



PROJECT MUSE[®]

CLIMATE CHANGE AS THE WORK OF MOURNING

ASHLEE CUNSOLO WILLOX

Climate change discourse often negates grief and mourning associated with the resulting environmental alterations. Mourning, however, holds potential for expanding climate change discourse in politically and ethically productive ways. This article extends the analysis of mourning to non-humans through a recognition of shared vulnerability, and examines the ways in which constituting non-humans as mournable expands climate change discourse, research, ethics, and politics. By transcending humanism to ground an ethical ecology of mourning, the ways in which thinking climate change as the work of mourning can contribute to an ecological democracy-to-come, and achieve a more inclusive political order, will be considered.

PRELUDE: LAMENT FOR THE LAND

When I was five, a pond and thicket area down the street from my house was filled in and leveled while I was away. I remember coming home and finding my beloved ecosystem denuded of all greenery, and completely empty of the beavers and their dam, the minnows, the birds, and the countless rabbits and squirrels that had been a comforting and valued presence. I was devastated. Consumed and overcome by grief and loss. I did not want to eat, or play, or go to school. I felt as though I had lost something deeply important, and intimately a part of the fabric of my life. It was the first time in my short life that I became aware of the fragility of life—mine and others—and from that moment, I found myself in a different life-world full

of the awareness of the potential for death and injury to befall plants, animals, and ecosystems, aware of the corporeal acuteness of grief and mourning that could emerge from environmental destruction and degradation. This experience was also my first of many moments of environmentally-based grief—grief for the loss of non-human bodies, spaces, and places: the clear-cutting of a favourite hiking spot in British Columbia; the shooting of a mother black bear that I used to watch with her cubs every morning; the housing complex that disrupted a cougar corridor in Alberta; the dam that blocked salmon spawning near our home in the mountains; destruction of fertile farmland in Ontario; degradation of beloved ecosystems due to changes in climate; and grief that comes from witnessing the environmentally-based mourning of friends and loved ones. Moments where I went through processes of grief and mourning for creatures and areas that were not human, but still caused significant feelings of loss within me.¹ It was also the first loss of many to come, human or non-human, that I have experienced, and those early days of grief and sadness created the foundations for my personal acts and responses to mourning—acts and responses that grew and transformed with each subsequent loss, with each grief process, with each work of mourning I undertook. While each loss was experienced differently, uniquely, there was, within each a memory, a fleeting sense of that first death and of that early corporeal response to mourning an ecological loss.

INTRODUCTION: ECOLOGICAL GRIEF AND MOURNING

These ecological grief experiences are certainly not unique to my personal experience; there are numerous people around the globe who have experienced or are currently experiencing grief and mourning responses to changes in their environment or due to the deaths of non-human entities, or understand the need to grieve for non-humans. Mental, emotional, and corporeal felt responses to environmental degradation and destruction have also been documented in response to severe drought (Albrecht et al. 2007; Berry, Bowen, and Kjellstrom 2010; Speldewinde et al. 2009; Berry et al. 2011), industrial activity and toxic exposure (Downey and Van Willigen 2005; Bevc, Marshall, and Picou 2007), and localized ecological disasters such as hurricanes and oil spills (Palinkas et al. 1993; Havenaar, Cwikel, and Bromet 2002; Picou and Hudson 2010). Despite the commonality of experiencing negative or emotional responses to environmental degradation, discussions of such responses do not appear in

broader public and academic discourses concerning climate change—as though animal, vegetal, and mineral bodies are somehow constituted to be ungrievable in these broader narratives. Judith Butler expressed this unequal allocation of grievability well: “Some lives are grievable,” she wrote, “and others are not; the differential allocation of grievability that decides what kind of subject is and must grieved, and which kind of subject must not, operates to produce and maintain certain exclusionary conceptions of...what counts as a livable life and a grievable death” (2004, xvi).

There are, tragically, bodies that do not matter in the public sphere, or bodies that have been disproportionately derealized from ethical and political consideration in global discourse: women, racial minorities, sexual minorities, peoples of different religions, certain ethnic groups, economically and politically marginalized groups, Indigenous peoples, and those living with HIV/AIDS, to name but a few. To this list of derealized bodies, I would also add non-human bodies—animal, vegetal, and mineral. These derealized bodies “cannot be mourned because they are always already lost or, rather, never ‘were,’ and they must be killed, since they seem to live on, stubbornly, in this state of deadness” (Butler 2004, 33), at once alive but discounted.

This differential allocation of grievability became personally clear in 2006 when I began working in the Canadian North with Inuit communities on issues of climate change. Inuit in Canada are intimately connected to and reliant on their homeland, as the land and sea ice are the basis for their livelihoods, culture, and survival. The land is also an animate being with *whom* Inuit feel relational ties (the land is very often equated with the same language as people). Indeed, my Inuit colleagues in Northern Labrador, Canada, have described the land as a close intimate, a mother figure, and a spiritual entity, capable of response and reciprocity, and deserving of respect and recognition (Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011, 2012).

In the last decade, Inuit across Canada’s North have been experiencing rapid changes in weather, water, snow, ice, wildlife, and vegetation due to human-induced climatic and environmental change, and the resulting alterations in social and cultural activities, livelihoods, and land-based activities (Krupnik and Jolly 2002; Ford, Smit, and Wandel 2006; Ford et al. 2008; Furgal 2008; Ford and Furgal 2009; Pearce 2009; Prowse and Furgal 2009; Ford et al. 2010; Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011, 2012). Since Inuit lives and livelihoods are intimately intertwined with and reliant on the land, even subtle changes in climate and weather can cause significant environ-

mental impacts—impacts which not only impact daily activities, but also cause strong emotional and mental responses (Norgaard 2006; Albrecht et al. 2007; Fritze et al. 2008; Albrecht 2010; Berry, Bowen, and Kjellstrom 2010; Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011; Berry et al. 2011; Doherty and Clayton 2011; Norgaard 2011; Cunsolo Willox et al. 2012) . My colleagues frequently remarked that the current changes in climate and environment caused anxiety, fear, stress, worry, and anger as well as intense feelings of sadness, disorientation, grief, loss, and lament for a rapidly changing land. They also expressed place-based mourning for a changed land, and for the affected plants and animals (Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011, 2012).

