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Introduction: a feminist geopolitics of climate change?

For feminist geographers, the body is a foundational site through which to counter abstractions, to challenge and, ideally, to replace such distanced renderings with more materially empowering formulations (Longhurst and Johnston 2014). Climate change has become one of the most preoccupying generalizations of our times, thus critical geopolitics has sought to challenge one of its most dominant facets – the techno-scientific narrative (O’Lear 2016; O’Lear and Dalby 2015) – in order both to critique and replace the ‘dangerous myths of climate science’ underpinning much of the governance and governmental practice of climate security. In place of such ‘geometrics’ such as carbon targets and tipping points that ‘reduce climate to measurable, quantifiable observations about environmental systems’ (Liverman 2009; O’Lear 2016, 5), critical geopolitics has sought to reframe ‘humanity’s place and role in the biosphere’ (Dalby 2007, 113). In this chapter, we imagine a feminist geopolitics of climate change and the contribution that it might make to (and the productive critique it might make of) this wider geopolitical project.

In what follows, we draw together three rich sets of feminist resources, from geographers and others, to challenge the ‘delusions of hyper separation, transcendence and dominance’ that tend to underpin the prevailing techno-scientific accounts of climate change and that might be seen to deny global environmental crises while also hindering effective and engaged responses (Gibson-Graham 2011, 28; see also Plumwood 2002). We draw inspiration from feminist geographers and activists Gibson-Graham (2011), feminist new materialist Stacy Alaimo (2010, 2016) and philosopher Luce Irigaray (1992, 1993), including work from feminist geography that bears her influence. In doing so, we imagine a feminist geopolitics of climate change that opens up abstractions through two intersecting dimensions: first, an engagement with embodied experiences; and second, through taking the ‘geo’ in geopolitics seriously (Adey 2015; Elden 2012; Squire 2016). In doing so, we offer a feminist geographical take on concerns to recouple the scientific debate and study of climate change with ‘the social and political contexts of its material production and cognitive understanding’. Through the study of artworks, we are concerned in particular with approaches that foreground how climate change must be
understood through proximate relations attuned to embodied and, specifically, located and felt manifestations (Brace and Geoghegan 2010; Hawkins et al. 2015; Yusoff and Gabrys 2011).

Our feminist geography colleagues offer us a range of resources through which to think further about these proximate relations. We are inspired by Gibson-Graham’s feminist project of belonging in the Anthropocene and its imperative for connection with the nonhuman. These are connections, they argue, that are felt or otherwise sensed, rather than simply seen, and built through attunement to the lively animate matters of the world. Attending to animate earthly matters as political agents reframes the ‘geo’ in geopolitics, but also requires a rethinking of politics beyond intra-human relations and an acknowledgment of the critical importance of a human politics within and alongside any politics of the nonhuman. Such debates have been proceeding apace within geopolitics and beyond (see, for example, Clark 2013; Dalby 2013; DeLoughrey, Didur and Carrigan 2015; Elden 2012; Squire 2016, 547; Swyngedouw 2013). We are surprised, however, that geopolitics has yet to turn to feminist materialisms as a site from which to rethink the ‘geo’ and to theorize the intra-human and human–nonhuman relations that such a rethinking involves. Here, then, we turn to both Alaimo (2010, 2016) and Irigaray (1992, 1993), and their understanding of vibrant, volatile matters, bodily vulnerabilities and the becoming of body-worlds to evolve the basis for the kinds of embodied, animated accountings of climate change we seek.

