PART II

Origins, trajectories, and futures

The chapters in this section are reflective chapters on the field of political ecology as a whole: its origins, the reasons it has evolved in the particular ways it has, and what in the future it might become.

The first chapter, by Ben Wisner, one of the founders of the field and a continuous contributor since, offers a first-hand account of the formation of political ecology. Explicitly weaving together the personal and the professional, the academic and the activist, the chapter situates some of political ecology’s key aspects and commitments at a pivotal political moment, yet also makes an argument regarding their continued salience for those newly drawn to the field under what may at first glance appear different circumstances.

The second chapter, by Enrique Leff, and the third, by Denis Gautier and Christian Kull, provide invaluable perspectives on Anglophone political ecology by looking at it from “outside” in a sense. Inasmuch as contemporary political ecology as represented in this volume is overwhelmingly an academic undertaking carried out by professionals in Anglophone universities and research traditions, it is necessarily shaped and limited (if also enabled) in many ways by those contexts: what questions it asks and where and how it asks them; where and in what language its products appear; what other groups outside of those institutions it engages with, and more. These two chapters on “political ecology,” by important contributors to the field who are rooted in and work through other linguistic, national, and regional research traditions, help to make visible some of the situated aspects of the field that are so familiar to many practitioners as to often be invisible or unquestioned. Likewise, they make explicit the potential of the growing but still nascent trend towards productive interchanges between Anglophone political ecology and political ecology research traditions in other regions and languages: the growing interest in and explicit networks organized around “political ecology” in the EU and Latin America, for example.

Finally, the chapters by Paul Robbins and Bruce Braun raise linked questions regarding the “essential nature” and potential futures of political ecology. Specifically, they probe the relationship of political ecology to other fields, asking whether political ecology is an approach or undertaking that is necessarily oppositional, alternative, or one of critique, and if so, what it means for it to become widely accepted and institutionalized on the one hand, or what it might look like if turned more in the direction of constructivist experiments, rather than critique of what already exists, on the other.
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SPEAKING TRUTH TO POWER
A personal account of activist political ecology

Ben Wisner

Introduction
This is a personal account of the development of what might be called ‘radical geography’, or ‘activist’ or ‘engaged’ political ecology (Akatiff, 2007; Wisner, 2012). It is personal in the simple epistemological sense that it’s one person’s experience and understanding. It’s also personal in the somewhat more interesting sense that this ‘take’ on political ecology does not belong wholly to the streams that became rivers of research and advocacy within geography (Robbins, 2012; Castree, 2014), anthropology (Escobar, 2008; Goldman et al., 2011) and development studies (Forsyth, 2003; Blaikie and Brookfield, 1987). Having dived in the deep end with two degrees in philosophy and paddled my way more or less blind (that is, without much theory or other flotation devices from these disciplines), I’ve ended up (washed up) on a shore whose name I do not know. I think of it as right livelihood or good work. I’ve been fortunate to have loved what I do, enjoying Schiller’s dialectic of work and play. Dr Ack has his banjo. Jim Blaut sang calypso. I joke in Swahili with elders as we compare walking sticks and use them to ‘map’ the movement of livestock in the semi-circle of dirt between our three-legged stools. Maybe political ecology will continue to grow and eventually understand it has to do performance, with comedy and tragedy, and the aspirant will spend time in Clown School (www.clownswithoutborders.org/).

Looking and listening deeply
Looking back to 1959, when I worked for six weeks picking apricots and lived in a migrant labour camp in Hollister, California, I did more than stand every morning at 5 am in a line as farmers chose us to climb into their pick-up trucks. I learned to enjoy Mexican food and company. I absorbed with this food all the elements of what would become my political ecology: history, property, work and low pay, the company store, mobility and the Other; the land, irrigation water, the single golden fruit whose size and shape may be perfect today, these years later, for my grandson’s hand, weighing down painfully on my shoulders then in their commodity form: 15 US cents per bucket hanging on my chest. I did not ask myself if this system was ‘sustainable’, and I didn’t have words for ‘exploitation’ or ‘surplus value’; I didn’t even know about pesticides. Rachel Carson’s book, Silent Spring, was not to be published for
another five years. But as Thich Nhat Hanh would write, in the apricot there are non-apricot elements. The basis was laid down. It would be years before I understood these non-apricot elements – genocide against native people, water theft, land degradation, oppression and exploitation of migrant labour, global markets, union fight back and sometimes transformation (Jones, 2013; Pelling, 2010).

