Overview

This course is concerned with exploring the idea of “capitalist nature”. Specifically, the course is based on six central questions:

(i) What are the unique political, ecological, and geographical dynamics of environmental change propelled by capital accumulation and the dynamics of specifically capitalist forms of “commodification”?

(ii) How and why is nature commodified (however partially) in a capitalist political economy, and what are the associated problems and contradictions?

(iii) How do the contemporary dynamics of environmental change and environmental politics shape and help us understand transformations in

---

markets, commodity production regimes, and capitalist social relations and institutions more broadly?

(iv) How can we understand the main currents of policy and regulatory responses to these dynamics?

(v) How do dominant ideas about nature (non-human as well as human) reflect, reinforce and subvert capital accumulation?

(vi) Is there or can there be any such thing as “green capitalism”?

Objectives

1. To develop some conceptual tools to analyse how capitalist dynamics transform or metabolize nature (in the broadest sense and including in material and semiotic registers), how biophysical processes become enrolled in and actively constitute capital accumulation and commodification, and how environmental politics shape a (more than) capitalist society.

2. To develop and refine critical reading skills, and in particular, to read more closely, carefully, and critically (which does not mean antagonistically) than we would otherwise be able to do on our own.

3. To read and luxuriate in the joy of scholarly reading and thinking about scholarly reading.

4. To participate in and learn from group discussions of assigned readings.

Logistics

Course meetings: Thursdays, 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m., ES 1042.

The course will meet once per week for three hours. Students will be asked to comment on readings prior to class meetings in the form of email summaries and responses submitted to me and circulated to the rest of the group via the course web site in Quercus (accessible through the University of Toronto portal on the U of T homepage) or via some other electronic means (we will discuss this during the first class meeting). Class meetings will be oriented primarily toward discussion, analysis, and critique of the assigned readings. I will get us started each week. However, I much prefer that issues be raised and discussed interactively. In addition to regular attendance, participation in the discussion of assigned readings, and email responses, students will be expected to complete some sort of significant, original piece of written work (see below for suggested formats and approaches).

Office hours: Thursdays 2:30 - 4:30 p.m. in SS 5007 or by prior arrangement.

I am available during this time on a drop-in basis. I have a strong preference that consultation on issues related to the course, including on course related assignments, take place during this time. If this does not work for you, please make an appointment see me at an alternate mutually agreeable time. I am more than willing to look over something in writing you send it to me in advance of our meeting, provided you give me at least 24 hours.

Readings:
The readings in this course consist primarily of books. Longer books we read over two
weeks, and shorter books we read in one week. These readings will be supplemented by one
or two articles per week that complement, contradict, critique, or extend the assigned book
reading. The idea of the articles is to complement the books with materials and arguments
that may be of some assistance in deepening our understanding of the books particularly vis-
à-vis course related questions and themes.
The course should provide a good start for Ph.D. students in preparing for comprehensive
exams, but also for Masters students looking for an introduction to literatures and concepts
that may be applied to contemporary political economy, environmental politics and
environmental policy.

**Grading scheme:**

- Weekly participation in class discussion – 30 per cent
- Email responses to readings – 30 per cent
- Term paper (or other equivalent) – 40 per cent

**Details on Course Work:**

1. **Email responses.** Weekly email responses to the assigned readings must be
   submitted to me (scott.prudham@utoronto.ca) *by noon on Wednesdays, the day
   prior to the course meetings.* Please don’t be late; I need to be able to read these
   prior to class meetings and to prepare something for the next day. These comments
   will be used to help me facilitate the class discussion and will also allow me to get a
   sense of how the readings are being received and what significant questions or issues
   are being raised. I am also asking you to post and share your comments with others
   via the Quercus course web site (or possibly via some other electronic group if we
   need to do that). For this we need to allow time for others to read and consider the
   comments. If you are accustomed to reading for class the night before (not usually a
good idea anyway), just convince yourself class is on Wednesday, and there will be
no problem! The email responses are also meant to facilitate the development of
close, critical reading skills, and to develop a facility with completing substantive,
fair-minded critiques. The email responses should be a *maximum* of 500 words in
length and should be sent in *plain text (i.e. no attachments)*; please do not exceed
this limit (we will all appreciate it). The email comments should consist of three
elements:

   a. *A concise paraphrase of the main argument of the reading,* including some
      of the argument structure and the evidence on which the argument is based,
      where appropriate. This is a difficult skill to master, since it requires distilling
      the argument to its bare essentials, and concisely explaining it in your own words. As
      you will see, it is not obvious, and not all of us will agree on even this seemingly
      basic distillation of the argument.

   b. *A response of some sort.* This should be evaluative and can focus on aspects of
      the argument that are either strong or weak, discussions of the relevance and
significance of the argument, and suggestions as to how the argument might be
improved. Critiques should always be fair-minded and respectful, reflecting the
author’s apparent purpose, and should mix “internal” appraisals (i.e., can the
argument stand as it is posed?) and “external” appraisals (i.e., ways in which the
argument does not deal with or explain things you think are important). Keep in
mind that there is a fundamental difference between critiquing someone else’s
argument on its own terms on the one hand, and advancing your own position
on the other. The second strategy is easier, often more obvious or easy, and is
typical of the external critique; it is also, in my opinion, too prevalent in
academia. I am not saying this is off limits, but I am saying that appraisals should
also deal with the argument on the authors’ terms. Keep in mind also that contesting or
disputing the argument tends to come more easily than explaining how and why the argument is
actually persuasive and important. But there is often a lot to say in reinforcing the strengths of
an argument that is not limited to re-stating the argument, or vacuous celebration. I do not want
to be complicit in this class in equating critique with negation, and I would appreciate some
assistance in this regard in both written responses, and in how we engage with one another in
class discussion. Consider discussing, for example, how the reading(s) might help
explain something you are interested in.

