THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Multispecies justice

WIREs Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews

Article Title: **Multispecies justice: Climate-just futures with, for and beyond humans**

Article Type:

◉ OPINION ○ PRIMER ○ OVERVIEW

○ ADVANCED REVIEW ○ FOCUS ARTICLE ○ SOFTWARE FOCUS

Authors:

First author   Petra Tschakert*, ORCID 0000-0002-4268-3378, Department of Geography and Planning, University of Western Australia, petra.tschakert@uwa.edu.au. No conflict of interest.
Second author   David Schlosberg, ORCID 0000-0003-3547-919X, Department of Government and International Relations, University of Sydney, david.schlosberg@sydney.edu.au. No conflict of interest.
Third author   Danielle Celermajer, ORCID 0000-0002-5827-6988, Department of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Sydney, danielle.celermajer@sydney.edu.au. No conflict of interest.
Fourth author   Lauren Rickards, ORCID 0000-0001-6088-3448, Climate Change Transformations Research Program, Centre for Urban Research, RMIT University, lauren.rickards@rmit.edu.au. No conflict of interest.
Fifth author   Christine Winter, ORCID 0000-0002-5427-9196 Department of Government and International Relations, University of Sydney, c.winter@sydney.edu.au. No conflict of interest.
Sixth author   Mathias Thaler, ORCID 0000-0001-7045-6159, Politics and International Relations, University of Edinburgh, mathias.thaler@ed.ac.uk. No conflict of interest.
Seventh author   Makere Stewart-Harawira, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7375-2305, Indigenous, Environmental and Global Studies, University of Alberta, makere@ualberta.ca. No conflict of interest.
Eight author   Blanche Verlie, ORCID 0000-0002-1614-9913, Sydney Environment Institute, The University of Sydney, blanche.verlie@sydney.edu.au. No conflict of interest.

This is the peer reviewed version of a paper published in *WIREs Climate Change*. To cite, please consult the final version:

***

If your university does not provide access to this journal, please send me an email so that I can share the published paper with you.

Abstract

In 2019, the climate emergency entered mainstream debates. The normative frame of climate justice as conceived in academia, policy arenas, and grass roots action, although imperative, is no longer adequate to address this emergency, despite the concept's growing popularity and resonance across climate movements. This is for two reasons: first, as a framing for the problem, climate justice is insufficient to overcome the persistent silencing of voices belonging to multiple 'others'; and second, it does not question and thus implicitly condones human exceptionalism and the violence it enacts, historically and in this era of the Anthropocene. Therefore, we advocate for the concept of multispecies justice to enrich climate justice in order to more effectively confront the climate crisis. The advantage of reconceptualizing climate justice in this way is that it becomes more inclusive; it acknowledges the differential histories and practices of social, environmental, and ecological harm

while opening just pathways into uncertain futures. A multispecies justice lens expands climate justice by decentering the human and by recognizing the everyday interactions that bind individuals and societies to networks of close and distant others, including other people and more-than-human beings. Such a relational lens provides a vital scientific, practical, material, and ethical road map for navigating the complex responsibilities and politics in the climate crisis. Most importantly, it delineates what genuine flourishing could mean, what systemic transformations may involve, and with whom, how to live with inevitable and possibly intolerable losses, and how to prefigure and enact alternative and just futures.

Graphical/Visual Abstract and Caption

Figure caption: Navigating multispecies justice toward climate-just futures.

1. INTRODUCTION

2019 may well have been the beginning year of publically recognizing the climate emergency, not least because the Oxford Dictionary selected it as the word of the year[i]. The ground swell of climate movements catapulted the climate emergency into our mainstream vocabulary, even if the expression is noticeably absent in the Paris Climate Agreement and the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C Global Warming (IPCC, 2018). Etched into our memories are the year's tumbling temperature records across the globe, with July 2019 as the hottest month ever recorded, to date. For countless human and non-human beings, the devastating effects of climate-driven disasters, from Mozambique's Cyclone Idai and monsoon flooding in India to Australia's wildfires, will remain life-long and harrowing embodied experiences. The fires destroyed >10 million hectares of land across Australia, including >20% of temperate forests – unprecedented for any continental forest biome (Boer et al., 2020) –, and killed or displaced an estimated three billion animal lives (WWF-Australia, 2020). They are "a harbinger of life and death on a hotter Earth" (Climate Emergency Summit, 2020). This predicament has stayed with us in 2020, the year of the California fires and the warmest September so far, despite the fugitive dip in global emissions due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

How do we come to terms with the inseparability of our vulnerabilities, the experience of 'omnicide' – the killing of everything (Celermajer, 2020) –, and the enormous responsibility for the losses among all life? The academic literature has started to ponder these questions and the no-longer hypothetical matter of whether it is "too late" to stop dangerous climate change (Hulme, 2020). Some scholars argue that it is definitely too late (Whyte, 2019) or for many more soon too late (Farbotko,

2020). And if it is too late to stop climate change, then we should at least "learn how to dwell in this predicament" (Garrard, 2020, p. 6) or learn to "stay with the trouble" (Haraway, 2016).

