



ENERGY

AN ANTHOLOGY

humanities

EDITED BY *Imre Szeman & Dominic Boyer*

Energy Humanities

An Anthology

Edited by Imre Szeman and Dominic Boyer

Johns Hopkins University Press *Baltimore*

© 2017 Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved. Published 2017
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Szeman, Imre, 1968– | Boyer, Dominic.

Title: Energy humanities : an anthology / edited by Imre Szeman and Dominic Boyer.

Description: Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016019648 | ISBN 9781421421889 (hardcover : acid-free paper) | ISBN 9781421421896 (paperback : acid-free paper) | ISBN 9781421421902 (electronic) | ISBN 1421421887 (hardcover : acid-free paper) | ISBN 1421421895 (paperback : acid-free paper) | ISBN 1421421909 (electronic)

Subjects: LCSH: Humanities—Philosophy. | Power resources—Social aspects. | Power resources—Philosophy. | Power resources—Political aspects. | Power resources—Moral and ethical aspects. | Fossil fuels—Social aspects. | Nuclear energy—Social aspects. | Petroleum—Social aspects.

Classification: LCC T14 .E58 2017 | DDC 333.79—dc23 LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016019648>

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Special discounts are available for bulk purchases of this book. For more information, please contact Special Sales at 410-516-6936 or specialsales@press.jhu.edu.

Johns Hopkins University Press uses environmentally friendly book materials, including recycled text paper that is composed of at least 30 percent post-consumer waste, whenever possible.

Contents

Acknowledgments

Imre Szeman and Dominic Boyer, Introduction: On the Energy Humanities

Judy Natal, *Another Storm Is Coming*

Amy De'Ath, Institutional Critique

ONE Energy and Modernity: Histories and Futures

Introduction

Dipesh Chakrabarty, The Climate of History: Four Theses

Imre Szeman, System Failure: Oil, Futurity, and the Anticipation of Disaster

David Nye, The Great White Way

Pablo Neruda, Standard Oil Co.

Italo Calvino, The Petrol Pump

Stephen Collis, Reading Wordsworth in the Tar Sands

Hermann Scheer, The Visible Hand of the Sun: Blueprint for a Solar World

Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway, The Frenzy of Fossil Fuels

Paolo Bacigalupi, excerpt from *The Windup Girl*

Margaret Atwood, It's Not Climate Change—It's Everything Change

TWO Energy, Power, and Politics

Introduction

Timothy Mitchell, Carbon Democracy

Dominic Boyer, Energopower: An Introduction

Jean-François Mouhot, Past Connections and Present Similarities in Slave Ownership and Fossil Fuel Usage

Michael Watts, Imperial Oil: The Anatomy of a Nigerian Oil Insurgency

John McGrath, excerpt from *The Cheviot, the Stag and the Black, Black Oil*

Gabrielle Hecht, Nuclear Ontologies

Gökçe Günel, A Dark Art: Field Notes on Carbon Capture and Storage Policy Negotiations at COP₁₇

Sheena Wilson, Gendering Oil: Tracing Western Petrosexual Relations

Cymene Howe, Anthropocenic Ecoauthority: The Winds of Oaxaca

Pope Francis, excerpt from *Encyclical on Climate Change & Inequality: On Care for Our Common Home*

Ken Saro-Wiwa, “Night Ride”

THREE Energy in Philosophy: Ethics, Politics, and Being

Introduction

Allan Stoekl, Bataille’s Ethics

Joseph Masco, Atomic Health, or How the Bomb Altered American Notions of Death

Laura Watts, The Draukie’s Tale: Origin Myth for Wave Energy

Timothy Morton, A Quake in Being

Martin McQuillan, Notes toward a Post-carbon Philosophy: “It’s the Economy, Stupid”

Roy Scranton, Learning How to Die in the Anthropocene

Dale Jamieson, Ethics for the Anthropocene

Claire Colebrook, We Have Always Been Post-Anthropocene: The Anthropocene Counterfactual

Karen Pinkus, Air

Reza Negarestani, excerpt from *Cyclonopedia: Complicity with Anonymous Materials*

FOUR The Aesthetics of Petrocultures

Introduction

Amitav Ghosh, Petrofiction: The Oil Encounter and the Novel

Patricia Yaeger, Literature in the Ages of Wood . . .

Abdul Rahman Munif, excerpt from *Cities of Salt*

Lesley Battler, poems from *Endangered Hydrocarbons*

Julia Kasdorf, poems from *Shale Play*

Stephanie LeMenager, Petro-Melancholia: The BP Blowout and the Arts of Grief

Jennifer Wenzel, Petro-Magic-Realism: Toward a Political Ecology of Nigerian Literature

Ursula Biemann and Andrew Pendakis, This Is Not a Pipeline: Thoughts on the Politico-aesthetics of Oil

Adam Dickinson, excerpt from *The Polymers*

Warren Cariou, An Athabasca Story

Barry Lord, What Does the Culture of Stewardship Look Like?

Graeme Macdonald, The Resources of Fiction

Marina Zurkow, Una Chaudhuri, Fritz Ertl, and Oliver Kellhammer, *Dear Climate: Post-energy*
Previews

Works Cited

List of Contributors

Acknowledgments

Critical engagements with energy have taken many forms and have multiple origins. The beginning point of this project in the energy humanities dates back to March 2013, when two key sites of research on energy and culture—the Center for Energy and Environmental Research in the Human Sciences (CENHS) at Rice University and the Petrocultures Research Group at the University of Alberta—first had an opportunity to share ideas and resources. Since then, members of each group have collaborated on a number of research and writing projects, including “The Rise of the Energy Humanities,” the 2014 op-ed in *University Affairs* that gave an emerging field of research the name it now bears. The present volume owes its life first of all to those researchers at CENHS and in Petrocultures who have contributed to development of this emergent field, including Bill Arnold, Lynn Badia, Brent Bellamy, Gwen Bradford, Joe Campana, Adam Carlson, Ann Chen, Cecily Devereux, Farès el-Dahdah, Randal Hall, Cymene Howe, Richard Johnson, David Kahane, Jordan Kinder, Jeff Kripal, Caroline Levander, Elizabeth Long, Carrie Masiello, Cyrus Mody, Tim Morton, Albert Pope, Alexander Regier, Matthew SchneiderMayerson, Derek Woods, and Jack Zammito.

We thank the distinguished visiting scholars and guest lecturers at CENHS and Petrocultures, each of whom has also helped give form and substance to energy humanities, including Paolo Bacigalupi, Darin Barney, Ursula Biemann, Warren Cariou, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Tom Cohen, Paul Edwards, Jón Gnarr, Akhil Gupta, Graham Harman, Gabrielle Hecht, Brenda Hillman, Dale Jamieson, Eric Klinenberg, Stephanie LeMenager, Graeme Macdonald, Mika Minio-Paluello, Timothy Mitchell, Laura Nader, Naomi Oreskes, Karen Pinkus, Doug Rogers, Antti Salminen, Suzana Sawyer, Kristin Shrader-Frechette, Allan Stoekl, Bron Taylor, Anna Tsing, and Marina Zurkow. A special thanks to Sheena Wilson, cofounder and codirector of Petrocultures, and to Michael O’Driscoll and Mark Simpson, who have been at the center of the After Oil research initiative at the University of Alberta. Their energies on behalf of energy have been infectious, multiplying possibilities in ways that the first law of thermodynamics suggests should be impossible—which is true, too, of the work of Jennifer Wenzel, who has also played an essential role in bringing greater attention to the study of energy. Special thanks also to the Rice University Provost’s Office for ongoing support of CENHS and energy humanities in general.

