

Karin Esders

Introduction: Empowering the Humanities

The climate crisis constitutes a profound challenge to humans, more-than-humans, other-than-humans. Rising temperatures driven by greenhouse gas emissions – manifested in melting glaciers, rising sea levels, ocean warming, and extreme weather events – have become a material reality that disrupts life on Earth for everybody and everything. However, not everybody and everything is affected in the same way or at the same time. Neither responsibility for global warming nor exposure to its risks are equally distributed.¹ Instead, the crisis is shaped by stark asymmetries, with so-called “frontline communities” bearing a disproportionate share of its consequences despite contributing least to its causes.² Any meaningful engagement with climate change must therefore attend not only to its environmental dimensions but also to its entanglements with structural inequalities.

The climate crisis constitutes a major challenge to the humanities. No longer understood as the exclusive domain of the natural sciences, climate change has become a central concern of the environmental humanities: under this umbrella term the “humanities+”³ have engaged in critical, inter- and transdisciplinary work to re-consider the social, political, cultural, and ethical implications of climatic transformations. Yet scholars in this field face both external pressures and internal struggles. The destructive fury of contemporary US politics as of 2026 is guided by unashamed climate denial, denunciation, and strategic attacks that seek to reinforce geographically and racially concentrated configurations of power and privilege. Climate change as an ongoing catastrophe is not merely con-

1 According to Oxfam Aotearoa, on 9 January 2026, only ten days into the year, the richest 1% of the world’s population had already exhausted their annual carbon budget, that is, the amount of CO₂ that can be emitted while remaining within the 1.5°C global warming limit (“Richest”).

2 “Frontline communities are those that are disproportionately impacted by climate change, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities, immigrants and refugees, people living with low incomes, communities experiencing disproportionate pollution exposure, women and gender non-conforming people, LGBTQIA+ people, people who live and/or work outside or depend on natural resources for their livelihoods, those with existing health issues (like asthma and heart disease), pregnant people and people with limited English skills. Children and elderly people are also more vulnerable to climate change impacts.” (“Climate Inequity”)

3 The humanities+ include among others, literary and cultural studies, social sciences, legal studies, geography, social anthropology, philosophy. My thanks go to Ingo Warnke who mentioned the term at the tenth anniversary of the interdisciplinary research platform “Worlds of Contradiction (WOC)” at the University of Bremen.

tested but rendered irrelevant through systematic silencing and withdrawal from international climate agreements. The boosting of extractivism, remilitarization, and authoritarian policies echoes the timeworn hegemonic violence of settler colonialism and racial capitalism. Within these debates or – rather non-debates – “the climate” is instrumentalized to deepen divisions between “us and them.”⁴

The escalating “environmental culture wars” (Fusco and Seymour 72) have tangible consequences for academia, including funding cuts, the dismissal of scholars, and the dismantling of research programs. At the same time, higher education institutions themselves remain embedded in the very ideologies and structures that have produced and sustained environmental destruction. The traditional divide between the sciences (focusing on “nature”) and the humanities+ (studying “culture”) has encouraged compartmentalized responses to the climate crisis. Proposed remedies rely heavily on techno-scientific, incentive-based management strategies that promise an “easy fix.”⁵ Furthermore, as Ursula Heise emphasizes in her introduction to *The Routledge Companion to the Environmental Humanities*, scientific knowledge and technological solutions, while indispensable, are themselves shaped by “socioeconomic inequality, cultural difference, and divergent histories, values, and ethical frameworks” (2). Without interrogating the histories, ethics, and politics that underpin dominant systems of knowledge production, “ecomodern”⁶ promises risk reproducing narrow and universalizing conceptions of human agency, social relations, and change, while failing to account for the complex, situated entanglements of human and non-human worlds. To become a powerful agent in confronting the climate crisis, climate change denial, and sociopolitical disruptions, the environmental humanities have to develop inspirational approaches and knowledge practices that operate outside dichotomized conceptions of science and culture, society and environment, human and non-human.

Against this backdrop, Deborah Bird Rose and her co-editors, in their 2012 editorial launching Duke University’s journal *Environmental Humanities*, outline central questions and methodological orientations coalescing within the emerging field. They call for an effort “to enrich environmental research with a more exten-

4 I would like to thank my students at the University of Bremen for their astute contributions to these matters.

5 As Donna Haraway observes, these paradigms are animated by “a comic faith in technofixes” (3), while Isabelle Stengers critiques such strategies as enabling continued extraction and combustion without accountability or consequence (8).