In this article, we argue that, while the normative frame of climate justice as typically conceived in academia, policy arenas, and grass roots action is crucial, it is no longer adequate to address the climate crisis, despite the concept's growing popularity and resonance across climate movements. This is for two reasons: first, as a framing for the problem, climate justice is insufficient to overcome the persistent silencing of voices belonging to multiple 'others'; and second, it often does not question and thus implicitly condones human exceptionalism and the violence it enacts, historically and in this era called the Anthropocene. The effect of this double omission is to impede truly inclusive and responsible pathways forward and deprive us of the tools needed to learn to become and be otherwise.

Therefore, we advocate for the concept of multispecies justice (Figure 1) to enrich the guiding frame of climate justice, and to emphasize that the ultimate aim of a justice approach needs to be relational and focused on inclusive, interacting, functioning, and flourishing environments. The advantage of incorporating multispecies justice into climate justice is that it decenters both the human and the individual, and intensify efforts to comprehend and confront the climate crisis. By paying close attention to the core claims of climate justice activists, above all Indigenous peoples, this more encompassing lens acknowledges the harm climate change brings to those beyond human communities. It recognizes the numerous, wide-ranging, cross-scalar, and everyday interactions that bind individuals and societies to networks of close and

distant others, including other people and more-than-human[ii] beings: animals, plants, rivers, seas, and more.

2. THE MULTIPLE AND PERVASIVE ERASURES IN CLIMATE JUSTICE

2020 could have been the year to celebrate 20 years of climate justice. In 2000, the first Climate Justice Summit took place in The Hague, parallel to COP6. What followed were the 2002 Bali Principles of Climate Justice, the 2004 Durban Group for Climate Justice, and the Climate Justice Now! global coalition formed in 2007. Undeniably, climate justice has galvanized fair burden sharing frameworks for emission reduction (e.g. Shue, 2019; McKinnon, 2019), climate-just initiatives by alliances and foundations (e.g. Climate Justice Alliance, 2018; Robinson, 2018), and, to a certain extent, policy negotiations under the Paris Agreement and other international regimes (e.g. Okereke & Coventry, 2016). Heated debates in scientific and policy arenas and movements continue to revolve around differential vulnerabilities and pervasive inequalities, responsibility for historic emissions and climate debt, compensation for loss and damage, human rights and rights of Indigenous peoples, and structural culprits such as capitalism and globalization (e.g. Gach, 2019).

Yet, this 20-year climate justice anniversary also demands critical stocktaking. Despite the irrefutable feats, we sense a mounting unease when we watch the faces of those included under the climate justice umbrella while apprehensively searching for others that have remained silenced. We draw attention to the potential damage of erasing the voices particularly of racialized and Indigenous peoples, as documented across feminist, post-colonial, and critical race studies.

Environmental justice scholar Pellow (2018) reminds us that racial (and other) expendability is entrenched in long histories of colonialism, oppression, and exclusion as it singles out certain people as undervalued, unneeded, and subhuman, hence unworthy of protection. Such erasures, in the form of material, discursive, and embodied violences, Pellow argues, are commonplace aspects of our societies, "reinforced by state power" (p. 22). This pervasive exclusion, silencing, and dehumanizing based on race, class, or gender, and in particular harm done to Indigenous peoples, is often replicated in climate justice advocacy when devoid of understandings of colonial and capitalist domination (Whyte, 2019). Some climate justice approaches, particularly those couched as resilience-building programs among vulnerable populations, can too easily perpetuate structural racism and intersecting traumas (Ranganathan & Bratman, 2019). Following Tuana (2019), without calling out such 'forgetting' in the world and in conceptions of climate justice, we enact a form of climate apartheid, and thereby exacerbate the climate emergency. The lives constructed by the persistent interaction of racism, environmental exploitation, and contamination must be consistently illuminated in conceptions and practices of climate justice. And that illumination, we argue, must extend beyond the human.