This book benefited from the great enthusiasm of Matthew McAdam, Senior Humanities Editor at Johns Hopkins University Press, who understood the aims and ambitions of this project from the very beginning. Thanks to David Janzen, who helped us with permissions—an essential task for a book project like this one—and Miriam Mabrouk, who assisted with copy-edits. A special shout-out goes to Jeff Diamanti for feedback on the introduction and section introductions.

Finally, a huge shout-out goes to Justin Sully, who performed the same magic here that he has on any number of projects. This volume would not have found its way into print without his efforts on our behalf.

Introduction: On the Energy Humanities

Imre Szeman and Dominic Boyer

Energy Humanities: An Anthology brings together research that attends to the social, cultural, and political challenges posed by global warming and environmental damage and destruction. As the title suggests, the pieces collected here focus on a specific issue in relation to today's environmental challenges: energy. The use and abuse of energy have had a significant impact—perhaps *the* most significant impact—on the shape in which we find the planet today. This is especially the case when it comes to the use of fossil fuels—first coal, and then oil and natural gas. The pieces brought together here address the social as well as environmental consequences of energy once it gets industrialized across the globe. This volume makes a strong case for why it is essential to better understand the import and impact of energy when it comes to trying to puzzle out how we might address global warming. It does so not by pointing out that we remain dependent on forms of dirty energy that continue to increase the level of CO₂ in the atmosphere—or not only by doing so: for most of the planet's inhabitants, this is no longer a mystery.¹ Rather, *Energy Humanities* draws critical attention to the fact that energy is absolutely necessary for modern societies. To be modern is to depend on the capacities and abilities generated by energy. Without the forms of energy to which we've had access and which we've come to take for granted, we would never have been modern. We are citizens and subjects of fossil fuels through and through, whether we know it or not. And so any meaningful response to climate change will have to tarry with the world and the people that have been made from oil.

This strong equation of energy and modernity has two consequences. First, it necessitates a fundamental reconsideration of our understanding of the forces that have given shape to modernity. Our dominant narrative of the modern combines the expansion of rights and freedoms, the advent of scientific insights and technological innovations, and the ballooning of capitalist economies, holding these very different spheres of social life together under the sign of “progress” in a powerful way. The work of critical theory in the humanities and social sciences has been to pull apart the clunky (albeit effective) apparatus of an enlightened modernity, exposing the multiple fictions of this narrative and bringing to light the truths of the modern buried beneath the shiny drama of progress that proclaims that each year is better (richer, bigger, freer) than the one before it. That rights and freedoms—when and where they exist at all—have to take place through a process of Kantian maturation, rather than being enabled all at once, points to the limits of a liberalism born in the Industrial Revolution rather than speaking to its supposed self-evidence; and as critics of colonialism and postcolonialism have repeatedly shown, the progress and growth of the global North have been made possible only by centuries of exploitation of the people and resources of the global South.

As the contributions to this book highlight, these invaluable, important critiques of modernity have nevertheless left a key element out of our understanding of the modern—energy. Economic growth, as well as the expansion of access to the goods and services we have come to associate with the experience of modernity, is a *direct* consequence of the massive expansion of energy use by human

communities, especially (though not only) in the global North;² the capacities and freedoms that are connected to the modern, from the opening up of leisure time to expectations of almost unfettered mobility, are similarly the consequence of a world awash in the kilocalories generated primarily by fossil fuels. While the story of modernity isn't reducible to the use of energy on an ever-greater scale, an account of its developments, transgressions, and contradictions that fails to address the role played by energy in shaping its infrastructures (cities designed around automobiles) and its subjectivities (mobile consumers with near-infinite powers—such as communicating with someone across the globe), and everything else in between, can't help but misrepresent the forces and processes shaping historical development, especially over the past two centuries. That access to and the struggle over energy have had a role in shaping modern geopolitics is evident; witness the protracted struggle over power in Africa and the Middle East and the role played by access to oil in shaping conflict in World War II.³ What is less evident, however, is the degree to which the energy riches of the past two centuries have influenced our relationships to our bodies, molded human social relations, and impacted the imperatives of even those varied activities we group together under the term “culture.”⁴

In the modern era, the rapid expansion of humans on the planet, from an estimated population of 1 billion in 1800 to 7.3 billion in 2016, has been facilitated by (perhaps even animated by) growth in the availability and accessibility of energy. And these increases in human population and energy consumption have had, in turn, a decisive impact on the state of the environment.⁵ The second consequence of adding energy to our accounts of the modern experience is that it offers us a new vantage point on global warming and environmental crisis. One of the principle causes of global warming has been the emission of CO₂ produced by the burning of large quantities of fossil fuels. The problem of global warming is, at its core, an energy problem. The link between energy use and global warming may seem to be an obvious-enough point: the operations of industrial capitalism and the civilization it has brought into existence have had a deleterious impact on the global environment. It makes sense that there would be a focus in environmental studies on shifts in how we employ fossil fuels (e.g., switching from coal and oil to natural gas) or on the transitions away from fossil fuels to other forms of renewable energy. Too often, however, these changes are envisioned as narrowly technical ones. Much of the contemporary discussion about energy in relation to the environment imagines energy as an input into modern social and material processes that doesn't alter their character or nature very much, if at all: it's seen as little more than the gas that runs the engine of a society whose shape and form are largely independent of it.⁶ But just as energy is essential to a fuller understanding of modernity, its critical role in shaping existing social structures, lived and material infrastructures, and even cultural practices points to those sites in which changes will *have* to take place if we are to address global warming. Even if it envisions difficult, large-scale shifts in the dominant source of energy, the existing language of energy transition is most often defensive, insisting on changes in input in order to preserve global capitalism and its systems of property and profit.⁷ The texts in *Energy Humanities* move beyond the limits of such affirmations of the present state of things and speak instead to the widespread social, cultural, and political changes that are necessary if we are to truly address global warming and its multiple consequences.

