theories and methodologies

Globality, Difference, and the International Turn in Ecocriticism

URSULA K. HEISE

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE HAS ALWAYS PURSUED LITERARY STUDIES IN A TRANSNATIONAL FRAMEWORK. BUT FOR MUCH OF ITS HISTORY it has been a "modest intellectual enterprise, fundamentally limited to Western Europe, and mostly revolving around the river Rhine (German philologists working on French literature). Not much more," as Franco Moretti pithily sums it up (54). The rise of postcolonial theory in the wake of Edward Said's and Gayatri Spivak's influential work vastly expanded comparatist horizons, as did the attention to minority literatures that spread outward from the study of American literature and culture in the 1990s.[1] In 1993 Charles Bernheimer's report to the American Comparative Literature Association, "Comparative Literature at the Turn of the Century," criticized the elitist and exclusionary tenor of earlier reports on the state of the discipline by Harry Levin (1965) and Tom Greene (1975). Instead, it emphasized "tendencies in literary studies, toward a multicultural, global, and interdisciplinary curriculum" and called for an expansion from comparative literature's traditional focus on a mostly western European and North American canon of works to a truly global conception of Goethean *Weltliteratur*, for inclusion of previously marginalized minority literatures from around the world, and for connections to media studies, other humanities disciplines, and the social sciences (47).

If Bernheimer's report marked the moment in which comparative literature explicitly committed to global horizons of research, the varied reactions to it highlighted that globality meant different things in the discipline. For Mary Pratt the report indicated that comparative literature was embracing a project of globalization, democratization, and decolonization (59), which she wanted to see manifested in "the cultivation of multilingualism, polyglossia, the arts of cultural mediation, deep intercultural understanding, and genuinely global consciousness"—in other words, a detailed understanding of cultural differences and what might mediate between them (62). In Jonathan Culler's view, by contrast, the call to take on global literature could

URSULA K. HEISE is professor in the Department of English and the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her books include *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global* (Oxford UP, 2008) and *Nach der Natur: Das Artensterben und die moderne Kultur* ("After Nature: Species Extinction and Modern Culture"; Suhrkamp, 2010). She is working on a book project called "Where the Wild Things Used to Be: Narrative, Database, and Endangered Species."

© 2013 URSULA K. HEISE
PMLA 128.3 (2013), published by the Modern Language Association of America

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not be understood to mean that comparative literature was proposing to take on the overwhelming, amorphous task of studying all literatures and cultures of the world. Instead, leaving cultural studies to national literature departments, comparative literature would focus on "literature in general, and to study it as such, in all its ramifications" (121).

With twenty years' hindsight, this debate might seem dated if it did not point to two ways of conceptualizing the global in comparative literature. On one hand, comparatists have sought for overarching models and methods that account for the wide variety of literary forms and genres across cultures, for the circulation of texts beyond their regions and languages of origin, and for the interrelation of literary practices with economic stratification and social prestige: Northrop Frye's archetypal criticism, Pascale Casanova's and David Damrosch's investigations of world literature as a system of circulation, Franco Moretti's "distant reading," or John Guillory's and James English's economies of cultural assets. These theories seek to explore and account for global systems, networks, and cultural economies as structures that already exist. They understand and explain cultural difference as internal to such systems, networks, and economies.

For a different group of comparative theorists, on the other hand, cultural difference—broadly understood here to include socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, religious, gender, linguistic, and national differences—is a foundational premise. Their work explores the formation, loss, or displacement of local identities; the ambiguous role of national identities and what might transcend them; and the cultural and political functioning of hybridity, borders, and diasporas. Examples of such analyses that focus on difference include Said's, Spivak's, and Walter Mignolo's seminal work on postcolonial literatures; Paul Gilroy's mapping of the "Black Atlantic" and Simon Gikandi's of "Englishness"; Xiaomei Chen's, Sibylle Fischer's, and Ramón Saldívar's explorations of alternative modernities; and Timothy Brennan's, David Palumbo-Liu's, and Bruce Robbins's controversies over cosmopolitanism. In this comparatist work, global culture and citizenship are not so much existing structures to be studied as they are imaginative goals to be reached by negotiating fundamental differences of gender, race, nation, ethnicity, class, language, and religion.[2] Global capital, which features prominently in some of these accounts, is usually understood as a force for exploiting and intensifying difference rather than as a tool for creating an equitable world society. Because of this distinction in how the two groups of theories conceptualize the relation between globality and difference, Casanova's "world republic of letters," for example, is a complex but well-defined network, while Spivak's "planetarity" remains frustratingly but deliberately vague, since the construction of a planetary whole beyond the inequalities of colonialism, in her argument, is a task yet to be accomplished.[3]

