12 Planetary times and queer times

A critical planetary romanticism for the earth

Whitney A. Bauman

If nothing else, 2020 forced many of us (western modern types) to take stock of our lives and to examine the worlds in which we live. I use ‘worlds’ in the plural to conjure what Walter D. Mignolo and other decolonialists/postcolonialists call the ‘multiverse’ or the ‘pluriverse’. We live in multiple worlds on a daily basis; furthermore, there are multiple worlds across the planet that, at any given moment, make up the planetary community. (Mignolo, 2011) This essay, for instance, was written between worlds: writing sometimes from Berlin, Germany and sometimes from Miami, FL, USA, I am aware of the ways that the contours of these two places and the shifting between them, shape the tone and insights of what is to follow; not to mention all the places that I have lived in, visited, loved and hated, and how these multiple places have shaped my person and drawn-out different identities. All of these worlds, and many more, go into this essay. Our worlds provide the habits and discourse for how we think about ourselves, other humans, and the rest of the natural world. We have no access to ourselves or others outside of a particular world. The pandemic has thrown our worlds into disarray.

The dominant voice in most of the worlds that make up the planetary community – the fossil-fuelled reality of the modern, western reductive, productive, and progressive model of science – has begun to show its many flaws. This world-making and world-destroying fossil-fuelled reality really got going during the period that some sociologists call ‘The Great Acceleration’, beginning after World War II (McNiell and Engelke, 2016) The increase in the speed of communication, transportation, and production technologies and the increase in life spans due to medical technologies, have enforced a fast-paced chronological time over the face of the planet. This unified chronos, emanating from the prime meridian and enforced by the GMT (an atomic clock with links to atomic energy that will enable fossil-fuelled speed to increase and continue well beyond the decline of fossil fuel production) is necessary for living at such a fast pace. We must be ‘on time’, and we must measure time in days, weeks, months, and years in order to make the fossil-fuelled reality work. This fossil-fuelled chronos also makes possible the idea of progress: that we are moving towards something,

building up on the past into a ‘better’ future: hence the productive, progressive model of knowledge and science.

The problem is, as the Covid pandemic has revealed perhaps in new ways, the fossil-fuelled time of chronos is an anthropic imposition upon the world; and not just any old anthropos, but the modern, western European anthropos. This standardisation of time paves over all the other times that exist within the planetary community. The different times of different peoples, animals, plants, systems, and places are all made to conform to this single sped up, progressive reality. This process began long ago with the most recent bout of European colonisation in the 15th century: as European elites and intellectuals began to travel and be exposed to new landscapes and cultures, everything had to be ordered into a single (European-centred) history – and a progressive one at that. Native peoples and Africans were considered so primitive they didn’t have ‘culture’ and/or were subhuman, and either could be treated as subhuman or had to be educated/cultivated in the image of European history and culture and/or eliminated in some way. Other places were Orientalised, written into the single history of western Europe, with ancient Aryan roots in Indic cultures, Ancient Greece, and Rome; then a period of darkness and a Renaissance that coincided with European colonisation. China and India become sources for fuel for renaissances and romantic movements, and the entire Muslim world was written as a passive receptacle that simply preserved knowledge during the dark ages for the real agent of history, western Europe (Said, 1978; Mignolo, 2011).

The torch of progress was passed to Christian Europe and, later, to the USA, and was taken up with gusto by modern science. Whereas Christianity was the colonising force that brought light to the dark masses, the emerging scientific method and scientific mentality would become the new bearer of light, creating technologies that would make some human lives better and longer. The sciences and scientists would become the new agents bringing about a New Eden on Earth (Merchant, 2003).