As an increasing number of researchers have insisted, the challenge of addressing global warming isn't fundamentally a scientific or technological one.⁸ Environmental scientists have played a crucial role in identifying the causes and consequences of global warming, including projections of what might occur if we fail to keep increases in global temperature to less than 2.0°C, as it appears we are poised to do.⁹ However, the next steps in addressing environmental crisis will have to come from the humanities and social sciences—from those disciplines that have long attended to the intricacies of social processes, the nature and capacity of political change, and the circulation and organization of symbolic meaning through culture. This constitutes an enormous challenge and is one that we have barely begun to take up. What we need to do is, first, grasp the full intricacies of our imbrication with energy systems (and with fossil fuels in particular), and second, map out other ways of being, behaving, and belonging in relation to both old and new forms of energy. The task is nothing less than to reimagine modernity, and in the process to figure ourselves as different kinds of beings than the ones who have built a civilization on the promises, intensities, and fantasies of a particularly dirty, destructive form of energy. It is a large enough challenge that many engaged in research in the energy humanities wonder whether we have the conceptual, affective, material, and collective capacities to take it on.

The refigurations to which the work of energy humanities draws attention go beyond changes to driving habits or the establishment of stricter policies on emissions and the energy efficiency of new homes. The more difficult changes are those that are harder to see, name, or grasp, those zones of experience and expectation generated by our energy systems that we take as equivalent to normal life—what might well be described as the energy dimension of the “spontaneous consent” of hegemony. The sharpest critics working today on the concatenation of oil and culture explore the depths of being-in-relation to our era's dominant form of energy. “Energy systems are shot through with largely unexamined cultural values, with ethical and ecological consequences,” writes Stephanie LeMenager.¹⁰ Frederick Buell argues that “it has become impossible not to feel that oil at least partially determines cultural production and reproduction on many levels.” “Nowadays,” he writes, “energy is more than a constraint; it (especially oil) remains an essential (and, to many, *the* essential) prop underneath humanity's material and symbolic cultures.”¹¹ The degree to which energy has shaped modern forms of life and ways of being means that the energy humanities have to be seen as more than just a specialist field of study—a subset of environmental studies, for instance. The claim being made by this volume is a much stronger one. “The mansion of modern freedoms stands on an ever-expanding base of fossil fuel use,” writes Dipesh Chakrabarty. “Most of our freedoms are energy intensive.”¹² Anyone interested in understanding the material, social, and symbolic operations of an issue as important as (for instance) human freedoms *must* take into account the significance of energy in enabling the very possibility of these freedoms, and must certainly do so if they want to grapple with their continuation or extension in an era of environmental challenges and diminishing energy resources.¹³ Every evocation of Rousseau or Jefferson today needs to be accompanied by information on per capita energy use and knowledge about the sources and implications of this energy configuration for the operations of politics at every scale, from personal politics to geopolitics.¹⁴

Energy humanities is a burgeoning field, with a huge amount of research developing over the past decade.¹⁵ The work collected here emerges out of the specific coordinates of our contemporary environmental crises and struggles over the use and abuse of energy that have made the broad social significance of energy increasingly difficult to avoid. Like any new area of research, recent explorations of energy and society build on earlier studies that have addressed the social and cultural import of fossil fuels. Lewis Mumford's influential *Technics and Civilization* (1934) was among the first books to attend to the social impacts of shifts in energy, recognizing the broad changes produced by (for example) the movement from coal-fired steam power to the electric motors that were emerging in the 1930s.¹⁶ In "Energy and the Evolution of Culture" (1943), anthropologist Leslie White linked cultural development directly to the amount of energy available to human communities; his attention to the link between the ever-greater use of fossil fuels and the expansion of social systems was repeated in anthropological studies following the 1973 oil crisis, and again in the past few years in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis.¹⁷ In early environmental studies, E. J. Schumacher's influential *Small Is Beautiful: A Study of Economics As If People Mattered* (1973) begins by noting the short- and long-term consequences of the ever-expanding use of fossil fuels—a source of fuel that isn't renewable, generates pollution, and reinforces capitalism's insistence that "bigger is better."¹⁸ The connections that have been repeatedly drawn between the growth in the size of human communities and the growth in their economies has a long tradition of critical analysis—another work we might mention in this vein is Jean-Claude Debeir, Jean-Paul Deléage, and Daniel Hémery's *In the Servitude of Power: Energy and Civilization through the Ages* (1986)¹⁹—although one whose force and effectivity have ebbed and waned along with the price of energy and the difficulty of keeping the social import of fossil fuels front and center for academics and publics alike.

What distinguishes contemporary critical attention to energy and fossil fuels is the growing recognition that we now fully inhabit the difficult circumstances of which Mumford, White, and other critics forewarned. As the energy source around which we have shaped our social and economic development, the fact that fossil fuels are in ever-greater demand at a moment when there are anxieties about their long-term availability, as well as growing environmental challenges to their necessity and legitimacy, means that energy is on our minds as never before. While there are fluctuations in the demand for oil at any given moment, even in the best-case scenario outlined by the World Energy Council, we can expect to use 27% more energy in 2050 than today.²⁰ At the same time, the most recent report from the Emission Database for Global Atmosphere Research suggests that annual global emissions of CO₂ have increased *significantly* since the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992, an agreement whose aim was to have had the opposite outcome.²¹ The difficult coordinates of our own circumstances do not stop there. Access to energy is a key component of development. Those countries whose citizens currently use significantly less energy than the average European or North American have expectations of using more, so as to gain the capacities and opportunities that attend the expanded use of energy.²² While some of this energy will come in the form of renewables, the infrastructures and mechanisms supporting global modernity demand the use of fossil fuels, which means that, in large part, the development of the global South requires the

increased use of fossil fuels.²³ In the tension established between North and South, and between oil producers and consumers, the opening decades of the twenty-first century are unwittingly establishing the conditions for an expansion and intensification of the geopolitical conflict around energy—something about which a global political and economic elite seem aware, but about which they seem inclined to do relatively little.

This gap between knowledge and action is important in how we figure the next steps in environmental politics. Despite ample evidence to the contrary, there continues to be belief and expectation that scientific evidence will, of its own accord, communicate—and hence trigger—the social and political changes needed to address climate change. This is one of the hoped-for outcomes of such expansive collections of scientific expertise as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), whose fifth iteration brought together the work of thousands of scientists and reported that it is “extremely likely” (95%–100% probability) that humans are the dominant cause of global warming. And yet, as more and more scholars are coming to recognize, quantification of global environmental threats through scientific research has, on its own, “failed to effect anything resembling the radical change likely to be required in order to avert environmental catastrophe.”²⁴ The frustrating impasses that have appeared in naming environmental problems have characterized the communication and analysis of energy as well. In *Carbon Nation: Fossil Fuels in the Making of American Culture* (2014), historian Bob Johnson remarks that “we industrial peoples have preferred to keep our energy dependencies out of sight.”²⁵ One of the issues explored by many of the contributions in *Energy Humanities* is the structure and function of what might be termed “energy epistemologies.”²⁶ Not only energy in general but also fossil fuels in particular have been surprisingly hard to figure—narratively, visually, conceptually—as a central element of the modern. Petroleum firms have been among the biggest companies in the world since the modern advent of oil, and they remain so even in an era of computers and social media. An alarming array of everyday goods, without which we might find it hard to live, are made up of petroleum by-products.²⁷ And the geopolitics of the modern era—and especially of the period following World War II—have been shaped by the struggle over access to and control over fossil fuels. Despite this, recent critical scholarship has had to account for the ways in which fossil fuels have managed to hide in plain sight/site, evading inclusion in our economic calculations as much as in our literary fictions.²⁸

Recent film, fiction, and visual arts have also explored the character of our energy epistemologies, with the aim of grasping the curious invisibility of such a powerful substance as oil, while also trying to render fuels nameable, readable, and visible. One of the takeaways of this volume is a broader understanding of the peculiar, if hitherto unremarked, philosophical characteristics of fossil fuels, and perhaps, too, of the dominant energy source of any given era.²⁹ If it has been so difficult to grasp and grapple with so important an element, it is in many respects because fossil fuels are saturated into every aspect of our social substance. The dark black, inky liquid that we sometimes encounter as oil is in fact a ruse: it gives away this obvious sign of itself, dead and harmless, so that it might all the more powerfully inhabit and shape the modern under the cover and with the force of its own darkness.

