Book Review: Joseph Pugliese's *Biopolitics of the More-than-Human* and Indigenous Subversion in the Canadian State

PATRICIA WEBER

PHD CANDIDATE

YORK UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, CANADA

How does a new approach to biopolitics, the biopolitics of the more-than-human, help our understanding of Canada's relations with Indigenous peoples? This paper will review Joseph Pugliese's book, Biopolitics of the More-than-Human (2020). Pugliese connects the practice of Western biopolitics, a power derived from making life and letting die, with the operation of speciesism, settler-colonialism, racism and environmental degradation in the Western state. After exploring his theory, this paper will draw on points raised by Paul Nadasdy in his earlier anthropological study, Hunters and Bureaucrats (2003), which characterizes the Canadian state as attempting to exert biopolitical power over the Kluane First Nation. Comparing these works expands on Pugliese's theory of biopolitics of the more-than-human and his corollary argument that outside this form of Western power, Indigenous cosmo-epistemologies have existed and remained radically untouched by the biopower. Pugliese's claim is richly showcased in Nadasdy's book, suggesting that the Kluane worldview and practices are ways of resistance that defy a simpler theorization of biopolitics. Reading these books together helps illustrate the complex relationship between the environment, Indigenous nations and the Canadian government while also fleshing out biopolitical ecology theorizations.

KEY WORDS Biopolitics, Indigenous Studies, Settler-colonialism, Ecology, Nation-state, More-than-Human

Discussions about how power operates in the modern state have largely been dominated by reflections on Michael Foucault's concept of biopolitics. Foucault's theory holds that since the eighteenth century, the modern Western state has been governed by encouraging humans to live away and let them die according to a particular ideal life. Since Foucault, the conversation around biopolitics in the modern state has taken many forms. Around 2014, Achille Mbembe emerged with his theory of necropolitics, modifying Foucault's concept of biopower to argue that Western governance makes life, let's die and, in some (racialized) cases, makes die subjects. Theorization along these lines has questioned if it is only racialized human lives that are targeted for letting or making die, suggesting that power also targets non-human or more-than-human lives. Biopolitical ecology is an emerging field that links Western sovereignty with race, speciesism, and the environment (collectively, the more-than-human) to argue that the state seeks to make live life forms that support a certain kind of human and that it lets or makes die lives that do not support the idealized human life.

Contingent Horizons Volume 8, Issue 1 (2022–2023), ISSN 2292-7514 , online ISSN 2292-7514.

The latest addition to this field is Joseph Pugliese's book, *Biopolitics of the More-than-Human* (2020). Pugliese presents a theory of biopolitical ecology that argues Western states make live entities that are or support a certain type of human life and lets (or makes) die lives that are more than human. Pugliese elaborates on this theory by linking speciesism, settler-colonialism, racism, environmental degradation and health inequalities to a dense network of Western power. Pugliese argues that although this network is extensive and intricate, Indigenous cosmo-epistemologies exist, and Indigenous peoples practice them. To lay out the key parts of Pugliese's theory and to review the book, this paper will summarize the theory and select case studies alongside an earlier ethnographic study by Paul Nadasdy, Hunters and Bureaucrats (2003). Nadasdy's book is about how the Canadian state used biopolitics to govern the Kluane First Nation in a rural and remote section of the country, and it is a book that is implicitly about the struggle of a Western state to impose biopolitical governance on an Indigenous nation.

What is remarkable about Nadasdy's book is that he, like Pugliese, suggests that while the Western state uses biopower, there are practices of living (and dying) that are unaffected by this power. To open up the discussion about how biopolitics and its resistance can be (re)conceived as operating in a Western state, this paper will review Pugliese's book and suggest that a theory of the more-than-human biopolitics can be supplemented by Nadasdy's anthropological study. Such a reading helps articulate a biopolitics that captures the Western state's attempts at governing certain human lives and letting (or making) die more-than-human lives, all while Indigenous cosmology-based legal and political orders persist.

