Author/s:
Rust, S;Monani, S;Cubitt, S

Title:
Introductio - Cut to Green: Tracking the Growth of Ecocinema Studies

Date:
2023

Citation:
Rust, S., Monani, S. & Cubitt, S. (2023). Introductio - Cut to Green: Tracking the Growth of Ecocinema Studies. Rust, S (Ed.). Monani, S (Ed.). Cubitt, S (Ed.). Ecocinema Theory and Practice 2, (1), pp.1-15. Routledge.

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/326049

INTRODUCTION

Cut to Green: Tracking the Growth of Ecocinema Studies

Stephen Rust, Salma Monani and Seán Cubitt

It has become increasingly clear, in the decade since our first volume of *Ecocinema Theory and Practice* appeared in late 2012, that film can no longer be considered apart from its imbrication in the fabric of the world. Until the close of the twentieth century, it may have been possible to ignore the material connection of celluloid reels with the oil industry, or the fact that drive-in movies depended on paving large tracts of ground. Even then, however, it was difficult to miss the insistent ecological themes that filmmakers returned to over and over in their onscreen messaging. We follow Hegel's old edict about Minerva's owl that only flies at dusk ([1820] 1991) when our hindsight helps us understand how the ruin of "first nature" becomes really apparent only when cinema, along with much of our culture, economy, and politics, moved into the "second nature" of virtual data. The majority of ecocritical cinema and media studies conducted so far has come in this century when, arguably, cinema and other media seemed to have finally severed the indexical umbilical that attached it to the physical world and become digital information. While Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring,* published in 1962, gives a respectable start date for the modern environmental movement, cinema studies has taken a considerable amount of time to catch up.

Ironically, in the 1970s cinema was considered the privileged site where technology and human subjectivity produced one another; yet, as products of "culture," neither were necessarily associated with "nature." It wasn't until this new generation of ecocritical scholars – who insisted that the cinematic apparatus, far from being divorced from nature, is in fact profoundly ecological – that ecocinema studies took root. Cinema has become unthinkable apart from its dependence on mining, electricity generation, and fabrication with their attendant pollution, on global logistical operations and supply chains with

DOI: 10.4324/9781003246602-1

massive ecological footprints, on material and technical infrastructures with direct consequences in the physical world, and on the problem of waste. For film scholars and filmmakers, the scale of this collective realization produces a specific challenge for ecological thought. Ontologically, it is clear that like human beings, media technologies and screenings are only thinkable as permeable congregations of materials and energies suffused by flows and affects coursing through the wider world as cells and neurons, chips, and datastreams. But historically, since the 1970s (at least), it has become equally clear that the three orders – ecologies, technologies, and societies – are profoundly alienated from one another.

A shadow of this problem is dimly, though rarely systematically, reflected in the way we understand the words "environment" and "ecology" as terms that construct our worlds and our storyworlds. Ecology is usually defined as referring to a system or fluid field of interactions involving everything, at every scale, connected to Planet Earth – animate and inanimate, from oxygen to the machinations of the United Nations – so that we cannot think of a phenomenon like the Los Angeles freeway system apart from its interwoven human, technical, and natural components. An environment, on the other hand, materially environs: it is constructed in a historical moment – endlessly repeated – of exclusion. Like "nature," the word "environment" appears as the negative of a positive term. Here is our vaunted civilization, over there is nature. Here is social and technical order, over there is what environs us – the merely physical and less-than-human noise to be excluded from the rationality of technological signals. Alas, history tells us that equating nature with less-than-human also reduced women, enslaved and colonized peoples, brutalized animals, and despoiled environments all to the same level of raw materials to be exploited.

Drawing this distinction between an ontology of ecological flows and a history of environmental alienation cannot provide a technical vocabulary for ecocriticism; instead, we draw on it to make explicit the consequent ethical and political relevance of ecocinema studies. From the ecological ontology of mutual implication in planetary flows, we take the utopian path. As Jennifer Fay writes, the love of film and the love of nature, cinephilia, and ecophilia are

> forms of love that intensify when celluloid and certain ecosystems draw near their moment of disappearance. The latter expresses a love of dwelling in the world, the former a desire to dwell in the image. Or, taken together, they express a singular love of dwelling in the world *through* the image.
>
> *(2018, 163)*

In this utopian current, film as medium and cinema as a mode of experience are mediations that suture us back into a world that otherwise slips away. On the

other side of love stands the pedagogical and political compulsion to point out that the worst environmental damage has already happened or is about to happen, and cinema's obligation is to horrify its audiences, to force them to change or to help them envision some form of survival. Just as it is hard to discern our contributors making hard and fast distinctions between ecology and environment, it is impossible to unpick their commitments to radical change and to the celebration of wholeness. This ambivalence is not a failing: it is integral to the practice of ecocinema studies in the present moment.

