



Full Length Article

Political ecologies of the Green New Deal: Critiques, contentions and radical appropriations



Diego Andreucci^{a,*}, Gustavo García López^b, Christos Zografos^{c,d}, Marta Conde^e

^a Department of Geography, University of Barcelona, Spain

^b Center for Social Studies (CES), University of Coimbra, Portugal

^c JHU-UPF Public Policy Center (JHU-UPF PPC), Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF) - UPF Barcelona School of Management (UPF-BSM), Spain

^d Research Group on Health Inequalities, Environment, and Employment Conditions (GREDS), Department of Political and Social Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain

^e Institute of Science and Environmental Technology (ICTA), Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain

A B S T R A C T

The Green New Deal (GND) emerged forcefully around 2019 as an ambitious, movement-inspired policy framework. Put forward by progressive political parties in the US and Europe, GND programs promised to tackle climate change while advancing social justice through state-led decarbonization efforts. The concrete achievements of such policies have proven disappointing. Yet, the GND framework sparked important debates and ideological and programmatic elaboration within climate justice, feminist, Indigenous, ecosocialist and degrowth movements across the global North and South. This, we argue, contributed to pushing political ecologists out of the comfort zone of abstract critique, and towards engaging with issues of strategy for radical socioecological transformation. The articles in this Special Issue provide a critical overview of, and contribute to advancing, political ecology's engagement with the GND framework. They critically unpack mainstream GND proposals, and the contentions engendered by their implementation, while at the same time exploring processes of — and providing insights for — the elaboration of alternative GNDs informed by anticolonial, anticapitalist and feminist principles. Taken together, these contributions present a comprehensive view of what a GND compatible with political ecology's radical outlook could look like.

1. The “Green New Deal moment” and its afterlives

This Virtual Special Issue has been a long time in the making. When we first started planning it, in the spring of 2020, we were at the height of what we could call a “Green New Deal moment”. For a time, political and strategic discussions around the climate crisis, primarily in the US but reverberating globally, revolved around the Green New Deal (GND). It was a period of intense ferment and hope — perhaps naively so, yet the shift to the Left, and to ecosocial(ist) politics within the Left, was real. Half a decade on, what's left of such a ferment, and of the flurry of proposals, demands and organizing around the GND it generated?

The term “Green New Deal” (GND) first started circulating as a series of neo-Keynesian proposals for economic recovery in the wake of the

2007–2008 global financial crisis, with a focus on private and public investments in low-carbon energy and transport infrastructure (Mann and Wainwright, 2018).¹ These proposals, however, were quickly rendered irrelevant as all global North states set aside grand investment ambitions and resorted instead to neoliberal responses to the aforementioned crisis, centred on bailing out banks and cutting social programmes. Demands for a GND remained relatively marginal to public debate and political ecology for nearly a decade.

Then, suddenly, the GND debate exploded into life. In November 2018, the Sunrise Movement staged a sit-in at the office of US Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi demanding a 12-year plan for “creating thousands of good jobs for working class people and transform our economy away from fossil fuels over the next decade”, responding to a

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: diego.andreucci@ub.edu (D. Andreucci), gustavo.garcia@ces.uc.pt (G.G. López), christos.zografos@upf.edu (C. Zografos), marta.conde@uab.cat (M. Conde).

¹ It seems to have been coined in a 2007 article by neoliberal economist Thomas L. Friedman (2007), who called for a government plan to incentivize (but not fund) corporate “green” innovations. Then-presidential candidate Barack Obama adopted these ideas as part of his campaign with promises of a “green” recovery (which never materialized). In the UK, the New Economics Foundation published a report in 2008 focused on solving what they described as a “triple crunch” of the credit crisis, climate change and high oil prices (Simms et al., 2008). At the international level, the United Nations Environmental Programme published a report in 2009 calling for a “Global Green New Deal” as a way of recovering from the crisis (UNEP, 2009).