To explore this claim, this paper will begin with a summary of Pugliese's theory of governance through the biopolitics of the more-than-human. Then, it will move to explain Pugliese's idea of Indigenous cosmology, which operates alongside this biopolitics, and compare this with Nadasdy's research about this cosmology in the Kluane First Nation. To apply Pugliese's theory, his case study on the United States' campaign of drone strikes using biodata will be contrasted with Nadasdy's discussion about the Canadian government's use of biodata to govern the sheep population in the Indigenous territory. Finally, the review will conclude by suggesting future research areas for theorizing the biopolitics of the more-than-human.

Biopolitics of the More-than-Human

Pugliese's book uses a "forensic audit" methodology to explore the early 2000s military campaigns at the 'fringes' of the Empire, places that include the attacks in Gaza, the Middle East, and the encampment of Guantanamo Bay. Pugliese argues that by examining how the violence unfolded in these areas, he can uncover how power operates in the larger area. These areas are where power is colonizing, as it attempts to secure control over a territory or people it sees as needing domination. As Pugliese explains: "the possibilities of political life for the settler subject are indissociably predicated on infrastructural foreclosures of political life for the broad spectrum of more-than-human entities attempting to survive within regimes of settler occupation

and military violence" that is inscribed with the speciesist based legal and political orders (Pugliese 2020, 5).

Using this methodology, Pugliese argues that military campaigns create 'zones of indeterminability' between the flesh of humans, animals, and more-than-humans, and this constitutes the modern subject. To begin theorizing biopolitics as operating in the binary, Pugliese suggests that Michel Foucault's concept of state power was meant to govern man "not as man-as-body but man-as-species" (Pugliese 2020, 5). From here, Foucault argues that society increasingly uses a discourse of biological degeneracy through race, operating to eliminate one race to improve the human species. For Pugliese, Foucault's argument is an opening to explore biopower's "foundational, but unspoken, dependence on speciesism" (Pugliese 2020, 6). To conceptualize this connection, Pugliese introduces the term "racio-speciesism" to describe how the human/more-than-human binary is mobilized in settler-colonial environments to 'make live' subjects designated as human and to 'make die' those colonized 'more-than-human' subjects. Pugliese argues that understanding the racio-speciesism connection is vital to reconceptualizing biopolitics as a framework that "transmutes the race struggle into distinct racio-anthropocentric registers designed to impact diverse targets that are scripted as deviating from the norm" (Pugliese 2020, 6).

Pugliese formulates his concept of racio-specieism by extending Jacques Derrida's response to Giorgio Agamben. Agamben argued that biopolitics emerged from the political structures of Ancient Greece, where sovereign power was constituted through the separation between zoe (human life, or participation in the home and farm outside of the city) from bios (political life, or participation in the city). This separation constitutes the sovereign and the exalted subject, a proposition that Carey Wolfe uses to conceptualize 'zoopolitics': the use of biopolitical power to use a discursive dispositif to interpellate a subject in the human/animal binary. Pugliese argues that the constitutive nature of the binary means that both the human and the more-than-human categories are politicized, producing what Neel Ahuja calls "the interspecies zone of the political" (Pugliese 2020, 64). Thus, Pugliese redefines politics as that which "exposes what biopolitics continues to elide and disavow: that the conditions of possibility of the very concept of the 'the human' are founded on the occlusive operations of this originary ruse" between zoe and bios, human and more-than-human (Pugliese 2020, 64).

Pugliese sees zoo politics as insufficiently accounting for the logic of the settler state. To illustrate this, he draws on Israel's 2014 military campaign against Gaza, called 'Operation Protective Edge'. Israel justified the campaign by claiming that Israel had to 'mow the lawn' and pre-emptively attack Gaza to ensure the people did not grow too strong to potentially attack. By referring to Palestinians' lives as if they were mere grass, , Pugliese argues that the campaign illustrates the hierarchization of life and more-than-life because Israel did not just target Palestinian lives but the non-human lives that supported Palestinians. It conducted the military campaign by doing things like shooting up orchids, bulldozing trees and vegetative life, killing pets, bombing houses, and targeting sewage and water systems. Pugliese argues that the campaign reveals that the settler state does not just seek to make settler (human) lives live but that the logic of colonialism is a process that aims to eliminate Indigenous human and

non-human lives. Thus, he suggests that the settler state operates not just on zoo politics but the biopolitics of the more-than-human.