Fast forward to 2009, and I was two years into what has turned by this writing into a seven-year engagement with people in several Tanzanian villages and a group of schools that serve the villages. Here, too, as the reader will see below, I was made aware of many of the same processes that keep poor people in ‘their place’ in unjust societies, constructed risk, and literally push marginal people into marginal places. I was also reminded that oppression and injustice provoke resistance and that ‘weapons of the weak’ (Scott, 1987) and local knowledge can combine with specialist knowledge and result in a ‘pedagogy’ of both researcher and the oppressed (Freire, 1970).

The ‘revolutionary’ 1960s

War, huh, yeah
What is it good for
Absolutely nothing
Uh-huh
War, huh, yeah
What is it good for
Absolutely nothing
Say it again, y’all

War, huh, good God
What is it good for
Absolutely nothing
Listen to me.¹

I was writing a master’s thesis on the justifiability of civil disobedience at the University of Chicago when I first heard Thich Nhat Hanh speak. This was in March 1966. He was the founder of a group of more than 20,000 Vietnamese youth who cared for the dead and wounded, and rebuilt schools and clinics on both sides of that tragic war. Martin Luther King was to nominate him for the Nobel Peace Prize. I did not know at the time the important role this first of three teachers would have in my practice of political ecology.

In the protest march that followed Thay’s speech² by a few days I saw a sign carried by four teenaged African American women: ‘The Vietnamese never called me a nigger’. Aged 20-something, I inhabited a moral universe that I believed ‘bends toward justice’, in MLK’s words.³ The civil rights, anti-war movements and struggles within higher education over free speech framed and influenced my academic work. These, and also the environmental movement were behind the creation of Antipode when I was resident at Clark University from 1968–70 (Wisner, 2012). My mind was opened to non-violent civil disobedience and, increasingly, to Marxism. Silent Spring (Carson, 1964) met a very noisy spring in the streets of Paris in 1968, and also on campuses across the United States. Having been arrested for blocking the army recruitment centre in Worcester, MA, home of Clark University, I recall a memorable ‘seminar’ involving some Clark professors and a large number of geography grad students during our time together in a holding cell at the county jail.
I had lived in a Tanzanian ‘African socialist’ (ujamaa) village from 1966 to 1968, when I rejoined anti-war activists in the United States. The second of the great teachers who nourished the seeds of my off-beat political ecology was also called ‘teacher’. He was Mwalimu (Swahili for ‘teacher’) Julius Nyerere, the first president of Tanzania. Ujamaa and self-reliance were core elements in his philosophy, honed while Nyerere studied at Edinburgh University, where he translated Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar and Orwell’s Animal Farm into Swahili. Daily life, villagers’ confrontations with officialdom, environmental challenges and conflicts in the village taught me a great deal about ‘habitat, economy and society’ (Forde, 2010 [1934]). Although my BA had been at the great agricultural school, University of California at Davis, I did not know a pigeon pea from my elbow when I graduated in philosophy. Mbambara village was my finishing school, or, better, my kindergarten, where hands-on projects (construction of a dam, a bridge and large cooperative grain storage structure), the friendship and patience of the wanakijiki (villagers) made philosophy concrete and pushed me further in the direction of political ecology (Wisner et al., 1975).

Back to Africa

I returned to East Africa in 1970, when my cohort of field workers was documenting the Biafra War in Nigeria, Sahel famine, and deadly cyclone in Bangladesh and hurricane-triggered mudslide flooding in Honduras (Blaikie et al., 1994; Wisner et al., 2004). Trained in the tradition of human ecology that led from Harlan Barrows to Gilbert White and his students Ian Burton and Robert Kates (Burton et al., 1993), I began to question the purchase it gave on such events. I toyed with re-naming my work ‘inhumane’ ecology as a better way of focussing on power relations that trapped farmers in vicious cycles (Chambers, 1983; Blaikie and Brookfield, 1987; Wisner, 1988; Wisner et al., 2012a; Gaillard et al., 2014).

I had two concerns about the White–Burton–Kates approach. First of all, their macro analysis involved pairing of ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ country examples in their major work, The Environment as Hazard (Burton et al., 1978). For instance, Australia and Tanzania as examples of drought management seemed to contain an uncritical, assumed belief in ‘stages’ of modernisation. Other geographers had used the idea of modernisation and later written autocritiques (e.g. Soja, 1979). I rejected modernisation approaches erasing what Rodney (1972) called ‘the development of underdevelopment’ (see also Gunder-Frank, 1966). Second, the approach was ethno-centric, specifically Euro-centric (Blaut, 1993).

