family resemblance between these programs and the increasingly urgent calls to reimagine our relationship to the planet, some of which Chakrabarty discusses (e.g., Lovejoy's Gaia model) and some of which he does not (e.g., the renewed interest in Native American philosophies of nature). I am not proposing, like Modi, that a renewed study of Sanskrit texts will in itself set our relationship to the planet right; Chakrabarty's book argues powerfully that the planet itself is a modern category. What interests me is the possibility of converting knowledge into action by a thoroughgoing recalibration of the way we see ourselves and our environment.

Chakrabarty reflects calmly and systematically on issues that many of us cannot think about without panicking. But as it becomes increasingly clear that our knowledge about the climate crisis will not, in itself, lead to action—and clear to some of us that Enlightenment presuppositions about knowledge and power might be part of the problem—we might take a closer look at the concept of "training" (*śikṣā*). Training is supposed to allow us to overcome the limitations on our thinking, feeling, and acting that are imposed by the relatively circumscribed horizons of our biological and social existence. As Chakrabarty and many others have argued, the planetary age requires us to see things we cannot at present see, think of things we cannot currently think of, and organize ourselves politically in ways we never have.

Decolonial and Indigenous Climate Studies' Contributions to Climate History and Humanities for a Planetary Age

Brooke Ackerly

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA

doi:10.1017/S0034670522000705

In a book that provokes the humanities as a modern academic endeavor to rethink its ontological underpinnings, Dipesh Chakrabarty asks how this academic terrain, developed to understand humans in their own scale of world history, can revise itself to reflect on the meaning of the planetary scale. He sets out the challenge:

> The figure of the human had doubled, in effect, over the course of my lifetime. There was (and still is) the human of humanist histories—the human capable of struggling for equality and fairness among other humans while caring for the environment and certain forms of nonhuman life. And then

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670522000705 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> there was this other human, the human as geological agent, whose history could not be recounted from within purely humanocentric views (as most narratives of capitalism and globalization are). (3)

With this doubling of the human Chakrabarty reveals the nature of the new age and the insufficiency of the humanities of the previous age for apprehending it.

Chakrabarty engages attentively not only with what the humanities—philosophy in particular—can provide from its historical reflections on that first human, but also with what Earth System scientists offer regarding the second: to apprehend planetary history, now that humans' impact on the planet's climate and on other planetary systems is part of human ethics. In turning to these sources, he never abandons the modern approach to these questions. However, one of his main arguments throws into question the appropriateness of modern tools for wrestling with a decentered human in the planetary age. The entire middle section of the book and chapter 3, which he characterizes as the "fulcrum" of his argument, suggest a mode of contemplation inconsistent with modern thought: "contemplating our own times required us to behold ourselves from two perspectives at once: the planetary and the global. The global is a humanocentric construction; the planet decenters the human" (18–19). He does not intend to set aside the role of sociogenic oppressions—"colony, race, class, gender, sexuality, ideologies, interests" (17), capital, and extraction—in contributing to climate change and injustice with his turn toward developing a planetary (not merely global) humanities of climate change, but he relies on mainstream academic Earth System Science, philosophy, and, to a lesser extent (see chapter 7), the social sciences to provide the basis for this two-perspective adventure.

Chakrabarty both challenges and advances the humanities by clarifying why decentering the human is also part of taking on the ethical challenge raised by climate change, proposing along with Earth System Science that the ontological basis for humanocentric modernity no longer holds. Thus, his approach is in praxis—in theory and in practice—modern. It is a modern academic methodology for approaching human problems. Despite his dissatisfaction with postcoloniality because as a mode of governing it has maintained the political commitments to modernity, Chakrabarty does not look outside those academic approaches that claim authority over the problem as he frames it: Earth System Science and philosophy.

Given Chakrabarty's question, his distinction between global and planetary perspectives on climate change, and the questions it prompts him to explore, decolonial theory generally and Indigenous climate studies in particular would seem like appropriate engagements. Indigenous climate studies offer a range of ways of conceiving of ontology that can frame the problem of the two perspectives without centering modernity. Moreover, the experience of Indigenous communities of North America of being relocated from one climate to a completely different one illustrates the need to consider the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670522000705 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deep connections between sociogenic injustice and climate change as causal mechanisms and contacts of adaptation.

Chakrabarty briefly considers that Indigenous histories may provide "some exemplary lessons on some of the principles involved here" (48, see also n95). This reflection focuses merely on limited "exemplary lessons" from non-Indigenous anthropologists about Indigenous communities and is dismissive and extractive. It is dismissive of the contributions of Indigenous knowledge and a form of colonial extraction from Indigenous knowledges. In fact, Indigenous studies generally, and Indigenous climate studies in particular, have provided valuable insights that bear centrally on Chakrabarty's puzzle "in search of a redefinition of human relationships to the nonhuman, including the planet" (19).

Across a range of empirical contexts and Indigenous histories, Indigenous climate studies offer (in Western academic language) empirically supported theoretical contributions to the question of how we should understand the planetary age. Taken together (but not lumped together in some constructed pan-Indigenous cosmology), this scholarship goes beyond laying out the question that Chakrabarty raises and illustrating its deep history. It offers multiple ancestral, land-based wisdoms to human relationships in the planetary age. Indigenous climate studies have been developing the answer. It provides as least three broad directions to enable those who find the problem Chakrabarty raises ontologically provocative and have an interest in learning how it might be explored.