While the triad of feminist thinkers offers us the theoretical means to unsettle and replace abstract understandings of climate change, we develop these ideas through an examination of the art–science collaborations of Cape Farewell, a UK-based organization working internationally with artists and scientists to produce a ‘cultural response to climate change’ (Cape Farewell n.d.). From the wide range of Cape Farewell’s work, we focus here on its interdisciplinary Arctic voyages, of which it has conducted eight since 2003, involving over a hundred artists and scientists. The voyagers spend between several weeks and several months on board a 1910 two-masted schooner – *The Noorderlicht* – conceptualizing and developing work that engages with climate change and its impacts in the polar regions. That we would choose arts practice as a site through which to glimpse felt and otherwise-sensed attunements to the environment and the body will come as no surprise to anyone following the evolution of aesthetic theory and art within geography (Colls 2012; Hawkins 2010; Hawkins and Straughan 2014a). Geographers have increasingly sought to understand the role that experience, encounter and embodiment have played in twentieth-century art, recognizing the valuable resource that aesthetics offers to some of our most pressing contemporary concerns (Hawkins 2013). Cape Farewell’s icy imaginaries contribute directly to the diverse Western imaginaries of the Arctic as a site for ‘new nature’. While many of these visions are shaped by encounters with atmospheric, optical and acoustic landscapes (Bloom 1993; Bravo 2000, 2009; Brunn and Medby 2014; Craciun 2016; Dittmer et al. 2011; Dodds 2008), they are also interwoven with debates concerning the north-polar region as a site for knowledge, whether of imperial and contemporary climate science or of Indigenous inhabitants (Anderson 2009; Bravo and Triscott 2011; Cameron 2015; Gearhead et al. 2017; Kusugak 2002).

Our chapter proceeds through two analytic dimensions. First, we explore the experience of artists and scientists in the Arctic as an embodied challenge to abstractions of climate change and as cultivating attunement to animate ‘geos’. Second, we investigate the embodied experiences of *High Antic* to appreciate the vulnerable, transcorporeal bodies this installation instils in galleries distant from the Arctic experiences. Concluding, we probe the limitations of our particular feminist materialist approach to climate change, which incorporates a geopolitics that not only accounts for the intra-human as well as nonhuman but, perhaps most importantly, seeks a more expansive appreciation of the ‘geo’.
An artful feminist geopolitics of climate change

Animate ‘geos’ – A felt politics of climate change

What happens when you come to 78 degrees North to document your experience of a vulnerable environment in a changing climate – which at this temperature seems unchanging, immutable, eternal. Your experience tells you one thing but 15 years absorbing the contents of peer-reviewed journals and computer models suggests something very different. In a sense both are right, the reality of standing on the ice confronts you with the power of the Arctic.

Charlie Kronick, Director of Greenpeace, Cape Farewell Participant 2011
(Cape Farewell n.d.)

Walking on those glaciers was the most magical moment for me. When I was standing on them, one of the scientists said: ‘In 50 years’ time, these won’t be here.’ It is this beauty, scale and fragility and sense of loss which we are trying to embody in this exhibition … We would really like the visitor to slow down, listen, watch and think about the consequences of human behavior and how it will affect the Arctic. However we don’t want to bombard people with facts, statistics and preach how it should be done.

Matthew Clark, artist, Cape Farewell Participant 2011
(Effects of Global Warming 2011)

The Cape Farewell voyagers, like seafarers before them, kept ships logs in the form or b/logs (Cape Farewell nd.). Reading, looking and listening to the poems, interviews, cartoons, sound works, impromptu songs, sketches, reflections on ethnographic visits to local Inuit services and settlements, photographs, scientific expositions and personal diary entries that constitute these blogs, we encounter a range of Arctic experiences. These are dissonant Arctics, with minor scenes of struggle to reconcile the conflicted, embodied experiences of frozen, seemingly static expanses that are simultaneously dynamic, rapidly changing environments characterized by cyclical freezing and thawing over a constantly churning ocean. Such dissonance is set against those Arctic abstractions – graphs, statistics, models – that assert the vulnerability of these environments and act as a harbinger of climate change writ large.

Western icy imaginaries have long been premised on comparisons of environmental stasis and the dynamisms at work in these frozen places. Indeed, since the nineteenth century, ice has shifted in the Western cultural imaginary from being dangerous ‘evil matter’ to a ‘vehicle for and revelation of vital energy by both scientists and artists alike’ (Wilson 2003). As Wilson observes of the Romantics: ‘If the cosmic poles and massive glaciers reveal the life coursing within miniscule man, the tiny ice crystal opens into forces pervading the solar system’ (2003, 5). In short, to Westerners, ice has been appreciated not only as a physical force but also a creative one that extends humans’ capacities for knowledge as:

frozen forms pattern and reveal invisible, imponderable, holistic, causal, vital powers, ranging from electromagnetic waves that can be measured to psychological energies, vague yet discernible, to cosmological principles beyond fact and image.