To group such diverse and influential bodies of work into just two categories and to omit many other works that have shaped comparative literature may seem reductive. My aim here, however, is not to present an exhaustive account of comparative literature but to highlight how the discipline maps the realities and possibilities of the global as a function of human relations. This admittedly broad schematization clarifies some of the challenges that confront environmental literary criticism, or ecocriticism, which has taken its own global turn in the last decade.

The story of this international turn is no longer news. When it emerged in the early 1990s, ecocriticism focused mostly on British and American literature after 1800, especially British Romantic poetry, the American nature-writing tradition from Henry David Thoreau to Annie Dillard, and Native American literature. Since 2000 ecocriticism has greatly expanded its scope, to earlier periods

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of literature as well as to the literatures of Australia, East Asia, continental Europe, and Latin America.[4] The productive fusions of ecocritical perspectives with postcolonial theory and criticism during this period have opened up African, Caribbean, and South Asian literatures in particular to environmental approaches. At the same time organizations allied to the United States–based Association for the Study of Literature and Environment, which has grown to 1,400 members, have begun to institutionalize the study of environmental literature academically from Japan to Turkey and from Spain to India.

But the international turn in ecocriticism does not simply repeat the global expansion of comparative literature or, for that matter, the hemispheric turn in American studies. The ecocritical perspective has always distinguished itself by its interest in how the nonhuman interacts with human culture: how ecological conditions shape cultural expression and, conversely, how culture shapes the perception and uses of natural environments; how cultural communities structure and give meaning to humans' relations with other species; and how risk scenarios, crises, and disasters amplify or reduce sociocultural differences, define community boundaries, and change cultural practices. The question of difference in ecocriticism, in other words, is never purely human. Alterity is always also defined by the nonhuman other. As ecocriticism, with a ten-year lag, has expanded its objects of study and entered the global territory into which comparative literature and, to a lesser extent, American studies ventured in the 1990s, the question of globality and difference plays itself out not only at the borders of human communities but also at the interface of human and nonhuman systems.

Given the prominence of the nonhuman in environmental thought and the recurrent risks that many communities around the globe now confront—from water scarcity and soil erosion to pervasive toxification, and from biodiversity loss to climate change—one might surmise that ecocritics would highlight a global culture and literature of ecological crisis that takes precedence over local specificity. Some recent ecocritical scholarship has done so. Scott Slovic, for example, whose organizational efforts have more than anyone else's encouraged the emergence of ecocritical research communities around the world, confesses in a roundtable on Turkish environmental literature, "To be honest, I'm not sure I've observed an entirely idiosyncratic and 'unique' tendency in Turkish ecocriticism or literature" (Oppermann, Özdağ, Özkan, and Slovic 467). His judgment is implicitly confirmed by Ufuk Özdağ's call for a Turkish ecocriticism based on the American conservationist Aldo Leopold's "land ethic" rather than on Turkey's own intellectual traditions (Oppermann, Özdağ, Özkan, and Slovic 476–77). Karen Thornber, a scholar of East Asian literature, argues more systematically for an approach that subordinates cultural difference to shared themes. "Because damaged environments are a global phenomenon, literary treatments of ecodegradation regularly transcend their particular cultures of production and together form intercultural thematic and conceptual networks," she writes in *Ecoambiguity: Environmental Crises and East Asian Literature*. "Ideally, . . . literary systems should be studied not only along cultural/national lines, but also in terms of [such] intercultural thematic and conceptual networks" (16, 23). While these scholars would certainly want to hold on to local specificity as an important subject of research, specificity figures in their approaches less as difference than as variations in a context of globally shared environmental concerns.