6 Within ecomodern discourse, economic growth is framed as the foundation for transitioning energy and environmental policies toward a sustainable future. Emerging as a dominant paradigm in energy and environmental policymaking in the early 1990s, ecomodernism promotes the belief that technological innovation and market-driven solutions can reconcile continued economic expansion with ecological sustainability (Hultman 86).

sive conceptual vocabulary, whilst at the same time vitalising the humanities by rethinking the ontological exceptionality of the human” (2). By introducing questions of meaning, value, ethics, justice, and knowledge production into ecocritical debates, the environmental humanities challenge reductionist notions of the self-contained, rational, modern subject and the promise of epistemic certainty. Instead, the field positions humans as participants in “lively ecologies of meaning and value,” entangled within dense patterns of cultural and historical diversity that shape both subjectivity and the possibilities of “becoming with” others (2).

Similarly, Stephanie LeMenager argues that the “humanities after the Anthropocene” must fundamentally rethink human agency and move beyond human-centered epistemologies. Emphasizing relationality, responsibility, and “deep interconnection with other life” (473), she suggests that such a reorientation can foster new practices of togetherness while simultaneously challenging entrenched configurations of power. This perspective requires a critical interrogation of earlier anthropogenic frameworks that center a universalized notion of humanity while effacing social, historical, and structural differences. Likewise, Rebecca Macklin underscores the importance of the environmental humanities for understanding “the foundational logics and infrastructures” of climate change specifically in relation to modernity and coloniality (57). At their best, the environmental humanities “bring into focus developments across the field by exploring what it means in practice to bring other ways of thinking, knowing, and being to the fore” (Macklin 58).

As Alex Moulton observes, several core challenges remain for the environmental humanities: how to examine and articulate questions of place, race, and power without reinscribing racialized difference or evading it altogether; and how to critically engage relations of power without naturalizing them. Scholars have repeatedly pointed to the problematic tendency to conceptualize the climate crisis as a global threat best addressed through Western technologies and knowledges. As Malcolm Ferdinand demonstrates, the historical whiteness of environmental movements and discourses has not only excluded racialized minorities from environmental policies but has also contributed to the marginalization of non-white voices in ecological texts and theories. Drawing on his experience as a Black scholar, Ferdinand identifies several mechanisms that normalize white-centered climate discourse, including the denial of the histories of slavery, colonialism, and imperialism; the universalizing tendencies of the Anthropocene; and the denial of biased knowledge production and recognition (45–47). These “colonial erasures” not only normalize the absence of racialized minorities in environmental discourses but also obscure and render invisible the main drivers of climate change itself (Resurrección 2).

As a result, Indigenous peoples, people of color, and women are frequently framed as especially vulnerable to climate change; however, such framings often essentialize vulnerability and obscure the structural conditions and the slow violence⁷ that produce climate-related marginalization in the first place (Arora-Jonsson). By emphasizing vulnerability without interrogating its causes, dominant accounts deflect attention away from the systemic inequalities that generate and sustain susceptibility. Post- and decolonial feminist praxes therefore call for a critical re-evaluation of dominant understandings and narratives of climate change. Such a paradigmatic shift requires recognizing climate change not as an isolated environmental or natural phenomenon, but as a complex assemblage of colonial legacies, capitalist extraction, and intersecting gendered and racialized injustices (Resurrección 4). To constructively respond to the climate catastrophe, the humanities must therefore account for the unequal causes and consequences of the crisis, unsettling the unmarked whiteness and the Eurocentric, gendered, and classist assumptions that continue to shape dominant climate discourses.

Black, feminist, decolonial, and Indigenous ecologies play a crucial role in this endeavor. Even though or rather because marginalized communities are most susceptible to the effects of climate change, they have generated insurgent knowledges that expose long-standing legacies of uneven relations and geographies (Roane and Hosbey). A widened and flexible understanding of Black and feminist ecologies and Indigenous climate studies offers a way of mapping ongoing vulnerability as a consequence of colonialism and racial capitalism, while simultaneously generating innovative socioecological practices of resistance and kinship (Davis et al. 3). What emerges as crucial, then, is the relationship between vulnerability and resistance, susceptibility and innovative socioecological and cultural practices. Tyszczuk and Smith argue that this orientation within the environmental humanities fosters imaginative capacities that can help to grapple with uncertain futures, and difficult-to-imagine transformations. It enables more expansive understandings and supports shifts in perspectives and practices. Productive interventions into hegemonic climate discourses recognize the transformative potential of cultural work, including the roles of the