Wilson 2003, 23

For Cape Farewell artist Matthew Clark, creator of High Arctic, the response to such corporeal and cognitive dissonances was a cultivation of particular bodily comportments; a ‘slowing down, a listening, a watching and a thinking’. In these desires, he shares an affinity with the bodily dispositions that Gibson-Graham (2011) seek for engendering the worldly connections at the
heart of their environmental politics. Their project of ‘connecting’ calls for ‘subsuming ourselves within others’, often by way of incorporating our own materiality with nonhuman others and attuning ourselves to forces and dynamics that do not originate in human action. They draw on Latour to detail the emergence of these connections as a learning to be affected by non-human others. For them, as for Clark and other Cape Farewell travellers, stillness and slowness become a key form of intra-action with the surroundings. While this stance risks a romantic relationship to the landscape, what Gibson-Graham foreground in such affective environmental encounters are the possibilities for ‘becoming other’: these are ‘process[es] of constitution that produces a new body world’ (2011, 322). These connections are built through a feminist materiality and an ontology that resists sorting into human and nonhuman categories. As such, they challenge any sense of distance, of vertical hierarchy, with a relational horizontality between ‘humans, biota and abiotica’ (Bennett 2010, 112). As such, we might recognize the embodied encounters with environments that these Western artists experienced in the Arctic as being brought about by constitutive entanglements with the nonhuman, and their post-human condition. For Gibson-Graham, such an awareness opens up positive possibilities for reducing capitalist practices of production and consumption that recklessly harm or endanger those non-human elements (2011, 5).

Regarding the Cape Farewell voyagers, we are interested in how their experiences, in particular their art-making practices, demonstrate this becoming affected by their surroundings. Guided by discussions of matter and feminist new materialisms (e.g. Coole and Frost 2010; Grosz 1994), we note the importance of not simply admitting the relevance and force of the ‘geo’ (the complex physical world of Earth, the land, air and water and the organisms that live in and on them). We also argue the need for keen attention to detail, and for comprehension of the localized expressions of ‘geos’, materials and properties, including the nature of the entangled relations between human and nonhuman bodies (Adey 2015, 59; McCormack 2015; Steinberg and Peters 2015).

We turn now to the Cape Farewell artists’ accounts of making work in the Arctic through their exploration of nonhuman forces. While the use of ice, snow and variegated solar power was a common theme, we discuss here Tracey Rowledge’s Arctic drawings (Figure 40.1), which are intricate framings of geopower, such that their compositional concerns and their material manifestation in the final work demand but also cultivate refinements and understandings of the localized variations in elemental forces. As Rowledge explains:

I’m making drawings with coloured felt-tips on paper. These works respond directly to the sea, working with the impact in terms of movement the waves have on the ship and then using the Arctic seawater to impregnate the drawings, causing the images to bleed and fade. I have also rigged up an automatic drawing system to make drawings from the motion of the boat. This system has created interesting drawings, that for me explore movement, time, place and permanence.

Cape Farewell n.d.

Titled by date, time and geographical coordinates, these are drawings of and by the force of motion. They document periods of calm, registered in minuscule marks on vast, white paper landscapes, and record rough seas when sharp zigzags and jagged lines sketch the movements of a ship in the chaotic grasp of weather, water and being buffeted by ice. Such documentations render visual a ‘geo’ of flows, connections, liquidities and becomings, enabling us to imagine a world in perpetual motion (Steinberg and Peters 2015). Such work is an example from an animated archive of the ‘geo’, enabling an account of climate change that requires not only registering the ‘distinctively non-human materialities of the earth’ but also attending to their agencies, ‘releasing the materialities of the earth from being seen as a stockpile of inert stuff or
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a destructive threat’, or as a sublime landscape backdrop through human attention to these nonhuman materialities (Bennett 2010, xi).

We turn, in the next section, to the Cape Farewell-inspired installation, *High Arctic*, to elaborate on this relationship between human and nonhuman materialities. Inspired by feminist ideas of transcorporeality, we discuss how artworks might cultivate dispositions that instil bodies, of artists and audiences, as vulnerable, porous entities, and thus open to the kinds of environmental ethics that Gibson-Graham seek.