But difference does play a crucial role in another strain of recent transnational ecocriticism, the fusion of postcolonial and ecocritical perspectives in the work of Elizabeth DeLoughrey, Graham Huggan, Robert Marzec, Pablo Mukherjee, Rob Nixon, Susie

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

O'Brien, Helen Tiffin, and others. In a sense, this fusion started not in literary studies but in sociology, in the 1990s, with Ramachandra Guha and Juan Martínez-Alier's emphasis on "varieties of environmentalism."[5] Environmentalism in the developed world, especially in North America, Guha and Martínez-Alier argued, combined a commitment to wilderness areas with a mainly aesthetic appreciation of nature. This investment in landscapes really or allegedly untouched by human hands made it difficult for environmentalists in the global North even to perceive as environmentalist the struggle of communities in the global South against the destruction of their natural means of subsistence: against deforestation, mining, dam building, oil drilling, and the transformation of agriculture by multinational corporations. Unless Euro-American environmentalists recognized these fights as part of their own political project, they risked participating—as indeed some had already participated—in the displacement of indigenous peoples and the erasure of ways of life that had been sustainable for millennia. Postcolonial ecocritics have developed this perspective further by exploring the systematic links between imperialism, racism, resource exploitation, and environmental degradation as they are articulated in literary texts.

The spatial imaginary that underwrites these explorations tends to see local places as traversed and reshaped by transnational vectors of power. "[P]ostcolonial studies has utilized the concept of place to question temporal narratives of progress imposed by colonial powers. . . . Place encodes time, suggesting that histories embedded in the land and sea have always provided vital and dynamic methodologies for understanding the transformative impact of empire and the anticolonial epistemologies it tries to suppress," DeLoughrey and George Handley argue in *Postcolonial Ecologies* ("Toward" 4). Nixon, in *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*, calls for a "transnational ethics of place" that acknowledges postcolonial contexts in which, frequently, "[p]lace is displacement" and that engages with processes of dislocation, migration, and hybridization rather than with the conventional ecocritical tropes of dwelling and inhabitation (245, 247). More broadly, the geography of difference that dominates postcolonial ecocriticism opposes the global North, where most of the planet's economic wealth and political power are concentrated, with the global South, where human populations and natural systems disproportionately suffer the consequences of economic exploitation, toxification, and climate change. This geography, both material and symbolic, traces transfers of resources and capital at the same time that it functions as a metaphor for the social divide between rich and poor and between those who are protected from environmental risks and those who are fully exposed to them.

To some extent, the different approaches to comparative ecocriticism exemplified by Thornber's and Nixon's books resonate with the two visions of the global I identified earlier in the context of comparative literature. Thornber is most interested in the structural similarities in figurations of ecological crisis across the literatures of China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan (as well as in a multitude of examples from other traditions). Nixon's analyses range across Antiguan, Kenyan, Indian, Nigerian, Saudi, and other literatures, but Nixon emphasizes principally the structures of difference they highlight—not so much cultural differences in the vein of identity politics as socioeconomic and power differences that are foundational in the postcolonial perspective. As my quotations from DeLoughrey and Handley and from Nixon indicate, ecocriticism brings a distinctly spatial imagination to bear on the question of alterity. Place in its varying material and symbolic significations figures centrally in comparative ecocriticism as a way of mapping relations between culture and nature.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ecocriticism focused on North America has also addressed questions of culture in terms of this underlying spatial imagination for much of its twenty-year history. In *The Ecocriticism Reader*, the new field's first anthology, published in 1996, Cheryll Glotfelty answered her own programmatic question, "In addition to race, class, and gender, should place become a new critical category?" by affirming that "as a critical stance, [ecocriticism] has one foot in literature and the other on land" (xix). Knowledge of and care for one's place of inhabitation was as much a criterion for judging literary merit in a good deal of ecocritical work in the 1990s as it was a condition for an ecologically based ethic in the American environmentalist movement.[6] Local difference, in ecocritical thought, took on the foundational function that cultural difference did in some varieties of comparatist work. Much of the more recent and more internationally oriented work in ecocriticism, in spite of its trenchant critiques of American-centered ecocriticism, continues to emphasize the difference that place makes in figuring nonhuman alterity.