My PhD uncovered the long history of marginalisation rather than modernisation. The post-colonial Kenyan elite took possession of the colonial settler core of Kenya’s arable highlands and expanded this core. The politically unconnected had no alternative but to move farther into an expanded, semi-arid periphery. Adding insult to injury, the new elite neglected the periphery when it came to infrastructure and services. My field work revealed the value of local knowledge and provided evidence that people could resist political, economic and social power that was a root cause of their vulnerability to harm from natural hazards. My specific focus was drought in eastern Kenya, where the operation of triple marginalisation – ecological, economic and political – was clear in my early 1970s data and still present in a 30-year retrospective study carried out with Tom Smucker (Smucker and Wisner, 2008).

Two years at Universidade Eduardo Mondlane in the early Marxist-Leninist days of independent Mozambique (1978–80) exposed me to ideas that deepened my materialist understanding of power across spatial and temporal scales. An example is the magnificent group effort to study the history and condition of Mozambicans who migrate to the South African
mines. This was underway while I was at the university and was coordinated by Ruth First (1983). She was later assassinated by the South African secret police.

It was also in FRELIMO’s single party ruled Mozambique that I was exposed to the problems created by top-down planning. I was nearly thrown out of the country by the rector of the university for criticising top-down imposition of plans for communal villages in a one-size-fits-all manner despite the huge agro-ecological, topographic and cultural-linguistic differences in this large country (Wisner, 1984). I didn’t want Mozambique to make the same mistakes Tanzania had during the final phase of expanding *u*̃*jamaa* village programme, and I couldn’t keep my mouth shut.7

In the geography department at UEM, I learned about state controlled rural and regional planning from colleagues from East Germany, Bulgaria and the USSR. Under this influence I suggested in an early *Antipode* article that one could theorise a ‘socialist human ecology’ (Wisner, 1978: 84). Of course, I soon found out that one could ‘theorise’ all sorts of things, but putting them into practice is quite different. In Mozambique I learned that when theory (that is, policy based on ideology) is applied from the ‘top down’ with no space for ‘bottom up’ agency, voice and spontaneity by ordinary people, trouble is the result (Wisner, 2010; Scott, 1998).

The result of these experiences and teachings from 1959 through roughly 1980 was the development of a view of political ecology that I continue to hold. It is an applied – even proactive – interdisciplinary study of society and the earth that focuses on political, economic and social power relations (as well as violence – structural and overt – and coercion) up and down a continuum of scales from global to local (Wisner, 1993). Activist political ecology also includes practice and study of resistance to these power relations: efforts to ‘bend’ the universe in the direction of justice that in the more insightful literature about ‘climate justice’ these days is called ‘transformation’ (Pelling, 2010).

### Activist political ecology

#### What is an activist scholar?

J.M. (Jim) Blaut, my friend and mentor, was the third of the great teachers that shaped my own style of political ecology. He encouraged me to put together macro and micro as well as inside (emic) and outside (etic) perspectives that have defined my work. He also modelled activism in science. Reflecting on his life and work (Wisner et al., 2006: 1046), two colleagues and I distinguished among ‘application’, ‘advocacy’ and ‘activism’:

‘Application’ is well known to geographers and planners, who very often are engaged in *applied research*. Here one works on a concrete problem – tropical soil erosion, child malnutrition, affordable housing, etc. – with a particular constituency or certain practitioners in mind. In applied research that constituency or stakeholder is often a governmental or official entity …

In *advocacy research* the relationship is more often than not with non-governmental, unofficial groups of people – often disenfranchised or marginalized by society at large. The advocate takes the side of a group whose need, complaint, or demand is clarified and given strength and voice through one’s scholarship.

… Both applied and advocacy research aim to change things. They are ‘active’ in that sense. However, they both take prevailing and dominant social, political, and
economic relations for granted. They constitute the framework within which research is applied and the positions advocated. The activist scholar questions these dominant power relations. [Emphasis mine]

**Activist political ecology in Tanzania: case study**

Since 2007 I have been involved with a team of Tanzanians and outsiders conducting research supported by the US National Science Foundation. The goal is to comprehend how farmers, herders and fishers understand climate change in the broader context of many changes they had experienced over the past 20–30 years. These changes, people told us, include political, economic, environmental, demographic, technological, administrative, legal and social ones. Our team used mixed methods including 18 months of field scoping and site selection during 2007–2008, a large N household survey in all the village sites in 2008, and continuing with age and gender exclusive focus groups, numerous key informant interviews and larger community discussions (Wangui et al., 2012; Wisner et al., 2012b; Smucker et al., 2015).