Settler-Colonialism, Slow Violence and Indigenous Cosmology

Pugliese also argues that the settler state uses slow violence to reinforce the biopolitical ends of the human/more-than-human binary. Pugliese focuses on the Israeli state, whose military campaign included digging up aquifers, shooting up orchards, and bombing the land. Long after the initial violence ends, the environmental and health damage these acts cause lingers in a way that operates at the "nucleic level" as heavy metals and poisoned bacteria enter waters and air, causing sickness and even death. In these acts, biopolitics becomes atomized, "in a capillary-like fashion, gnawing at the body in question and weakening it" as the settler state aims to 'make live' one population (the Israeli state) and 'let die' (or also make die) the colonized population (Pugliese 2020, 101). Slow violence makes it difficult to locate the perpetrator, as the nature of pathogens "may defy categorical medico-legal identification of the causal agent" (Pugliese 2020, 103). Pugliese argues that the settler state targets more-than-human subjects because of their life-giving means, which affects the colonized subjects' health. Pugliese's 'atomization of biopolitics' reframes the concept of slow violence as occurring in ecology to turn the colonized bodies against them, reconceptualizing the need for land and 'environmental' rights in settler-colonial states.

Pugliese's more-than-human biopolitics theory, as it operates in the zoopolitical modality of the settler colonies and as it unfolds in the slow violence of the state, can be used to explore other aspects of power in the Western state. For instance, the research could apply the theory to First Nation reserves in Canada to understand how many cannot access clean drinking water and adequate housing and are located near toxic industries (Canada 2019, Cecco 2019, Liao n.d.). Similarly, research can use the more-than-human biopolitical lens to explore the difficulties that Black and Latinx communities in the United States have with accessing food or clean water (Brones 2018, Ewing-Chow 2021, Potter et al. 2017). Jasbir Puar has recently argued that the more-than-human biopolitics would also offer a salient argument for the global and domestic response to the COVID-19 pandemic (Puar 2020).

This concept of slow violence is not directly addressed in Nadasdy's book, but the theory brings an interesting dimension to his arguments. As will be discussed, Nadasdy contends that the settler state is trying to govern Indigenous people and the lands that make them live more like settlers (or bureaucrats) and live less traditional Indigenous ways (or hunters). The government's fumbling of wildlife management in the Kluane nation results in a decline in the sheep population that threatens Indigenous ways of life, pushing the Indigenous people to live more like settlers. Thus, Nadasdy argues that the Kluane people tried to engage with the state to change this declining population, but the state did not take their concerns seriously. If Nadasdy's research is read through Pugliese's more-than-human biopolitics, then what emerges is a claim that the settler state is making traditional Indigenous ways of living untenable. This pushes the Indigenous people into lifestyles that are foreign to them; it is dispossession that makes

them live closer to a settler life and further from the non-settler life. This type of theorization suggests that the settler state engages in the form of slow violence to govern the lands, and this idea is useful for further theorizing in the Canadian context.

This is not to paint biopolitics as a totalizing power. In these chapters and throughout the book, one of Pugliese's deft theoretical moves is to assume that Indigenous epistemologies exist outside of Western thought, despite ongoing attempts at colonization. Pugliese makes this assumption because he relies on the arguments by Indigenous scholars like Vine Deloria Jr, Gregory Cajete, Winnona Le Duke, and Robin Wall Kimmerer. He argues that these works present an Indigenous cosmology that premises existence as part of the natural world. This existence is ruled in a way that is unknowable to humans, but humans can benefit from learning to live within this web of being if they observe nature and participate thoughtfully. Unlike other Western aesthetic, and political theories, Pugliese centers on Indigenous cosmo-epistemology. In so doing, Pugliese is replying to a call from Jacques Derrida, who suggests that Western thought does not yet know of political aesthetics outside of European thought (Derrida 2000, 11). Pugliese's reply is: that we can know aesthetics by listening to Indigenous people. His book is a demonstration of this reply.