**Vulnerable bodies**

Now all we have left to do is get together our own personal kit. Plenty of warm and waterproof clothes, wellingtons, lots of dry socks … And very important: sunscreen and sunglasses. The sun is very bright in all that snow, and the ozone layer is too thin to protect us properly from harmful ultraviolet radiation.

*Sarah and Vál, 2003*

This recounting of bodily threat and the action taken by the Cape Farewell voyagers to mitigate it echoes older Arctic narratives, where the crucial imperative for survival was for the ‘frontiers of one’s body to be rigorously established and maintained’ (Wylie 2002, 259). Below, we recast these bodily vulnerabilities in our discussions of the body-worlds formed through the experiences of Cape Farewell art. We seek an understanding of how art might attune us both to our constitutive entanglement with the nonhuman and to a heightened awareness of the ethics of our post-human condition. Describing audience experiences of *High Arctic*, we recognize the
entwining of human and nonhuman bodies in a becoming body world: what we might call, after Alaimo (2010), transcorporealities, where to be human is to be open – both voluntarily and involuntarily – to the world, rather than bounded from it. To understand how the installation creates these transcorporeal Arctics, we find inspiration in the feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray’s (1992, 1993) writings on touch and hearing and the way her writings give meaning to experiences of light and sound in *High Arctic*:

The edges of the gallery-cum-landscape are hard to make out, the collections of white glacial columns seem to rise up out of the black sea and fade gradually towards the horizon. Exploring the darkened environment visitors are guided through the 65 separate islands of some 3000 white columns – some at ankle level, some towering above them – that constitute the archipelago created in the space. The tones of the Shipping Forecast theme tune, slightly flattened, sound through the space, the almost monotonal voice of the newscaster begins the familiar roll call of places, Dogger, Fisher, German Bight … With UV torches in hand, visitors sweep their blue spotlights around the installation, activating the white light animations ahead of them as they go. Navigating around the white columns, each named for a glacier in Svalbard that will disappear due to global warming, they step into pools of swirling snow, pin-pricks of white that collect in flurries around the base of the white columns before moving off again, swirling around the visitors’ feet before dissolving into the black masses. A cacophony of shifts, pops, cracks, and creaks echoes through the space. Sweeping torches across contour-line maps of light, blue spotlights alight on a large black pool between towering white masses, as torches move over the glacial columns a mass of geometric
light-based icebergs calve off into the blackness. Driven by invisible currents directed by the sweep of the torches, the pool becomes a seething mass of geometric shapes, coming together, splitting, moving off across the floor as great white masses, only to disappear into the distance. Directing the flows and intensities of these geometric bergs with sweeps of torches, animating the waxing and waning of snow flurries across the space, the audiences interact with abstract landscapes of this installation. 

The immersive installation of *High Arctic* creates a dynamic encounter for its interactive audiences. Its materiality offers a complex recreation of the tensions between static and dynamic and the agentive and vulnerable found in the Cape Farewell b/ logs. The white columns, each named after a decaying glacier in Greenland, stand in for the Arctic’s white expense, over, alongside and around which ephemeral icebergs of light and sound are scattered, composing and decomposing, calving, detaching, drifting and melting amid snowstorms of light.

We argue that the transcorporeal Arctics developed by the installation depend on these experiences of sound and light. These are worldly connections, formed less through an attention to what we see and hear and more through an appreciation of how we sense. As such, bodies, human or otherwise, are rendered as vulnerable porous entities, thoroughly interleaved in the decaying icy forms affected by those same forces.