3. BEING HUMAN IN THE ANTHROPOCENE AND HUMAN EXCEPTIONALISM

Who and what counts as human or as less-than-human, not-fully-human, non-human, other-than-human, or more-than-human, and the many shades in-between, is a question that seems to petrify and paralyze many climate justice advocates. On

the one hand, this is not surprising, given the limitations of classic liberal justice theories tied to human exceptionalism. And yet, a multispecies approach has clearly been articulated in the climate justice movement as the concomitant "submission and destruction of human beings and nature" is enshrined in the People's Agreement of Cochabamba (from the 2010 World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth). In addition, the recognition of a functioning environment as an integral component of climate, social, or environmental justice (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014) and nonanthropogenic climate ethics (Nolt, 2011) remain largely absent in climate change policies. In fact, all nine domains of climate justice identified by Gach (2019) in UNFCCC documents fall exclusively within the realm of the uncontested "human".

In Anthropocene discourses that take for granted the "human" as a separate, unique yet universal, and more important figure than any other species, the failure to disrupt this homogenizing narrative has detrimental corollaries for how to engage with the climate crisis. A vital eye-opener to the blind spots in such discourses can be found, for instance, in "Anthropocene feminism" as proposed by Grusin (2017). We also find inspiration in critical feminist race theorists (e.g. Jackson, 2013; Weheliye, 2014; Wynter, 2003) who have argued that the appeal of posthumanism as a way out of the pathologies generated by human exceptionalism ought to be treated with caution. This requires probing moves beyond the 'human', particularly if they have assumed and re-inscribed the very anti-blackness and imperialism that constituted that category ('the human'). Via the three examples below, and as an extension to the erasures from above, we illustrate the danger of human exceptionalism and the flattening of the human. To overcome such dangers, we argue that any

conceptualization of MSJ and climate justice must remain critically alive to the risks of implicitly recreating violent hierarchies and histories.

First, the types of pervasive racialized hierarchies within 'the human' result in the discounting of millions of non-Western, non-white, non-affluent, non-adapted, and non-resilient individuals as "less-than-human" or "not-fully-human" (Butler, 2004; Marhia, 2013), blamed for being unable to secure their lives and livelihoods due to climate change impacts. As a consequence, human mobility and migration are not seen as a potentially successful adaptation strategy but as a pathology (Bettini, 2019), to be resisted by supra-national and national institutions alike. Such narratives, in turn, fuel racialized and exclusionary containment policies in attempts to climate-secure Northern/Western borders and privileged futures against 'African', 'Muslim', and other climate migrants (Telford, 2018). Within the neoliberal discourse of climate security (Lyster, 2019), these narratives conceal slow emergencies and slow violences (Nixon, 2011) that, concomitantly, allow for the governing of 'unruly' bodies to address order and disorder in an uncertain world (Anderson et al., 2019).

Second, human exceptionalism and white privilege in climate justice debates make us believe that 'we humans' have suddenly landed in this eco-apocalyptic, extinction-riddled Anthropocene (Mitchell, 2018, cited in Houston, 2019). This obscures the fact that colonial violence, slavery, imperialism, and ongoing exploitations "have been ending worlds for as long as they have been in existence" (Yusoff, 2018, p. 11). Such histories of rupture and annihilation, as Whyte (2017) argues, have cost Indigenous peoples the loss of not only their culture and identity but "their reciprocal relationships with thousands of plants, animals and ecosystems – most of which are not coming back" (p. 159). Suggesting that 'we are all in this together', with equal

capacities and responsibilities to avert catastrophic climate change and the same burden of harm and loss, constitutes a selective and elitist blindness. It obfuscates long-lasting struggles for justice that pre-date the unease of the privileged coming to grips with dangerous climate futures.

Third, climate justice literature and discourse have shied away from scrutinizing processes of othering the non- or more-than-human-world. Countless humans devalued as less-than or not-fully-human have been treated as expendable, and the same exclusion from considerations of justice befalls plants, animals, fungi, microbes, and the non-human realm. Such exclusions and erasures applied to all other life forms beyond the human (Sheikh, 2018) entrap us into accepting, and even legitimizing sacrifice and death zones. Taking just one example, Neimanis (2019) argues that as long as we picture the ocean as an 'other place', a 'nonplace', or an 'unfathomable elsewhere', we tolerate its slow suffocation and that of all creatures in it as they become "the convenient dump for our out-of-sight, out-of-mind discards, and the ultimate –away-washer of all our sins" (p. 492). By bringing to the fore 'traces of erased bodies' (de Vos, 2017), human and non-human, extinction research offers vital insights into such processes of othering, even when beings other than humans don't 'story' their experiences in ways we can easily comprehend (Houston, 2019). These distressing and seemingly less tangible insights are often ignored yet are key to bringing a multispecies lens to climate justice scholarship and activism.