UN report setting the 2030 target for addressing the climate crisis.² This was followed in February 2019 by the (non-binding) congressional resolution sponsored by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Ed Markey.³ Ferment around a GND coincided with and fed into Bernie Sanders's primary campaign, which proposed a more detailed and ambitious GND.⁴ It was part of a radicalization of the political debate in the US not seen in many generations.⁵

These more ambitious versions of the GND were partly related with the growth of Leftist tendencies in and around the US Democratic Party, as well as increasing discussions about the global climate crisis. Their key idea was to put forth a comprehensive strategic vision and programme (as opposed to piecemeal interventions) that promised a transition to a carbon-free economy capable of avoiding the climate catastrophe while advancing social justice.

The GND became a key framework for proposals and debate within Leftist camps, starting in the US but inspiring political and social movements globally. For a brief but intense period, policy proposals, social mobilisations, public debates and, to a lesser extent, academic interventions, were theorising, advancing or contesting GND proposals. Institutions and parties in other countries, from across the political spectrum, also adopted variations on the name GND, and tried to emulate its ambition and rhetoric. Some of these were opportunistic appropriations by green neoliberal projects — most notably the European Union's "Green Deal" package approved in 2019.⁶ Others replicated the radical ambitions of the left-Democrats' GND, for instance Jeremy Corbyn's Labour GND in the UK,⁷ or DIEM (Democracy in Europe)-25's Green New Deal for Europe proposal.⁸ Several other appropriations and local adaptations — from South Korea to Spain — speak to the appeal of the GND framework even in countries where the historical reference to the New Deal means very little.

The excitement, however, didn't last long. By 2021, GND talk started receding into the background. The global COVID-19 pandemic first dampened aspirations for a New Deal moment of ambitious state investment. Bernie Sanders's loss in the primaries and Joe Biden's election as US president coincided with a phase of relative demobilization of democratic-socialist and ecosocialist organizing in the US; while the ostracizing of Jeremy Corbyn after his loss in the 2019 general elections marginalised the radical Left within the UK Labour party. The GND dream, whose hope-effects depended so much on a highly improbable radicalization of institutional politics in the imperial core, quickly deflated.

1.1. What did the Green New Deal achieve?

In terms of actual policy advances, the GND moment was generally underwhelming. It didn't manage to push mainstream policy frameworks to meaningfully address the climate and related crises. Even though COVID did encourage public spending in the imperial core, with important recovery packages approved, these remained within the framework of neoliberal austerity. In the EU especially, the prevailing neoliberal character of such spending — recovery funds financed through private debt and largely favouring multinational corporations,

² See <https://www.sunrisemovement.org/movement-updates/my-home-state-is-drowning-and-my-representatives-don-t-care-today-i-fight-for-a-green-new-deal-ed6ae0c2b42a/>.

³ See <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/1097/s=1&r=62>.

⁴ See <https://berniesanders.com/issues/green-new-deal/>, as well as Schumacher and Hillbrandt, this issue.

⁵ See <https://news.gallup.com/poll/240725/democrats-positive-socialism-capitalism.aspx>.

⁶ See https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_19_6691.

⁷ See <https://www.labourgnd.uk/>.

⁸ See <https://gnde.diem25.org/>.

such as the NextGenerationEU programme — was accompanied after the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 by a chauvinistic retreat into energy "independence" and "security", and a more aggressive energy imperialism (see Vela Almeida and coauthors' paper in this issue). In the US, the high-water mark of the GND moment was the politically ambivalent Inflation Reduction Act, which mixed investment in large scale renewables with continued support for fossil fuels, signalling a defeat of the GND forces (Aronoff, 2022) — even though organizing around the GND continues to take place.

In important respects, the ambitiousness of the GND was limited from the start. It did show impressive political intelligence on the part of sectors of the US Left in occupying and re-signifying a largely green-capitalist discursive space, towards an aspirational vision of change aligned with climate and just transition movements. Yet it never developed into a strategy capable of mounting a serious challenge against capitalism. The GND takes from the original Green Deal an ambition to push for state-directed, comprehensive socioecological restructuring, but also its reformist character.⁹ Moreover, unlike its 1930s antecedent, it lacks an organized and militant class struggle to push it forward, being primarily focused on a short-term electoral plan (Huber, 2022).