Alaimo’s (2010, 2012, 2016) idea of ‘transcorporeality’ provides a particularly materially and forcefully inclined understanding of the ‘attunements’ to lively matter we seek. She assembles feminist materialist theory, art analysis, literary theory and archival work to explore a ‘sense of precarious, corporeal openness to the material world’ that she argues fosters an environmental politics (2012, 23). She argues for environmental relations as ones of bodily vulnerability, performed as ‘transcorporeal condition[s] in which the material interchanges between human bodies, geographical places and vast networks of power provoke ethical and political actions’ (2012, 23). Alaimo (2012) employs Kirsten Justensen’s artwork, *Ice Pedestal* (2000), to expand upon art’s challenging of bounded, inviolate human subjects, interpreting Justensen’s placing of her naked body in contact with ice as: renouncing the ‘boundaries of the human … allowing us to imagine corporeality not as a ground of static substance but as a place of possible connections, interconnections and ethical becomings’ (Alaimo 2012). The artist’s vulnerability cultivates a ‘sense of precarious, corporeal openness to the material world’ that is founded in an environmental politics (2009, 23). Appreciating the volatile matter of the human body and its connections with other-than-human volatile matters is not a new perspective for feminist geographers. Indeed, attention to bodies as fleshy matter, as porous spatialities open and vulnerable to the wider world, is a central tenet of feminist geographical theorizing over the last thirty years (Colls 2012; Grosz 1994; Irigaray 1992; Longhurst and Johnston 2014). Here, we argue that experiences of the light and sound created by *High Arctic* produce in the gallery a series of transcorporeal Arctics that bring us to attend to our own vulnerable bodies and their implication and entanglement with the ‘geo’.

Light is the key to audience experiences of the work. Most obvious are the lighted animations and the UV (ultraviolet) torches that the audience members brandish around the space, with their false-blue spotlight (UV light is not visible to the human eye). These torches trigger the exposure of Arctic destruction, whether the calving of light icebergs, the revelation of the glaciers’ names or the changing patterns and movement of snowstorms. Such audience-directed agency references human-induced global warming, the result of increased amounts of UV light penetrating the polar regions. It is not just Arctic landscapes that are rendered vulnerable to UV light, however, but also human bodies. The potency of UV rays at the poles is exacerbated by the reflective capacities of snow, requiring humans to protect
their skin and eyes from the extreme photic effects of the summer season. Recognizing the phenomenality of light and the vulnerability of the bodies that it penetrates is to move us beyond human subjectivities constituted through seeing. As Barker explains, 'the emission and reception of light [is] usually considered to be a phenomenon of vision, [whereas it is] actually a matter of light falling on and reflecting off or being absorbed by an object before it ever becomes visible' (2009, 30). The light-object relation is especially pronounced with UV light, which is invisible to the naked human eye yet permeates the skin, with the potential to cause serious damage.

The touch of light, for Irigaray, creates corporeal space-times that demand acknowledgement of bodily limits and horizons, thus ‘disrupt[ing] the distinction between self and other’ (Shildrick 2001, 392), at the same time replacing bodies as surfaces reflective of light with corporeal imaginaries that foreground porosity and vulnerability. In such an appreciation, Irigaray overturns a logics of light premised on truth and reason, and a world rendered knowable through distance, a separation of seer and seen and of the sensible from the intelligible (Irigaray 1992; Vassaleu 1998). Instead, her reframed logics of light implicate touch and vision in creating corporeal intimacies and proximities (Hawkins 2015). The materiality and phenomenality of UV light deployed in High Arctic demonstrate this effectively. Rather than rendering bodies visible to the human eye, UV light penetrates bodies, challenging the accepted view of their enclosed, stable nature and reforming them as permeable, susceptible bodies, thoroughly mingled with the world. As Irigaray writes, such ‘touchings’ of light preclude the possibility of ever ‘closing … off [of the world] or closing off of the self (Irigaray 1993, 141). Indeed, feminist geographers have developed incisive accounts of how touch might evolve corporeal space-times that demand our encounter with bodily limits and horizons and ‘disrupt the distinction between self and other’ (Shildrick 2001, 392; see also Johnston 2012; Straughan 2012).

It is not just the interactive light components of High Arctic that render audiences as vulnerable humans, however, but also the audio experience. If sound objects are understood to ‘engender the communication of urgent climate effects in a more accessible and publicly compelling way’ (Kanngieser 2015), hearing creates the conditions for becoming-connected world bodies. The materiality and physicality of sound and the effect of listening are premised on the transcorporeal. Sound art is typically produced as an immersive experience, creating an audience that is ‘engulfed, enveloped, absorbed, enmeshed, [such that] the subject loses itself … touched physically and emotionally’ (Hawkins and Straughan 2014b, 132). Sound artist and theorist Brendon La Belle elaborates this point: sound ‘deliver[s] a dynamic phenomenal weave in and around the individual body, creating points of contact … sound moves in and through us to immerse the body in energetic motion that is equally socially and politically charged’ (2010, 5).