How might we use the critical insights provided by research in energy humanities to develop a

different relationship to energy, to fossil fuels? One beginning point is to consider how we have imagined our relation to history.³⁰ We've tended to allow history to just happen to us. In the modern period, this is in part due to our faith in the forward and upward pull of technology, and in part because the calculus of progress insists that we will, by the forward march of time alone, of necessity be better off than our predecessors. This is not to say that history hasn't also been shaped and guided by those with a vested interest in retaining or attaining power, and equally by those who have wished to challenge and unnerve social, political, and economic privilege. What we haven't done—or perhaps haven't had to do before now—is take on the collective challenge of planning what comes next, and in the fullest way possible.

In the context of a now almost universally accepted faith in free markets, the suggestion of something akin to central planning can't help but invoke images—and fears—of failed, clunky, Soviet-era plans to increase collective prosperity and reshape subjectivities at the same time. Yet it is difficult to see how we might engage in the energy transition we need without plans that bring together scientific knowledge about the causes and consequences of global warming with social and cultural insights into the shape and character of our oil subjectivities. To date, the hope has been that market forces will, if managed properly, address the self-same problems they have generated. This has been, in large measure, the official response to climate change, as represented by the Kyoto Agreement and the follow-up series of international climate summits that resulted in the UN Climate Change Conference in Paris in 2015. Assigning a cost to CO₂ emissions might well help to slow down the increasing warmth of the atmosphere, at least somewhat. But placing one's faith in environmental change in a market system built around growth and profit, endless expansion, and the bottom line, and one, furthermore, premised in a fundamental way on disavowing or negating the value of natural systems, is questionable, to say the least. At the heart of the energy humanities is a political project unlike any we've encountered before. There may have been coal capitalism and oil capitalism; there *cannot* be solar or wind capitalism.³¹ As we figure out how to no longer be oil subjects inhabiting destructive petrocultures (and it is worth remembering that the Soviet system was as much a petroculture as the capitalist variant of modernity), we will need to undertake a sociopolitical revolution that is both necessary and unavoidable.

But what will that revolution look like?³² Energy provides us with a vector to newly imagine societies defined by an equality of opportunities and capacities—communities in which, for the first time in history, we are always already attuned to our relations to natural systems. For instance, what if our political freedoms were to now come with a material component—an equity of kilocalories or British thermal units (Btu) assigned to each individual, determined in part by how much energy the planet could bear? Are there ways in which newfound attention to energy might reinvigorate our politics, allowing us to position our material demands and impact on the planet at the core of social equity?

The revolution that energy could produce would need to attend to more than just the sharing of kilocalories. In “Nature and Revolution,” Herbert Marcuse writes, “Our world emerges not only in the pure form of time and space, but also, and *simultaneously*, as a totality of sensuous qualities—

object not only of the eye (synopsis) but of *all* human senses (hearing, smelling, touching, tasting). It is this qualitative, elementary, unconscious, or rather preconscious, constitution of the world of experience, it is this primary experience itself which must change radically if social change is to be radical, qualitative change.”³³ Critical theory has sought to draw our attention to the multiple ways in which we are other than we imagine ourselves to be—for instance, as revealed by Marx’s critique of capitalism, Freud’s analysis of the liberal subject, and Nietzsche’s assault on morality and philosophy. To this, the essays in this volume add an account of the energy unconscious. Our everyday practices and activities have been shaped by energy in a way that we have never fully understood. If we are to be able to address the environmental challenges we currently face, we need to understand that something like “primary experience” in Marcuse’s account has been constituted by fossil fuels. If one aspect of our revolutionary transition will concern social uses of energy, another will refigure the coordinates of our primary experience, doing away with (for instance) the fundamental divide between human and nature on which the modern has been built.

To move forward, our critical work will also have to push past our inherited categories of analysis and action. Bruno Latour has noted, for example, that the critique of Enlightenment rationality that once fueled critical theory has inadvertently played into the hands of climate change deniers and racial essentialists.³⁴ Other scholars have noted how our epistemic tools for revolution and redemption are deeply entangled with the magnitudes of energy promised by fossil fuels.³⁵ Still more unsettling questions have been raised by materialist feminist scholars who argue that even terms like “Anthropocene” can reproduce the conditions of anthropocentrism they purport to analyze. Stacy Alaimo writes, for example, that we should consider how easily Anthropocene “becomes enlisted in all too familiar formulations, epistemologies, and defensive maneuvers—modes of knowing and being that are utterly incapable of adequately responding to the cataclysmic complexities of the anthropocene itself.” “Anthropocene” even contains a “vener of species pride” in its geo(onto)logical formulation, which is figured around an implicit sense that no other species could affect the lifeworld of all other species. And Claire Colebrook asks whether even the posthuman embrace of living systems might not be “a way of avoiding the extent to which man is a theoretical animal, a myopically and malevolently self-enclosed machine whose world he will always view as present for his own edification.”³⁶

One generative response to such concerns, as Donna Haraway has recently suggested, is to further diversify our critical conceptual resources for interrogating our current ecological condition—engaging our situation in the Plantationocene, Capitalocene, and even Chthulucene as well—while also resolutely committing ourselves to “join forces to reconstitute refuges, to make possible partial and robust biological-cultural-political-technological recuperation and recomposition, which must include mourning irreversible losses.”³⁷ We view the rise of energy humanities as part of this project of recuperation and recomposition. As fragile rather than omnipotent creatures, *Homo sapiens* have long sought to harness other forms of energy to magnify and extend their capacities. As that harnessing intensified with the mastery of the enormous energetic potentiality of fossil fuels, human industry accelerated, creating more and more machines, institutions, expectations, and practices dependent on new energy magnitudes.³⁸ That acceleration has, as discussed above, led us to the brink of ecological

catastrophe. Not all humans share equal culpability in this process, of course. We must interrogate the “we” that is the subject of climatological and ecological responsibility. Only certain populations in the world drove the globalization of fuel-intensive life, and they did so through centuries of colonizing violence. More than that, northern white masculinity continues to epitomize the apex species logic of entitlement that has brought us to our current situation; the Anthropocene has, in other words, always been the Andropocene.