7 “By slow violence I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. [. . .] we [. . .] need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively” (Nixon 2).

humanities, the arts, or popular culture. In confronting the uncertainties of living with climate change, multiple frameworks and provisional perspectives can expand the imaginative registers and open spaces for critical and creative engagement. Drawing on Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogism, such an approach resists the monological traditions of Western thought and instead embraces a diversity of perspectives and a polyphony of voices, foregrounding open-ended, relational forms of understanding. What is essential at this moment in time is a multiplicity of discourses that remain open to dialogue and transformation, to controversy and productive contradiction, and that offer potential and unforeseen possibilities for learning and unlearning.

In the humanities+, and not least in American studies, scholarship on climate change has proliferated rapidly, making it increasingly difficult for students, educators, and interested readers to navigate this expanding field. This volume seeks to offer an accessible entry point and conceptual roadmap through the abundance of recent work. Following Ferdinand's articulation of decolonial ecologies – which include Indigenous communities, Black and ecofeminist resistance movements, as well as diverse collectives in the North and the South – this anthology brings together contributions from a wide range of scholars whose work exemplifies the vitality of contemporary interdisciplinary and intersectional debates on the climate crisis. The selected texts juxtapose marginalized and established voices alike, situating their arguments within ongoing critical conversations in the environmental humanities.

The contributions assembled here have been carefully selected and tested in cultural studies courses in the MA program English-speaking cultures at the University of Bremen, where they have proven to be valuable resources for teaching and learning about the cultural dimensions of climatic transformations. While the texts frequently challenge readers with conceptual and theoretical complexity, they have consistently functioned as catalysts for new ways of thinking, opening epistemic horizons and fostering imaginative engagement. For students, these readings have deepened analytical understanding while encouraging reflection on agency, responsibility, and the possibility of intervention. By foregrounding historical, social, cultural, and aesthetic perspectives, the collection deepens an understanding of the causes, effects, and uneven impacts of socioecological crises at local and global scales.

It is in this conjuncture – marked by accelerating climatic disruption, intensifying political backlash, and the persistent reproduction of colonial and racialized epistemologies – that this anthology intervenes. Rather than treating climate change as a singular, technocratic problem awaiting managerial solutions, the contributions gathered here insist on understanding it as a historically situated, structurally produced, and unevenly lived crisis. Bringing together perspectives

from across the environmental humanities and allied fields, this volume foregrounds voices, knowledges, and analytical frameworks that have too often been marginalized or rendered invisible within dominant climate discourse. By centering questions of coloniality, racial capitalism, gendered violence, and epistemic injustice, the anthology seeks not only to critique prevailing paradigms but also to open up space for alternative modes of thinking, narrating, and responding to climate change. In doing so, it positions the humanities not as ancillary to scientific knowledge, but as indispensable to imagining more just, accountable, and transformative climate futures.

The anthology opens with a sparkling contribution by Donna Haraway, who critically interrogates the concept of the Anthropocene. She finds the term misleading not only because of its universalizing tendencies, as noted above, but also because it implies that significant human impact on the planet began with European industrialization. Instead, Haraway points to the Plantationocene and the Capitalocene as more precise designations for the devastating transformations wrought by colonialism and racial capitalism.⁸ Yet, as one might expect, Haraway develops speculative concepts and practices that aim to offer “solace, inspiration, and effectiveness” (*Staying with the Trouble* 49) among them the Chthulucene – an “otherwise” that breaks with human exceptionalism and instead calls for intense commitment, collaborative labor, and playful engagement across species boundaries. As a rich multispecies assemblage, the Chthulucene interweaves myriad temporalities and spatialities and intra-active entities-in-assemblage. Haraway’s proliferating hyphenations and syntactical combinations are not merely stylistic flourishes; her language creates new forms of togetherness, new collective practices of thinking, being, and living with others and other organisms, that invite people (not Man) to generate “oddkin,” and participate in transformative ecoplay. Readers willing to embrace her playful idiom may find themselves participating in a *jeu d’esprit* that stretches the imagination and reshapes stories and concepts. While her slogan “Make kin, not babies!” has not really caught on and met criticism – appearing entangled with adultism or non-natalist politics (see, for example, Mattheis) – the underlying concept of kinship remains vital. As a mode of relation grounded in care, intimacy, and response-ability,⁹ kinship becomes a precondition for multispecies ecojustice. Thus, Haraway urges us to move beyond a state of indecisive agitation, get over human hegemony, and learn to care for unfamiliar kin and oddkin.