However, Pugliese does not mean to suggest, and neither do the Indigenous scholars he draws on, that colonization has not had a violent impact on Indigenous nations. Pugliese is dealing with an aesthetics of a political philosophy that is grounded on Indigenous epistemology, where the impacts of this violence do not necessarily reach the foundational worldviews and legal orders of Indigenous people, especially since they are de-anthropomorphized. Pugliese's argument suggests that 'working with' Indigenous nations can only be done if the Western state is ready to de-anthropomorphize its legal and governance structures or at least give Indigenous nations the autonomy to enact their own laws and political order. Thus, peaceful co-existence happens only when the settler state can respect the autonomy of the Indigenous nations, a major implication of Nadasdy's research. In Hunters and Bureaucrats (2003), Nadasdy illustrates how Canada's attempts at co-governing Indigenous lands with Indigenous nations often frustratingly fail because Canada co-governs to uphold "Euro-North American assumptions about land and animals" (Nadasdy 2003, 8). For a detailed explanation of how these two arguments are llustrated, a turn to Pugliese's theorization of biopower through data and Nadasdy's case study of the settler state co-managing wildlife with the Kluane First Nation.

Biopower and Biodata: Drone Strikes and Hunting Licenses

Nadasdy's book was one of the first to look at Canada's governance of Indigenous land through 'co-management' boards, and since the book, Canada has increasingly used this co-management approach in other aspects of Indigenous governance. Political scientists call this 'multilevel governance, and it is meant to bring the Canadian state and Indigenous nations together to decide what happens on Indigenous lands (Pasternak 2020). To unpack how the theory of biopolitics of the more-than-human can be applied in Canada, I will look at Pugliese's theorization of the bioinformational-

ization that propels the more-than-human biopolitics operating in the United State's drone strike campaign in the Middle East (chapter 3). Similar to the United States 'War on Terror', Canada's multilevel governance has increasingly used data collection and analysis to justify interventions on Indigenous land, sidelining Indigenous claims and rights based on the superiority of scientific knowledge (Burman 2016, Pasternak 2020, Pasternak and King n.d.). Nadasdy's book was one of the first to explore Canada's reliance on governance with data and argue that this was determinantal to Indigenous nations and the environment.

In Chapter 3, Pugliese argues that the settler-colonial state utilizes data and algorithms to govern more-than-human biopolitics. As an example of this, Pugliese examines the drone strikes that the United States conducted in parts of the Middle East as part of the "War on Terror". Pugliese argues that these drone strikes used data to determine where to strike, and such decisions reinforce anthropocentric hierarchies of life that attempt to place the settler state. The United States has a mandated drone strike policy because it needs to 'end' terrorism. Each drone strike kills humans, animals, plants, and other more-than-humans, and this killing is made extrajudicially as no legal permit is issued for that particular killing. This 'divine' killing, where the United States kills based on who it thinks is there but does not actually 'know' who is there, occurs because the United States collected data about life in that territory that is then converted to integers that it uses in an algorithm. The United States issued drone strikes based on a combination of algorithmic formulas, probability stakes, and outright guesses – what Pugliese calls the "drone casino mimesis" (Pugliese 2020, 177). The United States justifies these attacks based on the statistical probability that terrorists are there, and the non-terrorist kills are classified as 'non-combatant deaths' and not 'person deaths' (Pugliese 2020, 177). Research indicates that drone strikes hit suspected terrorists about 4% of the time.

Nadasdy's book focuses on how the Canadian government came to the co-management wildlife board to address the declining sheep population in the area. The Kluane believed that the sheep were declining because of overhunting and changes in the weather patterns, which today would be recognized as global warming. The settler population in the area largely depended on hunting for the tourism industry, the main economic source for the settler population. The Kluane argued that the state should decrease these licenses to halt the declining sheep population. The government resisted this suggestion and chose to rely on the data that they collected. The data came from the government workers who counted sheep through ariel surveys and by counting newborn lambs in the spring. Canadian biologists then converted the sheep's lives into integers that were then calculated using algorithms to decide how many hunting licenses the state could issue.