Many people also reported experiencing a sense of *anticipatory* grieving for losses expected to come, but not yet arrived. Based on the rapidity of the changes in the region and the realization that these changes will not only continue, but will most likely worsen in severity and impact, Inuit with whom I worked indicated they were already imagining future losses, already experiencing levels of pain over what may come.² This resonates with Derrida's position that even before death, we understand the possibility of mourning:

We know, we knew, we remember—before the death of the loved one—that being-in-me or being-in-us is constituted out of the possibility of mourning. We are only ourselves from the perspective of this knowledge that is older than ourselves; and this is why I say that we begin by recalling this to ourselves: we come to ourselves through this memory of possible mourning. (1986, 34)

In addition, as the community was engaged in anticipating the continuation of a changing climate at an increasing rate—and therefore of escalating disruption to and loss of the environment and non-human bodies—there was the associated memory and felt pain of previous loss and the anticipation of what future losses may feel like in comparison to these other losses. This anticipatory memory of loss is a mourning that begins before the break event, but is based in an understanding of the experience of other losses. That is, people are transferring their previous experiences of and responses to grief and trauma from other situations and to varying degrees to their current and expected experiences with climatic and environmental change and the understanding of the intimate impact the environmental losses will have (Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011, Albrecht et al. 2007, Albrecht 2010, Doherty and Clayton 2011).³

Despite these intense feelings and experiences, the grief and mourning experienced by individuals and communities globally to anthropogenic climate change seems strangely silenced in public climate change discourse. Indeed, the environment and non-human bodies do not normally or regularly appear within media reports, dominant political discourses,⁴ and even academic literature on climate change as something mournable or as a source of grieving.⁵ This is a serious gap in academic literature, political practice, and media discourse around climate change, and it does not match the lived experiences of people around the globe. Given the current global crisis of climate change, reconciling the private responses of environmentally-based loss with the relative absence of this grief in public and academic spheres is of the utmost importance. Going further, grief and mourning have the unique potential to expand and transform the discursive spaces around climate change to include not only the lives of people who are grieving because of the changes, but also to value what is being altered, degraded, and harmed as something mournable. We need, therefore, mechanisms that can extend grievability to non-human bodies and recognize them as mournable subjects, particularly within discourses of climate change. This article will argue that one possible avenue for reconstituting and recognizing non-human bodies as grievable within the climate change arena is through framing climate change as the work of mourning.

By integrating the loss of non-human bodies and processes and the work of mourning into the climate change discourse, this work intends to create discursive and political space for the lived experience of climate-related grief and mourning and argue for thinking climate change with and through the work and labours of mourning. In so doing, this article extends the concept of a mournable body beyond the human in order to frame climate change as the work of mourning, and to discover what type of work this would be. The ethical and political implications that may emerge from thinking and acting with climate change as the work of mourning, and the ways in which this work can attend to both human bodies and non-human bodies through this type of environmental-based grief work will also be examined. The extension of the work of mourning to the climate change discourse can assist in discovering the political and ethical possibilities emergent from uniting the work of mourning with climate change—possibilities that can translate to public action, discursive

sive shifts, and the recognition of non-human entities as fellow vulnerable beings deserving of our mourning and our concerted political action. This article concludes with a consideration of an ecological democracy-to-come, and how the productive work of mourning may help to achieve a more fully inclusive political and ethical order of humans and non-humans alike.

Before the discussion of grievability can be extended to climate change and the degradation or destruction of non-human bodies and processes, however, it is first important to examine what is entailed in the work of mourning, and what politically and ethically these labours have to offer.

THE WORK AND LABORS OF MOURNING

As Freud theorized in his seminal study of mourning and melancholia, mourning is work—long, hard, laborious work, which may never be concluded (Freud 2007; c.f. Derrida 1996, Engle 2007).⁶ This work is always and simultaneously personal, political, and ethical, and corporeally embodied. It is a process full of often-uncontrollable emotional and corporeal responses, such as grief, pain, anguish, sadness, devastation, denial, and affects, emergent from the shock of losing something or someone that was loved, valued, and important (Dubose 1997). It is an individualizing work, as loss is experienced differently by everyone; it is also a unifying work, bringing people together through collective experiences of sharing grief. For example, although grief is experienced individually and privately through one's own emotional and corporeal responses, it is also shared with others publicly, through collective expressions or gatherings of mourning (such as funerals, memorials, protests, eulogies, obituaries, and vigils). This grief can be shared by a relatively small group of familiar people in memory of an individual, or on a large scale in response to shared grief by a collective group of strangers in a public setting through public outpourings (for example, Columbine, 9/11, Matthew Shepard, and the Montreal Massacre at the École Polytechnique) and through mourning at public memorials (as a non-exhaustive list: AIDS Quilt, Grave of the Unknown Soldier, Korean War and Vietnam War memorials, Ground Zero, Highway of Heroes, Hiroshima Peace Memorial, the Killing Fields Museum). These tasks and processes of mourning take over the lives of mourners for varying temporal lengths, to varying degrees, and interrupt 'normal' activities and habits, while attempting to rebuild a new self in the

wake of the loss (Freud 2007, Dubose 1997). The mourning process also has the unique capacity to be both individualizing and unifying, making the mourner feel at once alone in grief, yet connected somehow to others who grieve simultaneously and to others who have grieved before.

Mourning is also a work that can never be avoided. From birth, our existence as a human body is shaped by our connections to other bodies (human or otherwise) who will pass before us and whom we shall precede through our own death. That is to say that, from birth, we are at once already survivors and are preparing ourselves to already be survived (Derrida 1997, Brault and Naas 2001). As a 'being-towards-death',⁷ our existence and our life are framed by our very finiteness, and by the bounded nature of life. All life has a beginning and an end, and as such, our very life project is both made possible by and limited because of the unavoidable nature of our own eventual end and of the eventual end of other life—life that and who came before us, existed with us, and will come after us. Our 'being-towards-death' is an ontological condition and, in of itself, is the very basis of and way of being in the world. To live authentically and to understand what it means to be alive is to daily face the eventuality of our own death, and to find meaning and freedom in our life through the very possibility of our death-to-come. Mourning, and the resulting work, then, is an unyielding and ever-present condition of life, the labours of which we partake in ceaselessly, interminably, and inconsolably (Derrida 1996). The work of mourning, then, begins *before* death, with the knowledge that 'we' will be surviving 'others' (whomever and whatever those 'others' are). In this way, mourning is also the opportunity to continually engage with death, with loss, and with those who have come before while *we* are still *alive* (Brault and Naas 2001, Kirkby 2006, Engle 2007).

If mourning is a work for the living and from which we cannot escape, is it ever fully finished? While there are different answers to that question, Freud laid the foundations for a belief that healthy mourning would, eventually, come to completion, which often still characterizes much discourse on mourning. In his works, Freud offered a psychoanalytic framework of mourning (albeit a changing one), which reported that successful mourning was about being able to substitute one loss object for another; that is, the attachment that one felt to a previous love object was replaced with a new attachment, implying an interchangeability of the objects of attachment and the ability to quell mourning by 'replacing' what

or who was being mourned with something or someone new (Freud 2007; c.f. Butler 2004). This view, however, changed in his later works to the full incorporation of the loss within and to the acceptance that what was lost cannot be exchanged; rather, the loss is internalized through the realization of non-substitution, and a process of mourning and catharsis occurs until the mourning is complete and the ego becomes free from grief work (Freud 2007). Despite this belief in the ability of mourning to finish, Freud did recognize, however, that there are times where mourning remains incomplete. For Freud, mourning that did not or could not finish became a pathological form of mourning—melancholia—a condition where one enjoys, or even becomes addicted to, the loss and absence and becomes stuck, unable to act, unable to move forward from the loss, instead choosing to stay attached or addicted to the loss object and the associated emotions (Freud 2007). Unlike mourning, however, melancholia can linger on in an unhealthy or narcissistic way, allowing the individual experiencing melancholia to become addicted to pain and suffering (Kristeva 1989, Freud 2007).⁸ As such, while mourning was seen as an appropriate response to loss, for the psychoanalytic tradition emerging from Freud, melancholia was to be avoided. Successful mourning from this perspective, then, emerged if the mourner no longer felt pain, no longer withdrew from regular activities, and found something ‘new’ to replace what was ‘lost’—and avoided the temptations of melancholia.

