produced over a large expanse of time. Instead of trying to fix the exact starting point of a massive body of ecological literary criticism, my work will record the multiple sources that have shaped this important field. Although my initial interview focused on one person and one book, the book would not have been possible without the work of many other scholars, which both the book and interview attempt to record. Indeed, Glotfelty emphatically said several times in the interview that she is one among many ecocritical scholars who made the field possible—she wanted to make sure that the collective efforts of others were recognized.

I see Glotfelty and Fromm's *Ecocriticism Reader* as a type of data portal for looking back to understand how the field originated and peering forward to discern its future developments. In the last decade we have seen new literature-and-environment programs emerge in many English departments. Two prominent programs with strong faculty support are at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and Washington State University. Now that ecocriticism has become nationally established, a next step might be its internationalization. The national society for ecocritical scholarship, the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE), already has branches in different countries, but an international ASLE (IASLE) has yet to be formed. The internationalization of ecocriticism is important because environmental issues have global sources and solutions. Creating a network of ecocritical scholars working across borders through an international organization might also elicit more immediate connections between the academy and society in ways that influence global social change.

Still, a question lurks at the heart of ecocriticism: can this literary theory and criticism influence society? It is a question that pulls at the edges of my scholarship and the humanities in general. Do the humanities have the capacity to provoke debate, dialogue, and change in societies? The evocative nature of literature provides enjoyment and individual enrichment. But beyond pleasure, can literature motivate and mobilize communities to create positive social and environmental change? If so, then studying the processes by which literature fosters social change is an important task for ecocritics.

Michelle Balaev
Wake Forest University

Reply:

I welcome Fred Waage's letter to the Forum. It points out that before any serendipitous consolidating event such as a special session at the MLA convention or a groundbreaking anthology or monograph, there has been a widely disseminated sprinkling of what appear to be unrelated charged particles lying in wait for a rousing magnet. Then, with the unforeseen groundbreaking event (such as President Obama's speaking out about same-sex marriage), the particles magically cohere.

The 1991 MLA convention session Ecocriticism: The Greening of Literary Studies triggered a series of repercussions that Waage's 1976 session regrettably did not, though his 1985 book *Teaching Environmental Literature* increased the magnetic charge. Blame the treacherous fates. Cheryll Glotfelty and I were not endowed with unique sensors of the socio-intellectual pulse. We were as surprised as anybody by the effect of our session, reinforced as it was by the Western Literature Association's success in establishing the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE) and its journal, *ISLE*, shortly thereafter.

Once one starts looking for *the* triggering ecocritical event, one could go back far into the past to make a case for Vergil and Hesiod as true begetters.

In passing, I would like to point out that Frederick Morgan, who edited the *Hudson Review* for many years, produced an ecology issue in 1970, introduced by his prescient description of the environmental scene of forty years ago. In

© 2013 HAROLD FROMM
PMLA 128.3 (2013), published by the Modern Language Association of America

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900123156 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the spring 2013 issue of the *Hudson Review*, devoted to ecology once again after so many years, I take the occasion to quote Morgan's keen statement of the relevance of the environment to literature and the arts before turning to my own reflections on "ecocriticism at twenty-five." As Waage intimates, putative landmark dates are merely convenient markers, less accurate than they seem. All I had in mind by "twenty-five" was to associate what we now think of as an academic mainstreaming of ecocriticism with the aftereffects of the 1991 MLA session, the establishment of ASLE and *ISLE*, and the influence of my and Glotfelty's *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*.

Harold Fromm
Institute of the Environment
University of Arizona, Tucson

Historicism and Unhistoricism in Queer Studies

To the Editor:

Valerie Traub's "The New Unhistoricism in Queer Studies" (128.1 [2013]: 21–39) invokes Marx's *Communist Manifesto*, but in her reading it is not communism that haunts Europe but teleology that haunts queer studies. Perhaps, then, teleologists should *openly, before the world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the specter of teleology with a manifesto of the party itself!*

But rather than a manifesto in defense of teleology, what ensues is a complaint about the degree to which antiteleologists purportedly malign as unqueer those who periodize and historicize. Traub denounces the antiteleologists' critique as opposition to history itself, thus suggesting that history is teleology, period.

I am not an antiteleologist. I have a strong theory of teleology: I call it mortality. This is how I practice what Traub calls an "enhanced discernment of the ways our bodies remain in time" (36); indeed, I frequently refer to myself in print as a "future dead person" ("Theorizing Queer Temporalities: A Roundtable Discussion" [*Queer Temporalities*; ed. Elizabeth Freeman; spec. issue of *GLQ* 13.2–3 (2007): 177–95; print; 184]). "A teleological perspective views the present as a necessary outcome of the past," Traub writes, though this perspective may equally comprehend the ends to which we are all tending (21). Apocalypse is also a teleological model, and perhaps when apocalyptic outcomes dominate the teleological discourse of the day, some LGBTQ scholars feel moved to explore temporality's queerness, to find in time a way "out," or at least another way. This may well be how some of us "contend with the irreducible force of time's movement on our bodies, our species, and the planet," in part because the contending goes hand in hand with an acute awareness of our relative incapacities to do so (32).

Both mournful and celebratory queer twistings of time have been emerging from decades of mortality's untimely reign in LGBTQ communities. Some of these writings explore the affective experience of temporality as recursive or even repetitive; some chart nostalgia's backward-looking melancholy; some trace temporality's effects in and as the present; and some celebrate the sheer queerness of nonprogressive time. But all fashion ways of thinking about how time—that strange measure of our mortal lives—impresses itself upon us subjectively and collectively. This is to discuss a temporality that is precisely not history, though history itself, either as "experienced" or as "narrated," has varying phenomenal temporalities and is, as well, subjective, insofar as there must be either a subject to experience or a narrator to narrate.

So, when Traub says that readings "are not the same thing as history" (30), I agree, and with acclaim, but add that history—insofar as "we" have access to it—presents itself as a reading. Fredric Jameson (historicist par excellence) writes, "History is not a text, for it is fundamentally non-narrative and nonrepresentational; what can be added, however, is

© 2013 Carla Freccero
PMLA 128.3 (2013), published by the Modern Language Association of America

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900123156 Published online by Cambridge University Press