But some recent comparative ecocriticism has focused on a different way of making the nonhuman present in environmental writing. In tandem with the rise of critical animal studies across various humanistic disciplines, the animal has moved to the forefront of concerns with difference. The otherness, the exploitation, and the oppression of the animal are sometimes a transparent metaphor, double, or proxy for humans' oppression of humans, as the frequent assimilation of indigenous peoples, colonized populations, or more generally racial others with animal existence highlights. But philosophers of animality have pushed this observation one step further by arguing that humans' willingness to assume a categorical difference between themselves and other kinds of animals enables discrimination against other persons not just rhetorically but also legally and politically. "[T]he discourse of speciesism, once anchored in [a] material, institutional base, can be used to mark *any* social other," Cary Wolfe maintains (7). While earlier forms of ecocriticism examined the assimilation of women or indigenous peoples with nature and the forms of exploitation this amalgamation enables (e.g., Kolodny; Ortner), more recent work has focused on the connection between the exploitation of animals and colonial oppression. The Australian writer and critic Deborah Bird Rose's *Wild Dog Dreaming* (2010) looks at this connection in the history between Anglo-Australians and Aboriginal peoples and in both groups' relations to domestic dogs and dingoes. Huggan and Tiffin, in *Postcolonial Ecocriticism*, analyze similar structures of oppression across a wider range of species and national literatures. They argue that "if the wrongs of colonialism—its legacies of continuing human inequalities, for instance—are to be addressed, still less to be redressed, then the very category of the *human*, in relation to animals and environment, must also be brought under scrutiny" (18).

As they trace the meanings of the species boundary across various postcolonial literatures, Huggan and Tiffin emphasize that the object of this kind of criticism "needs to be understood as a particular *way of reading*, rather than a specific corpus of literary or other cultural texts" (13). This view echoes similar claims Americanist ecocritics made in relation to place. Robert Kern, for example, argued that "all texts are at least potentially environmental (and therefore susceptible to ecocriticism or ecologically informed reading) in the sense that all texts are literally or imaginatively situated in a place, and in the sense that their authors, consciously or not, inscribe within them a certain relation to their place" (259). This emphasis on a way of reading rather than a canon has been a crucial tool in ecocriticism's international turn: it has enabled ecocritics to reread texts from a variety of historical periods and geographic regions,

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

postcolonial texts among them, with a view toward their portrayal of humans' relations to nature and experiences of ecological crisis.

But Huggan and Tiffin also point to the difficulty the interest in the nonhuman poses for an approach focused on literary forms:

> For researchers in geography, anthropology, philosophy and politics . . . animal and environmental considerations are increasingly seen as the necessary *basis* for human studies. But . . . the literary has lagged behind in this most recent of revolutions. One obvious reason has been that literature, with its traditional emphasis on plot, character and psychological states, has been seen perforce as being focused on individuals or groups of humans, or at least anthropomorphised animals, even in genres such as traditional pastoral or romantic elegy where human interaction with, and apparent concern for, the natural world come to the fore. (16)

In part because many if not all conventional literary forms privilege the human voice and human agency, ecocritics have devoted particular attention to nonfictional genres, which allow the environmentalist writer to construct textual universes in which human minds and actions are not invariably central.[7]

This is one reason the American tradition of nonfictional nature writing became so vital to ecocriticism in its first decade. Thoreau's *Walden*, of course, had always been a canonical work of American literature, but the writings of Susan Fenimore Cooper, George Perkins Marsh, John Muir, Mary Austin, Wendell Berry, Annie Dillard, and Barry Lopez had not been staples of literary studies, much less so popular scientific classics of environmentalism such as Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* or Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb*. Nonfictional nature writing is not as prominent in other literary traditions, which partially explains why the ecocritical work by German or Japanese Americanists has not always easily or immediately been matched by environmentally oriented studies of German or Japanese literature. But comparative ecocritics have turned to other nonfictional genres. Ishimure Michiko's blend of fiction and reportage in her journalistic *Kugai jōdo: Waga Minamatabyō* (*Paradise in the Sea of Sorrows: Our Minamata Disease*), a book on the ravages of mercury poisoning in Minamata, Japan, has attracted a great deal of ecocritical attention (Allen; Yuki; Thornber 68–69, 108–19). Nixon's recent work pays as much attention to the essays and political writings of activists such as Ken Saro-Wiwa, Wangari Maathai, Jamaica Kincaid, and Arundhati Roy as it does to novels. And the travel writings of authors as diverse as Bartolomé de las Casas and Alexander von Humboldt have come under ecocritical scrutiny (Paravisini-Gebert 103–04; Wilke). In other words, while ecocritics continue to focus on plays, poems, and novels that engage humans' relations with other species and natural environments, nonfictional genres have assumed a prominence in transnational ecocriticism that they do not have in other types of comparatist research.