4. MULTISPECIES JUSTICE

We acknowledge the growing importance and traction of the concept of climate justice, yet are also troubled by its limitations to not only expose violent hierarchies

but also to comprehend and confront the realities embedded in the climate crisis. Hence, we advocate for a multispecies justice (MSJ) lens that expands the existing frame of climate justice by repositioning justice to encompass all beings as quintessentially relational. Figure 1 depicts the core aspects of MSJ and the challenges it aims to overcome. This MSJ lens makes it possible to transcend liberal individualist notions of justice, in two fundamental ways: first by enlarging the range of obligations and duties vis-à-vis all those whose flourishing is undermined (Celermajer et al., 2020a); and second by shifting the focus and subject of justice from the individual and exceptional human being to a wide range of living and non-living entities, and their interactions and processes. Such a relational approach acknowledges the differential histories and practices of environmental and ecological violence while opening pathways toward more just, even if uncertain, futures. Moreover, it constitutes a distinctly more inclusive approach to (climate) justice that encompasses and responds to the destruction of multispecies lifeways and functionings, and actively nourishes rich webs of relationships that allow all beings to thrive (Celermajer et al., 2020b).

Outside mainstream climate science, scholarship in posthumanism, new materialism, and speculative fiction[iii] has adopted the term 'multispecies justice' (e.g. Rose's Wild Dog Dreaming, 2011; Kirksey's et al.'s Multispecies Salon, 2014; Heise's Imagining Extinction, 2016; and Haraway's Staying with the Trouble, 2016). The definition by Jones (2019) describes the goal of MSJ as "a politics for composing a common world that considers the needs and livelihoods of a diversity of human and nonhuman life" (pp. 485-486). This scholarship has been creative and innovative with respect to multispecies relationality, but is less developed in its conceptualization of justice. Here, we thicken those considerations, and delineate a

relational MSJ frame for climate change, using four parameters or coordinates: intersectional, inclusive, responsible, and cosmopolitical.

Three disclaimers upfront. First, 'multispecies' and 'beyond the human' does not mean "leaping straight to the question of the animal (or vegetable or fungal, or microbial…)" (Neimanis, 2019, p. 497). As argued above, we cannot skirt the obligation to decolonize the Anthropocene, de-homogenize 'the human' to fathom different violences, and hold accountable actors and structures that continue to dehumanize. Second, the post-human Anthropocene we envision here is not a dense, congruous, and amorphous pluriverse (Bettini, 2019) but one that re-politicizes the current crisis while embracing both interdependencies and heterogeneities (Swyngedouw & Ernston, 2018). Third, none of what follows negates the urgent need for stringent mitigation action and much strengthened adaptation and resilience building to cap harm from further warming. We see the four coordinates as outlined below as an ethically and politically imperative compass to help us navigate the complex web that we enter when we embrace the trouble of dwelling in the predicament of the unfolding climate crisis and work toward climate-just futures (Figure 1).

4.1 Intersectional

Building on Crenshaw's (1989) work on intersectionality, our MSJ lens commits to an intersectional approach to justice that recognizes the simultaneity of identities and categories of difference and inequalities (race, class, gender, age, ability, species, and beings) and their interlocking in structures and processes of injustice and oppression (Pellow, 2018). Such an intersectional approach requires recognition of

the philosophies of the First Peoples of modern states whose philosophical engagement with the environment of their homelands dates back thousands of years. Following Tuana (2019), we endorse ecologically informed intersectionality that traces environmental exploitation as intertwined with social injustices. Rather than glossing over historically specific contexts and ever-shifting axes of privilege, power, and disenfranchisement, these are made explicit in ways that promote the forging of coalitions across diverse populations, agendas, needs, and aspirations (Hathaway, 2020). For instance, in majority Black areas in Washington D.C., ecological harm and racism need to be understood in conjunction with housing justice and climate justice, as shown by Ranganathan and Bratman (2019), requiring an ethics of care as part of a radical politics. Such coalition building goes hand in hand with what Anguelovki and Pellow call "an ethic of indispensability" (p. 18), welcoming the diversity of actors and agency in building just climate futures (Porter et al., 2020).

4.2 Inclusive

Drawing from feminist philosophy and theories of relational autonomy (e.g. Nedelsky, 2011), we understand that even the quintessential white, privileged, able-bodied, heterosexual man does not exist independent of others (human and more-than-human). A MSJ framing offers an inclusive and relational ontology, ethics, and politics that acknowledges the vast relational web of co-existence within and across species. It concerns all bodies and lifeforms, organic and inorganic, "entangled" (Barad, 2007) with each other in a myriad of different ways. Such relationships and entanglements reject simplistic human-nature binaries and are thus crucial for

grasping how more-than-human spaces function, including their life and death zones.