The current fossil-fuelled reality, which emerged out of this western, materialistic, and reductive scientific worldview, is now finally outstripping the carrying capacity of so many humans and the rest of the natural world. From genocide, to slavery, to black lives matter, MeToo, mass extinctions, and climate change fossil-fuelled reality is beginning to act as the ouroboros, eating its own tail. This brief essay argues that the current pandemic has enabled many people to open up to the problems of fossil-fuelled time and open onto the multiple times of the planet. Queering the times of the planet is key, I argue, to re-attuning to the multiple bodies of the planetary community that make up our worlds at any given moment. And this re-attuning is the ground from which we can begin to co-construct new worlds that promote the flourishing of and justice for a broader population of the planetary community. This process will never be ‘for all’ and final, but rather a continual process of critique, deconstruction, re-attunement,

Figure 12.1 The Goodwin-Bauman family farm (Photo courtesy of James Walsmith)

and co-constructing. I begin first with my autobiographical roots, which have shaped my understanding of fossil-fuelled and planetary times. I then move on to what religion as ‘re-attuning’ might look like in the context of developing what I am calling a Critical Planetary Romanticism (CPR) for the earth. Finally, I end where I began, with a small autobiographical reflection on planetary possibilities for the future (Figure 12.1).

From uncertainty to certainty: The story of one family farm

This is my family’s old farm in Stuttgart, Arkansas, USA.¹ I lived in that little house in the front left corner for some time, and I grew up playing on that farm, helping out around the farm with our family garden plot, shucking corn and hulling peas, riding in combines with my grandfather, and hunting and fishing in many different wooded areas and reservoirs that made up that unique landscape. All of this gave me embodied knowledge

¹ I took this autobiographical excerpt and the closing excerpt from an article I published in the journal, *Religions* (Bauman, 2020).

about human–earth relations: predator–prey, the importance of ‘listening’ to the land, the type of ‘balance’ that one had to make in terms of how much land should be under production at any given time, etc. It also gave me a sense of what it meant to live in faith and hope: every year, farmers take out loans for the crop they are putting in the ground in hopes that the yield will be enough to pay off the loan with some profit. This is not guaranteed, and it takes the ‘cooperation’ of many different entities within the natural world to make it happen. This cooperation – between humans and the rest of the natural world – is something that was always open-ended (never certain). Furthermore, we (my family) were a part of this unique landscape and ecosystem. Nature was, then, never for me a wilderness devoid of human life, nor was it just mere resource for human projects: rather, we (humans) are a part of nature and whatever culture, language, and human knowledge and technologies are, they are a part of nature as well.

During the 1980s, as some readers will recall, the deregulation by the Reagan administration put huge strains on smaller family farms like ours. I watched over a period of 10–15 years as this farm, under economic pressures, changed from a multiple-use (hunting, fishing, rotating crops of corn, soy, rice, sunflowers, and milo, mostly, and family garden plots) family farm into a mono-cropped Monsanto soybean farm. The forested areas where we went hunting were cut down for more production area, and the reservoirs were not maintained as an ecosystem (with a focus on the game and wildlife) but were turned into mere sources of water for the crops. This is the reductive-productive model that I critique in this article, along with its fossil-fuelled time and assumptions about truth, nature, and human beings. The transformation of my family farm by this reductive and productive, fossil-fuelled model is a microcosmic experience of what living in the Anthropocene is like. The fossil-fuelled pace of life changes the geography of specific places to be uniform and efficient towards (some) human ends.

In contrast to these fossil-fuelled, productive and reproductive times, I want to argue for a different sort of time. It is both queer- and pandemic-related (Halberstam, 2005); pandemics, after all, remind us of the porous boundaries between inside and outside and our entanglement with other creatures, not to mention how pandemics jolt us out of the ‘normal’ everyday routines of life. On that farm, the poisonous snakes, mosquitoes, and (sometimes) dangerous farming equipment, along with the plants and animals that became part of me and through my waste I of them, kept me constantly aware of the porosity of my body. From this porous perspective, we might become more attuned to the multiple times of the planetary communities and more attuned to the multiple places that make up the planetary at any given moment. Let’s just call this ‘pandemic time and places’ for short.

Pandemic times and places

Perhaps one of the silver linings of the pandemic of 2020 is that it jolted many of us fossil-fuelled western types out of the ‘business as usual’ in our daily lives. From social distancing, to economic shutdowns, to the end or severe decrease in the amount we travel, there was nothing ‘normal’, about 2020. But then again, as many in the BLM and MeToo movements have pointed out, what ‘normal’ is it that some of us long for? The continued system of structural and institutional racism and sexism that kills and abuses black and brown bodies and the bodies of women? The continued fossil-fuelled reality that is literally outstripping the carrying capacities of the planet? The continued neoliberal globalisation that we call ‘progress’ but that places billions of people in the world into poverty and degrades their local environments? The same system of fossil-fuelled reality that has brought about what scientists refer to as the sixth mass extinction event? If this is normal, then who in their right mind would want to return to it?