By envisioning an end to mourning, a Freudian perspective misses the many potent and fecund opportunities for change and transformation that can emerge from mourning. Indeed, both Butler and Derrida would, to a certain extent, disagree with Freud’s understanding of mourning as having an eventual conclusion, and their works help us move beyond Freud’s psychoanalytic framework of full interiorization and replacement or substitution of the love object in mourning to a more active and salient perspective of mourning and its associated work. For Butler, ‘successful’ mourning and grieving does not come from the full substitutability or the forgetting of what was lost; rather, mourning is about transformation:

...one mourns when one accepts that by the loss one undergoes one will be changed, possibly forever. Perhaps mourning has to do with agreeing to undergo a transformation (perhaps one should say *submitting* to transformation) the full result of which one cannot know in advance. There is losing, as we know, but there is also the transformative effect of loss. (2004, 21)

In mourning, we not only lose something that was loved, but we also lose our former selves, the way we used to be before the loss. We are changed internally and externally by the loss in ways that we cannot predict or control, and in ways that may be disorienting, surprising, or completely unexpected. Through this mourning-as-transformation we are open to others—human, animal, vegetal, and mineral—and continually exposed and vulnerable to these bodies through the potential for loss, and our subsequent grieving. In this understanding of mourning, we are also continually seized by unexpected responses to loss for which we can little prepare, and which continually compounds through subsequent experiences with loss and grief. These responses to human and other-than-human loss can leave us changed in ways we cannot previously have imagined, and hold the possibility of leaving us more open to other bodies, to grief, and to our transcorporeal connections with all bodies, species, and life forms; or, conversely, leaving us closed off, desensitized to the suffering and destruction of other bodies—a condition that the work of mourning can challenge and disrupt.

From a Derridean perspective, ‘successful’ mourning is not about internalizing or replacing the other; rather, mourning is about recognizing that all we have to give to mourning, to what we have lost, is in our own *living* and our own actions taken within life (Brault and Naas 2001). For Derrida (1996), this work is about encountering and engaging with the responsibility posed by death and the foregrounding of vulnerability, and of responding through our ethical and political choices, actions, and framings. Mourning is, from a Derridian perspective, both a necessity of life and a call to responsibility to engage with what was lost (Derrida 1996, Kirkby 2006), and carries a requirement of response through our own lives and actions (Naas 2003). Mourning, then, is work to which we must always attend and which we must always share with others—a work that does not finish while our own body is alive.

We can also mourn for those whom we do not know, for those whom we will not know: the bodies lost in wars and acts of terrors (most recently: 9/11, Afghanistan, Iraq), natural disasters (Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the 2004 Tsunami, the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the 2011 earthquake in Japan), and humanitarian tragedies (the current drought in Somalia, deaths from poverty and disease). These mourning responses can emerge through direct exposure to the actual event, or they can be mediated through news clips, stories from others, photographs, works of art,

texts, video, or social media (Reser and Swim 2011). Regardless of how we experience loss and respond with and to mourning, we are characterized in part by the continual loss of lives and bodies around us—both human and non-human—through events both in our control and beyond our control.

We are also characterized by who and what we grieve; and just as importantly, by who and what we *do not* grieve. As Butler explained,

If I understand myself on the model of the human, and if the kinds of public grieving that are available to me make clear the norms by which the ‘human’ is constituted for me, then it would seem that I am as much constituted by those I do grieve for as by those whose deaths I disavow, whose nameless and faceless deaths form the melancholic background for my social world. (2004, 46)

There are, in many cases, deaths and bodies that go, or have gone, unnoticed or unmourned by ourselves and others, or who do not seem to matter in discourses or politics of mourning: the AIDS body, the homosexual body, the Indigenous body, the poor body, the woman body, the racialized body, and the bodies on different sides of religious or ethnic conflict. While we may not explicitly mourn, we are still shaped by those myriad losses and, consciously or unconsciously, are impacted. Even though these bodies have been historically denied or may still be denied in various ethical and political domains, with concerted political effort and through mourning and shared vulnerability, these bodies have come to secure recognition as bodies that matter (albeit still a work in progress in many cases).

There are also non-human bodies that go unrecognized; yet, we also mourn for environmental bodies and for environmental degradation and destruction: the destruction of forests and farmlands, the devastation of landscapes for open-pit mining, the scarring of lands from tar sands projects, the levelling of mountain tops for mining, the pollution of rivers and lakes; the loss of forests from clear-cutting, the deaths of other creatures (beached whales, birds stuck in oil slicks, mass fish die-offs, and animals struck by vehicles, to name a few), the melting of ice caps, the permanent loss of biodiversity through human-induced extinction, and the changes in lands all over the world because of climatic shifts and variability. These environmental bodies and non-human entities are, too, disavowed deaths that often escape the literature around mourning, and our own conceptualizations of mournable bodies.

EXTENDING MOURNING BEYOND THE HUMAN

Despite these environmentally-based grief experiences, however, there is a profound lack of non-human entities and bodies in our discourses about mourning. Indeed, neither Freud, nor Derrida, nor Butler include the non-human in their discussions of mourning (although they do not *specifically* exclude non-humans either); and while I find much traction in their works to extend the discussion to the non-human, this very exclusion in these works, as well as within the dominant discourses of mourning, serves to further derealize our animal, vegetable, and mineral kin in the same way that other human lives have also been derealized. In this limiting anthropocentric notion of mourning, it is always the human who occupies ethical and political consideration within mourning, and it is human loss that is predominately featured (even though there are still human bodies who and losses that do not seem to matter in political or public discussion). Quite simply, grief and mourning for the loss of the environment or non-human entities currently do not enjoy or garner serious or widespread discursive work.

Despite the anthropogenic focus of mourning in current discourse, we can, and we should, extend this discussion of mourning to the non-human, and use this mourning as a resource for recognizing non-humans as *fellow* vulnerable entities and mournable subjects, capable of degradation, destruction, and suffering.⁹ We can make these extensions in thought and action by learning from other examples where previously ignored bodies were reconstituted as mournable subjects through collective action and concerted effort: for example, through the conscious political mobilization that reconstituted and recognized the AIDS body as a mournable subject. Although the first medical reports of AIDS appeared in North America in 1981, for many years, AIDS bodies were marginalized within public discourse, and in many ways, those living with AIDS and their loved ones were derealized from the public sphere of mourning (Butler 1993).¹⁰ The reconstitution of the AIDS body as something grievable required significant theoretical, political, and cultural activism and re-codification, and countless individuals uniting together to attempt to re-define the AIDS body as something mournable and something absolutely imperative to grieve publicly and openly. This process would not have succeeded without the conscious creation of public acts of mourning: public testimonies and eulogies, elaborate funerals, public memorials, the crea-

tion of the AIDS quilt (The NAMES Project), the famous photograph of AIDS activist David Kirby at the end of his life (photographed by Therese Frare¹¹), plays and theatrical productions, and even Hollywood films, helped to reconstitute the AIDS body as a human body in broader social discourse (Butler 1993), vulnerable like our own, whose suffering and destruction is tragic, grievable, and an appropriate source of mourning. That is, with concerted theoretical, political, social, and cultural activism and reframing, and through public outpourings and testaments of grief, previously marginalized and ungrievable bodies became socially constituted to again be mournable in public, political, and ethical discourses. In this movement, grief and the work of mourning became a driving factor and a potent political strategy to break through the marginalization to reconstitute the AIDS body as something worthy of and appropriate for mourning in the public discourse.