Similar to the high rate of failure in the drone strikes, Nadasdy argues that Canada's reliance on data to manage the declining sheep population was unsuccessful. For instance, the government decided to focus its hunting licenses on mature male sheep but did not decrease the number of licenses, arguing that the older males did not affect the sheep population. Nadasdy points out that this angered the Kluane elders, who argued with the government that this approach was wrong because older male sheep

played an important role in managing the population. The elders had this knowledge because they spent time on the land and observing nature, and they understood that older male sheep taught younger sheep how to attract a mate, how to prepare for winter, and how to eat – they played important roles in the reproduction of the sheep population. Nadasdy argues that when the elders presented their knowledge to the government, the government reduced the knowledge into statistical data that was coded as "traditional ecological knowledge" (TEK). Government biologists used TEK because they were required to collect and store TEK under the co-management agreement, but the government biologists did not have to value TEK over their data and assumptions. Nadasdy argues that the government frequently devalues TEK in favour of scientific-based data. As the Kluane people and elders realize this in their meetings with government officials, Nadasdy argues that their participation in the co-management board became less enthused, and eventually, they lost hope that the government would change. For their part, the government barrelled ahead with issuing hunting licenses that emphasized killing the older male sheep. Ultimately, the sheep population continued to decline substantially.

Nadasdy's case study illustrates how the settler state uses biodata to make live more-than-human lives. The state sought to make live the sheep lives because they supported the settler tourism industry. They managed using ariel counting and sheep birth, translating the sheep lives into integers that the government then used to determine how many hunting licenses it should issue. Nadasdy suggests that the sinister side of Canada's governance by data is that it allows Canada to feign participation from the Indigenous nation. He argues that true co-management is not possible until there is a shift in Western epistemologies that restructure the way 'data' is viewed, collected, valued, and utilized by the Canadian state. It is striking that Pugliese's account of the drone strikes relies on satellite information in a way that is similar to how Canada collects data by conducting aerial surveys to count sheep. The Kluane was appalled by this practice of data collection, arguing that it is disrespectful for Canada to treat the animals "as objects of study, as non-sentient beings with whom social relations are impossible. Many Kluane people, however, refuse to make such a distinction between the proper treatment of animals and people" (Nadasdy 2016, 10). As Pugliese would say, the Kluane rejected the practice of data collection that translates lives into integers. Nadasdy calls on sweeping changes in the collection and use of data, but I suspect that Pugliese would advocate for an even more radical approach. As Nadasdy describes the Kluane people as believing that decisions about the sheep population can only be made by living on the land and participating in a relational ecology, perhaps Pugliese will favour one Kluane elder's solution: "it is not enough to know about only bears and moose; one must know about all the animals out there – how they behave, what they eat, how they interact with one another, how they think... biologists do not know as much about the environment as they think they do because, if you put them out in the bush alone, they would not be able to survive" (Pugliese 2020, 124).

If Pugliese was writing Nadasdy's book, he would likely argue that the elder's comments reveal a way of governance that is based on an Indigenous cosmo-epistemology. The elders that Nadasdy speaks to gathered their knowledge of the sheep

because of the time they spent living on the land, hunting and observing them. These elders observed that the sheep population was declining because of the changing migration patterns they speculated were caused by the warming weather patterns and nearby resource extraction activities. At the time of Nadasdy's book, the Canadian government did not heed these concerns. In another article, Nadasdy emphasizes the unknowing aspect of Klaune ontology. He writes that the Kluane sees humans as the "most pitiful" creatures who need the most help to survive, and it is only by the graciousness of nature and animals that the Kluane can learn some things (but not all) about how to live. Therefore, Nadasdy describes how the Kluane believe that it is important to live on the land and to observe nature, as these are opportunities to learn important lessons about how to live (Nadasdy 2016, 8). Further, Nadasdy argues that the Kluane see animals as political actors who "understand human speech (whether spoken or merely thought), and it is they, not humans, who authored many of the laws that still govern not only human-animal interactions but also social relations among humans" (Nadasdy 2016, 9). This characterization of the Kluane epistemology is similar to how Pugliese characterizes Indigenous cosmo-epistemologies, suggesting that this is a useful source of knowledge.

Although Pugliese's theorization of bioinfromationalization was not present when Nadasdy was writing the book, this is a rough sketch of how I would want to apply Pugliese's theory in the context of Canada-Indigenous relations. Further research is warranted, especially as Canada increasingly uses co-management boards and private contracts, called Mutual Benefit Agreements (MBAs), that seek to involve Indigenous nations in governance to reconcile and manage the lands better. Scholar Shiri Pasternack argues that Canada's larger strategy of multilevel governance agreements is to force Indigenous nations to consent to resource extraction (Patzer 2019). Pugliese's more-than-human biopolitics offers a nuanced understanding of power dynamics in the settler-colonial state that led to this coercion under multilevel governance.