These pandemic times have uncovered the seeping wounds of the racist, anthropocentric hetero-patriarchal body of the so-called ‘western world’. It is this same world that saw my family farm turned into a mono-cropped culture of death. As Carolyn Merchant suggests, one way of understanding the transformation of the world that took place during the so-called ‘scientific revolution’, is as the transformation of matter into dead stuff (Merchant, 1980). In addition, this was coupled with the idea that humans alone are made in the image of God (from Christian monotheism) (White, 1967). Thus, agency and value lie with humans alone (hence the Cartesian cogito). The scientific revolution, was, in part, enforcing the idea that humans alone (and to be sure, only some humans) contain all agency and value, and the rest of the natural world was mere dead matter for use towards the human (western, Christian, white, male) ends of progress. This same reductive and productive system is also caught up in the reproduction of ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ and gender and sexual dimorphism. Humans, too, get reduced to (nuclear) family-making, economic units. In retrospect, as I will discuss more below, the violence of the fossil-fuelled time and that of heteronormativity were forever linked for me as a result of growing up on that family farm.

The problem is, of course, this productive and reductive model of naturalism (and heteronormativity) never really fully caught on. What I want to suggest here, however, is that during the 19th century, there were still a few scientists who fought against this type of necrophilia (the making of matter dead stuff). In a sense, they understood the queerness of evolutionary times, planetary times, and the importance of the multiplicity of place.

The culture wars in Europe of the 19th century are not unlike the culture wars in western democracies today. There was a battle over competing authorities and a growing sense of nationalism as economies became more and more entangled and transportation allowed more and more people to

travel to different places. Furthermore, the first effects of the fossil-fuelled industrial revolution on the rest of the natural world were coming into focus. Enter Ernst Haeckel. Haeckel, the so-called German ‘Darwin’ and ‘father’ of ecology, fell on the rhetorical side of the emerging sciences. He was one of the first to construct a full-blown naturalistic worldview, but it was not a reductive vision. All of nature was ‘alive’ for Haeckel, and the human cultural sciences were yet another level of the natural sciences in general: humans and all things human emerged from the rest of the natural world (Richards, 2008). He called his naturalistic worldview monism, but it was not of the reductive Spinozian type of monism. Rather, it was an open and evolving monism (Rubenstein, 2018).

Haeckel, perhaps more than any other scientist of his time, did more to place humans and all things human within an evolutionary perspective. This had some serious consequences. First, the idea that there was anything like a *a priori* knowledge or a ‘thing in itself’, was out the window for Haeckel. If humans emerge from the entangled evolving process of life, there is no point at which something could be totally separate. Every individual entity is itself a community of processes and other entities, an ecosystem, so to speak (Haeckel, 1992). He, in other words, recognised the porosity of all bodies. Second, if humans emerge from evolutionary processes along with all other things on the planet, then humans cannot have an objective, non-located perspective on reality. Rather, we are ‘in the mix’. All knowledge and thought is thus contextual, and hermeneutics and interpretation matter. There is no universal view of truth or experience of time, but a plurality of truths and experiences. Third, if humans are a part of the rest of the evolving planet, species distinctions become nomenclature in the end, and there are no essences or forms for living entities, including humans. This latter point led Haeckel to support the work of Magnus Hirschfeld at the Institute for the Study of Sexuality in Berlin (Hirschfeld, 2000). Haeckel knew that there was a variety of sexes and sexualities throughout the natural world, so if humans are part of the rest of the natural world, there must be a variety of sexes and sexualities in human beings as well. In this sense, evolutionary theory is a queer science. In a similar way, my own recognition of being part of nature from my experiences on the farm that I grew up on, somehow connected to a queering of time, and forms, and possibilities for what it meant to be ‘human’ outside of the reductive, (re)productive, fossil-fuelled model that was being enforced upon bodies regardless of context: cultural or ecological.