While I hasten to add that this example does not intend in any way to compare the deaths of those who passed from AIDS or the mourning of their loved one with the deaths of non-humans from climate change, nor to ignore or conflate the politics of sex, race, gender, and marginalization within the AIDS movement and literature with the politics of climate change, there are similarities between the actions and thinking that pushed for the recognition of the AIDS body as vulnerable and mournable, and the attempt to extend this same recognition to non-humans through the work of mourning.

THE ETHICAL AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF MOURNING

Mourning is never strictly theoretical. It is real, it is work, and it binds us together with others (Butler 2004, Engle 2007). It is always already a condition of corporeality, and it is not something from which we can escape. It is affectively contagious, easily shared, and exposes the primacy of bodily ties. And it is a task which calls to us all through the relations we share with other bodies. What if we are expected *not to mourn*? What if we are asked to publicly shelve or bracket our mourning for something or someone or somewhere, as we have been asked to do with the impacts of climate change? What do we do when what *could* be mourned is stripped of its capacity to *count* as a grievable body in public discourse, in the ways that non-human entities have been treated? If we map the ethical and political potential for discursive transformation that emerges from the example of mourning and the AIDS movement and the works of Derrida

and Butler above onto the climate change discourse, there is the potential for expanding the ethics and politics of mourning to this arena. Indeed, while mourning exposes our connections to others—human, animal, vegetal, or mineral—and provides an opportunity to connect to ourselves and others through loss and shared vulnerability, it also provides ethical (through recognition of shared vulnerability) and political (through moving this recognition to action) opportunities to expand discursive spaces to include bodies that are not mourned in dominant discourse, and to encourage individual and collective action, recognition, and responsibility in environmental matters.

Beyond being a necessary condition of life and relations, both Derrida and Butler have argued that mourning is also a potent ethical and political force. For Derrida, “there is no politics without an organization of the time and space of mourning” (Derrida 1993, 61), without the recognition of our ethical and political responsibilities to the other through the recognition of the fragility and vulnerability of our own life. For Butler (2004, 22), the process of mourning “furnishes a sense of political community of a complex order, and it does this first of all by bringing to the fore the relational ties that have implications for theorizing fundamental dependency and ethical responsibility.” This ‘we-creating’ capacity of mourning (Butler 2004) is what brings to the fore our relational ties to others—whether we know those others or not—and where the potential for enhancing individual and collective resilience to loss through a shared capacity to grieve, to suffer, and to mourn. Mourning, and the related works and tasks, are the basis and mechanisms for recognizing the vulnerability of others through our own fragility—a fragility that, through climate change and the resulting impacts, we all share to varying degrees and in varying ways on this planet. The ethical implications of mourning are here, in the ways in which mourning works to make us viscerally and emotionally aware of the fragility of others that we have lost, or that we could lose; in so doing, this awareness moves our own vulnerability as ‘beings-towards-death’ to the foreground of our experience. This understanding of vulnerability—our own and others—allows us to recognize others—human and non-human—as vulnerable subjects, capable of suffering and destruction, grief and mourning. In this light, mourning and grief are capable of reaching across cultures, languages, species boundaries, and differences and connecting with others through recognition of the shared pain and vulnerability. Recognition of mournability for other species, then, becomes an

ethical act of the work of mourning within the context of climate change; thus, ethically, mourning is a source of insight into the responsibilities that we share for and to one another, and reconstitutes human *and* non-human others as grievable subjects.

Politically, the work of mourning builds on this visceral and phenomenological experience of mourning, and challenges us to extend our limits of recognition of ‘mournable bodies’ or ‘mournable entities’. In so doing, mourning can be a catalyst for political action between, among, and across species. Working together, an ethico-political understanding of mourning may expose the inherent injustice in silenced deaths (Spargo 2004) and may counteract the derealization of non-humans, and those whom mourn them, in dominant climate change discourses through this recognition. If mourning is politically and ethically productive, then,

...is there something to be gained from grieving, from tarrying with grief, from remaining exposed to its unbearability and not endeavouring to seek a resolution for grief through violence? Is there something to be gained in the political domain by maintaining grief as part of the framework within which we think our international ties? If we stay with the sense of loss, are we left feeling only passive and powerless, as some might fear? Or are we, rather, returned to a sense of human vulnerability, to our collective responsibility for the physical lives of one another? (Butler 2004, 30)

The ability of mourning to return to vulnerability and collective responsibility through recognition of the other is the very essence of the power of mourning. While grief and mourning may indeed be unbearable, expose our very vulnerability, and at times make us feel as though we are powerless, their labours can also be understood “as the slow process by which we develop a point of identification with suffering itself” (Butler 2004, 30). From this perspective, grief and mourning have the ability to mobilize, to galvanize, and to cause conscious action through the recognition of others as fellow vulnerable beings, and through an understanding of shared suffering, *not* to privatize, silence, and subdue (Engle 2007). Through mourning, then, and as we encounter the suffering and vulnerability of others, we come to recognize the other as vulnerable, as grievable, wholly deserving of the work and labours of mourning.

THINKING CLIMATE CHANGE AS THE WORK OF MOURNING

Given the discussion of mourning above, it is clear that there are ethical and political implications for thinking climate change as the work of mourning—implications that have the potential to extend mourning to non-human entities, and to recognize their vulnerability as something that we too share. This recognition also demands action—individual and collective, ethical and political. If we return to movements that have used the work of mourning to reconstitute and recognize others as mournable subjects, such as with the AIDS body above, there are some mechanisms and lessons to be learned from movements that extend to climate change.

First, we must recognize the vulnerability of humans and non-human entities to climatic changes and subsequent environmental alterations. The work of mourning further exposes our individual and collective vulnerability not only to other humans who are currently experiencing the burden of global climatic changes, but also to non-human bodies and processes transforming because of climate change. This shared vulnerability emergent from understanding climate change as the work of mourning can extend beyond the human in order to be more inclusive of humans and non-humans alike. This mutual vulnerability may also be a powerful mechanism to incite public participation in ecological-grief-related events (see below), and subsequently, to enhance adaptation and resilience through shared grief, collective mourning, and group action. In addition, this shared vulnerability may itself be a mechanism for shared resilience to change, as people have the opportunity to share their grief, take comfort in communities formed in response to climate-related mourning, and come together in unity to effect change for both humans and non-humans.