A Montage: The Collective Work of Ecocinema Studies

Ten years ago, *Ecocinema Theory and Practice* was published as part of the American Film Institute Readers Series by Routledge to introduce a then-nascent field. In the subsequent decade, ecocritical cinema studies have matured and proliferated, most of all in relation to new kinds of attention applied to new areas of practice. *Ecocinema Theory and Practice 2* speaks first and foremost of, to, and from practice. By collaborating in collective practices that embrace not only humans but also non-human partners in cultural making, a new aesthetic comes into view. It is still vital to maintain fierce criticism of the performative power of old, bad theories and practices. But it is equally essential to make possible new practices and ideas, the collective endeavor we undertake in this collection. By engaging in and thinking through such emergent modes of practice as those exemplified by our contributors, ecocinema scholars worldwide have sought to overcome the historical legacy of binary thinking and intellectual norms criticized by new ecocritical, intersectional, decolonial, queer, feminist, Indigenous, vitalist, and other developing theoretical, cinematic, and social practices. A significant goal of the collection is to demonstrate the unique ways that cinema studies scholarship can address environmental injustices and global environmental change. Organized around the themes of cinematic materialities, discourses, and communities, the essays in *Ecocinema Theory and Practice 2* have benefitted from peer reviewing between authors and feedback from multiple editors, encouraging a stronger sense of "the book" as a collaborative process appropriate to our field of study.

Since the publication of *Ecocinema Theory and Practice* and our related collection *Ecomedia: Key Issues* (Rust, Monani, and Cubitt 2016), a tide of new journals (among them *Environment and Planning: E: Nature and Space*, *Media+Environment*, and the *Journal of Environmental Media*, launched in 2018, 2019, and 2020 respectively), books, articles, and conferences confirm the growing impact of environmental discourse across the field of cinema and media studies. Things are moving so quickly that whole new fields and subfields of inquiry have opened up. Richard Maxwell and Toby Miller's *Greening the Media* (2012) kickstarted ecological studies of media infrastructure (also

Maxwell et al., 2015; Cubitt 2017), and Nadia Bozak's *The Cinematic Footprint* (2012) introduced ecocritical production studies, while Alexa Weik von Mossner (2014), Adrian Ivakhiv (2013), Nicole Seymour (2013), E. Ann Kaplan (2016), and Sylvia Bissonnette (2019) turned our attention to affect studies. Pietari Kääpä (2013), Pat Brereton (2016), Weik von Mossner (2017), and others inspired audience research and empirical ecocriticism. Robin Murray and Joseph Heumann (2014, 2016, 2017), Stephen Rust and Carter Soles (2014), Bridgette Barclay and Christy Tidwell (2018), Tidwell and Soles (2021), Jennifer Fay (2018), Helen Hughes (2014), Anil Narine (2015), and many others worked to expand genre studies. Kääpä and Tommy Gustaffson (2013), Anat Pick and Guinevere Narraway (2013), Jussi Parikka (2015), Scott MacKenzie and Westerståhl Stenport (2015), Nicholas Mirzoeff (2014, 2015, 2016), Ellen Moore (2017), Debashree Mukherjee (2020), Elena Past (2019), Gabriella Blasi (2019), Nikola Lübecker and Daniele Rugo (2017), Hunter Vaughan (2019), Ivakhiv (2018), Seán Cubitt (2020), Cassandra Guan and Adam O'Brien (2020), O'Brien (2016, 2017), Catherine Elwes (2022), and many more have significantly extended the historical and theoretical reach of ecocritical film and media studies. Melody Jue (2020), John Durham Peters (2015), Janine Randerson (2018), and Nicole Starosielski (2015) have explored elemental media, while Kristi McKim (2013) and others (for example, Cahill, Jacobson, and Bao 2022) have considered cinematic representations of weather and climate. Anna Tsing et al. (2017), Laura McMahon (2019), and Belinda Smaill (2016) have opened new dimensions of interspecies communication studies for students of film and media, and Sheldon Lu (Lu and Mi 2009; Lu and Gong 2020), Cajetan Iheka (2021), Salma Monani and Joni Adamson (2018), Sean Rhoads (2018), Chia-ju Chang (2019), and Rayson Alex and Susan Deborah (2016) have challenged the Eurocentrism of early ecocinema studies. What was a new field in 2012 has become a bustling global crossroads for a radical rethinking of media and ecology engaged not only with intersectional questions of race, class, disability, gender, and sexual identities but also with the new configurations of social justice and the information economy.