Ecology is also a ‘queer’ science, and Haeckel was the one who named it. I say it is queer because ecology is, if nothing more, about blurring boundaries, or at least about admitting that boundaries between entities and systems are porous and shifting (Morton, 2010). All living (and non-living) things are, in a sense, shape-shifters. For Haeckel, the surrounding ecology of an organism is that which drives evolutionary adaptations. Different biological communities lead to the highlighting of different

aspects of a given entity, and over time, this leads to shifts in ontogeny. Furthermore, for Haeckel, an individual organism, and that which marks all living things from non-living things, is produced when the exterior of that organism is internalised. Said another way, the surroundings of an organism are internalised, and this is what makes up a unique individual. No single organism will internalise its surroundings in the same way. This has some interesting connections with E.O. Wilson's links between biodiversity and human creativity. The landscapes shape the innerscapes, and then the innerscapes return to shape the landscapes of which they (we) are a part (Wilson, 1984).

In the fossil-fuelled times of neoliberal globalisation, in which a reductive and productive science understands nature as dead stuff for use towards human 'progress', what happens to our innerscapes as the outerscapes are diminished. German biologist and philosopher Andreas Weber suggests that we internalise 'dead nature' and become, ourselves, dead on the inside. (Weber, 2017, p. 70) In fact, a whole host of psychological disorders, he suggests, stem from trying to anaesthetise the internal decay of internalising a dead planet. In terms of my own family farm, the internalisation of the necrophiliac industrialised landscape turned into feelings of loss, despair, grief, and longing. Weber suggests that whereas the Enlightenment mentality leads to pushing out vitality and affect for cold, calculating reasons, what we need now is an 'enlivenment'. Some type of re-animation, or neo-animism, or what I will call a critical planetary romanticism (CPR) that understands the entire planetary community (nature, culture, technology, etc.) as a living, evolving, and open process.

It is perhaps during these pandemic times, peering through the cracks of reified fossil-fuelled worlds that we can begin to find ways to let more life into our worlds, and to see that we are entangled with all other bodies evolutionarily, ecologically, and on a planetary scale. Perhaps we can begin to think in terms of queer times and places (Halberstam, 2005). From my understanding, this means recognising that the times and places of the planet are multiple. Planetary times queer our understandings of chronological time because it forces us to recognise deep cosmic, geological, and evolutionary times. It also helps us to recognise the multiple times of different bodies: the times of bees, goshawks, lemurs, sloths, humpback whales, redwood forests, canyons, dung beetles, and the seasonal times of the planet itself. The time of winter in the northern hemisphere is the time of summer in the southern one: these times exist together in one planetary community. The times of duck migration, and the times of crops from seed to harvest, are multiple and do not conform to human, fossil-fuelled technological time. All of these times make up the planetary community at any given point, and no time scale can be collapsed into the other. We live in the multiple times of the planetary community. And, since time and place are intimately connected, we should also pay attention to the multiple places of the planet.

Whereas fossil-fuelled reality, with its smooth chronological time, paves over places with disregard, opening up to planetary places leads to a polyamory of place (Bauman, 2014). Places unfold at their own paces, but entangled with the planetary flows of energy, information, materials, and bodies. That is, no place is in isolation; rather, each place is made up of a unique set of planetary flows that makes it that unique place. My own person is played by and carries the multiple places that I have lived within: the family farm, Little Rock, Arkansas; Nashville, Tennessee; Berkeley, California; Miami, Florida; Jogjakarta, Indonesia; Berlin, Germany; and all the places I have visited for short periods in between. These places call out different parts of me because I am in an open evolving relationship with them. It is a polyamorous affair with multiple planetary places.