Second, environmentally-based grief needs to continue to be spoken loudly and often, in private and public settings. Despite the absence of mourning in climate change discourse, and the implicit framing of non-human bodies as non-grievable subjects, it is imperative to also highlight and share these grief experiences. Indeed, public mourning can be an important mechanism for political mobilization, the counteraction of dominant discourses around the derealization of non-human bodies, and for sharing the grief experienced from climatic and environmental change. For example, at the 2009 Conference of the Parties (COP 15) climate change negotiations in Copenhagen, the Tuvalu Delegation publicly shared their grief, sadness, and distress about the destruction of their coastlines and

the rapid disappearance of parts of their island due to rising water levels. Ian Fry, one of the lead negotiators for Tuvalu, wept during his public speech, and this emotional outpouring of grief in a largely scientific and political setting served to disrupt the conversations momentarily, and to cause discomfort throughout the delegation (see Farbotko and McGregor 2010 for an analysis of the impact of this event on the negotiation process). Despite this event, to date, emotions such as grief and loss in response to climate change remain almost completely unexplored in climate change studies (Farbotko and McGregor 2010, Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011, Norgaard 2011).

Just as Ian Fry and the Tuvalu Delegation did in Copenhagen in 2009, and just as many Indigenous peoples, artists, photographers, and writers continue to do through their stories and visual media, this grief for non-human bodies and processes—particularly grief experienced through changes in climate and environment—needs to be shared broadly to counteract the violence of derealization to repopulate the climate change discourse with the voices and experiences of environmentally-based mourning, and to socially constitute non-humans as mournable and grievable. While this climate-related grief and mourning is emerging around the globe from people living at the frontlines of climate change—peoples in the Circumpolar region, Small Island States, and Australian farmers, to name a few (Albrecht et al. 2007; Speldewinde et al. 2009; Berry, Bowen, and Kjellstrom 2010; Farbotko and McGregor 2010; Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011; Berry et al. 2011; Cunsolo Willox et al. 2012)—this is a work for us *all*. We need to continue to eulogize and read out the names of those non-humans that have been lost, or are close to disappearance. We need to continue to speak the names of the extinct (or close to) at public events, in classrooms, and in private settings. We need to continue to create works of art, literature, and writing extolling this environmentally-based grief and loss. An interesting example of this is the creation of the Mass Extinction Memorial Observatory (MEMO) currently being erected in the United Kingdom on the Isle of Portland, which will host carvings of all the plants and animals that have become extinct in modern times. The MEMO is also meant to celebrate biodiversity and the importance of all creatures on this planet, and every year on May 22nd for International Biodiversity Day, a bell will toll marking all animals and plants that have passed.

Third, this grief needs to be witnessed and shared by others, whether

they have experienced environmentally-based grief due to climate change or not. This shared witnessing allows the opportunity for individuals to connect with shared responsibility of this grief from a global process, and to understand this mourning as personal, political, and ethical, illustrative of the injustices perpetuated against the other-than-human world by human actions *and* illustrative of the injustices experienced by those who currently bear the burden of this type of mourning. We need to continue to share this ecological grief and to provide places for people to go and collectively mourn (such as the MEMO).

Fourth, reframing a movement such as climate change through mourning can populate the literature and discourse with the understanding that emotions and grief are meaningful and powerful aspects of climate change, and can recognize publicly the substantial impacts of climate change on those who mourn the changes. Grief also offers an additional and powerful narrative to those highlighting the problems of climate change for humanity and those focusing on adaptation and mitigation (Randall 2009). In so doing, further opportunities for enhancing resilience and adaptive capacities through productive and shared mourning and public acts of grief may also emerge.

Finally, although mourning can lead to feelings such as anger, rage, or hatred, if mourned with intent to grieve and respect what was lost and to heal, mourning has the capacity to be a more psychologically healthy emotion to incite political action, rather than action premised on rage or hatred. As Butler wrote: “And though for some, mourning can only be resolved through violence, it seems clear that violence only brings on more loss, and the failure to heed the claim of precarious life only leads again and again to the dry grief of an endless political rage.” (2004, xix). Sharing in mourning and working through the grief process may assist in psychological resilience to the changes (Randall 2009, Cunsolo Willox et al. 2011). It may also furnish a sense of political and ethical community in response to the changes based on something beyond violence or rage (Butler 2004), yet still understands the place for anger and rage to emerge against the injustice of the deaths of other species and creatures due to anthropogenic climate change and human action. As such, mourning works to move beyond violence and hatred, towards a place of unification through shared vulnerability.

These examples are not meant to be limiting or exhaustive, but rather,

a starting point for examining opportunities to cohesively unify and engage with climate change issues through shared global grief and mourning for what has been, currently is, and will be lost in the other-than-human worlds. By conceptualizing and thinking with climate change as the work of mourning, a space opens up for grief and the loss experienced as a result of climate change to be expressed, shared, and discussed. It publicizes what has previously been pushed into the margins of the private sphere, and emphasizes the intimate and transcorporeal connections shared across species and boundaries and spatial and temporal scales.

This framing of and thinking with climate change as the work of mourning also exposes the weaknesses in our theoretical constructs and discursive framing, as the lived experiences of people living with and through environmental grief, place-based mourning, and the loss of the land and non-human entities have outstripped what is conceptualized in the theoretical work of mourning. Furthermore, the problem is not only with our conception of nature, or over the socially-constituted notions of what counts as mournable or grievable—it is also with our conception of those who grieve for the un-grievable, such as Indigenous groups, farmers, or those who rely closely on the natural environment. Perhaps mourning non-human entities has not received much public attention because those most likely to partake in this work in response to climate change are themselves bodies that do not usually matter within policy and discourses; that is, those who are most likely to grieve the loss of the land and climatic and environmental degradation are precisely those who are most often marginalized. This marginalization also means that the vulnerabilities these groups have to climatic and environmental change, and the resulting emotional responses such as loss and grief, are often ignored or absent in larger public discourse.¹² The work of mourning highlights vulnerability to loss and to change experienced by other people on this planet dealing with climate change—a vulnerability that we all share as lived bodies. By publicizing this non-human mourning, we make this ecological grieving and this vulnerability to climatic and environmental change visible to the dominant discourse and assist in the reconstitution of non-humans and those who mourn them, as bodies that matter, and bodies that *count* in the work of mourning.