The emergent cinema of the twenty-first century is embedded in economic, social, technological, and ecological supply chains of materials and services. In 2010, when we embarked on our first volume, the most urgent task seemed to be to create a theoretical and aesthetic vocabulary for addressing films with explicit ecological themes. Today, ecocinema studies has followed the lead of feminist film scholars who have illuminated not only films by, for, and about women but also bring a feminist lens to every aspect of cinema. The ambition of this collection is as wide. To set about this task is, however daunting in its ambition, not least because ecological thinking demands connecting the objects of our studies – films and the practices surrounding them – with so many other factors.

Aspirations of Ecocinema Studies: Everything Everywhere

We present here a book full of critical writing about audiovisual media. Writing, it has been said, is always after the event – critical writing follows after the event of thinking. Not necessarily so with film which, from the spectator's point of view, unfolds in the Now of viewing. But even the unfolding present bifurcates and multiplies. Lyotard (1994) distinguishes between the happening of an event and the something that happens. Take, for example, a shot of a leaf falling from a tree. Every leaf that falls, falls uniquely. Many millions of leaves fall every autumn, but each leaf falls in its own way. When we write "a leaf," each of us imagines a different leaf falling differently, but the word "leaf" remains generic: any leaf, not the discrete, irreplaceable, one-off leaf that cinema is condemned to capture.

The shot of an individual falling leaf is firstly motion itself, then it is the motion of the leaf, but almost inevitably, as the shot ends and is replaced by another, it arrives at significance. Perhaps the shot leads us to imagine the leaf shouting out "Freedom!" as it parts from the branch, or we get the feeling that "Autumn is sad" and perhaps elaborate on that emotional response with a verbal one like "Falling leaves are the way deciduous trees cry," before we then reflect with the thought that evergreens can't really cry, even though we know, metacognitively, that cypress trees, for example, have long emblematized mourning since the ancient Greeks. These more or less critical thoughts are always subsequent to the shot as event in the Now, the shot as pure motion, which itself precedes our perception that this is the motion *of* a leaf, and our understanding that its motion is one of falling. In other words, placing this shot of a leaf falling among other thoughts and shots that precede and follow it can place the individual falling leaf into something akin to discourse but only because we have become savvy about the way films are constructed aesthetically and historically. To write critically about cinema is always to reprise our experience of this initial sequence of sensations, affects, and thoughts that we percolate nearly simultaneously (as rapidly as human senses and brains are capable), and to retrace them, albeit more slowly. If watching a film is (nearly) *immediate*, writing about it is to meditate and *mediate* a process of understanding the relations between shot, experience, and communication, since writing entails communicating ideas in a way that thinking them does not.

The task of writing ecocritically about cinema is to mediate the experience of cinema in such a way as to evoke the near-immediacy of the filmic experience while emphasizing that the shot itself and our sensory, emotional, and intellectual responses to it are also processes of mediation. Once we start down this ecocritical path, it is impossible not to confront intricate networks radiating from the shot to how it was produced: not only where, when, and often why, but also with what devices it was made, from what materials, in

what organizational and economic form, in which format and at what scale over which lapse of time arriving to us. Ecocinema studies invoke where films come from and where they are going, as physical objects and as cultural forms, together with a series of cultural, economic, and ecological considerations of how they travel through time and space to reach us. The astute reader will already have noticed that this implies that writing critically about ecocinema is therefore about everything everywhere all the time. And that it wants to loop all of that accumulation of experience back into the Now of our initial viewing.

Ecocinema studies aspire to total knowledge of texts and contexts, which is both true and either absurdly ambitious or completely unachievable. That ambition is not as lunatic as it sounds, however, for that is also the goal of information capital in the age of network databases. The difference between cinema's ecocritics and the BAT/FAANG corporations (Baidu, Alibaba, Tencent/Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Netflix, and Google) that dominate network commerce is not only that the latter treat knowledge as information and instrumentalize information as a commodity but also that they genuinely act (since as corporations they cannot really be said to "believe") as if total knowledge can be accomplished. Ecocinema studies scholars acknowledge not only the endlessness but also the practical incoherence of total knowledge, always understanding that while even a simple shot of a leaf falling, unique as it is, is already implicated in a universe of seasons and arboreal evolution, film financing, camera lens manufacturing, and cinematic exhibition so vast and complex as to render any attempt to achieve total understanding of even a single frame of such a film ultimately fruitless.

