"There Is No Planet B": Youth Climate Dissent, Ecological Grief, and Literary Resistance in Richard Powers' *The Overstory*

Aritra Banerjee

Doctoral Research Scholar

Techno India University

West Bengal, India

aritra.siempre@gmail.com

Dr. Nibedita Paul

Associate Professor

Techno India University

West Bengal, India

Abstract

This article reads contemporary youth climate activism as a culture of dissent and proposes that Richard Powers' *The Overstory* (2018) functions as one of its most significant literary correlates. Drawing on ecocriticism, the environmental humanities, Rob Nixon's account of slow violence, and Judith Butler's theory of public assembly, the argument advanced here is that the movements gathered loosely under the banner of Fridays for Future are not reducible to a policy intervention. They constitute, rather, a generational poetics of refusal in which grief, embodiment, and the address to non-human life have become legible as forms of political speech. Powers' novel is approached as a structurally cognate work, one whose architecture of interleaved human and arboreal time, whose narrative redistribution of agency across species lines, and whose insistence that ecological resistance is an ethical rather than merely instrumental act, render visible the imaginative coordinates within which youth dissent operates. The essay argues that fiction of this kind does not illustrate activism but extends it,

providing the longer durations of attention and the interior moral grammar that the strike, the placard, and the speech cannot themselves contain. Read together, the novel and the movement disclose a shared archive of planetary mourning and a shared insistence that the unfinished question of the present is not what the future will look like but who, and what, will be permitted to inhabit it.

Keywords: Youth Climate Activism; Fridays For Future; Richard Powers; The Overstory; Ecocriticism; Environmental Humanities; Slow Violence; Ecological Grief; Non-Human Agency; Assembly

1. Introduction: Climate Crisis and the Rise of Youth Dissent

The climate crisis has produced, over the last decade, one of the most distinctive cultures of dissent in the contemporary world. Earlier protest traditions of the twentieth century were largely organised around the redistribution of rights within an existing political present, whether civil, economic, or cultural. The young people who have gathered under the banner of climate strike since 2018 are doing something subtly but importantly different. They are not asking for a better distribution of the present. They are asking whether there will be a habitable future at all, and on what moral terms it will arrive. The dissent that follows from such a question is generational in a way that older categories of protest do not fully accommodate, because it places in indictment not only specific governments or specific industries but the entire framework of late industrial modernity that has produced what the natural sciences now describe in increasingly unambiguous terms as planetary breakdown.

Movements such as Fridays for Future, which began in August 2018 with a single Swedish schoolchild seated outside the Riksdag, have since transformed the school strike, the placard, the public speech, and the digital campaign into globally legible forms of ecological resistance. Their reach is now planetary in scope; their rhetorical signature, captured in slogans such as “there is no Planet B” and “system change not climate change,” has migrated into

political discourse, courtroom argument, and the iconography of public life. What is at stake in this migration is not only an empirical demand for emissions reduction. It is a wider claim that the inherited vocabulary of progress, growth, development, and energy security has lost its moral credibility for those who must live with its consequences. To take that claim seriously is to recognise that youth climate dissent is, among other things, a cultural and aesthetic event, a reordering of public speech around the figure of the endangered child and the endangered Earth.

This article reads such dissent through Richard Powers' *The Overstory* (2018), the novel whose appearance almost exactly coincided with the first global wave of youth climate action and whose ambitions sit unusually close to those of the movement itself. *The Overstory* is not a work about climate change in the narrow sense; its primary subject is the forest and the human beings who come, by various routes, to defend it. Yet its concerns, the slow violence of extraction, the legal fiction of nature as property, the moral failure of ordinary politics, the question of what counts as a life worth defending, are precisely the concerns that animate the climate strike. The argument that follows is that the novel and the movement participate in a single, larger reorganisation of ecological feeling within the present, and that reading them together discloses something neither can disclose alone.

The essay proceeds in seven movements after this introduction. It first situates youth climate activism as a global culture of generational dissent. It then turns to Powers' novel as an ethics of ecological resistance, before considering the politics of grief, the testimony of the body, the question of non-human agency, and the distinctive contribution of literary form to climate response. A brief conclusion gathers the argument and returns to the implications of reading fiction and protest within a single ethical frame. The wager throughout is that ecological dissent cannot be adequately described as a campaign for policy. It is a struggle over perception, over memory, and over the right to imagine that a livable future is still a coherent thing to imagine.