Perhaps the most important legacy of this GND moment is the debates and collective work of ideological and strategic elaboration it stimulated (García-López & Andreucci, 2020). In radical activist circles, the GND inspired programmatic and ideological documents from eco-socialist and climate justice movements across the global North and South, building on decades of previous debate and organizing around climate justice and just transitions, but also repackaging these ideas as part of more ambitious strategic thinking. Advocating for more radical proposals that challenged the coloniality of large-scale decarbonization proposals, social movements and civil society organizations all over the globe developed their own GND counterproposals.¹⁰ Today, despite the decline in the centrality of GNDs in public debates, its mode of thinking remains relevant for transformative socioecological movements. And, we argue, it has also had an important influence on political ecology research and theorising.

2. The Green New Deal in (and around) academic political ecology

The engagements with the GND from academic political ecology have been primarily of two kinds. First, critical responses to institutional GND plans, which focused on the perils of "green" colonialism and imperialism, a key theme of this Issue (see the next section). These coincided with ongoing critiques of the Eurocentric and techno-optimistic character of mainstream green capitalism — including anti-colonial, feminist, anticapitalist and degrowth perspectives (Táíwò, 2019; Gebrial, 2019; Kolinjivadi & Kothari, 2020; Mastini et al., 2021).

⁹ Despite its many exclusions, the original New Deal from which it took inspiration promoted massive state investment into infrastructures and welfare programs, responding to demands from organized labour and winning widespread support among popular classes (Huber, 2022; Patel & Goodman, 2019). Yet it was always about saving US capital from the threat of economic destabilization and intensifying class struggle.

¹⁰ For instance, the Climate Justice Alliance (CJA)— composed of more than 70 grassroots organizations — deepened the discussions by linking the GND with longer-standing proposals for climate justice and just transitions, emphasizing that a GND should be led by frontline communities and workers most impacted by climate change (See <https://climatejusticealliance.org/gnd/>). Meanwhile, the *Feminist Coalition for a Green New Deal* (2019) stressed the importance of intersectional gender analysis of all policies, confronting institutional patriarchy and racism, recognizing systemic oppressions, prioritizing Indigenous peoples' rights and leadership, advancing reproductive justice, and centering community-led feminist regenerative economy alternatives focused on care work (see also Getova and Zografos in this Issue).

Part of this debate took place on the pages of this journal, stimulated by the publication of Paul Robbins's (2020) keynote address at the 2018 POLLEN (Political Ecology Network) conference in Oslo — and various responses from ecosocialist, degrowth and feminist political ecologists, as part of a broader critical conversation on the potentiality and perils of a Left ecomodernism. These critiques converge with a growing interest in the political ecology of green extractivism, whereby the colonial geographies of fossil fuelled capitalism are reproduced in an era of so-called renewable energy, creating “green sacrifice zones” in global extractive peripheries to the benefit of decarbonizing the core(s) (Zografos & Robbins, 2020; Dunlap et al., 2024; see also Andreucci et al. and Dunlap and Laratte in this Issue).

The second main way in which the GND framework influenced political ecology is by stimulating discussion around political visions and strategy. In this sense, the GND moment contributed to pushing political ecologists out of the comfort zone of critique (e.g., of neoliberalism) disconnected from political action, and to address instead pressing questions of how to advance towards socioecological and postcapitalist transformations (Undisciplined Environments Collective, 2024). It also blurred the boundaries between academia and organizing, with a host of proposals elaborated organically from within, or in dialogue with, social movements and political organizations. Interventions building GND-inspired visions of ecosocial(ist) transformation go hand in hand with the rediscovery of revolutionary and anticolonial traditions and their confluence with ecological activism, from approaches such as climate Leninism (Heron & Dean, 2022); degrowth and degrowth-ecosocialism (Mastini et al., 2021; Löwy, 2023); materialist (eco)feminisms (Barca, 2020); dependency and ecologically unequal exchange theory (Ajl, 2023); and abolition ecologies (Heynen & Ybarra, 2021).

The GND was not the only cause of these debates gaining centrality but contributed to a broader change related to the sense of urgency brought about by climate change and its multiple intersections with other socio-ecological crises. Other GND appropriations, particularly from autonomist-inspired political ecologies (predominant for instance in Latin America), maintain a focus on alternatives from below, largely against or at the margins of the state, but are also pushed by a GND mode of thinking to build coalitions and elaborate programmes at higher scales (more on this below).