As a collaborative venture, ecocinema studies can at least point in the various directions from and toward which that shot travels. It makes a fundamental point about the ontology of the moving image: that no image is complete in and of itself, autonomous from the rest of the world, either as pure art or pure commodity. Even the simplest shot already implicates an entire planet, a solar system, and perhaps forces far beyond it ("we are all made of star stuff" as Carl Sagan said in *Cosmos*). The physical laws of mechanical operation guiding the histories of media imaging, projecting, and archiving technologies precede the emergence of life, let alone the beginnings of humanity. This grounding insight into connectivity and the impossibility of ever knowing how it all works allows ecocinema scholars to understand that the already complex mediation of a simple shot implies that it is not self-identical. The leaf falling and the shot of the leaf falling are already at odds. The event of motion caught on film is not the same as the viewer's perception that the motion belongs to the leaf (perhaps you sense the tree falling upward leaving the leaf behind?). Any intuition as to what that perception feels like emotionally or means intellectually to each viewer, however swiftly such affects arrive, are always other than either the leaf or its image. And the leaf, let's recall, is after all only one of the millions falling every year, and the uncounted, unperceived, and unthought

billions that have fallen or will fall. The shot is incomplete because it cannot even catch every angle of this one event, let alone the billions of broadly similar but actually very different leaf events. The shot may draw together these various aspects of the moment of projection, but the understanding that every shot is preceded and followed by others (even the last frame of any moving image is inevitably followed by the first frame of another), and that audiences respond perceptually, emotionally, and intellectually, demonstrates that the shot is radically incomplete, triggering all kinds of work, from editing to critical writing, that seeks to produce what the image implies but can never deliver: totality. Despite recognizing that in the networked multitude of the universe, a single shot is incoherent and incomplete, ecocinema studies pursue collectively the critical change that the radical incoherence and incompletion of film brings into cultural life. The inevitable disjuncture between the experience of images and written communiqués that try to capture both the images and the experience is part of ecocriticism's aspiration to universality and its refusal of totality.

Cinema, Ecological Crisis, and Social Justice

The contributors to *Ecocinema Theory and Practice 2* share a sense of global ecological crisis, of intellectual and eco-political urgency. Anthropogenic climate change is only one environmental factor radically altering ecological relationships across our planet. Enclosure of Indigenous lands, clear-felling ancient-growth forests, animal mistreatment, petrochemical infrastructures endangering land and people, the recycling crisis, and oceanic plastic pollution have generated major political protests and new films and ways of making them. They have also propelled new modes of thinking, learning from colonized and Indigenous experiences how to reflect critically on globalization, colonialism, capital, and the European enlightenment tradition in science, engineering, philosophy, and politics (Tung 2020). Ecocritical thinking in cinema studies as elsewhere no longer believes in the kind of binary oppositions that once separated humans from nature. Instead, as we first noted in *Ecocinema Theory and Practice*, ecocinema studies is keen to show how film – from its production to its post-consumption – mediates the inevitable entanglements of humans and nature. We understand that films can themselves be critical of these entanglements. As events, films participate in but also bear witness to local and planetary ecological crises, as well as to the care that such crises instill in filmmakers, their filmed subjects, and their audiences.

New understandings of environmental injustices and ecological crises have emerged in the twenty-first century and with them new forms of care. In the current decade, in which neo-nationalist projects have become core political ideologies in many of the world's most populous nations, the capitalist economic structures of globalization still govern much of the supply of media, whether we speak of content, audiences, or devices. Where scholars of globalization

have been forced to confront the reality of what was often disingenuously called "uneven development" with demands for social justice, environmental studies scholars have tended to place the health of the planet first, in the fond belief that restoring and conserving the natural would automatically lead to political and economic equity. Among many writings from the Global South, Sharachchandra Lele (2020) makes us confront two presumptions of neoliberal thinking: one, that technical and economic solutions such as reforestation and carbon credits are presupposed to produce and prioritize "sustainable" economic growth, not to sustain an ailing ecology, and that, therefore, nature can be made to pay its way, like any other activity under capital; and two, that the bulk of the land and oceans to be restored are far from the Global North, whose metropolitan centers consume the vast majority of resources, produce the most pollution, and have demolished the greatest proportion of the world's natural environments. Since the time of Malthus, colonized and minoritized populations have been expected to bear the brunt of the presumed limits to growth (Meadows et al. 1972). Many of the contributions to this volume contest both the fiscal account of nature and the presumption that the poor must pay for its restoration. This marks a significant development since the first volume of *Ecocinema Theory and Practice*.

Learning from queer activists (e.g., Seymour 2018), ecocritical thinking in film studies no longer believes in the kind of binary oppositions that once separated humans from nature and divided "races," genders, sexes, and sexualities. In this collection, our contributors provide rich intersectional analyses to demonstrate the multiple ways in which motion pictures can be understood not only as keenly ecological but also as spaces to contest neoliberal thinking. They provide new or revivified means to engage with objects of study currently emerging, especially in the fields of visual effects, sound studies, the intersections of film and avant-garde art, and the new relationships formed in digital media. Many of the essays gathered here respond to and feedback on recent developments in contemporary critical theory including vitalist film philosophy (e.g., Brown 2018), feminist epistemologies (e.g., Barad 2017), epistemologies of the South and decoloniality (e.g., Tuck and Yang 2012; Santos 2018), affect studies (e.g., Braidotti 2019), and phenomenologies of embodiment (e.g., Angerer 2016). This volume presents new discourses and emerging ecocinema communities that offer radical alternatives to the neoliberal capitalist status quo.