2. Youth Climate Activism as Global Dissent

To call Fridays for Future a movement is in some respects to understate the looseness of what it actually is. It is, more accurately, a confederation of local strikes, networked through digital infrastructure and held together by a shared moral vocabulary rather than by any centralised programme. This decentralisation is itself one of its political features. The image of the lone Swedish striker has multiplied into thousands of dispersed actions in cities and small towns across every inhabited continent, each retaining its local political idiom while invoking a shared planetary horizon. The strike, in this sense, has become a portable form. It can be carried into a national capital and into a village schoolyard, and it preserves its meaning in both.

The materials of the strike are spare and have been so almost from the outset. A handmade placard, a refusal to attend school on Friday, a brief speech, a photograph taken and circulated online. These materials matter because they are accessible to those who possess almost no other political resources, and because their accessibility itself constitutes part of the argument. The young people who carry the placards have, by definition, not yet entered the franchise of adult political life, and in many jurisdictions they will not enter it in time to influence the decisions whose consequences they will inherit. The strike thus performs a peculiar temporal claim. It speaks from outside the present allocation of political power, in the name of a future that has not yet acquired representation, against decisions taken or deferred in a present that will not bear their full cost.

It is here that the slogan “there is no Planet B” acquires its particular force. As a piece of rhetoric, it is unremarkable, perhaps even banal. As a political utterance, it is precise. It refuses the residual technological optimism that has structured a generation of climate discourse, the implicit promise that the costs of inaction can be defrayed by some not yet

specified future innovation. It refuses, equally, the older modernist faith that the planet is the background against which human history takes place and not itself a participant in that history. The slogan compresses into five words the recognition that the Earth is finite, that there is no second site, and that the language of substitution and replacement which has shaped modern consumer life is, at the planetary scale, simply false. Read in this way, it belongs less to the genre of the political slogan than to that of the moral aphorism.

The dissent expressed by such utterances is also, importantly, intergenerational. It identifies a wrong committed by one generation against another. This is a difficult charge to make, because it requires the speaker to differentiate between adult political authority and adult biological identity, and to accuse the former without rejecting the latter. The leading figures of the movement have generally managed this distinction with greater care than their critics have allowed. The accusation is not that adults are responsible for the crisis because they are adults. It is that the political and economic institutions presided over by adults have known the facts of the crisis for several decades and have not acted upon them at a scale commensurate with what they know. The young striker, in this account, is not the moral superior of the older citizen. She is the witness who refuses to allow the institutional record of inaction to be quietly forgotten.

What emerges, when these features are considered together, is a culture of dissent in which the future has become a political category. To act on behalf of the future is no longer a metaphor for prudent planning. It is to assert that those who will live longest in the consequences of the present decisions ought to have standing in those decisions now. This shift is small in linguistic terms and considerable in conceptual ones. It rewrites the grammar of political representation around a constituency that does not yet exist, or that exists only in the demographic forecast and in the imagination. It is, in that sense, a profoundly literary mode of political claim-making, dependent at every stage on the capacity to picture lives that have not

yet been lived. The continuity between such claim-making and the work of climate fiction is therefore not accidental. They share an imaginative architecture.

3. The Overstory and the Ethics of Ecological Resistance

Powers' novel is constructed around a deliberate, almost botanical, principle of organisation. Its opening section, "Roots," introduces nine human characters across what at first appears to be a sequence of unrelated stories. "Trunk," the longest section, draws those lives into an intersection around a campaign to defend the old-growth forests of the American Pacific Northwest. "Crown" and "Seeds" follow the consequences of that campaign across decades and into the lives of those who survived it. The structure is not an incidental ornament. It is the formal claim of the book, namely that human lives, like trees, are connected by networks invisible to ordinary attention and that the ethical work of the novel is to bring those networks into view.