2.1. Feminist engagements

Another important debate developed within feminist perspectives concerning both dimensions — critique of mainstream GNDs and strategic elaboration inspired by a GND mode of thinking. Feminist and ecofeminist engagements have exposed how GNDs can exacerbate gendered burdens (Sultana, 2022), as well as ways in which they could be infused by principles of caring and inclusive solidarity to prioritise human and environmental health (Paulson, 2020).

Despite criticisms of mainstream GNDs' lack of awareness of the care economy and failure to address gender and gendered labour issues (Cohn & Duncanson, 2023), some consider that the GND framework could be compatible with feminist claims (Bauhardt, 2014). Feminist scholars have also helped converge demands for reproductive work compensation via public money into GNDs, both conceptually and through their participation in relevant campaigns demanding a care income — such as the Green New Deal for Europe (Barca, 2020; Muchhala, 2020).

Along such lines, ecofeminist approaches pose that GNDs must take the needs of social reproduction as a starting point for developing infrastructure policy logics that overcome the dichotomisation between an androcentric-functional rationality for technology development versus a “feminine” care ethic (Bauhardt, 2022). Finally, decolonial feminist engagements with a GND combine this approach with recognition of environmental colonialism and the colonial drainage of wealth, rejection of austerity and financialization, advocating for debt justice

and climate reparations, and a reimagination of humanity that breaks with the colonial dehumanization of those on the margins (Muchhala, 2020).

2.2. Three GND-inspired visions for a radical socioecological transition

We distinguish three types of postures taken by political ecologists, which correspond to three alternative ecosocial(ist) visions that emerge out of this debate. The first comprises interventions that largely accept the GND's focus on state reformism and adopt its pragmatic, interclass character, yet try to push it in more ambitious directions (e.g., Aronoff et al., 2019). One of the most widely debated formulations of this ecosocialist vision is Matt Huber's (2022) *Climate Change as Class War*. Huber presents a long-term transformative horizon drawn on classical Marxism, based on global “decommodification” and the abolition of the capitalist value form. At the same time, he advocates for a focused strategy with a more reachable short-term goal: to push the state to make decisive, socially sustainable decarbonization efforts, centred on total electrification and the socialisation of key sectors. The GND is central to this strategy, alongside union organizing — promoting a “politics of more” capable of mobilizing popular majorities based on improving their material conditions. Huber's proposal has the merit of framing the climate issue as one of class struggle, clearly “naming the enemy” — capitalist production — and advancing a strategic vision centred on the working class (though narrowly defined). At the same time, it reproduces the Eurocentric character of institutional GNDs and fails to interrogate the geographically uneven, socioecological implications of large-scale decarbonization plans (Heron, 2024).

The second set of radical counterproposals build precisely on political ecology critiques of GND's ecological imperialism. A key contribution to emerge from this conversation is Max Ajl's (2021) *A People's Green New Deal*. Half rant and half utopia, Ajl's book critically unpicks the green-capitalist, techno-optimist and ultimately imperialist character of both green-neoliberal and reformist GND proposals (including Ocasio-Cortez's GND). It advances instead an agrarian-centred vision from and for the global South — while also supporting degrowth as a global North focused strategy. Informed by the work of organic intellectuals of twentieth century anticolonial liberation struggles, as well as contemporary ecosocialist proposals of the Bolivarian Left in Latin America, Ajl's vision centres on affirming the sovereignty of dependent nations, in order to reclaim colonial, climate and ecological debt reparations, and create space for food sovereignty, sovereign industrialization, and the revaluation of indigenous knowledges and technologies against eco-capitalist techno-optimism. One of the aspects that remain marginal in Ajl's vision, however, are liberation struggles by Indigenous and peasant peoples in the global South, not for stronger national state sovereignty, but in parallel with and sometimes against it (Kolinjivadi, 2021).