We should not mistake technical innovation, a keyword of neoliberalism, for a radical alternative. The ecocritical lesson we should take from the recent history of technological development is to not just focus on what can now be included or enclosed by cinema but also on what has been further excluded and naturalized. High-resolution digital cameras and projectors have indeed offered new ways of seeing with and behind the veil of cinema. Other novelties that have impacted the recent history of cinema include the ubiquitous

cameras/computers in our pockets, buildings, and vehicles, the flexible but decidedly anthropocentric vision afforded by Steadicam since 1975 and, in the opposite direction, the distinctly non-human gaze and independence from gravity that drone photography has made cheap and accessible. The twin tendencies of anthropomorphism and allomorphism engendered by motion pictures, of becoming human and becoming other, should not necessarily be seen as forming a binary opposition. Through seeing and hearing with cinema, each can produce its own negative (becoming inhuman, becoming the same). Rather, the relation between them forms a terrain of mediation – of experience, as Belton (2014) demands, and of imagination.

Brakhage's *Act of Seeing with One's Own Eyes* (aka "the autopsy film," 1971) raised the question of whether it is possible to see the grinding visual truth of mortality and whether death, the most inevitable truth of nature, might escape not only cinema (which, as quasi-autonomous apparatus, can observe what we cannot perceive) but also the human vision itself (Miller 2018). It has been said that digital cinema reduces light to data. We have become all too familiar with mortality data during the COVID-19 pandemic. But death is not merely datum: it is an event that evades picturing and datafying. The best that data visualization can do is to try to represent time, as it does in weather reports and stock market feeds. Alternatively, it might be argued that in place of events, contemporary audiences experience only a narrow vocabulary of swipes, clicks, likes, and recommendations. We are reduced to behaviors. Because human action is so diminished, humans are becoming data. On the downside, as data, we act as functionaries of a cyborg data system (Flusser 2000). But on the upside, whatever cannot be harvested from the human population as data is left to become environmental: the raw material surrounding a vast technological empire, bringing greater possibilities for the alliance between the residual humanity left behind by information capture and the natural world left behind by the extraction industries. In the latest twist to this saga, left-over humans and nature, notably in the form of unpredictable storms and fire seasons, have become essential components of an economic system that thrives on contingency and disaster (Klein 2007, 2014; Ayache 2010). Contemporary cinema, and thus ecocinema studies, works at this fault line between enclosure and escape, to evolve new alliances between humans, technologies, and ecologies beyond the economic evolutions of profit-driven anthropocentrism.

Conclusion and Overview of Chapters

To the extent that film is digital, it is integral to the entire technological apparatus of contemporary social, political, and economic life. It can be seen as the servant of economic and socio-political forces that care no more for human populations than for ecologies. But it can also be seen as both the screen between us and nature, and as the screen on which nature projects itself, just

as we project ourselves onto nature. Contemporary cinema has the potential to become a mediating interface that at last allows us to comprehend what we have done, to the world and ourselves, but also how and where we might begin remaking that relation: in the image, in the imagining, of a healed world. But before we can heal, we need diagnoses, and we need to understand the pharmacopoeia that cinema provides us with to set about treatment. In this spirit, we have organized the book around three themes.

The section on Materialities opens with Cubitt's global overview of the competition between economy and ecology in cinema's supply chains of services and materials. We then turn to more local and specific accounts of such tensions to tease out particular resonances in specific regions of the globe. Carolyn Fornoff's chapter explores production and exhibition practices in Mexico, spotlighting bike-powered green alternatives designed to bring cinema to underserved rural areas. Marta Lopera-Mármol and Manel Jiménez-Morales' chapter analyzes green filmmaking in Catalonia and proposes strategies for extending the reach of such practices. Debashree Mukherjee turns our attention to Bollywood melodrama to reveal the links between India's coal and cinema industries of extraction and exhaustion.

The Discourses section introduces analytical frames and new keywords by which to engage in ecocinema studies. Catejan Iheka develops a concept of "wild cinema" from narratives of land depletion and repair in two African films and Elio Garcia coins the term "polytemporalities," extending ecocritique from places to times by analyzing climate trauma in the slow cinema of Filipino director Lav Diaz. Andrew Hageman and Helen Wang offer a model for comparative ideological ecocritique, using as their case studies two popular US and Chinese science fiction films, while Christian Quendler proposes a queering of comedic ecocinema by way of analyzing Buster Keaton's *Our Hospitality* (1923) as "chimera." Anthony Lioi rounds off the section by exploring the concept of "mesocosm"– bounded worlds – to help us understand how film and media fans collectively produce more-than-metaphorical ecological networks of cultural and material meanings.