From a more pragmatic perspective, mourning may be one such mechanism to assist with finding common ground among peoples from differ-

ent countries, cultures, and climates to unite together, share experiences, and creatively enhance resilience and adaptive capacities. Indeed, further research and work will benefit from including stories and reports of ecologically-based grief and mourning experienced by peoples in regions where the most serious impacts of climate change are being felt, such as the Polar regions, low-lying island states, and ecologically-sensitive ecosystems, as well as by people whose grief and mourning are in response to mediated images and texts (c.f. Reser and Swim 2011). In addition, research examining culturally-based patterns or responses to guilt, and an analysis of the ways in which previous traumas (ecologically or otherwise) were experienced, and comparing, contrasting, and mapping onto the grief experienced through climate change is also another important area for further study. Finally, there is the potential for fruitful and fecund research examining the intersection of grief and guilt within the context of climate change. Often, we grieve and mourn for that which we have no control or part; within the context of anthropogenic climate change, however, the changes experienced throughout the globe, and the impacts on humans and non-humans alike, are directly related to human actions, and thus although we may mourn, we are also implicated in our actions. This tension between mourning what has been lost or what is changing coupled with guilt over our own actions that have led to these changes is an important area for further research and consideration.¹³

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS: AN ECOLOGICAL DEMOCRACY-TO-COME

Climate change represents the largest human-induced global ecological threat experienced to date, but there is still much fragmentation in research, politics, ethics, policy, and action. We are all vulnerable to climate change, and we are all vulnerable to death and loss from climate change. Thinking climate change *as* the work of mourning provides the opportunity to learn from the deaths, or the potential deaths, of bodies beyond our own, and beyond our species to unite in individual and global action and response. Mourning is work for us *all*. Climate change—both its causes and its resulting impacts—is also work for us *all*, as citizens of this planet, and as those who hold the responsibility for the changes and for the changes perpetuated on our feathered, furred, scaled, insect, microbial, and phloemy kin.

As has been argued, mourning, and the associated work, is one of the most fundamental capacities of being human, and may provide the means to move ever deeper into the sensorial present with humans *and* non-humans. As Nass wrote, the work of mourning “opens up the possibility of a social or political space to accommodate all others” (2008, 170). Thinking climate change as the work of mourning means that we are ethically and politically implicated not only by what is happening to our animal, vegetal, and mineral kin, but also in the choice to respond. This work, then, opens up the opportunity to mourn each and every ‘body’ differently and publicly, rather than as an aggregation under an abstract concept or as a lived experience mourned privately, silenced in public and academic narratives of mourning, or simply not mourned at all. This ecological grief work, and the resulting ethics, offers something for us all to learn in the new global reality of climate change. How we reply may be different, and our responses may not always be up to the task, but the ecological work of mourning “is hope, the hope for unimaginably better futures for unknown and unknowable recipients in a space left to them” (Houle 2007, 163). In this ecological work of mourning, and in our individual and collective grief, and in the possibilities for transforming our political and ethical landscapes that climate change is offering, we may, as Houle wrote,

...glimpse a unique constellation of human witness, of immanent multiplicity: what is always everywhere asking for hospitality just where we are not yet ready for it. There was, or perhaps there is calling here. A calling for a unique form of response: what might come forth in the wake of attending to these sorts of deaths? Perhaps the featureless, nameless Face of the democracy to come. (2007, 164)

Or perhaps the featureless, nameless face of an *ecological* democracy-to-come: a democracy-to-come that both includes and recognizes animal, vegetal, and mineral bodies and ecosystems within the work and labours of mourning—a new ethical and political future in response to environmentally-based grief and lament and to counteract the destruction and degradation of our non-human kin. An ecological democracy-to-come that, through mourning, has the potential to create a more fully inclusive political order; a democratic order extending rights and recognition beyond the human, in which democratic decision-making also includes and recognizes non-human entities as fellow vulnerable beings, demanding and deserving of rights, of grief, and of mourning. Indeed, I find hope

in the already-emerging public expressions of grieving for non-humans as an indication of this ecological democracy-to-come.

We must also speak of this grief, for as Derrida explained, in mourning, “speaking is impossible, but so too would be silence or absence or a refusal to share one’s sadness” (Derrida 2001, 72). Mourning, then, is about sharing one’s sadness and bearing witness through our own lives and bodies to the lives. I, myself, have stood up and testified for human loved ones. I have publicly shared my grief. I have publicly mourned. I have written and spoken and expressed my grief and participated in the work of mourning for *human* intimates. But, until now, I have not done this work publicly for non-humans, for the loss of beloved ecosystems and the destruction of animal, plant, and mineral kin, for the affective grief and mourning I feel when confronted with friends’ and colleagues’ environmentally-based grief and mourning. Perhaps, then, this article is also, in a way, an expression of grief for the loss and pain and mourning that I feel for the derealization of non-humans; an environmental eulogy for the destruction and violence perpetuated on non-human bodies, for the anticipatory grief I feel for the future changes, and for the empathetic sadness I feel through the pain that my friends and colleagues experience because of changing climate and environments. This paper, then, is but a small step towards my environmental grief work, my own ecological work of mourning.

Re-casting climate change as the work of mourning means that we can share our losses, and encounter them as opportunities for productive and important work to be given primacy and taken seriously. It also provides the opportunity to stand up and publicly object to injustice: injustice to non-human bodies; injustice to the bodies that have been derealized and socially-constituted as unmournable. The work of mourning brings back these bodies to the foreground and recognizes them as something worthy to be mourned through productive, transformative, interminable, and never-ending work; work to be conducted and taken up, right now, *before* our death and the death of others; work that may allow for a deeper understanding of our relationships with other bodies, human and non-human—a new ecological ethic and platform for unification and action premised upon and mobilized through the work and labours of mourning, and through a commitment to ecological democracy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Raymond Anthony and the participants at the NSF Climate Ethics Works-in-Progress Conference at the University of Alaska at Anchorage September 8-9, 2011 for their feedback on an early draft of this paper, with particular thanks to Terrence Kelly (University of Alaska at Anchorage) for his astute insights and compelling commentary during the conference, and for his ongoing support and suggestions for the final version of this article. Sincerest thanks also to Karen Landman (University of Guelph), Karen Houle (University of Guelph), and James Ford (McGill University) for their comments and critiques on this paper, which have strengthened the final argument. I am grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship program for funding while completing this work.

NOTES

- 1 I am not speaking here of companion animals or pets, but rather, of non-human entities, such as animal, vegetal, and mineral bodies and ecosystems, which are not usually acknowledged to cause substantial feelings of loss.
- 2 This anticipation of the future expressed by people with whom I worked should not be generalized across other Inuit communities in Canada. For example, many Inuit Elders do not usually speak of the future, as there is a belief that speaking of what is to come (especially of negative things) will make what is spoken about come true.
- 3 Anticipating possible grief does not make the actual mourning event easier. As Brault and Naas explain, in this anticipatory grieving state “we thus imagine, even before the fact, a world without the friend or without us, a world that will have absorbed either absence. And yet, when the event itself comes, the event we thought we knew and had prepared ourself for, it hits us each time uniquely—like the end of the world” (2001, 14).
- 4 A potential attempt to bring non-humans to the centre of political discourse may be found in Bolivia’s push to create an historic ‘Law of Mother Earth,’ which would grant nature the same rights and legal protections as humans. This law is set to recognize that nature, the environment, and all entities within, have a right to life and to existence—an existence free from pollution, degradation, and destruction. Bolivia is also in the process of creating a Ministry of Mother Earth to oversee the new legislation. See, for example, an article by John Vidal in on April 10, 2011 in *The Guardian* newspaper: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/apr/10/bolivia-enshrines-natural-worlds-rights>.
- 5 Indeed, in an academic literature search of scholarly articles through Web of Knowledge (WOK) in October 2011 using search terms such as (nature AND mourning OR grief), (environment AND mourning OR grief), (“climat* chang* AND mourning”) yielded not one single relevant article. Only the search phrase (“climate change” AND grief) returned one short article

(Dean and Stain 2010) on the mental health impacts of prolonged drought on adolescents, which after reading it through, did not examine grief or mourning. From my other work on the impacts of climate change on mental and emotional health, I had discovered one article written by two psychologists who theorized that grief and mourning were possibilities resultant from climate change (Doherty and Clayton 2011) Also, there is work emerging in Australia about the impacts of prolonged drought on mental health, grieving, and loss, which also resonate with climate change and mourning (although are not explicitly about this topic) (c.f. Albrecht et al. 2007; Sartore et al., 2008; Albrecht 2010). This is not to negate the possibility of mourning for non-humans to exist in grey literature (for example, Thompson's 2008 article in *Wired* magazine), but rather to illustrate the almost complete absence in academic literature and peer-reviewed research.