These struggles for “sovereignty from below” (Andreucci et al., 2023) are central to the third category of GND-inspired radical socioecological visions — those advanced by Indigenous and decolonial proposals, and other feminist and “grassroots GNDs”. The most notable interventions in this category are by Latin American political ecologists who are writing collectively around the Ecosocial and Intercultural Pact of the South (2020).¹¹ The Pact's members have been very critical of what they have called the “decarbonization consensus” which also affects mainstream GNDs, reproducing the “commodities consensus” and its longer historical logics of green extractivism and energy colonialism, primarily in the global South (see also Bringel et al., 2023). Therefore, they connect their GND vision with proposals for debt justice and reparations for colonial-ecological debts as well as self-determination of Afro-descendent, Indigenous, peasant and urban-popular territories.

¹¹ See <https://pactoecosocialdelsur.com/>.

3. Overview of the virtual Special Issue

The articles in this issue contribute to these broad lines of political ecology engagement with the GND framework. They critically unpack mainstream GND proposals and the contentions engendered by their implementation; while at the same time exploring processes of — or providing insights for — the elaboration of alternative GNDs informed by anticolonial, anticapitalist and feminist principles.

Juliane M. Schumacher and Hanna Hilbrandt draw on Iris Marion Young's theory of justice to critically appraise the visions and potential outcomes of four progressive GND plans — the Ocasio-Cortez/Markey resolution, the Bernie Sanders's GND, the UK Labour GND, and DiEM-25's GND for Europe (GNDE). These are ambitious plans with concrete, state-centred political projects for structural change, which plans acknowledge the “global reach of responsibility” of core countries for the global climate crisis and envision measures for repairing past harms. Yet their main shortcoming is their poor consideration of the global justice dimensions of their proposed changes: They fall short of adopting a “forward-looking” understanding of justice, capable of combining climate, colonial and ecological debt reparations with structural reforms of the global democratic order, centred on the self-determination of oppressed nations and groups. Therefore, they don't do enough to address risks of deepening “green colonialism” associated with decarbonization plans centred in the core.

Picking up on this last point, the article by **Diego Andreucci, Gustavo García-López, Isabella M. Radhuber, Marta Conde, Daniel M. Voskoboynik, J.D. Farrugia and Christos Zografos** focuses on green extractivism and its coloniality. This contribution describes the impacts of intensifying mineral extraction of capital-driven energy decarbonization plans. It examines global production chains of nickel, one of the lesser investigated “transition minerals”, to support the argument that the massive expansion of so-called low-carbon technologies at the centre of mainstream energy transition plans intensifies extractivism, concentrating its negative effects in resource peripheries of the global South — a contradiction captured by the idea of “decarbonization by dispossession”. It also shows how dominant transition plans follow the logic of a “socioecological fix”, addressing the climate crisis through shifting geographies of energy production and reorganising socio-natures in ways that permit leaving dominant political-economic relations unscathed, while presenting capital as a global saviour.

Diana Vela Almeida, Vijay Kolinjivadi, Tomaso Ferrando, Broto Roy, Héctor Herrera, Marcela Vecchione Gonçalves and Gert Van Hecken provide a critical unpacking of what is probably the most neoliberal programme inspired by (or opportunistically rebranded after) the GND — the EU Green Deal (EDG). The EDG is a comprehensive “green growth” strategy launched by the EU in 2019 under the conservative presidency of Ursula von der Leyen, aimed to make the EU “the first climate neutral continent by 2050”, through decarbonising the economy across several strategic sectors, while “leaving no-one behind”.¹² The article aims to critically assess the EDG in four areas — global trade, diplomacy, finance and access to raw materials — looking at how Europe's colonial and empirical past continues to inform the epistemological and material dimensions of the Union's self-positioning as a global leader in climate action. The authors show how the discursive framing of EDG interventions denies the historical responsibility of the EU and the imperial core in producing the current crisis, while undermining the sovereignty of southern nations to choose alternative paths to — or away from — development.

The article by **Alexander Dunlap and Louis Laratte** also aims to shed critical light on the optimistic “green growth” proclaims of the EDG, directing attention to the contradictory socioecological impacts of its energy decarbonization plans in Southern Europe. The authors combine a critical analysis of the EDG-related neoliberalization of the

energy sector with a multi-sited ethnography of struggles over electric grid infrastructure that connects France, Catalonia, central-southern Spain and Morocco. The study documents how industrial-scale renewables and associated grid infrastructure generate divisions and resistance due to their impacts on biodiversity, physical occupation of landscapes (“infrastructural colonization”), land expropriation, and the disruption of local economies and culturally valued heritage sites. And shows how activists, in coalition with farmers and other affected groups, respond with direct action and, in the case of France, with the creation of “ZADs” (*zones à défendre*) that become spaces for commoning and prefigurative organizing. The authors argue for a confluence between anarchist-inspired direct action and degrowth; and globally (consistent with Schumacher and Hillbrandt's arguments), for greater “supply chain solidarity.”