Ecocritics' interest in historical, anthropological, philosophical, and journalistic writings about the environment has over the last few years enabled a transdisciplinary collaboration with environmentally oriented scholars in anthropology, communications, cultural geography, history, and philosophy that is often referred to as the environmental humanities.[8] As comparative literature did in the early 1990s, transnational ecocriticism faces the dual challenges of a global expansion of its objects of study and an interdisciplinary integration of theories, concepts, and methods. Less bound by national, regional, and linguistic borders than literary studies have tended to be, these related disciplines promise tools for developing ecocriticism's global horizons in what has come to be called the Anthropocene, an era in which humans, a new geological force, transform even the most

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

basic climatic systems on the planet (Crutzen and Stoermer). As the postcolonial historian Dipesh Chakrabarty has argued, the reality of climate change forces scholars in the humanities and social sciences to develop new theories of planetarity at the intersection of culture and environment ("Climate" and "Postcolonial Studies"). Nothing less than a thoroughly transdisciplinary field of environmental humanities research will do justice to this ambitious goal.

Notes

1. Ali Behdad recently highlighted "the tardiness of [comparative literature's] embrace of 'multi-culturalism,' as well as its delayed recognition of ethnic and postcolonial literatures as legitimate fields to study" (611).

2. It may seem counterintuitive to lump advocates and critics of cosmopolitanism such as Robbins and Brennan together in this category. But both Brennan and Robbins, as well as other theorists in this group, search for cultural formations and kinds of awareness that might make a fairer, more equitable, and less violent world society possible, while they disagree on the means to reach it. Both of their arguments, in other words, focus on the differences that need to be negotiated as part of such a new world order.

3. Spivak writes that "pluralization may allow the imagining of a necessary yet impossible planetarity in ways that neither my reader nor I know yet" (*Death of a Discipline* 92; cf. Spivak, "World Systems" 108).

4. The anthology of essays *Literatures of Nature: An International Sourcebook*, edited by Patrick D. Murphy, was a pioneer of transnational ecocriticism.

5. Their approach is most clearly articulated in their 1997 book *Varieties of Environmentalism*, which incorporates an essay by Guha that had already criticized basic assumptions of American environmentalism and pointed to the specificities of environmentalism in the developing world as early as 1989.

6. My own polemical engagement with this rhetoric in *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet*, which argued that an understanding of global ecology and global ecological citizenship does not logically or empirically follow from attachments to place, was predicated on a comparatist assumption of the primacy of cultural difference that I share with some of the other comparatist theorists I mentioned earlier. Cultivating a "sense of place" is itself a cultural practice down to its roots, so to speak, articulated in specifically American ways in much environmentalist writing. For this reason, it cannot in and of itself bridge differences between cultural communities or point the way to new forms of shared ecological citizenship. This argument met with a fair amount of resistance, given many ecocritics' deep investment in the primacy of the local.

7. Ecocritics have sometimes debated whether nonanthropocentric writing is possible, given that language is usually assumed to be uniquely human. But to argue that the mere use of language precludes nonanthropocentric perspectives is tantamount to claiming that altruism is no different from egotism because both stances originate in a self, as the philosopher Martin Gorke has maintained (211–18): the argument conceptually amalgamates subject and object.

8. For initial programmatic outlines of the field, see Sörlin; Rose et al.

Works Cited

Allen, Bruce. "Facing the True Costs of Living: Arundhati Roy and Ishimure Michiko on Dams and Writing." *Coming into Contact: Explorations in Ecocritical Theory and Practice*. Ed. Annie Merrill Ingram, Ian Marshall, Daniel J. Philippon, and Adam W. Sweeting. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2007. 154–67. Print.