Energy humanities thus retains a deep kinship and intimate conversation with environmental humanities, particularly with the pathbreaking efforts of materialist feminist thinkers to deliver new critical intellectual resources for understanding and remediating the biotic, social, cultural, and political dimensions of human and nonhuman life. The point of energy humanities is not to constitute a new explanatory causal monopoly (in the manner of Leslie White’s argument that all life can now be reduced to energy) that can then be used to dominate other analytics into submission. The point is rather to turn phenomena such as global warming, species extinction, and environmental degradation inside out, so as to reveal how the use and abuse of energy have contributed to the making of what Anna Tsing terms the “damaged planet.” We wish to shed light on the fuel apparatus of modernity, which is all too often invisible or subterranean, but which pumps and seeps into the groundwaters of politics, culture, institutions, and knowledge in unexpected ways. Moreover, energy humanities aspires to provide a speculative impulse as well as critical diagnostics. The works included here by artists and writers such as Margaret Atwood, Paolo Bacigalupi, and Marina Zurkow schematize the futures that beckon if our current trajectories remain uninflected. They also probe and surface the contradictions of our contemporary condition, materializing and communicating them in new and provocative ways. There is a place for sober criticism and discussion in the enterprise of energy humanities; there is also a place for surreal vision and wild imagination. It will take all the capacities of the arts and humanities to help transform this modernity. We hope only that this volume contributes a step in that direction, toward conversations and collaborations we’ve long waited to have with one another about what we want this century to become.

Notes

1. Even in the United States, which once remained an exception, a survey released in October 2015 indicated that 70% of Americans believe the science behind global warming—the highest since 2008. See Emma Howard, “Rising Numbers of Americans Believe Climate Science, Poll Shows,” *Guardian*, October 13, 2015. Available at <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/oct/13/rising-numbers-of-american-believe-climate-science-poll-shows>.

2. See, for instance, Edward Renshaw, “The Substitution of Inanimate Energy for Animal Power,” *Journal of Political Economy* 71, no. 3 (1963): 284–92; William McNeill, *Something New under the Sun: An Environmental History of the Twentieth-Century World* (New York: Norton, 2000); and Astrid Kander, Paolo Malanima, and Paul Warde, *Power to the People: Energy in Europe over the Last Five Centuries* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014). The last makes a strong case that, without the energy available from fossil fuels, modern economic growth would have been impossible.

3. On the latter, see Daniel Yergin, *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money, and Power* (New York: Free Press, 1991).

4. See, for instance, Imre Szeman’s claim that “instead of challenging the fiction of surplus—as we might have hoped or expected—literature participates in it just as surely as every other social narrative in the contemporary era. Ever more narrative, ever more signification, ever more grasping after social meaning: what literature shares with the Enlightenment and capitalism is the implicit longing for the plus beyond what is.” Imre Szeman, “Literature and Energy Futures,” *PMLA* 126, no. 2 (March 2011): 324. In a similar fashion, Frederick Buell has mapped how a dialectic of exuberance and catastrophe characteristic of modernity has found its way into culture: “In popular and also high cultural discourse, people’s bodies and psyches are refigured as oil-electric-energized systems, and avant-garde

artists become the experts who most aggressively convert these energetics into new styles, new aesthetics, new poetics.” Frederick Buell, “A Short History of Oil Cultures: Or, the Marriage of Catastrophe and Exuberance,” *Journal of American Studies* 46, no. 2 (2012): 286–87.

5. In its 2015 *Oil Market Report*, the International Energy Agency estimated global demand for oil for the fourth quarter of the year to be 95.47 million barrels per day. In 1980, by comparison, total world oil consumption was 59.93 million barrels per day—a 63% increase over this period. Over 1 year, this constitutes a difference of more than 13 billion barrels of oil.

6. While the work of Vaclav Smil on oil and fossil fuels is exemplary, for him, too, energy has relatively little impact on society and culture. For Smil, “the amount of energy at a society’s disposal puts clear limits on the overall scope of action” and little more. “Timeless literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, and music,” he writes, “show no correlation with advances in energy consumption.” Vaclav Smil, *Energy in World History* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1994), 252.

7. Jonathon Porritt’s *The World We Made: Alex McKay’s Story from 2050* (2013) offers a prime example of this defensive view of transition. Porritt narrates a prospective end to the age of oil via a carefully managed global retreat from the use of 76 million barrels per day in 2017 to only 4 million in 2048. In Porritt’s story governments react (all of a sudden) to a 2016 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, as well as to the growing cost of oil (!), and begin to actively make use of alternative energy sources such as solar power and biomass, as well as substituting algae-based materials for the “plastics, pharmaceuticals, paints, lubricants and so on” (171). “Of all of the projections I’ve used in this book,” Porritt writes, “I suspect it’s this one [the drop in energy use] that may cause more eyebrows to be raised than any other” (176).

In Porritt’s account, the global shift away from oil is driven by the increasing cost of getting it out of the ground—a fact that in the real world seems to have had relatively little impact on oil production, and certainly not to the degree he suggests. Porritt views the infrastructure of the “world that we made” as being able to sustain a transition to other forms of energy over a short period of time without any major disruptions in global capitalism, the size of populations, transportation systems, or other elements of the infrastructure of modernity. The aim of the view from the future he offers is to highlight energy input changes that need to be made in order to *sustain* existing politico-economic forms and the beliefs and practices that accompany them, rather than drawing attention to their implications for both environmental futures and social justice. Indeed, in Porritt’s view of things, even if oil is an incredibly important fuel source, there is in many respects nothing special about it. It is a source of energy—one of many such sources—and while its impact on the form and character of contemporary life might well be large, it has not played an especially determinate role in shaping modern life. Rather, for Porritt (as for many others who try to outthink or think past the limits of oil availability), oil is a neutral substance that can be replaced in time by other forms of energy; the task of environmentalists is not to address the expectations and structures of modernity that are enabled by and also sustain oil cultures, but to work to generate new energy inputs so that modernity can continue along unabated. See Jonathon Porritt, *The World We Made: Alex McKay’s Story from 2050* (London: Phaidon, 2013).

8. See, for instance, Andrew J. Hoffman, *How Culture Shapes the Climate Change Debate* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015), one of an increasing number of books making this case.

9. See Robin McKie, “World Will Pass Crucial 2C Global Warming Limit, Experts Warn,” *Observer*, October 10, 2015. Available at <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/oct/10/climate-2c-global-warming-target-fail>.

10. Stephanie LeMenager, *Living Oil: Petroleum and Culture in the American Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 4.