Our concluding section on Communities further expands the scope of ecocinema studies by reminding us of how cinema, while often a communal practice (collaboratively produced by a film crew), can more intentionally be about and for community justice, aimed to elevate ecological and social justice. Angelica Lawson (Northern Arapaho) describes how animator Jonathan Thunder (Ojibwe) and media artist Missy Whiteman (Arapaho and Kickapoo) spotlight Indigenous cosmologies of human and more-than-human communities through digital media, Aarón Lacayo links disability and ecological toxicity through *Polvo* (*Dust*, Julio Hernández Cordón, 2012) a film about a Mayan community in the wake of the Guatemalan civil war (1960–1996), and Emily Roehl provides an account of Indigenous community-building and drone filmmaking as a response to the destructive colonialism of the Dakota Access

Pipeline. Scholar and filmmaker Mila Zuo critiques the rise of streaming film festivals during pandemic conditions, as a condition for dissipating community, while Mariam Abazeri's chapter on the Iranian participatory film production *Women of the Sun: A Chronology of Seeing* (2020), which Abazeri co-produced, provides the Persian concept of "adab" to show that the women working on the film discovered "the world around them not as a fixed state of values and behaviors but as a dynamic process." Ecocinema studies have no lesser ambitions; it welcomes the truth that film criticism, along with films and filmmaking, can be "wild," to use Iheka's term, or in Zuo's words, that "cinema like the coyote…be feral," such that it is always unknowable, not only as finished products but also at every stage of its coming to be.

Jennifer Fay's afterword punctuates this dynamism of cinematic community and wildness by further exploring the connections between the chapters and possibilities for advancing the field. As she suggests, there must be many critical sequels to this collection to come, and much research and communication left to do. Work on materialities could easily be expanded with ecocritical analyses of the governance of technical standards, economic policy, extra-territorial contract and intellectual property law, financial services, risk management, and policing the global trade in services, including the movement of engineering and design expertise. We acknowledge here emerging work in such areas as environmental management through policy and governance (Kääpä 2018; Kääpä and Vaughan 2022), data and other modes of knowledge (Bacevic 2021), the rise of carbon financing (Freidberg 2017; Field 2022), and the oscillations between global production (Yeung 2021) and the terrifying insights into "global destruction networks" offered by Wang et al. (2021). Similarly, interest in ecocinema discourses could easily expand upon our collection and previous work in the field through scholarship devoted to animation (Pallant 2015), musicals, speculative fiction, horror, and other significant genres, into sound (Smith 2015) and other cinematic technologies and aesthetics, topics such as ethics (Brereton 2016), philosophy (White 2018), and piety (McFarland Taylor 2019), and, of course, deeper inquiry into ecological entanglements and social justice. We further invite forays into the rich evolving scholarship of temporality studies connecting collapsing and expanding time frames in global media's new distributed and re-connected geographies to Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) deterritorializing and reterritorializing, while also reaching toward Kyle Powys Whyte's (2018) Indigenous notions of "spiraling" and intergenerational time (2018). We are privileged to publish, in the communities section, work that articulates Indigenous worldviews; yet we have so much to learn, as a community of scholars, from the lived experiences and cinematic expressions of these communities, not least about how media technologies from digital storytelling to lightweight and small-file movies can complete circuits of inclusion between a people and its places, about what it can still mean to inhabit. Ten years after our first collection, we dedicate this volume to the emerging voices of the next

ten years, and to the startling, entrancing, and healing ideas they will develop in their scholarship, art, and activism.

Works Cited

Alex, Rayson K. and S. Susan Deborah, eds. 2016. *Ecodocumentaries: Critical Essays*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Angerer, Marie-Louise. 2016. *Ecology of Affect: Intensive Milieus and Contingent Encounters*. Translated by Gerrit Jackson. Lüneburg: Meson Press.

Ayache, Elie. 2010. *The Blank Swan: The End of Probability*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Bacevic, Jana. 2021. "Unthinking Knowledge Production: From Post-Covid to Post-Carbon Futures." *Globalizations* 18.7:1206–1218.

Barad, Karen. 2017. "Troubling Time/s and Ecologies of Nothingness: Re-Turning, Re-Membering, and Facing the Incalculable." *New Formations* 92: 56–86.

Barclay, Bridgitte and Christy Tidwell. 2018. *Gender and Environment in Science Fiction*. Washington, DC: Rowman & Littlefield.

Belton, John. 2014. "If Film Is Dead, What Is Cinema?" *Screen* 55.4: 460–470.