⁸ Haraway deliberates these terms in the text reprinted here.

⁹ Response-ability is a capacity to respond to “worldly urgencies with one another” (Haraway 7).

Sharon Stein's article immediately struck me as an excellent teaching tool. Both panoramic and programmatic, her text offers a rigorous overview of modern-colonial logics, critically examines the entanglements of higher education with these structures, and sketches possibilities for transforming knowledge and learning practices. What Hubbell and Ryan describe as a "WEIRD" definition of the good life¹⁰ is reframed in Stein's work as a modern-colonial habit-of-being (Shotwell). She identifies colonialism not only as the primary cause of climate change but also as a condition of possibility for modern higher education and ecological unsustainability. The promises of modernity – endless growth, predictability, choice, order, stable identity, wealth, autonomy, protection within nation-states, and accumulation without consequence – remain deeply alluring. Yet their underside – colonialism, extractivism, exploitation, genocide, and ecocide – is persistently disavowed, externalized, and denied by those invested in maintaining modern habits-of-being. Stein suggests that, if used responsibly, higher education institutions could become sites for learning how to disinvest from these harmful attachments and confront the denials that sustain them. In addressing how students might prepare for an uncertain future, she highlights three interrelated dimensions: the intellectual, the relational, and the affective. Together, these facets open possibilities for moving beyond both paralysis in the face of devastation and a reductive faith in "sustainability" as a sufficient response.

Romy Opperman advances Black feminist hauntology as a foundation for a transformative vision of transgenerational climate justice. Drawing on Derrida and Black feminist thought, she explores the ecological dimensions of hauntology, particularly its implications for conceptions of justice that exceed the limits of the present and cultivate responsibility toward past and future beings. Derrida's conceptualization of hauntology challenges Western philosophy's privileging of presence by insisting that we attend to that which is "neither living nor dead, present nor absent," since there can be no justice without responsibility that extends beyond the living present (63). In this sense, hauntology offers a critical departure from the presentism and human exceptionalism that shape dominant framings of climate change. With its radically trans- and intergenerational orientation Black feminist climate justice underscores the necessity of confronting past and ongoing systems of violence and assuming historical and collective accountability in order to imagine futures that do not merely reproduce the past. In Opperman's formulation, "making kin" is further expanded:

¹⁰ "The Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich Democracies' (WEIRD) definition of 'the Good Life' just so happens to immiserate billions of other people, cause mass species extinction, and destabilize the climate on which we all depend. This is a cultural problem, not a scientific one" (30).

kinship encompasses not only other-than-humans, but also kin across temporal boundaries – past and present, living and dead.

Françoise Vergès takes up many elements discussed so far but reframes them through a distinctly socio-political lens. She argues that climate change is not the result of generalized human hubris, but rather the outcome of the long history of colonialism and racial capitalism, with its systematic exploitation of “cheap nature” and “cheap labor”. The concept of the Capitalocene reintroduces history, difference, and power relations into the debate, elucidating the enduring effects of colonialism: environmental destruction, global organization of a mobile, racialized, gendered, and disposable workforce. For Vergès, the task is to analyze asymmetries of power rather than to invoke universalizing abstractions such as a supposed human drive toward destruction. She advocates a radical pedagogy grounded in the decolonization of knowledge production – one that acknowledges diverse lived realities and addresses multiple publics – while challenging dehumanizing forms of work in favor of shared, life-affirming labor practices.

Connecting feminism, capitalism, and ecology, Johanna Oksala offers a philosophical critique of materialist and Marxist ecofeminism. She argues that human-induced climate change demands political and economic transformations that have to contest the logic of capitalism itself. Feminism can and must engage in this task if it is to remain a meaningful political force in the twenty-first century. What is required, she contends, is an account capable of analyzing the diverse and sometimes contradictory mechanisms for the capitalization of nature. Feminist critique can no longer be limited to preserving a notion of “nature” outside the market; it must interrogate capitalism’s expanding capacity to subsume life into its circuits of value. At stake are both the transformation of exploitative social relations and the protection of the more-than-human world. Determining which forms of biological life are drawn into commodification and which remain outside becomes an ethical and political question, making the negotiation of the limits of the market a central task for contemporary feminist theory.