This work covered four of Kilimanjaro Regions’ five districts and a series of 18 village study sites. In addition, the study team defined an altitude and agro-ecosystem gradient that ran from mountain and ridge top villages in the North Pare Mountains contained within one of these districts (Mwanga) down through middle slope sites to our driest study villages near the Ruvu River and the Nyumba ya Mungu hydroelectric reservoir. The sub-village of Emangulai B was the very driest of our study sites, and it was there that we began conventionally but ended up in a dialogue about land grabbing.

Along with others in our team, I worked hard over five years to build relationships with the predominantly Maasai population of Emangulai B, a sub-village of Kirya village belonging to Mwanga District in Kilimanjaro Region of northeastern Tanzania. This was a slow process that involved showing respect for the traditional leadership (the laibon), providing employment for secondary school graduates who worked as enumerators, providing lifts to people (and becoming a de facto taxi service), and giving small gifts such as solar powered lamps and a mobile phone charger.

In my own case, admiration for the efforts of a local secondary school head teacher who had painstakingly ‘greened’ his semi-arid, wind-swept school compound turned to friendship and solidarity. My wife and I co-funded with school and District authorities construction of a water cistern, intake and pump at a reservoir where twice a day students had drawn water in buckets they carried to the school to water seedlings and trees. This parallel solidarity work, not formally or financially part of our NSF research, expanded into a network of three secondary schools that now call themselves the Tanzania Green School Network.

We also co-funded construction of a roof rain water catchment system for the local primary school in Emangulai B. This assistance might be considered merely normal ethical or good neighbourly behaviour by long term resident-researchers, or seen as possibly small-scale development work.

Whatever our motivations (conscious and unconscious) the end result was to build trust that later provided the basis for the researchers to be welcomed deeply enough into the world of the residents to see their situation from the ‘inside’. This allowed me and others in the team to grasp the historical continuity of exploitation, discrimination and marginalisation the Maasai have suffered and to use our expertise to ‘stand with’ the residents. The material expression of solidarity was a series of maps co-produced by the team and the community that highlighted community prioritised major problems they wanted addressed by district civil servants and political officials.
Brainstorming with the Maasai: ‘We didn’t kill the elephants!’

From 2008 until 2013 the Maasai residents of Emangulai B were experimenting with irrigation farming although not abandoning their herding activities. Herder-farmer tension was growing. Outside investors were positioning themselves to grab land and water as changes in Tanzanian law eroded the decentralised authority over water and land use of the elected village council.

In this context, very frank discussions of the past, present and possible future of this Maasai community ensued. In June 2013, the team held day long brainstorming meetings (catered with breakfast and lunch). On this occasion Maasai women, elders and young warriors (morani) spoke passionately about their lack of control over outsiders who enter their sub-village to extract sand and burn charcoal illegally. Participatory mapping of the journey that women took to find desirable species of wood were used by the women themselves to emphasise the problem. Resentment turned out to be long standing and focused not only on outside pressures on what these residents considered to be their own natural resources, but also decision making within the village of which Emangulai B is a sub-village. There had been a slow motion tug of war going on between irrigators (in adjacent sub-villages of Emangulai A and Kirya) and the Maasai over access of cattle and other livestock to the Ruvu River. Several years earlier the veterinary department built a cattle dip to protect against tick-borne disease. Non-Maasai irrigators made off with the pump, and the dip was never used. Later the veterinary department paid to fence the large seasonal cattle watering pond to the East of Kirya centre, in order to control Maasai animal movements. The cement pillars were destroyed and the wire turned up as useful material in various home compounds. None of this had risen to the level of violent conflict, but the number of land disputes was steadily increasing.