In their contribution, **Andrea Furnaro and Kelly Kay** examine the contradictory implementation of existing GND plans, shifting focus onto the role of labour. The article explores the Los Angeles Green New Deal (LAGND) launched in 2019 under the then Democratic party mayor Eric Garcetti, shedding light on its ambitions and limitations, and uncovering the reasons why unionized energy sector workers became the most vocal and organised opponents to the plan. Their research shows that the ambitious energy decarbonization plans of the LAGND, aiming to shift to 100% renewable electricity by 2035, caused several “scalar mismatches” between contending goals and interests: between the planned closure of local gas-fired power plants (losing stable union jobs) and the out-of-basin and out-of-state wind and solar plants that would replace them; and between the LAGND's global outlook (in terms of its communication and funding sources) and the workers' “local” concerns, namely job loss and electricity rate increases. The article sheds light on the limitations of acting at the local and municipal scale, often constrained by budgetary limits, political fragility, and limited geographical scope. And reaffirms the centrality of just transition policies for workers affected by decarbonization plans.

The article by **J. Mijin Cha, Dimitris Stevis, Todd E. Vachon, Vivian Price, and Maria Brescia-Weiler**, also centres on labour and on subnational scale policies in the US, analysed through the Just Transition lens and the voices of affected workers and communities. The authors draw on the voices of these affected groups to critically appraise the outcomes of five state and local-level transition plans for reducing emissions and phasing out factories and power plants. The study reveals important limitations in the design and implementation of the transition plans examined, related to their narrow scope, short time horizons, and the exclusion of key affected groups. While focused on their immediate health and security needs, the affected communities and workers are aware that an inclusive transition would require structural social transformation, addressing deep-seated injustices. Workers and community alliances are also key to building popular power and push towards more transformative JTs. For the authors, this requires severing capital's hold on the state, to favour the creation of state institutions capable and willing to adopt comprehensive and large-scale changes envisioned by GND proposals.

Simona Getova and Christos Zografos's article focuses on the transformative potential of grassroots GNDs. Based on Getova's participatory research and involvement in activist organizing, the paper explores how adopting an intersectional feminist vision and praxis shaped the outcomes of the “Grassroots Green Deal for North Macedonia” initiative. In that sense, while building on the focus of the GND framework on bringing together workers and communities, this paper helps consider the issue of including multiple and multi-scaled marginalities, groups and subjectivities. Analysing the collective visioning and organizing process of the initiative which involved several grassroots organizations, the paper considers the benefits and challenges of centring intersectionality as its core framework. It finds that the framework can help build a comprehensive coalition across diverse groups, and a shared transformative vision and praxis of solidarity. Yet the authors also note how adopting a novel (for the country's context) discursive framing such

¹² See https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_19_6691.

as intersectionality that is unfamiliar to popular classes, and putting a disproportionate burden of organizing upon activists that embody multiple oppressions in a context of widespread precarity, can make political involvement in the project difficult.

Finally, in an effort to partly redress the overall over-representation global North contexts in this Issue, the commentary accompanying this issue — "Southern decolonial and feminist perspectives on Green New Deals: From critiques to radical visions of ecosocial transitions", edited by **Gustavo García López** — features three interventions by scholar-activists who have been engaged in social organizations that have engaged critically with the GND framework from the majority world: **Breno Bringel** of the above-mentioned Ecosocial and Intercultural Pact of the South; **Bhumika Muchhala** of the Third World Network, a research and advocacy organization promoting greater articulation of the needs and rights of peoples in the global South, a fair distribution of world resources, and development which is ecologically sustainable and fulfils human needs; and **Vasna Ramasar** of the Global Tapestry of Alternatives, a network of networks seeking to build bridges of alternatives around the globe and to promote the creation of new processes of confluence. The piece delves deeper into political-ecological critiques of the mainstream GND from the global South, alternative visions of radical socioecological transformation from below, the potentials of strategic appropriations of the GND framework for advancing these visions, and the strategies for building solidarity and convergences across struggles for systemic transformations.