By scrutinizing how we live, consume, and interact with and care (or not) about and for fellow beings and ecosystems, a MSJ lens acknowledges individual and collective entanglements and complicities in the crisis that all beings are facing. It helps to apprehend how the consumption of cheap beef and the global economic order within which beef markets operate are joined up with the ~80,000 fires counted in the Amazon in 2019. It allows us to not just decry the mass dying of flying foxes in the Australian heatwaves (Ratnayake et al., 2019) but value their role as pollinators (Houston et al., 2018) and insist on inclusive habitat preservation and more-than-human agency in climate resilience building. Such "planning in the face of extinction", Houston (2019) argues, requires re-setting our coordinates to ethical decision making according to ecological, not just (fictional) human time.

4.3 Response-abilities

Learning to be responsible from a MSJ perspective means learning to live together and across difference. We draw upon Haraway's key concept of response-ability in more-than-human worlds as "cultivating collective knowing and doing" (2016, p. 34), to illustrate a new ethical sensitivity informed by MSJ. Such a conceptual shift is difficult. We may struggle to grasp how to be response-able, practice co-existence, and come to know and be in the world. Developing diverse ways of knowing entails learning to attend, respond, and articulate, possibly in more-than-verbal ways. In this regard, we have much to learn and gain from Indigenous frameworks, practices,

and protocols of MSJ, and ways of co-becoming with (e.g. Bawaka Country et al., 2019; Winter, 2020), predicated as they are on genealogies of deep relationality (Stewart-Harawira, 2020). These are palpable, for instance, in the co-agency between reindeer and Sami herders when negotiating mobility and spatial justice in Norway (Brown et al., 2019) and in the 'affective ecologies' and grounded ways of knowing ecological interdependencies among Indigenous and ethnic-minority migrants in Darwin, Australia (Lobo, 2019). Such learning will require deep examination of the ethical-episto-ontological foundations of MSJ and a humble orientation of theory to avoid perpetrating the harms of appropriation (Todd, 2016), while cultivating the conditions for inclusive flourishing.

MSJ compels us to nurture response-abilities toward 'others' with whom we are bound together, visibly or not, in everyday practices of production, consumption, and reproduction. This entails "entangled empathy" (Gruen, 2015), such as truly seeing homelessness, minorities, and threatened animals and plants in our cities (Steele et al., 2019). We may learn to respect the agency of the nonhuman realm (Watene, 2016; Winter, 2019), appreciate our own interdependency with critters like ants and worms as we collectively build common worlds together (Taylor & Pacini-Ketchabaw, 2015), and develop relationally attuned pedagogies (Verlie, 2018). This broader notion of agency is also reflected in approaches that extend legal rights and responsibility to more-than-human entities (Celermajer et al., 2020a), such as in Maori and other Indigenous governance modes that feature holistic river management (Te Aho, 2019). Finally, this nurturing of response-abilities necessitates that we see and listen differently. Neimanis (2019) recommends deep listening to enable us to hear suffocating oceans and their millions of creatures while Schlosberg (2016) emphasizes ecological receptivity and a politics of sight to make human

immersion in ecological systems more visible. Response-able learning means undertaking conscious efforts to forsake the reckless belief that we are superior to others, and have the right to abuse and dominate. This does not, however, mean romanticizing fantasized, harmonious sociocultures as if harm, death, and suffering did not exist.

4.4 Cosmopolitics

Having come this far in imagining what multispecies justice might entail, we have to ask ourselves whether existing institutions are able to rise to the challenge. How, for instance, will responses to Australia's Royal Commission inquiry into the 2019/20 bushfires do justice to the millions of lives lost, the hectares and structures burnt, and the relationships damaged? Will they seek to recognize Indigenous Australians' responsibilities under their own laws to protect species' and environmental flourishing, beyond acknowledging Aboriginal knowledge about land and fire management, and create the conditions where this might be possible? And how can we sensibly envision that the Commission's results will engender mechanisms capable of preventing and responding to multispecies suffering when the next installment of the climate emergency engulfs us? The answer, as Head (2020) suggests, demands transformative change that rejects the idea of "a new normal".

A crucial part of this change, we argue, is a more-than-human climate cosmopolitics. Once again, we turn to the humanities and social sciences to lead us in the right direction. Drawing upon Stengers' (2005, 2010), Latour's (2004), and Sheikh's (2019) notions of cosmopolitics, we can picture a type of politics for addressing the climate emergency that encompasses diverse experiences, emotions, practices, and

perspectives, and embraces both deliberation and disruption. Climate cosmopolitics then can move us beyond narrow technocratic and neoliberal solutions to climate change by opening up novel spaces for "liveability, survivability, and justice" (Houston et al., 2016, p. 264). The time is ripe to revive the Cochabamba Climate Court, as a "parliament of all things" (Latour, 2010), to bear witness to unseen experiences and make space for otherwise silenced voices. Such prefigurative politics as a counterforce to cycles of dispossession and exploitation (Henrique & Tschakert, 2020) exemplifies how to appreciate multiple types of knowledge and practices, understand what we have in common, across differences, and co-produce spaces of justice.