Earlier I cited Thich Nhat Hanh’s idea that when one looks deeply at an apricot, one sees non-apricot elements. Activist political ecology depends on such ‘seeing’ and ‘listening’. A break-through in our work came in 2012 when one of our senior Tanzanian researchers, Professor Adolfo Mascarenhas, noticed a very large tree in the background of a photo he took of some Maasai children. He knew that this tree was very old and a species that grows near rivers in areas currently inhabited by Tanzania’s mega fauna, including hippo, rhino, lion and elephant. He asked Maasai elders, who confirmed that 75 to 80 years ago the zone now known as Emangulai B sub-village did have these animals. The elders hastened to add, ‘We did not kill the elephants’. Rather, they were killed by the colonial White hunters and then the settlers from outside who came to farm along the river.

Why would the Maasai elders say a thing like that to Professor Mascarenhas? It is because the Maasai know they are seen by the government as second-class citizens and blamed for all sorts of environmental degradation. Indeed, the current President of Tanzania is on record as having said that pastoralism has no place in modern Tanzania (Pearce, 2012: 256). Suddenly it was obvious why the Maasai of Emangulai B worried so much about their land and water rights. At this point the team had already been facilitating participatory mapping as support for community-identified and controlled mini-research projects. Our perspective on the situation had begun to shift, and the master narrative of the long-dead elephants seemed to align and consolidate insights that had been coming from these mini-research projects.

These mini-research projects identified as priorities by the community led the team and the villagers working with us to formulate a number of questions about the root causes of the problems mapped. These, in turn, led to the passionate brainstorming in the meeting described in June 2013 and the formulation of questions and requests that Maasai representatives brought to the district meetings held in July of that same year. Questions to emerge from the joint community-team GPS based mapping included the following:
Mapping showed serious waterlogging problems. Why was the formal irrigation scheme constructed with no return drainage to the river? Why had there been no rehabilitation of the irrigation scheme a year after money had been provided to a contractor both for rehabilitation and construction of a new intake and canal? Who would get the irrigable plots once the new intake was finished?

What could be done to increase the productivity of farms served by the subsidiary irrigation canal dug by Maasai and revealed by participatory mapping of informal and formal irrigation systems? Would there be enough water for its continued use once the upstream intake began to divert Ruvu River water and the old intake closed?

GPS based maps showed Maasai women having to go farther from their homes to find the sort of wood they preferred for domestic purposes. Why was this? The answer was that outsiders with lorries from town regularly harvested wood, excavated sand, made and carried away charcoal with no payment to Emangulai B sub-village, to Kirya village or to Kirya ward.

What could be done to provide protection from crocodiles at critical sites along the river? On the basis of participatory mapping and discussion of river side domestic water points, there emerged a design concept that was costed out and presented to the district meeting in July 2013 by sub-village representatives.

These participatory mapping exercises and the conversations that followed caused the research team to see the landscape, local and regional economy and governance from the Maasai point of view. They were being exploited, stonewalled by non-transparent governance, inhibited in their attempts fully to integrate into an irrigation based village economy sited where, ironically, the ancestors of these Maasai pre-dated settlers who came from up in the North Pare Mountains. Thus, as an act of solidarity science, we ‘stood with’ these Maasai residents in June as we helped them articulate specific questions and requests for presentation to district civil servants and politicians.

In July 2013, a month after the sub-village brainstorming meeting with the Maasai, a delegation of three Maasai community members joined representatives from four other study site villages/sub-villages to present their concerns, together with supporting maps, to district political leaders and civil service professionals. The representatives were articulate and forceful. Working groups were also set up during the second day of district meetings, composed of civil servants responsible for water, education, livestock and farming and various community representatives. They undertook a process of working out the details of proposals in these areas.

Conclusion

I came late to geography as a discipline. I had two degrees in philosophy and two years learning about ‘life, the universe and everything’ in a Tanzanian socialist village. Robert Kates introduced me to geography by inviting me to study that Tanzanian village from the ‘outside’ as a way of complementing the understanding I had gained from living ‘inside’. Following Kates to Clark University, I soon found myself uneasy with the technocratic and modernist biases I detected in the up-and-coming sub-discipline of ‘natural hazards geography’. I pushed against this paradigm, while I remained happy enough with the master narrative of a society–nature dialectic. Vietnam war protest and living in the Tanzania had immunised me against the cultural imperialism of the ‘quick fix’. Living and working in Mozambique was also a caution against top-down ‘solutions’ to problems. All these experiences bumped up against, challenged or confirmed what I read in an eclectic and almost random way. In the first edition of Antipode I
explored advocacy planning. Who was to know that eventually unpacking and digesting the learning I had from Thich Nhat Hahn, Julius Nyerere and Jim Blaut, that I would stumble along a path that led me to participatory mapping as a tool for political empowerment.