First, it offers methodologies. Nishnaabeg storyteller and theorist Leanne Betasomasake Simpson reveals in her community's intellectual history—in "Nishnaabeg Brilliance"—methodologies (Kwe) to understand the world without constructing binaries.[5] The first problematic binary Chakrabarty uses is the construction of a time when "we" were unaware of the planet as he defines it. Many people raised in Indigenous knowledge systems are not newly aware of the planet as Chakrabarty conceives of it, because they have always been aware of humans' relationships to the nonhuman, animate and inanimate (to use another modern binary).

Second, Indigenous studies offers ideas that span human engagement with the planet long before the blip in human time that began with colonial extractivism. Of course, Indigenous people have a history of survivance,[6] resurgence,[7] refusal,[8]

[5]Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence* (Winnipeg, Manitoba: Arbeiter Ring, 2011); *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*, Indigenous Americas (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

[6]Gerald Robert Vizenor, *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

[7]Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, Indigenous Americas (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

[8]Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670522000705 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and political determination.[9] Through settler-colonialism, much of what has been suppressed includes their linguistic and other cultural resources for conceiving of humans' relationships in a planetary way.[10] Despite these losses, Indigenous studies provides an intellectual resurgence that makes these insights available. These ideas are shared with non-Indigenous audiences through organizations like the First Alaskan Institute,[11] media,[12] policy briefings,[13] and scholarship. Kyle Powys Whyte reviews much of this literature in his essay on Indigenous climate studies.[14]

Third, it provides an ontology and politics for the planetary age. Again, in turning to this thought from a settler-colonial academic mindset (regardless of critical and postcolonial orientations within settler-colonial academe), we risk appropriating Indigenous thought to address material and conceptual problems caused by the same modern praxis that justified and organized centuries of settler colonialism and that continues to sustain its legacies of oppression and exploitation. The harms perpetuated by the forces supported by settler colonial ontology include ignoring, killing, displacing, impoverishing, and suppressing Indigenous thought and people. The history of resistance and resurgence in the face of settler colonialism is also telling.[15] In that vein, it is possible to learn from Indigenous climate studies made available through the efforts of Indigenous academics in a way that respects by engaging with those ideas. Such engagement need not be extractive. Rather, in this context, ignoring and ignorance is a form of epistemic oppression.[16] Indigenous climate studies provides many examples of a "humanities" for the "planetary age" by ontologically and methodologically decentering the human and centering relationality in understanding these at the planetary scale across time, but doing so in a way that does not artificially construct a binary cognition of global sociogenic problems and planetary ones.

A more thorough review of Indigenous climate studies would only make the point more thoroughly. Indigenous thought has asked Chakrabarty's question in another way generations before Chakrabarty. Further, integrated

[9]David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2019).

[10]Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass* (Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed, 2013), esp. 48–59.

[11]Kyle Powys Whyte, "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene," *English Language Notes* 55, no. 1–2 (2017): 159.

[12]Costa Boutsikaris and Anna Palmer, *Inhabitants: An Indigenous Perspective* (Pasadena, CA: Good Docs, 2021).

[13]Kirsten Vinyeta, Kyle Powys Whyte, and Kathy Lynn, *Climate Change through an Intersectional Lens: Gendered Vulnerability and Resilience in Indigenous Communities in the United States* (Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture, 2015).

[14]Whyte, "Indigenous Climate Change Studies."

[15]Treuer, *Heartbeat of Wounded Knee*.

[16]Kristie Dotson, "Conceptualizing Epistemic Oppression," *Social Epistemology* 28, no. 2 (2014).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670522000705 Published online by Cambridge University Press

within these knowledge systems are deeply relational politics that provide not just "principles," but historically resilient, surviving, evolving, dynamic modes of engaging with each other and with earth systems that maintain that integrated view even through change.

Political Theory in the Age of the Planetary

Adom Getachew

University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA

doi:10.1017/S0034670522000675

The culmination of over a decade of thinking and writing about climate change, Chakrabarty's book challenges humanists, including political theorists, to contend with the limits of our analytic categories and received intellectual traditions in the face of the contemporary climate crisis. Central to the book's intervention is the arresting formulation of the planet as distinct from the globe. The distinction emerges from a simple observation. "The word *globe* as it appeared in the literature on globalization is not the same as the world globe in the expression global warming" (71, emphasis in original). Where the globe of globalization points to the ways humans produced and represented a connected world, the globe of global warming is concerned with earth systems far outside of human agency and that can only be fully comprehended in relation to the systems of other planets. It is the latter that Chakrabarty discusses under the rubric of the planetary.

Chakrabarty's insistence on taking the planetary seriously is a significant departure from and challenge to the traditions of anticolonial and postcolonial theory with which he is so closely identified. As he acknowledges, from Frantz Fanon's image of the Manichean world of colonialism to his own *Provincializing Europe*, anticolonial and postcolonial critique has been concerned to theorize the global as a space of unevenness, differentiation, and hierarchy. From this perspective, claims to the oneness of the world are viewed with skepticism and subjected to unmasking critiques (17–18). Within the debate over climate change, the Anthropocene has been the object of similar intervention. Those informed by Marxist and postcolonial perspectives have argued that the attribution of climate change to humans as such elides the fact that the greatest contributors to our carbon footprint have been states of the global North, with China and India playing a growing role only in the last decade. Alternative framings such as the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670522000705 Published online by Cambridge University Press