Finally, as Heise and Haraway, and Nyikina Warrwa Traditional Custodian and scholar Poelina (2020) remind us, we need different stories to counter the dominant apocalyptic narratives that the Anthropocene throws at us. Heise's eco-cosmopolitanism (2016) necessitates "a patient and meticulous process of assembly" (p. 226) that, without imagination and practical guidance to overcome our engrained biases and limitations, may be difficult to envisage (Radomska, 2017). Here, speculative fiction, for instance Atwood's eco-dystopian MaddAddam trilogy (Jennings, 2019), or Forest Law, a multimedia art installation by Biemann and Tavares (2014; cited in Sheikh, 2019) help us see that different ways of co-existing between the human and non-human are possible in order to generate new forms of being and acting in this world. Such stories, as well as our own embodied experiences of the climate emergency across three continents, compel us—authors and allies—to reevaluate not only academic concepts but the everyday response-abilities we take on to enact and inhabit multispecies justice, in line with the four pillars outlined here. This entails attending to and learning from each other, in the generative spaces

between us as Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars, activist-academics, and engaged citizens, alongside our fellow denizens.

5. CONCLUSION: NEVER TOO LATE TO CARE AND GRIEVE, TOGETHER

A multispecies justice lens provides a vital scientific, practical, material, and ethical road map for enriching climate justice approaches and actions to navigate the climate crisis. It makes explicit and propels us to embrace the crucial relations and processes that tie all beings together. It shows new ways of understanding and relating, and prospects for becoming "other-than-the-human as we know it" (Neimanis, 2019, p. 504), while honouring difference. Most importantly, it delineates what systemic transformations may involve, and with whom, how to live with inevitable and possibly intolerable losses, and how to prefigure and enact alternative and just futures.

Figures

Figure 1: Navigating multispecies justice toward climate-just futures.

Notes

[i] Defined as "a situation in which urgent action is required to reduce or halt climate change and avoid potentially irreversible environmental damage resulting from it." (Oxford Dictionary, 2019).

[ii] One of the earlies usages is the 1997 book by D. Abram.

[iii] Some of the literature cited here refers explicitly to climate change or ecological/environmental crisis. Some influential scholars who inspire us have (so far) not ventured into this space.

References

Abram, D. (1997). *Spell of the sensuous: Perceptual language in a more-than-human world*. Vintage Press.

Anderson, B., Grove, K., Rickards, L. and Kearnes, M. (2019). Slow emergencies: Temporality and the racialized biopolitics of emergency governance. *Progress in Human Geography*, p.0309132519849263.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.

Bawaka Country, Suchet-Pearson, S., Wright, S., Lloyd, K., Tofa, M., Sweeney, J., Burarrwanga, L., Ganambarr, R., Ganambarr-Stubbs, M., Ganambarr, B. and Maymuru, D., (2019). Goŋ Gurtha: Enacting response-abilities as situated co-becoming. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *37*(4), 682-702.

Bettini, G. (2019). And yet it moves! (Climate) migration as a symptom in the Anthropocene. *Mobilities*, *14*(3), 336-350.

Boer, M. M., de Dios, V. R., & Bradstock, R. A. (2020). Unprecedented burn area of Australian mega forest fires. *Nature Climate Change*, 1-2.

Brown, K. M., Flemsæter, F., & Rønningen, K. (2019). More-than-human geographies of property: Moving towards spatial justice with response-ability. *Geoforum*, *99*, 54-62.

Butler, J., 2004. *Undoing gender*. Routledge.

Celermajer, D. 2020. Omnicide: Who is responsible for the gravest of all crimes? URL: https://www.abc.net.au/religion/danielle-celermajer-omnicide-gravest-of-all-crimes/11838534 (accessed 3 November 2020)

Celermajer, D., Schlosberg, D., Rickards, L., Stewart-Harawira, M., Thaler, M., Tschakert, P., Verlie, B., Winter, C. (2020a). Multispecies justice: Theories, challenges, and a research agenda for environmental politics. *Environmental Politics*. DOI: 10.1080/09644016.202.1827608

Celermajer, D., Chatterjee, S., Cochrane, A., Fishel, S, Neimanis, A., O'Brien, A., Srinivasan, A., Reid, S., Schlosberg, D., & Waldow, A. (2020b). Justice through a multispecies lens', *Contemporary Political Theory*, DOI 10.1057/s41296-020-00386-5

Climate Emergency Summit (2020). The safe climate declaration. URL: https://www.climateemergencysummit.org/declaration/ (accessed 3 November 2020)

Climate Justice Alliance (2018). Just transition principles. URL (accessed 03/11/2020) http://neis.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/CJA_JustTransition_Principles_final_hi-rez.pdf

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 8(8),*138-167.