Stepping back from my personal trajectory and acutely aware that many readers are graduate students who are much younger than I am, and whose lives are very different from mine, I wonder what I can say about activist political ecology that will be of use to you, the 20-something or 30-something reader. What messages do I want you to take away from my personal journey to political ecology and my past and present activist use of its tools? You are living through a rather different historical moment as you pursue your graduate studies and embark on field research. Much has changed about the world, but much has remained constant. What does activist political ecology allow us, as scholars and activists, to do?

I think the continuities outweigh the changes despite technological change, rise of social media, economic globalisation, the rise of the BRICS as economic and political powers, unravelling of the USSR and Yugoslavia, corporate concentration, financial system instability, growth of inequality (Piketty, 2014), decline of the post-war welfare state (Seabrook, 2013), escalating environmental assault on the world’s oceans, biosphere and atmosphere, and spiralling cost of education. I do not underestimate the last mentioned and the fact that with heavy college and grad school debt, you have more at stake in ‘doing the proper, expected, conventional thing’ than I did. Nevertheless, the United States was at war when I ‘came into this movie’ and it still is at war. Various groups of people in every country in the world are still marginalised by systems of political, economic and social power and by coercive threat of violence. The way such marginalised people make use of natural resources, rural space and the built environment in urban contexts is still affected strongly by the power relations under which they struggle to survive and to raise their families. They still resist, they learn and they share local knowledge with one another. Therefore, despite all the changes, the lessons I learned from Thich Nhat Hahn, Julius Nyerere and Jim Blaut are still relevant and useful in the application of political ecology.

The take-home messages are these:

1 People matter. The most important research question is not about things and physical processes (soil moisture, climate, biodiversity) but the relationship between the researcher and the people who affect and are affected by these things and processes. Who are your interlocutors? What commitment do you make to their well-being? Will your research benefit them?

2 Context matters. Anywhere you work, there will be organised violence, call it ‘war’, recovery from war or preparation for war or coercion. This is the historical context of any and all field research. Researchers have to be aware of how a history of violence and displacement colours contemporary attitudes toward place, livelihood and the state (Mascarenhas and Wisner, 2012). Indeed, even absent overt violence at a particular moment in a village or country, one needs to be aware that economic and social life (some call it ‘development’) is not harmonising as modernisation theory assumes, but conflictual (Wisner, 1988). People have objectively different material interests, and these have to be negotiated.

3 Local knowledge matters. Deep listening, co-learning and problem solving with local people is a powerful mode of action research. Local knowledge exists everywhere. While much of my work has been in the rural, global South, I have also helped create and studied urban gardening in a low income, Hispanic area of Chicopee, Massachusetts and used participatory video as a tool for people’s self-study of hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities in various parts of Mexico City and greater Los Angeles.
Some of the changes in the world make it easier to work in this manner. Increasingly the poor and marginalised are networked and organised, and most use social media. Consider, for example, international networks such as Via Campesina (http://viacampesina.org/en/) that connects many rural people or the International Slum Dwellers’ Association (www.sdinet.org/).

All this is to be taken with a pupusa and a cold beer, and maybe a grain of salt! I am not preaching but trying to communicate across generations. Ultimately everyone comes to political ecology along a different path and will use differently its toolbox (containing, among other things, Robbins’s (2012) hatchet and seed).

Notes
1 Excerpts from ‘War’, an anti-Vietnam war song written by Norman Whitfield and sung by Edwin Starr on the Motown label in 1970; hear it at: www.youtube.com/watch?v=bX7V6FAoTLc.
2 ‘Thay’ is a term of respect used for senior Vietnamese Buddhist monks and means ‘teacher’.
3 ‘The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice’ (King, 1958).
4 The 1993 revised edition of The Environment as Hazard is hardly a revision at all, and certainly contains no autocritique.
5 Walter Rodney, a brilliant economic historian from Guyana, taught at University of Dar es Salaam while I was there teaching in the department of community health at the medical school, 1972–4. Rodney was inspirational. Later he was assassinated when he returned and became politically active in Guyana.
6 Front for the Liberation of Mozambique.
8 Local Knowledge and Climate Change Adaptation Project (LKCCAP), supported by US–NSF Grant No. 0921952. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in chapter are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.
10 I really do mean random. I stored books under the rafters that held up a grass roof over my mud and waddle house in the Tanzanian village. Over two years I read what the termites didn’t eat.
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