Behdad, Ali. "What Can American Studies and Comparative Literature Learn from Each Other." *American Literary History* 24.3 (2012): 608–17. Print.

Bernheimer, Charles. "The Bernheimer Report, 1993: Comparative Literature at the Turn of the Century." Bernheimer, *Comparative Literature* 39–48.

———, ed. *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995. Print.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "The Climate of History: Four Theses." *Critical Inquiry* 35 (2009): 197–222. Print.

———. "Postcolonial Studies and the Challenge of Climate Change." *New Literary History* 43.1 (2012): 1–18. Print.

Crutzen, Paul J., and Eugene F. Stoermer. "The 'Anthropocene.'" *Global Change Newsletter* 41 (2000): 17–18. Print.

Culler, Jonathan. "Comparative Literature, at Last!" Bernheimer, *Comparative Literature* 117–21.

DeLoughrey, Elizabeth, and George B. Handley. "Toward an Aesthetics of the Earth." Introduction. DeLoughrey and Handley, *Postcolonial Ecologies* 3–39.

———, eds. *Postcolonial Ecologies: Literatures of the Environment*. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

Glotfelty, Cheryll. "Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis." Introduction. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Ed. Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1996. xv–xxxvii. Print.

Gorke, Martin. *Artensterben: Von der ökologischen Theorie zum Eigenwert der Natur*. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 1999. Print.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Guha, Ramachandra, and Juan Martínez-Alier. *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*. London: Earthscan, 1997. Print.

Heise, Ursula K. *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global*. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Huggan, Graham, and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.

Kern, Robert. "Ecocriticism: What Is It Good For?" *ISLE* 7.1 (2000): 9–32. Rpt. in *The ISLE Reader: Ecocriticism, 1993–2003*. Ed. Michael P. Branch and Scott Slovic. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2003. 258–81. Print.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as History and Experience in American Life and Letters*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975. Print.

Moretti, Franco. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54–69. Print.

Murphy, Patrick D., ed. *Literature of Nature: An International Sourcebook*. Chicago: Fitzroy, 1998. Print.

Nixon, Rob. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2011. Print.

Oppermann, Serpil, Ufuk Özdağ, Nevin Özkan, and Scott Slovic. "A Roundtable Discussion on Ecocriticism." *The Future of Ecocriticism: New Horizons*. Ed. Oppermann, Özdağ, Özkan, and Slovic. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011. 459–79. Print.

Ortner, Sherry. "Is Female to Male As Nature Is to Culture?" *Woman, Culture, and Society*. Ed. Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1972. 67–87. Print.

Paravisini-Gebert, Lizabeth. "Deforestation and the Yearning for Lost Landscapes in Caribbean Literature." DeLoughrey and Handley, *Postcolonial Ecologies* 99–113.

Pratt, Mary. "Comparative Literature and Global Citizenship." Bernheimer, *Comparative Literature* 58–65.

Rose, Deborah Bird. *Wild Dog Dreaming: Love and Extinction*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2011. Print.

Rose, Deborah Bird, et al. "Thinking Through the Environment, Unsettling the Humanities." *Environmental Humanities* 1 (2012): 1–5. Web. 1 Dec. 2012.

Sörlin, Sverker. "Environmental Humanities: Why Should Biologists Interested in the Environment Take the Humanities Seriously?" *BioScience* 62.9 (2012): 788–89. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003. Print.

———. "World Systems and the Creole." *Narrative* 14.6 (2006): 102–12. Print.

Thornber, Karen. *Ecoambiguity: Environmental Crises and East Asian Literature*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2012. Print.

Wilke, Sabine. "Performing Tropics: Alexander von Humboldt's *Ansichten der Natur* and the Colonial Roots of Nature Writing." *Postcolonial Green: Environmental Politics and World Narratives*. Ed. Bonnie Roos and Alex Hunt. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2010. 197–212. Print.

Wolfe, Cary. *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2003. Print.

Yuki, Masami. "'The Voice of Place': Soundscapes in Ishimure Michiko's *Paradise in the Sea of Sorrow*." *Soundscape* 3 (2001): 47–53. Print.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2013.128.3.636 Published online by Cambridge University Press