Bissonnette, Sylvia. 2019. *Affect and Embodied Meaning in Animation: Becoming Animated*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Blasi, Gabriella. 2019. *The Work of Terrence Malik: Time-Based Ecocinema*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bozak, Nadia. 2012. *The Cinematic Footprint: Lights, Camera, Natural Resources*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2019. "A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities." *Theory Culture and Society* 36.6: 31–61.

Brereton, Pat. 2016. *Environmental Ethics and Film*. London: Earthscan/Routledge.

Brown, William. 2018. *Non-Cinema: Global Digital Film-Making and the Multitude*. London: Bloomsbury.

Cahill, Leo, Brian Jacobson, and Weihong Bao, eds. 2022. "Special Issue: Media Climates." *Representations*, 157. University of California Press.

Chang, Chia-ju, ed. 2019. *Chinese Environmental Humanities: Imagining Huanjing as a Critical Concept*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cubitt, Sean. 2017. *Finite Media: Environmental Implications of Digital Technologies*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

———. 2020. *Anecdotal Evidence: Ecocritique from Hollywood to the Mass Image*. London: Oxford University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. [1980] 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Translate by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Elwes, Catherine. 2022. *Landscape and the Moving Image*. Bristol: Intellect.

Fay, Jennifer. 2018. *Inhospitable World: Cinema in the Time of the Anthropocene*. London: Oxford University Press.

Field, Sean. 2022. "Carbon Capital: The Lexicon and Allegories of US Hydrocarbon Finance." *Economy and Society*. doi:10.1080/03085147.2022.2030606

Flusser, Vilém. 2000. *Towards a Philosophy of Photography*. Translated by Anthony Matthews. London: Reaktion Books.

Freidberg, Susanne. 2017. "Trading in the Secretive Commodity." *Economy and Society* 46.3–4: 499–521.

Guan, Cassandra and Adam O'Brien. 2020. "Cinema's Natural Aesthetics: Environments and Perspectives in Contemporary Film Theory. Special Dossier Introduction." *Screen* 61.2: 272–279. doi:10.1093/screen/hjaa014.

Hegel, G.W. F. [1820] 1991. *Elements of the Philosophy of the Right*, edited by Allen Wood and translated by H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, Helen. 2014. *Green Documentary: Environmental Documentary in the 21st Century*. Chicago: Intellect.

Iheka, Cajetan. 2021. *African Ecomedia: Network Forms, Planetary Politics*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ivakhiv, Adrian. 2013. *Ecologies of the Moving Image: Cinema, Affect, Nature*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

———. 2018. *Shadowing the Anthropocene: Eco-Realism for Turbulent Times*. New York City: Punctum Books.

Jue, Melody. 2020. *Wild Blue Media: Thinking Through Seawater*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kääpä, Pietari. 2013. "Understanding the Audiences of Ecocinema." Special Issue Introduction. *Interactions* 4.2: 107–111.

———. 2018. *Environmental Management of the Media: Policy, Industry, Practice*. London: Routledge.

Kääpä, Pietari and Tommy Gustaffson. 2013. *Transnational Ecocinema: Film Culture in an Era of Ecological Transformation*. London: Intellect.

Kääpä, Pietari and Hunter Vaughan. 2022. "From Content to Context (and Back Again): New

Industrial Strategies for Environmental Sustainability in the Media." In *A Companion to Motion Pictures and Public Value*, edited by Mette Hjort and Ted Nannicelli, 308–326. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kaplan, E. Ann. 2016. *Climate Trauma: Foreseeing the Future in Dystopian Film and Fiction*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Klein, Naomi. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Henry Holt.

———. 2014. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lele, Sharachchandra. 2020. "Environment and Well-Being: A Perspective from the Global South." *New Left Review* 123 (May–June): 41–63.

Lu, Sheldon H. and Jiayan Mi, eds. 2009. *Chinese Ecocinema in the Age of Environmental Challenge*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lu, Sheldon H. and Haomin Gong, editors. 2020. *Ecology and Chinese-Language Cinema: Re-Imagining a Field*. New York: Routledge.

Lübecker, Nikola and Daniele Rugo, eds. 2017. *James Benning's Environments: Politics, Ecology, Duration*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lyotard, Jean François. 1994. *Lessons on the Analytic of the Sublime*. Translated by Elizabeth Rottenberg. Redwood City: Stanford University Press.

MacKenzie, Scott and Westerståhl Stenport, editors. 2015. *Films on Ice: Cinemas of the Arctic*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Maxwell, Richard, et al. 2015. *Media and the Ecological Crisis*. London/New York: Routledge.

Maxwell, Richard and Toby Miller. 2012. *Greening the Media*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

McFarland Taylor, Sarah. 2019. *Ecopiety: Green Media and the Dilemma of Environmental Virtue*. New York: NYU Press.

McKim, Kristi. 2013. *Cinema as Weather: Stylistic Screens and Atmospheric Change*. New York: Routledge.