Theorizing Resistance and Closing Thoughts

I want to close this book review by looking at Pugliese's chapter on Guantanamo Bay, where he argues that biopolitics of the more-than-human can also give racialized subjects access to a type of freedom through a re-imagined concept of The Open. In this chapter, Pugliese describes the more-than-human biopolitics that operates in the Camp, where the detainees are treated like 'pieces of furniture and have a legal status as 'not persons'. This moves the detainees from their previous identities as humans to a more-than-human position. Without any other avenues for intimacy or relationships, the detainees choose to relate and intimate with other more-than-human subjects that move in and out of the Camp. Pugliese draws on several such examples of detainees forming moments of relations with iguanas, cats, ants, flies, and banana rats, which are all beautiful vignettes. In each case, the detainee approaches the more-than-human subject with humility, curiosity, and kindness that allows both subjects to connect to each other. One detainee, Mansoor Adayfi, who was imprisoned from the ages of 14 years old to 31 years old, says that the longest relationship of his life was with an iguana

at the Camp. Mohammed Bashmilah, another detainee, described visits from feral cats and crows as vital to his survival at the Camp, saying that these relations "make you come out of Guantanamo completed" (Pugliese 2020, 146). Pugliese theorizes that while biopolitics places the colonized subject in a state where they have a doubled existence, the colonized can find solace in their exchanges and relations with other more-than-human subjects.

From here, Pugliese theorizes that such solace means that the detainees can experience "an encounter with animal alterity that establishes the conditions of possibility to be enveloped by the transient space of the Open and to be elevated, momentarily, beyond the binding shackles of the cage" (Pugliese 2020, 139). At this moment, the detainee uses his interpellated position to relate with another more-than-human entity that exists outside Western spatial and temporal confines. Pugliese re-draws the idea of The Open to describe this relation and theorizes a type of resistance. Heidegger theorized that humans could confront The Open to access the place of Being in which things first appeared as what they are; for Heidegger, this place could only be accessed by a unique balance of human language, poetry, and the everyday. Heidegger assumed that only humans have language. Contra Heidegger, Pugliese suggests that language is not exclusive to humans and that interspecies language is possible. Further, the detainees at the Camp are one example of this interspecies communication. The other evidence for this is Indigenous cosmo-epistemology, which acknowledges the importance of interspecies communication as illustrated in the work of Catej and Deloria. Thus, Pugliese argues that "across a number of Indigenous worldviews, animals and other-than-human entities have always responded [to humans]. It is Westerners who have been inattentive to their voices" (Pugliese 2020, 146).

Pugliese draws on Agamben to theorize about The Open, which brings into his theory of biopolitics a way that the subject can gain agency. Pugliese illustrates this in his account of the life of detainee Adan Farahan Abdul Latif, whose tortured life and tragic death could easily be characterized as a totalizing account of biopolitical and necropolitical power. Although these powers were likely at work in Latif's life, Pugliese's theory suggests that Latif also experienced moments of 'freedom' in his relations and moments of intimacy with the crows, feral cats, and other wildlife that he encountered while imprisoned. This conception of The Open reinforces an argument he makes earlier in the book, which is that Patrick Wolfe's theory of settler-colonialism cannot assume that colonialism's structure is complete and totalizing. As Pugliese suggests and as The Open indicates, there are parts of the Empire that are unknown and uncontrolled by Western biopolitics (Pugliese 2020, 107). Even more striking, Pugliese's theory suggests that subjects can engage in The Open in moments of colonial violence, under intense and violent power, even if the subject does not know about Indigenous epistemologies or worldviews.