As Kylie Whyte demonstrates, Indigenous scholars and activists have introduced crucial perspectives into climate discourse. For many Indigenous communities, severe environmental transformation is not unprecedented but part of a long history of anthropogenic change tied to colonialism, capitalism, and industrialization. Climate injustice thus appears less as a future threat than as a recurring pattern – “more like the experience of *déjà vu*” (88) as Whyte argues elsewhere – an intensification of colonially induced violence manifest in geographic, social, and psycho-cultural displacements. These histories of forced adaptation make Indigenous approaches to environmental change particularly instructive. The renewal of Indigenous ecological knowledges – relational epistemologies grounded in interdependence among human and other-than-human beings – supports both

self-determination and context-specific adaptation strategies. In this sense, Indigenous climate change studies not only reframe dominant narratives of the Anthropocene but also expand how histories and futures are understood, with the aim of sustaining Indigenous flourishing across generations.

Whereas the first section of this anthology develops and clarifies key theoretical positions, the second turns to concrete practices, aesthetic strategies, and case studies. Sarah Vaughn's brief contribution functions as an interlude between these parts. Vaughn argues that climate activism extends beyond protests and demonstrations, emphasizing instead the mobilizing force of storytelling and visual media for environmental movements. Because such interventions are not confined to the global North, climate activism must be understood as having multiple and heterogeneous origin stories. A central task of this activism, she suggests, is to narrate the connections between local experiences and the planetary dimensions of climate change. Careful attention to its narrative forms and visual repertoires can thus help to trace both the struggles and the possibilities that shape contemporary climate politics. The texts in the second section exemplify such analyses.

Blanche Verlie and Astrida Neimanis outline key methodological orientations of the environmental humanities, including immersive practices grounded in attention and attunement to more-than-human worlds, situated learning that privileges lived and experiential forms of education, and sensorial modes of engagement. These methodologies inform their analysis of breath as a mode of witnessing that is embodied and deeply personal while simultaneously relational. It enables attunement to the climatic experiences of other beings, thereby recognizing our own inseparability from them. At the same time, Verlie and Neimanis acknowledge the limits of embodied attunement for grasping the historical, political, and ethical entanglements of climate change within capitalist, colonial, and heteropatriarchal formations. Embodied witnessing, they argue, must therefore be complemented by other modes of knowing drawn from science, art, literature, and critical theory. By integrating creative and personal practices – such as photography, video, and creative nonfiction – with rigorous intersectional analysis, the authors propose what they term “conspiratorial witnessing”: an ethical and epistemic stance that compels recognition of our implication in the very catastrophe we seek to observe.

An emerging strand of the environmental humanities examines how energy regimes – and fossil fuels in particular – shape social relations, cultural imagines, as well as political and economic power.¹¹ The works of Cara Daggett and

¹¹ See, for example, Szeman and Boyer.

Sheena Wilson can be regarded as formative interventions in this area. Daggett offers a bracing feminist reading of climate change denial and fossil-fuel boosterism, analyzing the entanglement of masculinity and fossil fuels. In her account, fossil fuels are not only instruments of profit and privilege but also technologies of identity formation, producing what she terms petro-masculinity, a formation closely tied to white patriarchal rule and authoritarianism. Climate change denial, she argues, is not simply the result of inadequate scientific communication but must also be understood through the psycho-affective dimensions of desire. Hypermasculine ideals – valorizing toughness, technological mastery, and growth – mask vulnerabilities and render care-oriented responses to climate crisis subordinate, while also helping to legitimize authoritarian tendencies that seek to secure fossil-fueled ways of life.

Sheena Wilson, who partially revised her article for this reprint, likewise adopts a feminist and media-critical perspective, focusing on how petro-discourses circulate through advertising, fashion, and mainstream journalism. Her analysis shows how visual and narrative framings normalize Western women's association with oil while marginalizing environmental and Indigenous resistance, such as the Idle No More movement in Canada. Campaigns like Ethical Oil mobilize stark contrasts between “liberated” Western femininity and racialized others, thereby depoliticizing fossil fuel extraction and recasting Indigenous activism in ways that can undermine solidarity and even criminalize community members.¹² Together, Daggett and Wilson demonstrate that fossil fuels operate not only as energy sources but as cultural and ideological forces that reproduce gendered, racial, and colonial hierarchies, making petro-politics a key site for intersectional critique.