4. Conclusions

Taken together, the contributions in this issue present a comprehensive view of what a GND compatible with political ecology's radical outlook should look like. This vision of change: *a)* commits to deep decolonization, to promoting land-back and the self-determination of colonised peoples and nations, and the valorisation of subaltern knowledge systems; *b)* is aware of the implications of large-scale infrastructure, however "green", and their colonizing and violent effects on local as well as "distant" socioecologies; *c)* sees genuine transformation as incompatible with the extractivist and predatory logic of capitalism, with its inherent tendency to overcome barriers to accumulation by displacing socioecological costs and deepening dispossession effects; *d)* builds on the politics of organized labour, considered not just as a victim of post-carbon transitions or a reactionary force in stopping decarbonization policies, but as a key political actor for building political power against regressive green capitalist solutions, in alliance with (rather than pitted against) environmental justice and community organizations; and *e)* places the voices and priorities of the most oppressed groups at the centre of a transformative GND, linking diverse struggles through a class-conscious *and* intersectional vision and praxis.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Diego Andreucci: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization. **Gustavo García López:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization. **Christos Zografos:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization. **Marta Conde:** Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

No conflicts of interest to be reported.

Funding Acknowledgements

Diego Andreucci's research was supported by a Ramón y Cajal fellowship (#RYC2022-036291-I), funded by the Spanish State Research

Agency (AEI), the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033), and the European Social Fund (ESF+).

Christos Zografos would like to acknowledge support by the GRES research project (Contract No. CNS2022-136115) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation MCIN/AEI/<https://doi.org/10.13039/501100011033> and the European Union Next Generation/PRTR programme. Support for this research has also been provided by the Ramón y Cajal Programme (contract number RYC-2015-17372), funded by the Spanish State Research Agency (AEI), the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities, and the European Social Fund (ESF).

Gustavo Garcia Lopez acknowledges support by the Portuguese Foundation of Science and Technology (FCT), under the Individual Scientific Employment Stimulus (CEEC Individual), Contract CEECIND/04850/2017/CP1402/CT0010.

Marta Conde acknowledges support by the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 897072.