c. Questions for discussion. These can be anything from “what does the author mean
by…?” to “what is the context (geographical, historical, political, cultural, intellectual, etc.),
out of which this reading arises…?” to “what are the implications of…”. Some of these
readings are quite difficult and I stress that sometimes the most productive
questions are the ones that seem the most basic. If there are elements of the
argument or conceptualization you do not understand, there is no shame in and
certainly no penalty for asking for discussion on certain points. I consider honest
questions very helpful contributions to the dialog we will have in class meetings.
These kinds of questions also take courage to ask and we should all reward that.
Questions of clarification are the best way to flag jargon, concepts, theories, etc.,
that may be invoked in the readings, but which may not be adequately explained
in the text itself and which may be unfamiliar to many of us. Keep in mind this is
an interdisciplinary seminar, so backgrounds with relevant concepts will vary
widely. Please accept my invitation to simply ask for a discussion of concepts
raised by the authors (e.g. “what does the author mean by commodification?”),
and by all means, reiterate these questions when we meet.

In addition to sending me your email responses, I will also ask you to post them
to the Quercus course site (or to an email group) in order to allow others to read
your comments. I will explain in class how to access the course website if I need
to. Please note that you must send me your comments as well as post them.
Please circulate your comments in plain text format. No attachments please!

2. Class Participation. The majority of class time will be spent in discussion. Please
contribute by asking questions, suggesting issues for discussion, drawing on the text
to analyse it, listening carefully to others, engaging respectfully with their views, and
helping each of us to understand the readings better together than we can individually. This latter is, in my view, a central purpose of a graduate seminar. I want to ensure that everyone feels comfortable speaking, but it would also help if we can get into the practice of following discussion threads rather than jumping around randomly based on a strict speaker’s queue.

3. **Term paper/grant application/critical review paper/ research proposal/ annotated bibliography.** This will be a maximum of 30 pages (double spaced) and can be on just about anything you want it to be on. It need not be about capitalist nature *per se*, but I would like to see some sort of environmental connection, be it the role of environmental science in policy formation, environmental social movements, environmental justice issues, the political economy of environmental policy, etc. It should be something that seems relevant to the course, but that ideally also fits your purposes. If you are not sure, let’s talk it through. You can complete a review paper, a research paper, or a re-worked paper you are intending to submit for publication. It is up to you. Ph.D. students may want to consider the option of completing an essay or annotated bibliography tied to one or more areas of a comprehensive examination list under development. Students can also use the paper to contribute to a research proposal in some fashion.

If you choose the bibliography option, I am looking for a short (i.e. 1000 words or less) statement of topic which discusses what you are trying to capture with this list, your main research questions, and how the list is organized. This should be followed by the actual list with a maximum 500-word statement regarding each reading. Last, there should be some sort of concluding discussion or statement. The topic is flexible, depending on your interests, but should relate to this course’s themes and questions. This does NOT have to be an actual comps list, although for some, it may be. Some may consider it merely an exercise in drawing together an annotated bibliography on a topic of interest. In terms of number of sources, it depends on whether you rely mostly on books or mostly on articles, but I would think somewhere on the order of 15-20 journal articles is in order. One obvious topic is political ecology itself or some subset. The due date for your term paper/grant application/critical review paper/ research proposal/ annotated bibliography depends on your status. If you are graduating in June, then I need your term project document submitted by April 16th. If you are not graduating in June, then I need your term project document submitted by May 16th. If you require an extension, the forms for applying are available via the SGS website. The decision to grant extensions is not formally up to me, so we have to apply in each case and provide a reason. Normally these requests are granted.

**A Word on Auditors**


I have no objection in principle to individuals auditing this course. That comes with two caveats. First, if there are too many people in the course, including both registered students and auditors (and I would consider more than 15 to be at least worth discussing as an upper bound), then I must insist that registered students have priority over auditors. Conversely, if we have fewer than about 5-7 registered students, I could quite likely come under pressure to cancel the course in future years, and I would ask that any of you who can possibly take the course for credit, please do so. In addition, I ask that all auditors, as conditions of auditing, do the following:

(i) come to class on a regular basis;
(ii) participate fully in the discussion;
(iii) do all of the readings; and
(iv) complete the weekly email responses.

I do not expect auditors to complete the term assignment, and I understand if you miss one or two weeks of course meetings.

**Required Books**

The books we will read in the course are listed below. I have not ordered the books into a bookstore as I find this is becoming less and less the manner in which students obtain books and the bookstores then complain that no one buys the books I order! So I am afraid you are on your own here. I recommend independent book sellers, and the online ordering services provided via Abebooks, which deals with independent book sellers. They sell new and used books.


**Supplementary articles** – these should be available for download from the library at the University of Toronto (or other university libraries). Let me know if you encounter difficulties and I can provide you with a copy.


Schedule

January 10  Introduction


January 24  Polanyi ([1944] 2001), to the end plus Fraser 2014. (Also recommended: Burawoy (2003)).


February 14  Li (2014), whole book plus Bernstein (2004) and Murray Li (2009)

February 21  **Reading Week, no class meeting**

February 28  Williams (1973) whole book plus Mann (2009)

March 7  Malm (2016) to the end of chapter 8 plus Chakrabarty (2009)

March 14  Malm (2016) to the end plus Huber (2009)


---

\(^2\) Note that are 13 dates here. In the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at U of T there are now 12 weeks in the term, but this is a graduate course and SGS still works on a 13 week term. If this presents a problem for you, let me know.

\(^3\) This week’s meeting will need to be rescheduled as I will be away at an academic meeting for the week.