11. Buell, “Short History of Oil Cultures,” 274.

12. Dipesh Chakrabarty, “The Climate of History: Four Theses,” *Critical Inquiry* 35 (2009): 208.

13. See Ian Morris, *Foragers, Farmers and Fossil Fuels* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015).

14. Stephanie LeMenager notes, “I became frustrated while writing *Living Oil* by how much of what I think of as progressive modernity—feminism, environmentalism even, as it has been expressed in the U.S. in particular—is actually tied to assumptions, but also objects and paths, that have been created by fossil fuel energy.” The politics of energy reaches across the political spectrum, as well as across scales of the political. See Brent Ryan Bellamy, Stephanie LeMenager, and Imre Szeman, “When Energy Is the Focus: Aesthetics, Politics, and Pedagogy: A Conversation,” *Postmodern Culture*, forthcoming.

15. In addition to those in this volume, contributors to the field include Lynn Badia, Gretchen Bakke, Ross Barrett, Ericka Beckman, Brent Bellamy, Amanda Boetzkes, Frederick Buell, Cara Daggett, Mona Damluji, Jeff Diamanti, Danine Farquharson, Sarah Fredericks, John Bellamy Foster, David Haberman, Dan Hackbarth, Jacob Darwin Hamblin, Peter Hitchcock, Matthew Huber, Naomi Klein, Kairn Klieman, Toby Lee, Jenny Lin, Ernst Logar, Andreas Malm, Arthur Mason, Ellen McLarney, John-Andrew McNeish, Marty Melosi, James Nisbet, Wendy Parker, Claire Pentecost, Fiona Polack, Doug Rogers, Peter Shulman, Rebecca Slayton, Janet Stewart, Michael Truscello, Ilana Xinos, Eric Winsberg, Daniel Worden, and Natasha Zaretsky.

16. Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1934).

17. Leslie White, “Energy and the Evolution of Culture,” *American Anthropologist* 45, no. 3 (1943): 335–56. For an overview of the history of energy in anthropology, see Dominic Boyer, “Energopower: An Introduction,” *Anthropology Quarterly* 87, no. 2 (2014): 309–33.

18. E. J. Schumacher, *Small Is Beautiful: Economics As If People Mattered* (New York: Perennial, 2010).
19. Jean-Claude Debeir, Jean-Paul Deléage, and Daniel Hémerly, *In the Servitude of Power: Energy and Civilization through the Ages*, trans. John Barzman (London: Zed Books, 1991).
20. World Energy Council, *World Energy Insight 2013* (World Energy Council, 2013), <https://www.worldenergy.org/publications/2013/world-energy-insight-2013/>.
21. Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, *Trends in Global CO₂ Emissions: 2014 Report* (The Hague, 2014).
22. The figures detailing per capita energy usage offer a stark reminder of the planet's discrepancies. The US Energy Information Administration reports that in 2012, a resident of the United States used 313 million Btu of energy per capita; in Haiti, the figure is 3.13—a 100-fold difference.
23. See, e.g., Akhil Gupta, “An Anthropology of Electricity from the Global South,” *Cultural Anthropology* 30, no. 4 (2015); and John-Andrew McNeish, Axel Borchgrevink, and Owen Logan, eds., *Contested Powers: The Politics of Energy and Development in Latin America* (London: Zed Books, 2015).
24. Sverker Sörlin, “The Changing Nature of Environmental Expertise,” *Eurozine*, November 19, 2013, n.p.
25. Bob Johnson, *Carbon Nation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2014), xxix.
26. For an elaboration of the idea of energy epistemologies, see Imre Szeman, “How to Know about Oil: Energy Epistemologies and Political Futures,” *Journal of Canadian Studies / Revue d'études canadiennes* 47, no. 3 (2013): 145–68.
27. The list of products made from petroleum includes ink, tires, vitamin capsules, eyeglasses, footballs, detergents, parachutes, fertilizers, panty hose, aspirin, dyes, yarns, nail polish, plastics, dentures, bandages, linoleum, hair coloring, surfboards—in a word: everything.
28. For a discussion of energy and economics, see Philip Mirowski, *More Heat than Light: Economics as Social Physics, Physics as Nature's Economics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and Timothy Mitchell, *Carbon Democracy* (New York: Verso, 2011). For a discussion of energy and literature, see Amitav Ghosh, “Petrofiction,” *New Republic*, March 2, 1992, 29–34; and Patricia Yaeger et al., “Literature in the Ages of Wood, Tallow, Coal, Whale-Oil, Gasoline, Atomic Power and Other Energy Sources,” *PMLA* 126, no. 2 (2011): 305–26.
29. Antti Salminen and Tere Vadén, *Energy and Experience: An Essay in Nafthology* (Chicago: MCM Prime, 2015).
30. For an elaboration of the complex relation of energy to history, see Jennifer Wenzel, introduction to *Fueling Culture*, ed. Imre Szeman, Jennifer Wenzel, and Patricia Yaeger (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016).
31. As Daniel Tanuro points out, “generalized commodity production has brought humanity so close to the abyss that a new long wave of growth—whether ‘green,’ ‘selective,’ or ‘left-wing’—would result in a dreadful climate shift” (100). Tanuro argues that the demands of energy transition and global warming necessitate that Marxists, too, have to abandon productivist accounts of development in imagining post-fossil fuel societies and economies. Daniel Tanuro, “Marxism, Energy, and Ecology: The Moment of Truth,” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 21, no. 4 (2010): 89–101.
32. Dominic Boyer, “Revolutionary Infrastructure,” in *The Promise of Infrastructure*, ed. Hannah Appel, Nikhil Anand, and Akhil Gupta (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, forthcoming).
33. Herbert Marcuse, “Nature and Revolution,” in *The Essential Marcuse: Selected Writings of Philosopher and Social Critic Herbert Marcuse*, ed. Andrew Feenberg and William Leiss (Boston: Beacon, 2007), 237.
34. Bruno Latour, “Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam?,” *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2 (2004): 225–48.
35. Boyer, “Revolutionary Infrastructure”; Mitchell, *Carbon Democracy*.
36. Claire Colebrook, “Not Symbiosis, Not Now: Why Anthropogenic Climate Change Is Not Really Human,” *Oxford Literary Review* 34, no. 2 (2012): 198–99.
37. Donna Haraway, “Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin,” *Environmental Humanities* 6 (2015): 159–65.
38. Karen Pinkus, *Fuel: A Speculative Dictionary* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016).

Another Storm Is Coming

Judy Natal

In the face of Superstorm Sandy that blasted in on the heels of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, artist Judy Natal had to admit that the optimistic beliefs that guided her previous future-focused, environmentally driven work, *Future Perfect*, had been rapidly evaporating. Her belief that we would do the right thing and make the right environmental choices had been replaced by a visceral, ever-present anxiety about the future. *Another Storm Is Coming* is a premonition of a much darker future. Full of ominous warnings and a steadily escalating sense of foreboding, it tracks the impending disaster that is unfolding as environmental issues become more and more pressing and the need to act more immediate.