Pugliese is right to highlight the importance of human and more-than-human communication in Indigenous theory, but I wonder if his theorization here can be bolstered by a more nuanced understanding of what this role entails. For this, I turn to the work of Nadasdy, who argues that the settler state's inability to appreciate interspecies communication is one barrier to successful co-management with Indigen-

ous nations (Nadasdy 2016). Nadasdy's work is limited to the Kluane and other Indigenous nations in Northwestern Canada, and for them, interspecies communication is how Indigenous legal and political orders can be known:

> It is they [animals], not humans, who authored many of the laws that still govern not only human-animal interactions but also social relations among humans... human people depend for their very survival on the goodwill of their animal benefactors, and if animals are offended they may refuse to give themselves to hunters in the future. Recognizing their indebtedness to the powerful other-than-human persons upon whom they depend for their very existence, northern Indigenous people cultivate a sense of humility in their dealings with them. Indeed, many northern Indigenous people believe that animals are moved by pity to help humans. (Nadasy 2016, 7)

Nadasdy's argument is that interspecies communication is the only way that humans can understand how to survive on Earth. The Kluane believe that without this communication, humans would not know how to live sustainably and for a long time – and this is a point that seems important as we contemplate life in the Anthropocene. Perhaps we can then suggest that interspecies communication is not just a vehicle to confront Being; it is the only way for Humans to exist. Turning back to Pugliese's theorization, it seems like the detainees approached the animals with humility, curiosity, and a sense of care, which accords with Indigenous teachings. I wonder if we could also say that the detainees' relations with the more-than-human entities also taught them about a legal and political order that helped keep them alive, as Nadasdy writes: "most Kluane people believe that maintaining proper social relations with animals is essential to their survival" (Nadasdy 2003, 85).

The final question that I have about Pugliese's work concerns the idea of 'flesh-of-the-world', which is a critical part of the more-than-human biopolitics. Pugliese sees flesh as the basis for transcending the human/more-than-human binary by creating a subject that is deanthropromorphized. A question I have comes from a point raised by Catherine Malabou, who argues that the problem with biopolitics is that "for Foucault, as well as for Agamben, or Derrida, although in different ways, biology is always presented as intimately linked with sovereignty in its traditional figure" (Malabou 2014, 100). This leads me to ask: is Pugliese's more-than-human biopolitics making flesh the sovereign? I see this illustrated in how Pugliese theorizes that the more-than-human subject (the Arab detainee) is able to participate in The Open because the West has interpellated him in the more-than-human category. In making this move, is Pugliese foreclosing an identification or participation that the detainee may have with his own culture or race, a connection that might not be as easily observable as the relations with more-than-humans? What I wonder is: if we only recognize flesh that is not racialized, are we closing off a decolonial approach that recognizes Black epistemologies?

Fred Monton argues that Western theories of biopolitics may think of flesh as between the symbolic and the biological (or the human/more-than-human binary), but Black studies are concerned with "forging an understanding between" (Moten 2015, 28). Perhaps this applies to Pugliese's theorization if he cannot capture the in-between Black experience that is fundamental to the Black subject's experience with the flesh of

the world. For Pugliese, Western thought is haunted by the "zoopolitical phantom", which is the "dogma of human exceptionalism" (Pugliese 2020, 6). As Achille Mbembe points out, Afrofuturism sees Western thought as haunted by the phantom Negro that "put paid to the idea of the human species" (Mbembe 2019, 163). While it may be that the West has at least two ghosts outside Its doors, I would be interested in theorizations about this shared haunting ground.

Although Pugliese does recognize the connection between slavery and colonization in earlier sections of the book, I do not know if he fully reckons with this connection in his theorization of the more-than-human biopolitics. One indication of this is in Pugliese's dismissal of Fanon, who he says bemoaned the colonized subject's more-than-human position and wanted to make the colonized human. Thus Fanon's argument is "ineluctably entrenched in the locus of an unthought anthropocentrism that effectively operates to reproduce the very epistemic violence it desires to expose" (Pugliese 2020, 62). I suspect that it is possible that Pugliese may have misread Fanon. Mbembe describes Fanon as striving to emplace the Black man in a category outside that binary where "humanity is forever in creation" (Pugliese 2020, 175). Mbembe suggests that this 'humanity-in-creation' position means that the Black subject must co-exist in a relational network of humility and affect, creating a 'new' community as well as a 'new' man. To me, this suggests that Fanon's theorizations might be more similar to Pugliese's theory than he realizes, and this has interesting implications for a racial, Indigenous, and decolonial approach to biopolitics. This kind of research is outside the scope of Pugliese's book, and it does not weaken his strong theoretical strengths, but it warrants future work.