References

- Ajl, M. (2021). *A people's Green New Deal*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ajl, M. (2023). Theories of political ecology: Monopoly capital against people and the planet. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*, 12(1), 12–50.
- Andreucci, D., Radhuber, I. M., Chávez, M., & Jasser, M. (2023). Sovereignty against extractivism: Re-Centring decolonisation on indigenous territorial struggles in Bolivia. In *Neoextractivism and territorial disputes in Latin America* (pp. 207–222). Routledge.
- Aronoff, K. (2022). *The bitter triumph of the inflation reduction Act*. The New Republic. August 8 <https://newrepublic.com/article/167337/bitter-triumph-inflation-reduction-act>.
- Aronoff, K., Battistoni, A., Aldana Cohen, D., & Riofrancos, T. (2019). *A planet to win: Why we need a green new deal*. Verso.
- Barca, S. (2020). *Forces of reproduction: Notes for a counter-hegemonic anthropocene*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bauhardt, C. (2014). Solutions to the crisis? The green new deal, degrowth, and the solidarity economy: Alternatives to the capitalist growth economy from an ecofeminist economics perspective. *Ecological Economics*, 102, 60–68.
- Bauhardt, C. (2022). Ecofeminist political economy: Critical reflections on the green new deal. *Post-capitalist futures: Paradigms, politics, and prospects* (pp. 87–95). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Bringel, B., Lang, M., & Manahan, M. A. (2023). Colonialismo verde: raíces históricas, manifestaciones actuales y su superación. *Papeles de relaciones ecosociales y cambio global*, 163, 13–24.
- Cohn, C., & Duncanson, C. (2023). Critical feminist engagements with green new deals. *Feminist Economics*, 29(3), 15–39.
- Dunlap, A., Verweijen, J., & Tornel, C. (2024). The political ecologies of "green" extractivism (s): An introduction. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 31(1), 436–463.
- Feminist Coalition for a Green New Deal. (2019). *A Feminist Agenda for a Green New Deal. Principles and Values*. <https://feministgreennewdeal.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Feminist-GND-Kickstart-note-Final-Draft-9.20.2019.pdf>.
- Friedman, T. L. (2007). The power of green. *New York Times*. April 15 <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/15/opinion/15iht-web-0415edgreen-full.5291830.html>.
- García-López, G., & Andreucci, D. (2020). Green New Deal(s): A Resource List for Political Ecologists. *Undisciplined Environments*. July 16 <https://undisciplinedenvironments.org/2020/07/16/green-new-deals-a-resource-list-for-political-ecologists/>.
- Gebrial, D. (2019). As the left wakes up to climate injustice, we must not fall into 'green colonialism'. *The Guardian*, 8 May.
- Heron, K. (2024). The great unfettering. *Sidecar*, 7 September. <https://newleftreview.org/sidecar/posts/the-great-unfettering>.
- Heron, K., & Dean, J. (2022). Climate leninism and revolutionary transition. Organization and anti-imperialism in catastrophic times. *Spectre*. June 26 <http://spectrejournal.com/climate-leninism-and-revolutionary-transition/>.
- Heynen, N., & Ybarra, M. (2021). On abolition ecologies and making 'freedom as a place'. *Antipode*, 53(1), 21–35.
- Huber, M. T. (2022). *Climate change as class war. Building socialism on a warming planet*. London: Verso.
- Kolinjivadi, V. (2021). Subverting imperial greenwashing. Thinking with and beyond 'A People's Green New Deal' for anti-imperialist organizing. *Uneven Earth*. December 30 <https://unevenearth.org/2021/12/subverting-imperial-greenwashing/>.
- Kolinjivadi, V., & Kothari, A. (2020). How new is the green new deal for the global South? *Undisciplined Environments*. May 26 <https://undisciplinedenvironments.org/2020/05/26/how-new-is-the-green-new-deal-for-the-global-south/>.
- Löwy, M. (2023). Nine theses on ecosocialist degrowth. *Monthly Review*, 75, 154–159.
- Mastini, R., Kallis, G., & Hickel, J. (2021). A green new deal without growth? *Ecological Economics*, 179, Article 106832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106832>

- Muchhala, B. (2020). Towards a decolonial and feminist global green new deal. *Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung*. <https://www.rosalux.de/en/news/id/43146/towards-a-decolonial-and-feminist-global-green-new-deal>.
- Patel, R., & Goodman, J. (2019). A green new deal for agriculture. *Jacobin*, 4 April <https://jacobin.com/2019/04/green-new-deal-agriculture-farm-workers>.
- Paulson, S. (2020). Degrowth and feminisms ally to forge care-full paths beyond pandemic. *Interface: A journal for and about social movements*, 12(1), 232–246.
- Robbins, P. (2020). Is less more... or is more less? Scaling the political ecologies of the future. *Political Geography*, 76, Article 102018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.04.010>
- Simms, A., Pettifor, A., Lucas, C., Secrett, C., Hines, C., Legget, J., Elliott, L., Murphy, R., & Juniper, T. (2008). *A Green New Deal. Joined-up policies to solve the triple crunch of the credit crisis, climate change and high oil prices*. New Economics Foundation. July 20 <https://neweconomics.org/2008/07/green-new-deal/>.
- Sultana, F. (2022). The unbearable heaviness of climate coloniality. *Political Geography*, 99, Article 102638.
- Táíwò, O. O. (2019). How a Green New Deal could exploit developing countries. *The Conversation*. February 25 <https://theconversation.com/how-a-green-new-deal-could-exploit-developing-countries-111726>.
- Undisciplined Environments Collective. (2024). *Insurgent ecologies: Between environmental struggles and postcapitalist transformations*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). (2009). *Global green new deal*. Policy Brief. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7903/A_Global_Green_New_Deal_Policy_Brief.pdf.
- Zografos, C., & Robbins, P. (2020). Green sacrifice zones, or why a green new deal cannot ignore the cost shifts of just transitions. *One Earth*, 3(5), 543–546.