- 6 The use of Freud here is not meant to negate the work of others who have theorized on death and dying, but rather to recognize that it was Freud who first provided a psychoanalytic framework of grief and loss, and as a result, subsequent work and theorization of mourning owes its roots to and builds upon Freud. And while there are hundreds of works on grief and mourning, for the purposes of this paper this section is limited to the most prominent scholars who have built upon Freud's conceptions of mourning in a philosophical manner, and applied the work of mourning to ethical and political situations for the living, rather than solely psychoanalytic or from the perspective of the dying.
- 7 This concept is, of course, from Heidegger. While a more in-depth discussion of 'being-towards-death and Dasein are beyond the scope of this paper, the discussions of mourning from a Derridian perspective has as a foundation Heidegger's work in this area (please see Heidegger 1962).
- 8 I cannot help but wonder if we are currently experiencing a time of ecological melancholia, where through our technological advancements and addictions to energy consumption, as a species, we are somehow addicted to—or perhaps more accurately, reliant upon—the pain and suffering of other-than-humans. That is, we have become reliant on the loss, degradation, and destruction of the natural environment to maintain and further our own lifestyles. A pathological relationship if ever there was one...
- 9 There are currently some interesting movements in legal circles around extending 'rights' to non-human entities. Christopher's Stone's ground-breaking work *Should Trees Have Standing* (1972), which sought to extend legal rights to nature, based on the precedents set by extending rights to invisible, intangible, and/or artificial entities, such as corporations. As Stone argued forty years ago, it is important to think the unthinkable in law because "throughout legal history, each successive extension of rights to some new entity has been, theretofore, a bit unthinkable. We are inclined to suppose the rightlessness

of rightless ‘things’ to be a decree of Nature, not a legal convention acting in support of some status quo.... The fact is, that each time there is a movement to confer rights onto some new ‘entity,’ the proposal is bound to sound odd or frightening or laughable” (1972, 6, 7). We can see this tension of the extension rights to new entities in current movements, such as Bolivia’s Law of Mother Earth, and the attempts to extend rights to non-human bodies and entities in a legally-binding manner. Currently, lawyer and barrister, Polly Higgins, is arguing that Ecocide is a missing fifth Crime Against Peace, alongside Genocide. In April 2010, Higgins submitted a written proposal to the United Nations to include Ecocide as a recognized international crime, and has created a provision that will impose a legal duty of care on all companies to place environmental considerations first. This provision also places the responsibility on people (CEOs, heads of state, heads of institutions), rather than on legal entities such as corporations or political structures (Eradicating Ecocide, www.eradicatingecocide.com).

- 10 Infamously, then-president Ronald Reagan did not acknowledge the disease publicly or in political discourse. Even after the AIDS-related deaths of friends and acquaintances, such as Rock Hudson, he still did not mention the pandemic publicly until 1987 (and after almost 60,000 cases of AIDS were diagnosed in the United States alone).
- 11 To view this photograph, and the associated photographic documentary, “The Photo that Brought AIDS Home,” by Therese Frare, published online through Life magazine, please visit <http://life.time.com/history/behind-the-picture-the-photo-that-changed-the-face-of-aids/#1> (Cosgrove).
- 12 It is important to emphasize that here I am speaking about the absence of grief and mourning within media reports, policy documents, and academic discourse (see footnote 5 for a discussion of a literature search on this topic).
- 13 There may be helpful grief-related literature examining survivor guilt or coping mechanisms from those who have caused accidental deaths.

REFERENCES

- Abram, David. 1996. *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human-World*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Albrecht, Glenn. 2010. “Solastalgia and the Creation of New Ways of Living.” In *Nature and Culture: Rebuilding Lost Connections*, edited by Sarah Pilgrim and Jules Pretty, 217–34. London, UK: Earthscan.
- Albrecht Glenn, Gina-Maree Sartore, Linda Connor, Nick Higginbotham, Sonia Freeman, Brian Kelly, Helen Stain, Anne Tonna, Georgia Pollard. 2007. “Solastalgia: The Distress Caused by Environmental Change.” *Australian Psychologist* 15 (Supple.): S95–98.
- Berry, Helen Louise. 2009. “The Pearl in the Oyster: Climate Change as a Mental Health Opportunity.” *Australasian Psychiatry* 17(6): 453–56.