Neel Ahuja examines Northern literary and visual spectacles of mass extinction that recast climate disaster through settler-colonial fears and fantasies. His readings show how such texts universalize responsibility while masking colonial violence and provincializing security discourse. The texts oscillate between anxiety over lost privilege and fantasies of a purified, posthuman world. In contrast, Indigenous and Southern perspectives unsettle the Anthropocene's claim to a universal humanity. Junot Díaz' notion of cannibal capitalism – where the ultra-rich consume not-quite-alive people and nations – finds narrative form in Indra Sinha's novel *Animal's People*, which fictionalizes life after the Bhopal disaster. Here, mass death extinguishes particular lives without ending *Life* as an ecological process; life remains resilient, insurgent against an apocalyptic landscape. Ahuja shows that, despite a necropolitical regime that renders populations sur-

12 Most of these images and advertisements remain readily accessible online.

plus and disposable, Southern imaginaries can redirect attention toward responsibility, redress, and precarious ecological futures.

Kathryn Yusoff and Jennifer Gabrys examine the terrain of the imagination to trace how anthropogenic climate change materializes across culture and society. They conceptualize imagination as a mode of seeing, sensing, thinking and dreaming that participates in knowledge formation and can catalyze both material interventions and political sensibilities. Drawing on literary, filmic, artistic, and scientific practices, they demonstrate the constitutive role of the arts and humanities in shaping climate representations. Their attention to the interplay between scientific practices and imaginative forms resonates with the methodological concerns outlined by Blanche Verlie and Astrida Neimanis. At the same time, the density of examples and conceptual nuance in Yusoff and Gabrys's work opens an interdisciplinary space that moves readers across – and beyond – the boundaries of the academy.

In her discussion of climate cinema, Alexa Weik von Mossner distinguishes between spectacular, apocalyptic visions of climate change and more ecotopian films that imagine less pessimistic futures. To understand how such films engage viewers, she examines their ethical and affective dimensions across both fiction and documentary. While catastrophic scenarios may evoke distress or discomfort, she argues that these responses do not necessarily produce apathy or disengagement. Her primary focus, however, is on ecotopian works, which she reads through Ernst Bloch's notion of concrete utopianism – a form of socially grounded dreaming with transformative potential that remains bound to hope.

Laura op de Beke argues that most climate videogames reproduce technofuturist, growth-oriented imaginaries, a tendency she explains through the logic of premediation, which multiplies possible futures while narrowing them to those compatible with present neoliberal frameworks. Because their procedural, repetitive structures privilege mastery, optimization, and prediction, such games often foster the illusion that planetary crises can be simulated and controlled. Her reading of *Fate of the World* shows how scientific modelling, punitive failure loops, and techno-fix solutions reinforce a sense of inevitability and foreclose structural critique. By contrast, *The Stillness of the Wind* suspends progress and mastery, foregrounding slowness, loss, and uncertainty, and thus opens alternative affective and temporal relations to climate change that resist the closure of the future.

Last but not least, Keith Moser reads climate denial as a particularly lethal form of post-truth misinformation through Jean Baudrillard and inoculation theory. Baudrillard's notion of hyperreality – an informational environment in which signs circulate detached from empirical verification – clarifies how anti-scientific echo chambers normalize false equivalences despite an overwhelming

scientific consensus on anthropogenic warming. In this post-factual context, political and media actors erode the legitimacy of climate science through the strategic production of “alternative facts.” While Baudrillard offers no clear exit from hyperreality, Moser sketches counter-hegemonic practices: targeted climate communication, media literacy, and strategic reframing can operate as forms of inoculation that disrupt the self-reinforcing logic of simulation.

In the process of selecting the contributions for this anthology, I was necessarily unable to include a number of texts that have also been helpful in teaching and research contexts. It therefore seems appropriate to gesture briefly toward a small selection of works that can productively supplement a curriculum on the climate crisis. An accessible point of entry is Robert Wilson’s essay “Will the End of the World Be on the Final Exam?”, whose pedagogical strength lies in its capacity to translate the abstractions of climate discourse into the affective and institutional realities of student life. The article by Davis et al. “Anthropocene, Capitalocene, . . . Plantationocene?: A Manifesto for Ecological Justice in an Age of Global Crises” advances Donna Haraway’s text reprinted in this volume by foregrounding the centrality of racial politics and the ongoing colonial-racial legacies of the plantation.