What the novel insists upon, more sustainedly than perhaps any other recent work of Anglophone fiction, is that the forest is not the setting of the action but one of its principal agents. Trees in this book have biographies. They have communicative lives. They are organised into communities that exchange chemical information, share resources, and respond to the presence of pathogens with what can only be called a collective intelligence. Powers draws his portrait from contemporary forest science, in particular the work that has come to be associated with the so-called wood wide web, and incorporates it into the fabric of the prose with a thoroughness that some readers have found startling and a few have found tendentious. The point of the incorporation, however, is not to insist that trees are persons. It is to insist that the categories with which the novel has historically worked, agency, intention, history, and community, are not the exclusive property of human beings, and that fiction is one of the few cultural forms with the imaginative reach to register this without simply collapsing the difference between species.

The activism that occupies the central portion of the novel grows from this enlarged sense of who and what may be the subject of moral concern. Olivia Vandergriff, Nicholas Hoel, and the others who occupy a redwood named Mimas are not, in the conventional sense, extremists. They are people who have followed the logic of their perception to its conclusion. If the forest is what the novel has shown it to be, a community of living beings with histories that long predate human settlement, then the legal and economic apparatus that treats the forest as standing timber is doing something other than business. It is, in the novel's vocabulary, committing a crime that ordinary language has not yet learned to name. The activists' willingness to live in the branches of a single tree for a year is presented not as the gesture of fanatics but as a calibrated response to a wrong of a scale that polite politics has refused to acknowledge.

It is here that the resonance with youth climate dissent becomes most direct. The young people who strike on Fridays, and the activists of Powers' novel, share a structural argument. Both insist that the prevailing institutions, governmental, legal, and corporate, have failed not because of bad faith on the part of any single actor but because the institutions themselves rest upon a perceptual error. They were built for a world in which the non-human background was assumed to be either inexhaustible or unimportant, and they cannot easily be retrofitted to a world in which neither assumption holds. To dissent against such institutions is not to demand their incremental reform. It is to insist that their foundational categories are inadequate to the moral situation. This is what *The Overstory* and Fridays for Future have, in their different idioms, in common: a politics that begins from a crisis of perception.

What the novel adds to this politics, however, is its sustained attention to the question of what such a perceptual shift actually costs the people who undergo it. The characters of the activist sequence are not represented as heroic. They are represented as recognisably human beings whose lives are altered, sometimes ruined, by the seriousness with which they take what

they have seen. Olivia's near-death experience and the religious dimension of her conviction, Nicholas's long, solitary fidelity to a single image, and Adam Appich's eventual conversion of his discipline of psychology into a study of why the species cannot perceive its own emergencies, each represent one of the prices at which ecological perception is bought. Powers does not minimise these prices. He insists, on the contrary, that any honest reckoning with the climate crisis will have to take its measure. The ethics of resistance, in this account, is not the ethics of unbroken commitment. It is the ethics of remaining attentive after the cost of attention has become clear.

4. Ecological Grief and the Politics of Feeling

The affective register of youth climate dissent is at once one of its most discussed and one of its least theorised dimensions. Commentators have noted, with varying degrees of sympathy, that the movement is suffused with grief and with what has come to be called eco-anxiety, and a small but growing literature has begun to consider these affects as objects of clinical concern. What has been less often considered is that grief and anxiety are not, in this movement, private psychological conditions awaiting therapeutic management. They are political resources, deliberately exposed in public and recognisable as the affective ground upon which the political claim of the movement actually rests.

To grieve in public is to make a particular kind of argument. It is to insist that the loss in question is real and is not adequately covered by the existing public language of cost-benefit calculation. The young striker who weeps on a podium or who speaks in the trembling cadence of one near the limit of emotional endurance is not, in this view, failing to control her emotions. She is performing the recognition that something is being lost which the political class around her has refused, by a kind of administrative reflex, to register as a loss at all. The grief is, in that sense, an indictment. It marks a discrepancy between what is happening and what is being officially acknowledged to be happening.