Rather than holding on to one place at the costs of all others (nationalisms, parochialisms, etc.), a type of monogamy of place, perhaps we could practice love for multiple places and how they are entangled into a planetary community. This recognises that we can love multiple bodies in different ways, and that we are entangled with all other bodies. It also undermines the monogamous way in which private property, the individual, and humanity itself is construed under fossil-fuelled neoliberalism. Private property is an extractive practice that claims ownership of what is entangled. The isolated individual is an extractive practice that backgrounds the entangled connections that make up any given organism. Finally, anthropocentrism, or human exceptionalism, is an extractive practice that suggests ethical and moral concern should be held for one species (and who gets counted as human here has mattered dearly over the centuries).

Maybe, just maybe, there is some hope in the cracks of fossil-fuelled time that will begin to open up spaces internally and externally that let more vitality back into the entire planetary community. This will take processes of re-attunement and ones which I think can be guided by something like a critical planetary romanticism. It is to a discussion of CPR (for the Earth) that I now turn.

Re-attunements: Developing a critical planetary romanticism

If anything, I would argue, religion (re-reading and/or gathering together in its Latin roots) is about re-attuning to the worlds in which we live. In fact, I argue that re-attunement is one way to define what religions actually do (at their best). Moses re-attuning to a world in which an empire depended upon slavery and then working to create a new world that let more life thrive; Jesus re-attuning to a world of injustice by the Roman Empire and understanding that male and female, Jew and gentile, rich and poor were all deserving of basic human decency and dignity; Sufi's whirling to re-attune to the spinning of the planet; the Buddha, peering through the cracks of a caste system and re-attuning to a world in which all things were ultimately interconnected and separation was a lie; trickster figures that break

up strict boundaries and help humans re-attune to the worlds around them; Ghandi's anti-colonial movement and MLK Jr.'s movement for civil rights: all of these depend upon re-attuning to the worlds in which we live because the worlds have become ossified and unjust to many bodies. Religion, then, is a queer affair: breaking open the boundaries of identity that have become ossified and allowing us to open on to a host of bodies and ways of being in the world: ways that pay attention to how we enter into and are entered by multiple bodies on a daily basis (human and non). The process of nature naturing, or life living, is, it seems, an erotic affair and religions can help us re-attune to these planetary bodies when they are not used in the service of harnessing and hoarding power.

Such re-attuning depends upon paying deep attention to earth bodies; it depends, in other words, on some sort of earthly erotic desire. In the recent Netflix documentary on Walter Mercado, *Mucho Mucho Amor* (Tabsch 2020), there is a moment where the documentarian asks Mercado about his sexuality and Mercado responds (and I paraphrase): 'my whole body is sexual, I am making love to everything around me on a daily basis'. Mercado here is asking us to re-attune our bodies to the world. It is odd that the sensual desires we modern western humans are allowed to experience are reduced to functions: sex and eating, basically. Our sexual desires are more often than not relegated to the regions that we keep covered; our eating desires are shamed and shaped into all sorts of pathological habits. Not to mention, the violence surrounding these two ways of interacting with other bodies. How is it that our most intimate contact with other bodies has been reduced to either fucking or eating? What if, as Mercado suggests, our whole body is the site of eros, and all bodies are sites of eros. What types of engagement might we have with human bodies and all other earth bodies if we were to see our entire bodies as sites of intimate connection?

The porosity of the body is such that we have microorganisms crawling in and out of our skin daily; the air we breathe comes in and out and is recycled from other breathing bodies over millennia; the atoms that make up our bodies are recycled from stars; the microbiome of our gut that is part of the ecosystem of our bodies; AND the viruses and bacteria and germs and infections that can kill us are also part of this ongoing orgy of earthly bodies. It is not that all this entanglement is 'good' for individuals, humans, or any other species. This planetary orgy will eventually kill us all.

As our ancestors well know, porosity is a double-edged sword. It allows for the possibility of connection and life, but also for returning to equilibrium with the entities around us, or death. When the extant world religions were emerging onto the scene some 4000 years ago, life was short. There was no modern medicine and living until 40 or 50 was a big deal. It made sense that religious and philosophical narratives and cosmologies gave humans a special place in the world. It helped to know that one was part of a larger cosmos and that he/she/they would have something to look forward to after a relatively short life on earth. Though the life span of many peoples today

is still less than those of modern, more economically privileged societies, the modern world has made great strides in sealing the human individual off from the rest of the planetary community. Modern western architecture, transportation, medicine, agriculture and consumption systems, and education all suggest that we humans can live as if we were isolated individuals and not dependent upon the earth systems. We have extended life into the 80s and 90s, and there are many trans/post humanists who think eventually we humans will be able to 'beat' death. The problem is that this reifies the human, making the 'human' another unit of the efficient calculations required of fossil-fuelled time and technologies. Life is much queerer, much messier.