For additional perspectives from film studies, readers may wish to consult Sophie Christman Lavin and E. Ann Kaplan’s “The Climate of Ecocinema” as well as Adrian Ivakhiv’s “Green Film Criticism and Its Futures,” both of which offer valuable frameworks for analyzing cinematic engagements with environmental crisis and for situating ecocinema within broader debates in the environmental humanities. Julie Sze discusses abolitionist climate justice narratives that enact an imaginative reclamation and recognition within a brutalizing economic and political system using the example of the web series *The North Pole*. Kali Simmons theorizes time, contamination, and kinship alongside the work of Navajo artist Will Wilson. Charles Green et al. explore artistic, cinematic, televisual, and narrative practices that have shaped the communication of the climate crisis, while Haastrup and Marshall examine the role of the influencer in the age of climate disaster.

Finally, I wish to mention another article by Johanna Oksala that complements her contribution to this volume. In “Climate Change as an Existential Threat: Environmental Politics in the Shadow of Nihilism,” Oksala approaches the climate crisis through the lens of Hannah Arendt. In the face of contemporary political aggression and resurgent resource wars, the current situation can generate feelings of hopelessness, climate anxiety, or nihilism. Against this backdrop, Arendt’s concept of *amor mundi* calls for renewed engagement with the world rather than withdrawal from political, social, or environmental crises. *Amor mundi* entails nurturing the endangered common trans-species and transgenera-

tional reality: as a devoted commitment to futurity rather than to individual self-interest, it requires recognizing that the world is only temporarily entrusted to us and must be preserved for those who follow, while also affirming the human capacity to initiate new beginnings and profound transformations.

The articles assembled in this volume demonstrate that the debates in the environmental humanities strive to confront the complex entanglements of the present by fostering a deeper sense of responsibility toward humans, more-than-humans, and other-than-humans alike. Moreover, they challenge dominant narratives of the climate crisis and its proposed solutions, urging a rethinking of conventional frameworks of knowledge, power, and agency. Rather than offering easy fixes, this collection foregrounds the necessity of critical, relational, and transformative modes of thought and practice. However, as an ongoing intervention, the humanities must be prepared to unrelentingly confront tyrannical forces of world-abandonment and destruction.

Works Cited

- Adamson, Joni, and Michael Davis, editors. *Humanities for the Environment*. Routledge, 2017.
- Arora-Jonsson, Seema. "Virtue and Vulnerability: Discourses on Women, Gender and Climate Change." *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2011, pp. 744–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.01.005>.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Castree, Noel. "Making the Environmental Humanities Consequential in 'The Age of Consequences': The Potential of Global Environmental Assessments." *Environmental Humanities*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2021, pp. 433–58.
- Chang, Alenda Y., and John Parham. "Green Computer and Video Games: An Introduction." *Ecozon@*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2017, pp. 1–17.
- Curnow, Joe, and Anjali Helferty. "Contradictions of Solidarity: Whiteness, Settler Coloniality, and the Mainstream Environmental Movement." *Environment and Society*, vol. 9, 2018, pp. 145–63.
- Davis, Janae, Alex A. Moulton, Levi Van Sant, and Brian Williams. "Anthropocene, Capitalocene, . . . Plantationocene? A Manifesto for Ecological Justice in an Age of Global Crises." *Geography Compass*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2019, pp. 1–15.
- Elliott, Alexander, James Cullis, and Vinita Damodaran, editors. *Climate Change and the Humanities: Historical, Philosophical and Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Contemporary Environmental Crisis*. Springer Nature, 2017.
- Emmett, Robert, and David E. Nye. *The Environmental Humanities*. MIT Press, 2017.
- Ferdinand, Malcolm. "Decolonial Ecologies: Beyond Environmentalism." *Handbook of Critical Environmental Politics*. Edited by Luigi Pellizzoni et al., Edward Elgar Publishing, 2022.
- Ginn, Franklin. "Decolonizing Environmental Humanities." *Environmental Humanities*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2023, pp. 2–7.

