle' and 'Unproductive' Uplands in the Philippines. *World Development*, 79(July), 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.11.009>
- Mukono, D. (2021). Envisioning REDD+ and Environmentality Discourses in Lindi Community-based Carbon Enterprises in Rural Southern Tanzania. *Tanzania Journal of Sociology*, 7(1), 20–47.
- Mukono, D., & Sambaiga, R. F. (2021). Negotiating power from the margins: encountering everyday experiences and contestations to REDD+ in Southern Tanzania. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, (First Published Online ), 1–20.
- Murdock, E. G. (2021). Conserving Dispossession? A Genealogical Account of the Colonial Roots of Western Conservation. *Ethics, Policy and Environment*, 24(3), 235–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21550085.2021.2002625>.
- Nepomuceno, Í., Affonso, H., Fraser, J. A., & Torres, M. (2019). Counter-conducts and the green grab: Forest 'peoples' resistance to industrial resource extraction in the Saracá-Taquera National Forest, Brazilian Amazonia. *Global Environmental Change*, 56, 124–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.04.004>
- Neumann, R. P. (1998). *Imposing wilderness : struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa*. University of California Press.
- Nightingale, Andrea J. (2011). Bounding difference: Intersectionality and the material production of gender, caste, class and environment in Nepal. *Geoforum*, 42(2), 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geofor>

um.2010.03.004

- Nightingale, Andrea Joslyn, Eriksen, S., Taylor, M., Forsyth, T., Pelling, M., Newsham, A., ... Whitfield, S. (2020). Beyond Technical Fixes: climate solutions and the great derangement. *Climate and Development*, 12(4), 343–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2019.1624495>
- Nygren, A., Kröger, M., & Gills, B. (2022). Global extractivisms and transformative alternatives. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, (First Published Online), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2022.2069495>
- Peluso, Nancy Lee, & Vandergeest, P. (2001). Genealogies of the political forests and customary rights in Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 60(3), 761–812.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America (english translation). *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533–580.
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353>
- Quijano, A. & Wallerstein, I. (1992). Americanity as a concept: or, The Americas in the modern world-system. *International Social Science Journal*, XLIV(4), 549–557.
- Ranganathan, M. (2022). Caste, racialization, and the making of environmental unfreedoms in urban India. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 45(2), 257-277.
- Rao, M. (2018). Reframing the Environment in Neoliberal India: Introduction to the Theme. *Sociological Bulletin*, 67(3), 259–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022918796377>
- Rutherford, S. (2007). Green governmentality: Insights and opportunities in the study of 'nature's rule. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(3), 291–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132507077080>
- Rutherford, S. (2017). Environmentalism and green governmentality. *The International Encyclopaedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment, and Technology*, Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

- Samndong, R. A., & Bush, G. K. (2017). Governance structures established for REDD+ implementation and their adaptation to the institutional and ecological conditions in Equateur province of the DRC. *Noragric Report*, (81), vii-pp.
- Scheba, A. (2014). *Commodifying forest carbon: how local power, politics and livelihood practices shape REDD+ in Lindi Region, Tanzania*. University of Manchester.
- Scheba, A. (2018). Market-Based Conservation for Better Livelihoods? The Promotes and Fallacies of REDD+ in Tanzania. *Land*, 7(119), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land7040119>.
- Scheba, A., & Mustalahti, I. (2015). Rethinking "'expert' knowledge in community forest management in Tanzania. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 60, 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2014.12.007>
- Smith, A. (2020). Passing through difference: C.L.R. James and Henry Lefebvre. *Identities*, 27(1), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2018.1558880>.
- Srivastava, S., & Mehta, L. (2021). The social life of mangroves: Neoliberal development and mangrove conservation in the changing landscape of Kutch. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, (First Published Online), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25148486211045360>.
- Stephan, B. (2012). Bringing discourse to the market: The commodification of avoided deforestation. *Environmental Politics*, 21(4), 621–639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2012.688357>
- Sturgeon, J. C. (2021). Landscape plasticity and its erasure. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 251484862110620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25148486211062004>
- Sultana, F. (2021). Political ecology II: Conjunctures, crises, and critical publics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(6), 1721-1730. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325211028665>.
- Sultana, F. (2022). The unbearable heaviness of climate coloniality. *Political Geography*, (xxxx), 102638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2022.102638>.
- Svarstad, H., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2017). Nothing succeeds like success

- narratives: a case of conservation and development in the time of REDD. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 11(3), 482–505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2017.1356622>
- Svarstad, H., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2020). Reading radical environmental justice through a political ecology lens. *Geoforum*, 108, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.11.007>
- Svarstad, H., Benjaminsen, T. A., & Overå, R. (2018). Power theories in political ecology. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25, 350–363.
- Thakholi, L., & Büscher, B. (2021). Conserving inequality: How private conservation and property developers' 'fix' spatial injustice in South Africa Theme issue: Southern African conservation. *Environment and Planning E Nature and Space*, (First Published Online),1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25148486211066388>
- Turnhout, E., Gupta, A., Weatherley-Singh, J., Vijge, M. J., de Koning, J., Visseren-Hamakers, I. J., ... Lederer, M. (2017). Envisioning REDD+ in a post-Paris era: between evolving expectations and current practice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.425>
- Windegger, F., & Spash, C. L. (2021). *Reconceptualising Freedom in the 21st Century: Degrowth vs. Neoliberalism*. *Social-ecological Research in Economics* Discussion Paper: No.2021/02 WU Vienna.