This illusion, that we can wall ourselves off and escape the interrelatedness that will eventually lead to our death, has caused social injustice and ecological degradation. In fact, climate change and pandemics both remind us that we are, indeed, porous entangled bodies within an evolving planetary community and that we are not in control. The earth is not made for humans alone, rather the earth made it possible for we humans to exist: the earth gifted us our very existence. This gift only requires that we learn to live within the wider planetary community rather than as if we were the only things that matter. Part of living with, means accepting finitude, uncertainty, and ambiguity in terms of our own life. Indeed, all things living are justified in trying to continue living! Part of what it means to be nature naturing, is to bridge the gap from moment to moment and continue on into the future as an organised entity. That is not a crime. We have to eat, sleep, defecate, create, love, feel, mourn, and rejoice. We ought to be able to carve out spaces to live as humans within the rest of the planetary community in all the queer forms that we humans might take, without assuming that human forms are isolated or the only ones that matter. Let millions of relations and connections bloom. As humans, specifically, we might be able to carve out dwelling spaces for our own individual existences for about 80 years, but we can't expect to live forever without also realising that in order to do so we will give up the very thing that makes us human: our entanglement with the planetary community. Our dwelling here is, as Thomas Tweed argues, just for a time; life is on the move and our bodies move and change along with it, crossing from youth, to middle age, to old age (if we are lucky) and death. (Tweed, 2006) We ought to build institutions and systems that recognise our need to dwell in our diverse interrelated forms, but also pay deep attention to the needs of the ever-changing planetary community. In order to pay deep attention to and constantly re-attune ourselves to the needs of this ever-changing planet, we need to develop something like a critical planetary romanticism (CPR) for the Earth. I will spend the rest of this essay reflecting on each of these terms.

I want to start my reflections with the last of the three terms of a CPR for the Earth. What do I mean by romanticism in this context? If the problem with the fossil-fuelled, reductive and productive model of 'nature' is that the

rest of the natural world is treated as ‘standing reserve’ for human ‘progress’, (Heidegger, 1977) then a romanticism seeks to correct that understanding of nature. Romanticism here becomes our ontology (so to speak). We are entangled with the evolving and living bodies of the rest of the planetary community. All of the world is vital and contains value (Bennett, 2010). This matches up well with understandings from the new materialisms. The vitality and value of the entities and bodies that make up the planetary community become the basis for thinking about what is ‘good’ and what is ‘bad’. Goodness and badness are not imposed upon the planetary community from above, but rather emerge from our entangled relations. How ought we live, given our porous entanglements with all other life on the planet? Such reflection must be done not just with humans, but with non-human participants as well.

Romanticism cannot be tied to local places alone. A romanticism that is tied to local places alone can easily turn into parochialism or nationalism; this was part of the problem with the German romantics of the 19th century, for instance. Instead, we must extend that romantic concern towards the connections of local places and bio-regions that together make up the entire planetary community at any given moment. The planetary, then, provides us with our aesthetics, our understandings of beauty and ugliness. This is our imaginative boundary for thinking about what types of worlds we want to help co-create; and I do mean worlds in the plural: at any given time, the multiple worlds that are co-constructed help to make up the planetary community. Again, this can’t be just from a human perspective, but must be co-constructed together with other planetary citizens.