The Overstory has, throughout, this same quality of registered, refused, and finally mobilised grief. The novel's most affecting passages tend to be those in which a character first perceives the magnitude of what is being destroyed. Patricia Westerford, alone in the forest after the scientific community has discredited her work, sits with the recognition that the trees she has studied will not, in any meaningful sense, outlive their predicament. Dorothy and Ray Brinkman, immobilised by Ray's stroke, read their way through the literature of the natural world and learn to grieve in a register that their younger selves would not have understood. Adam Appich watches the slow conversion of a discipline he loves into one more instrument of denial. In every case the grief is not represented as a stage to be passed through on the way to acceptance. It is represented as the appropriate response to what has been perceived, and as the condition of any subsequent ethical action.

The political consequence of this account of grief is significant, and it is one of the points at which the novel and the movement most clearly converge. To accept that grief is the appropriate response to ecological loss is to reject the implicit emotional contract that has organised much of the public discussion of climate change for the past three decades. That contract has held, more or less, that climate communication ought to be hopeful, that despair is politically counterproductive, and that an appropriately measured tone is the precondition of being taken seriously. The young strikers, and Powers' characters, do not accept this contract. They proceed, instead, on the conviction that grief openly acknowledged is more politically generative than hope artificially maintained. Whether this conviction is correct is a question that the present moment is in the middle of testing. The argument here is simply that it is the conviction within which both the novel and the movement operate.

What follows from such a conviction is the politicisation of mourning. Grief, in this register, is not a passage from public engagement into private sorrow but precisely the reverse. It is the moment at which private sorrow refuses to remain private. The strike, the speech, the

demonstration, the novel itself, become the public forms in which an emotion that has been refused official recognition demands to be heard. Read in this way, both Fridays for Future and *The Overstory* belong to a longer history of what might be called dissenting mourning, the kind of mourning that does not consent to be a personal affair. They extend that history into ecological territory and ask what it means to mourn, in public, for losses that exceed the scale of any individual human life.

5. The Body in Protest: From Forest Occupation to Climate Strike

Judith Butler's account of public assembly, developed across several recent works, provides a useful frame for what happens when bodies gather in protest. Butler's argument, in compressed form, is that the gathering of bodies in public space is itself a form of political speech that is not reducible to the propositional content of any speech delivered there. To stand together in a square, or to occupy a street, or to refuse to leave a school until certain things are said, is to make a claim about whose lives are to be counted as livable and about the conditions under which life can be sustained. The claim is made by the fact of the gathering itself and is registered, often, before any of the gathered bodies has spoken a word.

The climate strike is an instance, and an unusually clear one, of this dimension of public assembly. The bodies that gather are young, sometimes very young, and they are out of place in a particular and pointed sense. They have left the institution, the school, in which the present social order has deposited them, and they have brought themselves into the public space in which adult political life is supposed to occur. The displacement is the argument. It says, with some precision, that the institutional separation of childhood from political life cannot be maintained when the political question at issue is whether childhood will continue to be a reliably possible stage of human life on this planet. The bodies that gather are testifying, by their gathering, that the line between minor and political subject has been redrawn by the crisis itself.

The forest occupations of *The Overstory* perform a structurally similar testimony. Olivia and Nicholas, on their platform high in the canopy of Mimas, are doing more than impeding a logging operation. They are demonstrating that the body can be placed in such a way that the destruction of the tree becomes inseparable from harm to the human, and that what is at stake, therefore, cannot be answered by the ordinary categories of property and contract. To remove the activists requires removing them as bodies, and to remove them as bodies is to confront, at last and unavoidably, the question of who counts as injurable in the conduct of an ordinary commercial operation. The activists' wager is that the visibility of their bodies will force the question into the public arena where the felling of the tree, conducted alone in the absence of human witness, would never have arrived.

Both forms of protest, the strike in the public square and the occupation of the canopy, depend upon the body as the site at which abstract ecological claims become unavoidably concrete. It is one thing to say that emissions are rising or that old-growth forests are in decline; it is another thing to refuse to leave the school or to refuse to descend from the tree. The body fixes the claim in space and time and in a particular life. It says that this is not a discussion about figures but about persons, that what is being asked is not whether the data are correct but whether what is being done can continue to be done while particular human beings stand in its way. This insistence on the body as testimony is, as Butler suggests, one of the constitutive grammars of contemporary protest. The climate strike and the forest occupation extend that grammar into ecological territory.