LaBelle’s formulation reflects Irigaray’s theorization of co-mingled body-worlds, this time through the bodily passage of sound. The Irigarayan body is a system of spaces and passages, of depths and membranes, through which sound as a set of vibrations passes. The result is a pervious spatiality of bodies, fully immersed in the materiality of the world of which they are an inseparable part. Penetrated by soundwaves, ‘the open horizon of [the] body … [is a] living, moving border’ (Irigaray 1993, 51). For Kanngieser, such properties of sound render it transversal, cutting across matter and beings, ‘render[ing] apparent that the world is not for humans. The world is rather with humans – a relation that is not without antagonism’ (Kanngieser 2015, 83, italics added). Attending to the materialities and the phenomenality of sound and hearing exposes those antagonisms as ontological vulnerabilities and epistemological perplexities (ibid.).
Conclusion: towards a feminist geopolitics of climate change

Feminist geography’s orientation to the body has become almost a cliché. But in the rush to get comfortable or to dismiss what may seem ‘done’, we risk overlooking the complexities and intricacies of what it means to reterritorialize abstraction across the terrains of that most intimate ‘space’. In this chapter, we have explored one iteration of what a feminist geopolitics of climate change might look like – or better, perhaps, feel like – and we have done so by using examples drawn from the icy archives of Cape Farewell’s Arctic voyages, exploring both the making of art and the audience’s experiences of it. We have sought to go beyond simply ‘fleshing’ out geopolitics, by way of taking seriously intersections of earthly elements and forces – animated geos – and the volatile matters of human bodies. We have drawn on three sets of feminist resources to further specify embodied engagements with climate change, ones that seek attunements of humans to the nonhuman and recognize the importance of embodiment to the ontological entanglements of a vital world.

What does it mean, though, to foreground the creation of these interpenetrated body-worlds in the face of climate change abstractions? One implication is that they might divorce the effects of climate change from other forms of politics or marginalize the cultural understanding of the elements proffered by the Indigenous inhabitants of the region, or ignore a range of intra-human politics, social relations and earthly entanglements. The soundings and visionings of sea, ice and air that the Cape Farewell artists offer are very much nonhuman ones. The more human-focused encounters present in the blogs rarely find form in art. As well, in a centuries-long aesthetic and ideological manipulation of images, sounds (such as the snowmobiles of Arctic Indigenous people) deemed to ‘rupture the tranquility’ of the traveller’s Arctic are largely absent from the Arctic encounters framed for audiences. We acknowledge the profound risks that these artworks negotiate when they create icy imaginaries that proffer a terra nullius (DeLoughrey 2015) and suggest that it remains an open challenge for Cape Farewell artists and others to reconcile both intra- and nonhuman relations. In their recognition of the role of the nonhuman in understanding climate change, DeLoughrey and others have, in the Pacific context, reflected on ‘the practice and philosophical implications of thinking politically beyond intra-human concerns’, while at the same time being ‘critically attentive to the intra-human power relations and different cultural understandings and practices of history and the environment’ (DeLoughrey, Didur and Carrigan 2015, 14). What we have offered here is but one iteration of a feminist geopolitics of climate change, built on taking seriously feminist materialist concerns with entwined body-worlds, wherein bodies emerge as open, porous and vulnerable. The result is two-fold: a disruption of distinctions between self and other that undermine ethical connections between humans and nonhuman worlds; and the proposition of the means through which such ethical connections might be made.

Notes

This research is part of a larger project titled “Art/Science: Collaborations, Bodies, and Environments” (http://artscience.arizona.edu/), co-funded under a joint agreement by the US National Science Foundation (Grant No. 86908) and the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (Grant No. AH/1500022/1).

1 See for example ‘Arctic Geopolitics and Autonomy’, developed by geographer Michael Bravo and Nicola Triscott, details of which can be seen at: www.artscatalyst.org/arctic-geopolitics-autonomy-2010 (accessed 6 August 2016).
See also Boetzkes (2010) and Hawkins (2014) for how art has been understood in this way.

Account developed through authorial experience of the exhibition at the Greenwich Maritime Museum (July 2011–January 2012) and accounts in reviews by Dixon (2011) and Letchet (2011).
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