The land and water between New Orleans and Houston, commonly referred to as the Energy Coast, is a watery mirage created by human intervention and land use and devastated by hurricanes, flooding, loss of wetlands, and oil spills. It is also the “eye of the needle,” where oil production and transportation in the U.S. reach their zenith. The area literally floats—a “terra infirma” that is liquid and fluidly unstable as a result of hurricanes, flooding, loss of wetlands, and the rise of the oceans as well as disastrous oil spills that have devastated both animal and human ecosystems

Natal explores both the economic boom and tragic events that forever unite these two cities, while imagining the future potential for environmental disaster that continues to exist on the Energy Coast. Drawing lines between Houston’s Astrodome and the Superdome in New Orleans to demarcate the Gulf Coast, Natal eventually focuses on Galveston Bay and Port Arthur, Texas, among the largest oil ports in the country, and Cameron Parish, Louisiana, where coastline erosion, loss of wetlands, saltwater intrusion, and offshore drilling activities continue to show the effects of multiple hurricanes that devastated these areas. She commemorates the tenth anniversary of Hurricane Katrina and reflects upon our stubborn insistence to ignore all the warning signs of climate change.

Commissioned by Rice University’s Center for Energy and Environmental Research in the Human Sciences (CENHS), *Another Storm Is Coming* was exhibited in conjunction with FotoFest 2016 International Biennial, whose theme was *Changing Circumstances: Looking at the Future of the Planet*.

Judy Natal: www.judynatal.com; *Another Storm Is Coming*

CENHS: <http://culturesofenergy.com/>

Institutional Critique

Amy De'Ath

poem based on an essay by Clint Burnham & other sentiments

If you ever walked down a street and
saw some disaster porn I will tell you
it was

Burtynsky

Never mind the sublime sugar-daddy
journalistic for the most part
yet still expressed crudely
as I want to show:

Huge Californian romance
Monumental & manmade
the aesthetic & the repulsive
and three times gushing
I've totally liberated myself
using a self-conscious technique
and a release from gravity
 release from form
and with respect to this very
fantasy of liberation and
fetishistic disavowal

I will tell you:

That art journalism unwittingly
raises the same Achilles' heel of
the artwork in the act of praising it
 like Mama raises the bar;
That we are compelled to progress
 toward the illiteracy of the future
And you can enjoy a privileged gaze
 on the despoliation of Mama
free of didacticism,
 unchained from politics,

no one will hold it against you
but against will hold it so

fuck you negative sublime
ah you toxic sublime
fuck you technological sublime

ah you inverted sublime
fuck you industrial sublime

Burtynsky I told you I'm not
trying to editorialize, this is not
an indictment of the industry, this is
 what it is?

we are compelled to progress
to a dry toxic wasteland
Burtynsky I'm one of the foot soldiers
in the war on sustainability

Evidently Burtynsky wants his cake
And eat it.

Burtynsky eat your cake.
Now: apologize.

I've totally librettoed myself
such a horrific fear of dismemberment
Ah, breakdown in Kantian categories
Hmm, terrifying snowslide
Beautiful objects, horrible scenes
where obsolescence is obsolete
a screen against the abyss of desire
a densified oil filter which as
 in a photograph imagines for you

well fuck you tar sands
ah you tar sands
as the plague of scale
warps around our feet
then a poem purports to be progressive
 political in any way
anyway it could be brute presence
infinitesimally small marks
stuplimity or
rubbish &

mere middlebrow kitsch

Note: Some of the language and ideas in this poem are drawn from Clint Burnham's essay "Photography from Benjamin to Žižek, via the Petrochemical Sublime of Edward Burtynsky."

Energy and Modernity: Histories and Futures

One of the most generative insights emerging from the work of energy humanities is the extent to which the affordances of modern life depend on certain magnitudes, forms, infrastructures, and cultures of energy. There is, for example, scarcely a modern convenience that does not require electricity for its operation. Given that that electrical power is supplied throughout most of the world by a majority mix of fossil and nuclear fuels, our every experience and practice of modern living is enabled, in a fundamental way, by particular fuel infrastructures. Fuel and electrical dependency is so banal in its omnipresence that it receives strikingly little public attention and commentary. But in an era of fossil fuel–induced climate change, our energetic conditions of possibility are becoming increasingly difficult to ignore. A kind of “energy unconscious” forms in which the desire to retain and/or increase our energy-intensive modernity grinds against a suppressed awareness of the impossibility of maintaining our energetic status quo.

Part of the critical work of energy humanities is to sound the depths of this energy unconscious, probing the symptoms and effects of various modernities and their entanglements with fuel and electricity. At the same time, especially in the context of literature and the arts, we find a parallel speculative impulse—often narrated in the future perfect mode of “what will have been”—to imagine how modern life might be reinvented for a post-carbon era. This first section explores these two dimensions of energy humanities through three sets of texts. The first collection (Chakrabarty, Szeman, and Nye) reflects on the conjuncture of energy and modernity and explores its implications for our critical-analytical practice in the humanities. The second group of texts (Neruda, Calvino, and Collis) consists of three works of literature, each of which unpacks a distinct and pivotal moment in fossil fueled modernity. Finally, four works (Scheer, Oreskes/Conway, Bacigalupi, and Atwood) engage speculatively with energy futures reimagining utopian and dystopian trajectories extending forward from our present condition.

Dipesh Chakrabarty’s already-classic essay “The Climate of History” explores how humanist practices of historiography might respond to the geological recognition of the Anthropocene, a period that challenges conventional distinctions between “human history” and “natural history” and the separation of the historical trajectory of *Homo sapiens* from the timelines of other species. Chakrabarty argues ultimately that “climate change poses for us a question of a human collectivity, an us, pointing to a figure of the universal that escapes our capacity to experience the world. It is more like a universal that arises from a shared sense of a catastrophe” and thus, for him, evidence of a contra-Hegelian “negative universal history” that can help to decenter the figure of “the human” in world history.

Imre Szeman's "System Failure" pursues the inextricable linkage between oil and capital and, in light of discourses on climate change and peak oil, assays dominant narratives of petrocapitalism to better understand public reckoning with oil (its use or its end) as a form of disaster. Strategic realist narratives, Szeman writes, hold at their core the "blunt need for nations to protect themselves from energy disruptions." Techno-utopian narratives meanwhile cathect scientific and technological forms of salvation. Finally, eco-apocalyptic narratives take the oil-capital nexus head-on but predict an inexorably grim future. Szeman concludes, provocatively, that the problem is not that the end of oil can't be imagined. Rather, "these discourses are unable to mobilize or produce any response to a disaster we know is a direct result of the law of capitalism—limitless accumulation—it is easy to see that nature will end before capital." He thus advocates a new practice of political economic criticism that takes humanity's planetary impact much more fully into account.

Finally, David Nye's "The Great White Way" takes us back to the dawn of the "electrical sublime," revealing through fine-grained social history how electrification transformed both the lifeworld of America's cities and the cultural imagination of its artists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Spectacular lighting changed the temporality of urban life and made dark spaces seem drab, indeed gloomy. Artificial illumination became a crucial technology of national imagining, a "white magic" whose contrasting shadows became home to new depths of secrecy and depravity in the aesthetics of *noir*.¹

Pablo Neruda's poem "Standard Oil Co." is a child of this time, documenting the internationalization of the oil industry and a new apparatus of global power. Its poetics play with the forces unleashed from "subterranean estates, / and dead years." From a world of "sinister depth" a new form of dominion leaks out from oil wells, spreading across social and natural landscapes. When the arteries of oil begin to flow, Standard Oil arrives, "with its checks and its guns, / with its governments and its prisoners." Its dark legions then reorganize political power, remaking the fates of persons and nations, uniting a world under one "petroliferous moon." Neruda's poem captures the "resource curse" of fossil fuel development decades before that language began to circulate in the human sciences.