- Berry, Helen Louise, Kathryn Bowen, and Tord Kjellstrom. 2010. "Climate Change and Mental Health: A Causal Pathways Framework." *International Journal of Public Health* 55: 123–32.
- Berry, Helen Louise, Anthony Hogan, Jennifer Owen, Debra Rickwood, and Lyn Fragar. 2011. "Climate Change and Farmer's Mental Health: Risks and Responses." *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health* 23(2): 1195–25.
- Bevc, Christine A., Brent K. Marshall, and J. Steven Picou. 2007. "Environmental Justice and Toxic Exposure: Toward a Spatial Model of Physical Health and Psychological Well-Being." *Social Science Research* 36: 48–67.
- Brault, Pascale-Anne and Michael Naas. 2001. "To Reckon With the Dead: Jacques Derrida's Politics of Mourning". In *The Work of Mourning*, edited by Pascale-Anne and Michael Naas, 1–30. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. "Critically Queer." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1(1): 17–32.
- Butler, Judith. 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. New York: Verso.
- Cosgrove, Ben. "Behind the Picture: The Photo that Changed the Face of AIDS." Accessed September 5, 2012. <http://life.time.com/history/behind-the-picture-the-photo-that-changed-the-face-of-aids/#1>
- Cunsolo Willox, Ashlee, Sherilee L. Harper, Victoria L. Edge, Karen Landman, Karen Houle, James D. Ford, and the Rigolet Inuit Community Government. 2011. "'The Land Enriches the Soul:' On Environmental Change, Affect, and Emotional Health and Well-Being in Nunatsiavut, Canada." *Emotion, Space, and Society*. Print version in press. Doi: 10.1016/j.emospa.2011.08.005.
- Cunsolo Willox, Ashlee, Sherilee L. Harper, James D. Ford, Karen Landman, Karen Houle, Victoria L. Edge and the Rigolet Inuit Community Government. 2012. "'From this Place and of this Place:' Climate Change, Health, and Place in Rigolet, Nunatsiavut, Canada." *Social Sciences and Medicine* 75(3), 538–47.
- Dean, John G. and Helen J. Stain. 2010. "Mental Health Impact for Adolescents Living with Prolonged Drought." *The Australian Journal of Rural Health* 18: 32–37.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1986. *Memoires for Paul de Man*, translated by Cecile Lindsay, Jonathan Culler, and Eduard Cadava. New York: Columbia University Press.
- .1993. *Aporias*, translated by Thomas Dutoit. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1996. "By Force of Mourning." *Critical Inquiry* 22: 171–92.
- . 2001. "Jean-Marie Benoist, April 4, 1942-August 1, 1990." In *The Work of Mourning*, edited by Pascale-Anne and Michael Naas, 105–10. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2001. "Paul de Man, December 6, 1919-December 21, 1983." In *The Work of Mourning*, edited by Pascale-Anne and Michael Naas, 69–75. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Doherty, Thomas and Susan Clayton. 2011. "The Psychological Impacts of Global Climate Change." *American Psychologist* 6(4): 265–76.
- Downey, Liam and Marieke Van Willigen. 2005. "Environmental Stressors: The Mental Health Impacts of Living Near Industrial Activity." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 46(3): 289–305.
- Dubose, J. Todd. 1997. "The Phenomenology of Bereavement, Grief, and Mourning." *Journal of Religion and Health* 36 (4): 367–74.
- Engle, Karen. 2007. "Putting Mourning to Work: Making Sense of 9/11." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 24(1): 61–88.
- Eradicating Ecocide. Accessed September 5, 2012. www.eradicatingecocide.com
- Farbotko, Carol and Helen McGregor. 2010. "Copenhagen, Climate Science, and the Emotional Geographies of Climate Change." *Australian Geographer* 41(2): 159–66.
- Ford, James and Chris Furgal. 2009. "Foreword to the Special Issue: Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability in the Arctic." *Polar Research* 28: 1–9.
- Ford, James, Barry Smit, and Johanna Wandel. 2006. "Vulnerability to Climate Change in the Arctic: A Case Study from Arctic Bay Canada." *Global Environmental Change* 16: 145–60.
- Ford, James, Lea Berrang-Ford, Malcolm King, and Chris Furgal. 2010. "Vulnerability of Aboriginal Health Systems in Canada to Climate Change." *Global Environmental Change* 20 (4): 668–80.
- Ford, James, Barry Smit, Johanna Wandel, Mishak Allurut, Kik Shappa, Harry Ittusarjuats, and Kevin Qrunnuts. 2008. "Climate Change in the Arctic: Current and Future Vulnerability in Two Inuit Communities in Canada." *The Geographical Journal* 174(1): 45–62.
- Freud, Sigmund. 2007 [1917]. "Mourning and Melancholia." In *On Freud's 'Mourning and Melancholia'*, edited by Leticia Glocer Fiorini, Thierry Bokanowski, Sergio Lewkowicz, 19–34 [243–58]. London, UK: International Psychoanalytical Association,.
- Fritze, Jessica G., Grant A. Blashki, Susie Burke, and John Wiseman. 2008. "Hope, Despair and Transformation: Climate Change and the Promotion of Mental Health and Well-Being." *International Journal of Mental Health Systems* 2(13). Doi: 10.1186/1752-4458-2-13.
- Furgal, Chris. 2008. "Climate Change Health Vulnerabilities in the North." In *Human Health in a Changing Climate: A Canadian Assessment of Vulnerability and Adaptive Capacity*, edited by Jacinthe Seguin, 303–66. Ottawa: Health Canada.
- Havenaar, Johan M., Julie G. Cwikel, and Evelyn J. Bromet, Eds. 2002. *Toxic Turmoil: Psychological and Societal Consequences of Ecological Disasters*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

- Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*, translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row.
- Houle, Karen. 2007. "Abortion as the Work of Mourning." *Symposium: Canadian Journal of Continental Philosophy* 11(1): 141–66.
- Kirkby, Joan. 2006. "'Remembrance of the Future:' Derrida on Mourning." *Social Semiotics* 16(3): 461–72.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1989. *Black Sun*, translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Krupnik, Igor and Dyanna Jolly, eds. 2002. *The Earth is Faster Now: Indigenous Observations of Arctic Change*. Fairbank, AL: Arctic Research Consortium of the United States.
- Mass Extinction Monitoring Observatory (MEMO). Accessed September 5, 2012. www.memoproject.org
- Naas, Michael. 2003. "History's Remains: Of Memory, Mourning, and the Event." *Research in Phenomenology* 33: 75–96.
- The NAMES Project. Accessed September 5, 2012. www.aidsquilt.org
- Norgaard, Kari. 2006. "'People Want to Protect Themselves a Little Bit': Emotions, Denial, and Social Movement Nonparticipation." *Sociological Inquiry* 76(1): 372–96.
- . 2011. *Living in Denial: Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Palinkas, Lawrence A. John S. Petterson, John Russell, Michael A. Downs. 1993. "Community Patterns of Psychiatric Disorders after the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill." *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 150(10): 1517–23.
- Pearce, Tristan, Barry Smit, Frank Duerden, James D. Ford, Annie Goose, and Fred Kataoyak. 2009. "Inuit Vulnerability and Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Ulukhaktok, Northwest Territories, Canada." *Polar Record* 45: 1–27.
- Picou, J. Steven and Kenneth Hudson. 2010. "Hurricane Katrina and Mental Health: A Research Note on Mississippi Gulf Coast Residents." *Sociological Inquiry* 80(3): 513–24.
- Prowse, Terrence and Chris Furgal. 2009. "Northern Canada in a Changing Climate: Major Findings and Conclusions." *Ambio* 38: 290–92.
- Randall, Rosemary. 2009. "Loss and Climate Change: The Cost of Parallel Narratives." *Ecopsychology* 1(3): 118–29.
- Reser, Joseph P. and Janet K. Swim. 2011. "Adapting to and Coping with the Threat and Impacts of Climate Change." *American Psychologist* 66(4): 277–89.
- Sartore, Gina Maree, Brian Kelly, Helen Stain, Glenn Albrecht, and Nick Higinbotham. 2008. "Control, Uncertainty, and Expectations for the Future: A Qualitative Study of the Impact of Drought on a Rural Australian Community." *Rural and Remote Health* 8: 950.

- Spargo, R. Clifton. 2004. *The Ethics of Mourning*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Speldekwinde, Peter, Angus Cook, Peter Davies, and Philip Weinstein. 2009. "A Relationship between Environmental Degradation and Mental Health in Rural Western Australia." *Health and Place* 15(3): 880–87.
- Stone, Christopher. 1972. *Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects*. Los Altos, CA: William Kaufmann.
- Thompson, Clive. 2008. "Global Mourning: How the Next Victim of Climate Change will be Our Minds." *Wired Magazine*, January, 70. Accessed August 15, 2011. <http://www.wired.com/images/press/pdf/globalmourning.pdf>
- Vidal, John. 2011. "Bolivia Enshrines Natural World's Rights with Equal Status for Mother Earth." *Guardian*, April 11.