McMahon, Laura. 2019. *Animal Worlds: Film, Philosophy, and Time*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meadows, Donella H., et al. 1972. *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*. New York: Universe Books.

Miller, Michael F. 2018. "Stan Brakhage's Autopsy: *The Act of Seeing with One's Own Eyes*." *Journal of Film and Video* 70.2: 46–55.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. 2014. "Visualizing the Anthropocene." *Public Culture* 26.2: 213–222.

———. 2015. *How to See the World*. New York: Pelican.

———. 2016. "It's Not the Anthropocene, It's the White Supremacy Scene, or the Geological Color Line." In *After Extinction*, edited by Richard Grusin, 123–149. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Monani, Salma and Joni Adamson, eds. 2018. *Ecocriticism and Indigenous Studies: Conversations from Earth to Cosmos*. New York: Routledge.

Moore, Ellen E. 2017. *Landscape and the Environment in Hollywood Film: The Green Machine*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mukherjee, Debashree. 2020. *Bombay Hustle: Making Movies in a Colonial City*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Murray, Robin and Joseph K. Heumann—. 2014. *Film and Everyday Eco-Disasters*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

———. 2016. *Monstrous Nature: Environment and Horror on the Big Screen*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

———. 2017. *Ecocinema in the City*. London/New York: Routledge.

Narine, Anil, ed. 2015. *Eco-Trauma Cinema*. New York: Routledge.

O'Brien, Adam—. (2016). *Transactions with the World: Ecocriticism and the Environmental Sensibility of New Hollywood*. New York: Berghahn.

———. 2017. *Film and the Natural Environment: Elements and Atmospheres*. London: Wallflower Press.

Pallant, Chris, ed. 2015. *Animated Landscapes: History, Form and Function*. London: Bloomsbury.

Parikka, Jussi. 2015. *A Geology of Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Past, Elena. 2019. *Italian Ecocinema Beyond the Human*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Peters, John Durham. 2015. *The Marvelous Clouds: Toward a Philosophy of Elemental Media*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pick, Anat and Guinevere Narraway, eds. 2013. *Screening Nature: Cinema Beyond the Human*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Randerson, Janine. 2018. *Weather as Medium: Toward a Meteorological Art*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rhoads, Sean. 2018. *Japan's Green Monsters: Environmental Commentary in Kaiju Cinema*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company.

Rust, Stephen and Carter Soles. 2014. "Living in Fear, Living in Dread, Pretty Soon We'll All Be Dead." "Ecohorror Special Cluster Introduction." *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 21.3: 509–512.

Rust, Stephen, Salma Monani, and Sean Cubitt, eds. 2016. *Ecomedia: Key Issues*. New York: Routledge.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2018. *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Seymour, Nicole. 2013. *Strange Natures: Futurity, Empathy, and the Queer Ecological Imagination*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2018. *Bad Environmentalism: Irony and Irreverence in the Ecological Age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Smaill, Belinda. 2016. *Regarding Life: Animals and the Documentary Moving Image*. New York: SUNY Press.

Smith, Jacob. 2015. *Eco-Sonic Media*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Starosieslki, Nicole. 2015. *The Undersea Network*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Tidwell, Christy and Carter Soles, eds. 2021. *Fear and Nature: Ecohorror Studies in the Anthropocene*. University Park: Penn State University Press.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt, et al. 2017. *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet: Ghosts and Monsters of the Anthropocene*. Minneapolis: University of Minnestoa Press.

Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1.1: 1–40.

Tung, Charles M. 2020. "Time Machines and Timelapse Aesthetics in Anthropocenic Modernism." In *Timescales: Thinking across Ecological Temporalities*, edited by Bethany Wiggin, Carolyn Fornoff, and Patricia Eunji Kim, 79–94. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Vaughan, Hunter. 2019. *Hollywood's Dirtiest Secret: The Hidden Environmental Costs of the Movies*. New York: Columbia University Press.

von Mossner, Alexa Weik, ed. 2014. *Moving Environments: Affect, Emotion, Ecology, and Film*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

———. 2017. *Affective Ecologies: Empathy, Emotion and Environmental Narrative*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Wang, Kun, Junxi Qian, and Shenjing He. 2021. "Global Destruction Networks and Hybrid E-Waste Economies: Practices and Embeddedness in Guiyu, China." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 54.3: 533–553.

White, Daniel. 2018. *Film in the Anthropocene: Philosophy, Ecology, and Cybernetics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Whyte, Kyle P. 2018. "Indigenous Science (Fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral Dystopias and Fantasies of Climate Change Crises." *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 1.1–2: 224–242.

Yeung, Henry Wai-chung. 2021. "The Trouble with Global Production Networks." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 53.2: 428–438.