Italo Calvino's 1974 short story "The Petrol Pump" captures the ethos of a different moment, the oil shocks of the 1970s, when cornucopian fantasies of endless oil first became unsettled. Calvino's narrator is invested in fossil fuel's engine of modern life—the accelerated mobility to go wherever one wishes, even when there seems no place to go. Low on fuel, desperately searching for an open petrol pump, he feels anxieties of dispossession and the compression of time: "experiencing simultaneously the rise, apex, and decline of the so-called opulent societies, the same way a rotating drill pushes in an instant from one millennium to the next." His discovery of a new self-service pump proves a momentary revelation until he realizes the banality of its automation. It is only when a young woman mistakes him for a pump attendant that he rediscovers his vitality in the gift of petrol. "I want her to understand that this is an extreme act of love on my part, I want to involve her in the last blast of heat the human race can make its own, an act of love that is an act of violence too, a rape, a mortal embrace of subterranean powers." The story ends with the pair in suspension on the cusp of divorce

from the Earth—“that ruthless devourer of living substances”—poised to start over again, beyond oil and the humanity that has been made from it.

Flash forward to the twenty-first century, where Stephen Collis in “Reading Wordsworth in the Tar Sands” confronts us with the effects of “unconventional” oil production on landscapes, culture, and the imagination in the tar sands of Alberta. Like Wordsworth, Collis finds the walking of land essential to his creative process. Sadly, there is little uplifting or picturesque to be found in the lands around Fort McMurray and Fort McKay. It reeks of death, devastation, and false promises. But Collis walks it with eyes open:

Perhaps I digress—the occasion
Was a public walk on a
Public road—but the aesthetics
Of the place is pure negation—
Open maw is no landscape
Ripped wound no terrain
There is no viewpoint despite
The signs and picnic tables of
Doom’s treeless playground.

The poem’s work is to excoriate, literally, to tear off the hide of petronormality that refuses to acknowledge the environmental costs of this particularly brutal form of fossil fuel extraction, all done in the name of creating an Albertan economic miracle.

Wordsworth there are things
That are fucked up
That we live among.

Much writing on energy futures, even when not explicitly eco-apocalyptic in tone and content, seems strikingly petrofatalist in its stunted capacity to imagine a post-fossil fuel future. The final set of writings in this section shows why this need not be so. In an excerpt from *The Solar Economy*, Hermann Scheer makes his case for a turn from the invisible hand of the market to the visible hand of the sun. Scheer, the chief architect of Germany’s renewable energy transition, offers an inspiring vision of solar economy and solar citizenship relieved of the congenital inefficiencies and inequalities of long-chain energy systems like fossil and nuclear fuels. By reemphasizing the primary economy over the market economy, by rejecting the centralized authoritarian systems empowered by fossil fuels, and by embracing the fact that all the earth’s wealth is ultimately owed to the sun, Scheer envisions a future modernity that promises greater local political independence paired with a more just and equitable global division of labor.

Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway offer a different, but equally provocative, experiment in an excerpted chapter from *The Collapse of Western Civilization*. Writing in the model of a textbook history from the year 2393, the authors chronicle the miserable end of petromodernity. From the political persecution of climate scientists in the 2030s through to catastrophic droughts, sea-level

rise, widespread refugeeism, and plague in the remainder of the twenty-first century, the authors deploy tropes of tragedy and how-could-they-not-have-acted-in-time remonstrations grooved by memories of global devastation that brought the human species to the brink of extinction. “There is no need to rehearse the details of the human tragedy that occurred; every schoolchild knows of the terrible suffering. Suffice it to say that total losses—social, cultural, economic, and demographic—were greater than any in recorded human history.” In the end, there is even a techno-utopian twist: humanity was only saved by a rogue scientist and her bioengineered black lichenized fungus that spread across the world sucking down carbon dioxide at an unprecedented rate.

Paolo Bacigalupi’s extrapolative science fiction is less sanguine about the potential for technoscientific salvation. In this excerpt from his novel *The Windup Girl*, we find instead a portrait of a world centuries deeper into the Anthropocene and with no end in sight. A planet largely devoid of fossil fuel use has renationalized to a great extent, with competition over fuel and resource use spawning conflicts and genocide across the world. Advances in kinetic energy capture have helped to plug some gaps in our energetic infrastructures—computer terminals are powered by foot pedals, factories are powered by massive kink springs turned by genetically engineered behemoths known as Megadonts—but the overall mood is one of poverty and desperation. Global business and science still do their work, but only in a corporate-driven neo-imperial mode in which genetic engineering becomes a weapon for assimilating or destroying national food stocks and thus for forcing markets open to future Monsantos. Meanwhile, sea-level rise has continued unabated, with Bangkok only preserved by massive sea walls withstanding the weight of the blue ocean. Bacigalupi’s is a *noir* future but one not devoid of resilient, imaginative creatures that survive and even occasionally thrive in the ruins of the late Anthropocene.

Margaret Atwood, another writer who has gifted us some of the most moving works of “climate fiction,” offers one of the more powerful statements in recent years of the stakes of climate change in her “It’s Not Climate Change—It’s Everything Change.” Atwood offers glimpses of three futures. The first is comforting and utopian, a future in which the post-carbon transition has been managed smoothly and we are all living a happy, modern, sustainable life. The second future is dystopian and fear inducing, a world that has bungled its future beyond oil and instead has devolved into chaos and violence. Finally, there is a world in which some countries have tried and succeeded to live beyond oil whereas others, like Atwood’s native Canada, have seemingly doubled down on fossil fuels. This is a world familiar to us, but one in which, as Atwood notes, the conversation concerning oil and the imaginableness of a post-carbon future have changed dramatically in only the past half decade. In the end, Atwood underscores the importance of the work that writers like her and other energy humanists have been doing to create new synapses in human imaginations, perhaps even new values: “Could cli-fi be a way of educating young people about the dangers that face them, and helping them to think through the problems and divine solutions? Or will it become just another part of the ‘entertainment business’? Time will tell. But . . . the outbreak of such fictions is in part a response to the transition now taking place—from the consumer values of oil to the stewardship values of renewables.” Atwood reminds that “we [humans] don’t always act in our own worst interests,” but her question as

to whether we have enough time left to do what needs to be done—to avoid the scenarios brilliantly and unsettlingly described by Oreskes and Conway and by Bacigalupi, among others—remains an open one. The moral being: the work of energy humanities is only just beginning.

Notes

1. See David Nye, *Electrifying America: Social Meanings of a New Technology, 1880–1940* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 66.