There are ongoing discussions in the scholarship about the connection between Black and Indigenous decolonial practices. Pugliese's *Biopolitics of More-than-Human* clearly illustrates a profound epistemological shift that must happen in Western governance to counter the violence that Western settler-colonialism inflicts. Indigenous epistemologies are a way to envision these alternative legal and political orders, and there is evidence that they are practiced by Indigenous and non-Indigenous subjects throughout the world. Pugliese's more-than-human biopolitics theory can also help explain why current research suggests that Indigenous nations are better at managing natural disasters and protecting against climate change than Western states (Sengupta, Einhorn, and Andreoni 2021). The challenge ahead is to understand how to support this radically different kind of stewardship, and Pugliese's book provides insight into why this is necessary and how this can be done.

References

Brones, Anna. 2018. "Food Apartheid: The Root of the Problem with America's Groceries." *The Guardian*. http://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/may/15/food-apartheid-food-deserts-racism-inequality-america-karen-washington-interview, accessed June 7, 2021.

Burman, Jenny. 2016. "Multicultural Feeling, Feminist Rage, Indigenous Refusal." *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 16(4): 361–72.

Cecco, Leyland. 2019. "UN Expert: Canada's Toxic Waste Policy Shows Disdain for Indigenous Rights." *The Guardian*. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/07/canada- un-human-rights-toxic-waste-baskut-tuncak, accessed June 7, 2021.

Derrida, Jacques. 2000. "Hostipitality." *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 5(3): 3–18.

Ewing-Chow, Daphne. 2021. "A Recent Survey Casts New Light On America's Racial Divide In Clean Tap Water Access." *Forbes*. *https://www.forbes.com/sites/daphneewingchow/* 2021/02/28/a-recent-survey-casts-new-light-on-americas-racial-and-water-divide/?sh=77e01fa721a6, accessed June 7, 2021.

Liao, Kristine. N.d. "61 Indigenous Communities in Canada Still Face Water Crisis." *Global Citizen*. https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/canada-indigenous-drinking -water-dangers/, accessed June 7, 2021.

Malabou, Catherine. 2014. "The King's Two (Biopolitical) Bodies." *Representations* 127(1): 98–106.

Mbembe, Achille. 2019. *Necropolitics*. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press.

Moten, Fred. 2015. "The Touring Machine (Flesh Thought Inside Out)." In *Plastic Materialities: Politics, Legality, and Metamorphosis in the Work of Catherine Malabou*, eds. Brenna Bhandar and Jonathan Goldberg-Hiller. Durham [N.C.].

N.a. 2019. "Canada: Blind Eye to First Nation Water Crisis." *Human Rights Watch*. https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/10/02/canada-blind-eye-first-nation-water-crisis, accessed June 7, 2021.

Nadasdy, Paul. 2003. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Nadasdy, Paul. 2016. "First Nations, Citizenship and Animals, or Why Northern Indigenous People Might Not Want to Live in Zoopolis." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 1–20.

Pasternak, Shiri. 2020. "Assimilation and Partition: How Settler Colonialism and Racial Capitalism Co-Produce the Borders of Indigenous Economies." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 119(2): 301–24.

Pasternak, Shiri, and Hayden King. N.d. *Land Back*. Yellowhead Institute. https://redpaper.yellowheadinstitute.org/, accessed November 11, 2020.

Patzer, Jeremy. 2019. "L." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 23(1–2): 214–33.

Potter, William Taylor, Brandon Kitchin, and Alexis Reese. 2017. *Crumbling Pipes, Tainted Water Plague Black Communities*. The Center for Public Integrity. https://publicintegrity.org/environment/crumbling-pipes-tainted-water-plague-black-communities/, accessed June 7, 2021.

Puar, Jasbir K. 2020. "Atmospherics of War A Response." *New Literary History* 51(4): 875–81.

Pugliese, Joseph. 2020. *Biopolitics of the More-Than-Human: Forensic Ecologies of Violence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sengupta, Somini, Catrin Einhorn, and Manuela Andreoni. 2021. "There's a Global Plan to Conserve Nature. Indigenous People Could Lead the Way. - The New York Times." *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/11/climate/nature- conservation-30-percent.html, accessed June 10, 2021.