De Vos, R. (2017). Provocations from the field-extinction, encountering and the exigencies of forgetting. *Animal Studies Journal*, 6(1), 1-11.

Farbotko, C. (2020). Is it too late to prevent systemic danger to the world's poor?. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *11*(1), e609.

Gach, E. (2019). Normative shifts in the global conception of climate change: The growth of climate justice. *Social Sciences*, *8*(1), 24.

Garrard, G. (2020). Never too soon, always too late: Reflections on climate temporality. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *11*(1), e605.

Gruen, L. (2015). *Entangled empathy: An alternative ethic for our relationships with animals*. Lantern Books.

Grusin, R. (Ed.). (2017). *Anthropocene feminism*. University of Minnesota Press.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Hathaway, J. R. (2020). Climate Change, the Intersectional Imperative, and the Opportunity of the Green New Deal. *Environmental Communication*, *14*(1), 13-22.

Head, L. (2020). Transformative change requires resisting a new normal. *Nature Climate Change*, 1-2.

Henrique, K.P., & Tschakert, P. (2020). Pathways to urban transformation: From dispossession to climate justice. *Progress in Human Geography*. doi: 10.1177/0309132520962856

Heise, U. K. (2016). *Imagining extinction: The cultural meanings of endangered species*. University of Chicago Press.

Houston, D., McCallum, D., Steele, W., & Byrne, J. (2016). Climate cosmopolitics and the possibilities for urban planning. *Nature and Culture*, *11*(3), 259-277.

Houston D, Hillier J, MacCallum D, et al. (2018). Make kin, not cities! Multispecies entanglements and 'becoming-world' in planning theory. *Planning Theory* 17(2): 190–212. DOI: 10.1177/1473095216688042.

Houston, D. (2019). Planning in the shadow of extinction: Carnaby's Black cockatoos and urban development in Perth, Australia. *Contemporary Social Science*, 1-14.

Hulme, M. (2020). Is it too late (to stop dangerous climate change)? An editorial. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *11*(1), e619.

IPCC (2018). Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)].

Jackson, Z. I. (2013). Animal: New directions in the theorization of race and posthumanism. *Feminist Studies*. *39*(3), 669-685.

Jennings, H. (2019). Anthropocene feminism, companion species, and the MaddAddam trilogy. *Contemporary Women's Writing*, *13*(1), 16-33.

Jones, B. (2019). Bloom/Split/Dissolve: Jellyfish, HD, and multispecies justice in Anthropocene seas. *Configurations*, *27*(4), 483-499.

McKinnon, C. (2019). Climate justice in the endgame for 2 degrees. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *21*(2), 279-286.

Kirksey, E. (Ed.). (2014). *The multispecies salon*. Duke University Press.

Latour, B. (2004). Whose cosmos, which cosmopolitics? Comments on the peace terms of Ulrich Beck. *Common knowledge*, *10*(3), 450-462.

Lobo, M. (2019). Affective ecologies: Braiding urban worlds in Darwin, Australia. *Geoforum*, *106*, 393-401.

Lyster, R., 2019. The Idea of (Climate) Justice, neoliberalism and the Talanoa Dialogue. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, *10*(1), 35-61.

Marhia, N., 2013. Some humans are more human than others: Troubling the 'human' in human security from a critical feminist perspective. *Security Dialogue*, *44*(1), 19-35.

Nedelsky, J. (2011). *Law's relations: A relational theory of self, autonomy, and law*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Neimanis, A. (2019). The weather underwater: Blackness, White feminism, and the breathless sea. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 1-19.

Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Harvard University Press.

Nolt, J. (2011). Nonanthropocentric climate ethics. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 2*(5), 701-711.

Okereke, C., & Coventry, P. (2016). Climate justice and the international regime: before, during, and after Paris. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 7*(6), 834-851.

Pellow, D. N. (2018). *What is critical environmental justice?* John Wiley & Sons.

Poelina, A. (2020). A coalition of hope! A regional governance approach to Indigenous Australian cultural wellbeing. In A. Campbell, M. Duffy, & B. Edmondson (Eds.), *Located research* (pp. 153–180). Palgrave McMillan. (Original work published 2019).