- Green, Charles, Belinda Smaill, and Sean Cubitt. "Iconographies of Climate Catastrophe." *Climate Disaster Preparedness*, Dennis Del Favero, Susanne Thurow, Michael J. Ostwald, Ursula Frohne eds. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 93–106.
- Haastrup, Helle Kannik, and P. David Marshall. "The Influencer in the Age of Climate Change: The Authentic Role Model for Sustainability." *Celebrity Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2024, pp. 160–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2024.2341596>.
- Haraway, Donna J. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press, 2016.
- Heise, Ursula K. "Introduction: Planet, Species, Justice." *The Routledge Companion to the Environmental Humanities*, edited by Ursula K. Heise, Jon Christensen, and Michelle Niemann, Routledge, 2017, pp. 1–9.
- Hubbell, J. Andrew, and John C. Ryan. *Introduction to the Environmental Humanities*. Routledge, 2022.
- Hultman, Martin. "The Making of an Environmental Hero: A History of Ecomodern Masculinity, Fuel Cells and Arnold Schwarzenegger." *Environmental Humanities*, vol. 2, 2013, pp. 79–99.
- Hultman, Martin. "The Process of Ecologisation: Is Schwarzenegger Back to Teach Us Something New?" *Men, Masculinities, and Earth*, edited by P. M. Pulé and Martin Hultman, Palgrave Macmillan, 2021, pp. 169–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54486-7_7.
- "Climate Inequity." *Climate Impacts Group*, University of Washington, 10 Jan. 2026. <https://cig.uw.edu/learn/inequities-in-climate-impacts/>.
- Ivakhiv, Adrian. "Green Film Criticism and Its Futures." *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2008, pp. 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isle/15.2.1>.
- Kaplan, E. Ann, and Sophie Christman. "The Climate of Ecocinema." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- LeMenager, Stephanie. "The Humanities after the Anthropocene." *The Routledge Companion to the Environmental Humanities*, edited by Ursula K. Heise, Jon Christensen, and Michelle Niemann, Routledge, 2017, pp. 473–81.
- Macklin, Rebecca. "Ecocriticism." *The Year's Work in Critical and Cultural Theory*, vol. 30, 2022, pp. 54–76.
- Mattheis, Nikolas. "Making Kin, Not Babies? Toward Childist Kinship in the Anthropocene." *Childhood*, vol. 29, no. 4, 2022, pp. 512–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09075682221098155>.
- Neimanis, Astrida, Cecilia Åsberg, and Johan Hedrén. "Four Problems, Four Directions for Environmental Humanities: Toward Critical Post-Humanities for the Anthropocene." *Ethics and the Environment*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2015, pp. 67–97.
- Nixon, Rob. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Oksala, Johanna. "Climate Change as an Existential Threat: Environmental Politics in the Shadow of Nihilism." *Purple Brains: Feminisms at the Limits of Philosophy*, edited by Annabelle Dufourcq et al., Radboud University Press, 2024, pp. 233–46.
- Resurrección, Bernadette P. "Colonial Erasures in Gender and Climate Change Solutions." *WIREs Climate Change*, 2024.
- "Richest 1% Blow Carbon Budget in 10 Days, Says Oxfam." Oxfam Aotearoa. 10 Jan. 2026. www.oxfam.org.nz.
- Roane, J. T., and Justin Hosbey. "Mapping Black Ecologies." *Current Research in Digital History*, vol. 2, 2019. doi.org/10.31835/crdh.2019.05.
- Schmidt, Matthias, Jens Soentgen, and Hubert Zapf. "Environmental Humanities: An Emerging Field of Transdisciplinary Research." *GAIA: Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, vol. 29, no. 4, 2020, pp. 225–29. <https://doi.org/10.14512/gaia.29.4.6>.
- Shotwell, Alexis. *Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times*. University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

- Simmons, Kali. "Reorientations; or, An Indigenous Feminist Reflection on the Anthropocene." *Journal of Cinema and Media Studies*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2019, pp. 174–79.
- Stengers, Isabelle. *In Catastrophic Times: Resisting the Coming Barbarism*. Translated by Andrew Goffey, Open Humanities Press, 2015.
- Sze, Julie. "Abolitionist Climate Justice, or ICE Will Melt." *American Studies*, vol. 60, no. 3–4, 2021, pp. 43–62.
- Szeman, Imre, and Dominic Boyer, editors. *Energy Humanities: An Anthology*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017.
- Tyszczyk, Renata, and Joe Smith. "Culture and Climate Change Scenarios: The Role and Potential of the Arts and Humanities in Responding to the '1.5 Degrees Target.'" *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, vol. 31, 2018, pp. 56–64.
- Whyte, Kyle. "Is It Colonial Déjà Vu? Indigenous Peoples and Climate Injustice." *Humanities for the Environment: Integrating Knowledge, Forging New Constellations of Practice*, edited by Joni Adamson and Michael Davis, Routledge, 2016, pp. 88–105.
- Wilson, Robert. "Will the End of the World Be on the Final Exam?" *Teaching Climate Change in the Humanities*, edited by Stephen Siperstein et al., Routledge, 2017, pp. 53–58.
- Yusoff, Kathryn. *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*. University of Minnesota Press, 2018.