Finally, we need critical theories to help remind us of our multiply embodied realities, and the multiplicity of perspectives that make up our worlds and the planetary community. There is no naïve, direct, unfiltered connection to ‘nature’. Rather, our different embodiments lead to different experiences of the planetary. And, due to the ways in which worlds are constructed, different bodies experience the planetary community differently. We need critical race theory, queer theory, disability studies, critical animal studies, post-colonial and de-colonial studies, feminist theories, and more to help remind us of the ways in which worlds are experienced differently depending on embodiment. And, we ought to listen to the bodies that are most adversely affected by a given construction of the world so that we can begin to co-construct worlds in ways that include those abject bodies in ideas of flourishing, goodness, and beauty. These critical theories are central to helping us understand that truth is multi-perspectival, shifting, and more about ethics and aesthetics than ontology and metaphysics (Figure 12.2).

Coda: From top-down monocrops to passive solar fields

Actions that don’t seem so obvious or possible from the present moment can emerge in the processes of building different worlds. When I think about

Figure 12.2 Solar fields on the former Goodwin-Bauman farm (Photo courtesy of James Walsmith)

growing up on that family farm in Stuttgart, Arkansas, as a child, I could have never imagined that it would one day be a solar field, nor that I would be writing about it from Berlin, Germany. This is part of what it means to live in faith and hope for a ‘different’ (and hopefully better) planetary future. This is no return to paradise, nor is it ‘business as usual’. There is technology involved, but it is renewable technology that listens to the demands of those voices who have been destroyed by fossil fuels. There is also technology involved in my ability to develop a polyamory of multiple places around the planet (but still to this point, it is that fossil-fuelled technology that has allowed for this). Am I loving multiple places at the peril of the planet? That is, indeed, a conundrum, and there is no Utopic world possible in which all

will be well and there will be no more violence; but I do think we can develop planetary technologies of polyamory that promote the love of multiple places without threatening the future of the planetary systems that keep life living.

A planetary technology that feels the erotic connection between earth bodies and understands its entanglement with the planetary community is possible. Any technology, even passive solar ones, will come with its own problems, such as the destructive mining of lithium needed to power the green, renewable revolution. But an earthly erotic, critical planetary romanticism for the Earth, might enable us to hear the suffering of bodies that results from our co-constructed worlds. And perhaps, the suffering that results from solar is already less than the suffering that results from fossil-fuelled technologies; perhaps, we can continuously find ways to reduce the impacts of our own lives on others in ways that we share in the flourishing and the suffering together. Perhaps in this small transition from industrial monoculture to solar fields lies hope for a different possibility for living that may bring about more justice and flourishing for, and solidarity with the bodies that will make up our planetary future. The fact that solar fields exist on a former soybean farm in Stuttgart, Arkansas (USA) is a major re-attunement that has taken place in my lifetime. It may be too little too late for many of our extant worlds, but the fact that this former unimaginable has now been made not only possible but real, gives me faith and hope for a different, even a queer, planetary future.

References

- Bauman, W. (2014) *Religion and ecology: Developing a planetary ethic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . (2020) Returning faith to knowledge: Earthlings after the anthropocene. *Religions*, 11(4), 169.
- Bennett, J. (2010) *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Haeckel, E. (1992) *The riddle of the universe*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Halberstam, J. (2005) *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. WB: New York, New York: NYU Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1977) *The question concerning technology, and other essays*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Hirschfeld, M. (2000) *The homosexuality of men and women*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- McNeill, J. R. & Engelke, P. (2016) *The great acceleration: An environmental history of the anthropocene since 1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Merchant, C. (1980) *The death of nature: Women, ecology, and the scientific revolution*. 1st ed. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Merchant, C. (2003) *Reinventing eden: The fate of nature in Western culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011) *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Morton, T. (2010) Queer ecology. *PMLA*, 125(2), 273–282.
- Richards, R. J. (2008) *The tragic sense of life: Ernst Haeckel and the struggle over evolutionary thought*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rubenstein, M.-J. (2018) *Pantheologies: Gods, worlds, monstrosities*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Tabach, K. Director. (2020) *Mucho Mucho Mucho Amor: The Legend of Walter Mercado*. Netflix.
- Tweed, T. A. (2006) *Crossing and dwelling: A theory of religion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, A. (2017) *Matter and desire: An erotic ecology*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- White, L. (1967) The historical roots of our ecologic crisis. *Science*, 155(3767), 1203–1207.
- Wilson, E. O. (1984) *Biophilia: The human bond with other species*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.