Porter, L., Rickards, L., Moloney, S., & Anguelovski, I. (2020). Climate justice in a climate changed world. *Planning Theory & Practice, 3*(3), 1-29.

Radomska, M. (2017). The anthropocene, practices of storytelling, and multispecies justice. *Angelaki, 22*(2), 257-261.

Ranganathan, M., & Bratman, E. (2019). From urban resilience to abolitionist climate justice in Washington, DC. *Antipode*. DOI: 10.1111/anti.12555.

Ratnayake HU, Kearney MR, Govekar P, et al. (2019) Forecasting wildlife die-offs from extreme heat events. *Animal Conservation* 22(4): 386–395. DOI: 10.1111/acv.12476.

Robinson, M. (2018). *Climate justice: Hope, resilience, and the fight for a sustainable future*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Rose, D. B. (2011). *Wild dog dreaming: Love and extinction*. University of Virginia Press.

Schlosberg, D. (2016). Environmental management for the Anthropocene. In T. Gabrielson, C. Hall, J. Meyer, and D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental Political Theory*. Oxford University Press.

Schlosberg, D., & Collins, L. B. (2014). From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 5*(3), 359-374.

Sheikh, S. (2019). More-than-human cosmopolitics. In: Maria Hlavajova and Wietske Maas, eds. *Propositions for non-fascist living: Tentative and urgent*. BAK and MIT Press, pp. 125-140.

Shue, H. (2019). Subsistence protection and mitigation ambition: Necessities, economic and climatic. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *21*(2), 251-262.

Steele, W., Wiesel, I., & Maller, C. (2019). More-than-human cities: Where the wild things are. *Geoforum*, *106*, 411-415.

Stengers, I. (2005). The cosmopolitical proposal. *Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy*, *994*, 994.

Stengers, I. (2010). Cosmopolitics I, trans. Robert Bononno.

Stewart-Harawira, M. (2020). Troubled waters: Maori values and ethics for freshwater management and New Zealand's fresh water crisis. *Wires Water*, *7 (5)*, e1464.

Swyngedouw, E., & Ernstson, H. (2018). Interrupting the anthropo-obScene: Immuno-biopolitics and depoliticizing ontologies in the anthropocene. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *35*(6), 3-30.

Taylor, A., & Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. (2015). Learning with children, ants, and worms in the Anthropocene: Towards a common world pedagogy of multispecies vulnerability. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 23(4), 507-529.

Te Aho, L., 2019. Te Mana o te Wai: An indigenous perspective on rivers and river management. *River Research and Applications*, *35*(10), 1615-1621.

Telford, A. (2018). A threat to climate-secure European futures? Exploring racial logics and climate-induced migration in US and EU climate security discourses. *Geoforum*, *96*, 268-277.

Todd, Z. (2016). An Indigenous feminist's take on the ontological turn: 'Ontology' is just another word for colonialism. *Journal of Historical Sociology,* (29)1. DOI: 10.1111/johs.12124

Tuana, N. (2019). Climate apartheid: The forgetting of race in the anthropocene. *Critical Philosophy of Race*, *7*(1), 1-31.

Verlie, B. (2018). From action to intra-action? Agency, identity and 'goals' in a relational approach to climate change education. *Environmental Education Research,* DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2018.1497147.

Watene, K. (2016). Valuing nature: Māori philosophy and the capability approach. *Oxford Development Studies*, *44*(3), 287–296.

Weheliye, A.G. (2014). *Habeas viscus; Racializing assemblages, biopolitics, and Black feminist theories of the human.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Whyte, K. (2017). Indigenous climate change studies: Indigenizing futures, decolonizing the Anthropocene. *English Language Notes*, *55*(1), 153-162.

Whyte, K. (2019). Way beyond the lifeboat: An indigenous peoples' allegory of climate justice. *In: Climate futures: Reimagining global climate justice.* Edited by Debashish Munshi, Kum-Kum Bhavnani, John Foran, and Priya Kurian. Zed Books.

Whyte, K. (2020). Too late for indigenous climate justice: Ecological and relational tipping points. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *11*(1), e603.

Winter, C.J. (2019). Decolonising dignity for inclusive democracy. *Environmental Values*, *28*(1), 9-30.

Winter, C.J. (2020). Does time colonise intergenerational environmental justice theory? *Environmental Politics, 29*(2), 278-296.

WWF-Australia (2020). *Regenerate Australia: A roadmap to recovery and regeneration.* Ultimo and Sydney, New South Wales, Australia (October).

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Toward the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. *The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257-337.

Yusoff, K. (2018). *A billion black Anthropocenes or none.* University of Minnesota Press.