What is novel in the ecological extension is that the body in protest is doing more than asserting its own livability. It is asserting the livability of the world that surrounds it. The striker who blocks a road is not principally asking that her own life be made easier. The activist who lives in the tree is not principally protecting her own habitat. The body becomes, in both cases, a witness to and on behalf of forms of life that cannot themselves bring their bodies into public

space, the forest, the species, the climate system, the future. This extension of the testimonial body into something approaching a planetary stewardship is, perhaps, the most ambitious and the most difficult claim that contemporary ecological dissent has made. Powers' novel and the youth climate movement are both, in their different ways, attempts to discover whether such a claim can be sustained.

6. Non-Human Agency and the Critique of Anthropocentrism

Anthropocentrism, as the term is used in the environmental humanities, is the conviction that human beings are the centre of value, that the non-human world is significant primarily in relation to human use and human meaning, and that the proper subject of moral concern is the human individual or, at most, the human collective. The conviction is older than the modern era and is held, in different versions, across most of the traditions that have shaped the institutions of contemporary global life. It is also, increasingly, the conviction that ecological dissent has identified as the deepest source of the crisis. To reform the policies of any single state, or to alter the practices of any single industry, will not be sufficient if the underlying assumption that the non-human world is a backdrop to the human drama is left intact. This is the recognition from which both youth climate activism and Powers' novel proceed.

Fridays for Future's critique of anthropocentrism is often implicit rather than theoretical, but it is not for that reason any less real. The recurring insistence that the Earth itself has been disregarded, that the rivers and forests and ice sheets are not infinite resources for human consumption, that other species are dying at rates that should disturb us even when the species in question are not commercially significant, amounts to a sustained challenge to the conviction that human use is the proper measure of ecological value. The challenge is not always coherent and is sometimes inflected with a more conventional environmentalism of the picturesque, but in its most serious moments it amounts to a claim that the moral community

must be enlarged to include forms of life that have so far been outside it. This is a substantial philosophical proposition, and the fact that it has been advanced largely by adolescents speaking in their second or third languages is one of the more remarkable features of the present moment.

The Overstory takes up this proposition with what one might call literary patience. The novel does not argue that trees are persons or that human concerns are unimportant; the activists, the scientists, the artist, and the gamer who populate its pages are vividly and recognisably human, and their interiorities are rendered with the kind of attention that the realist novel has long made its signature. What the novel does is to refuse the asymmetry of attention that has governed most fictional representation of the natural world. Trees in this book are not merely the surroundings against which human stories are told. They have their own time, their own scale, their own forms of communication and persistence, and the prose tracks these patiently across hundreds of pages. The cumulative effect is to make the reader newly aware of how much fiction has, by default, occluded.

This patient redistribution of narrative attention is, in the present argument, the novel's most direct contribution to the critique of anthropocentrism. It does not deliver its critique by argument. It delivers it by the slow accumulation of a different attentional habit. By the time the reader reaches the latter sections of the book, the question of whether trees can be the subject of moral concern has, in some measure, already been answered, not by any argument the novel makes but by the experience of having read for several hundred pages within a frame in which they are taken seriously. This is what fiction can do that protest, in its very different temporal economy, cannot. The strike compresses; the novel extends. The strike makes its argument in an hour, on a street; the novel makes its argument across the weeks during which the reader carries the book around. Both are necessary; neither is sufficient.

There remains, of course, a serious philosophical objection to the kind of redistribution that the novel attempts. To grant moral standing to trees, or to species, or to ecological communities, is to commit to a metaphysics whose implications have not been fully worked out and whose practical politics are uncertain at best. The objection is not without weight, and Powers, to his credit, does not pretend that it has been answered. What the novel offers is not the answer but the question, posed in a form that is harder to dismiss because it has been carried by characters whose interiorities the reader has come to know. The youth movement performs a comparable operation in a different register. By placing the demand for ecological seriousness in the mouths of young people who plainly understand what they are asking, it makes the demand harder to file away under the heading of utopian sentimentality. Both forms of address depend upon the embodied witness, the character or the speaker, to carry an argument that abstract philosophy has so far been unable to settle.

7. Literature as Climate Activism

It is sometimes objected, by those impatient with the long arc of cultural change, that literary attention to climate crisis is at best a displacement of more urgent forms of engagement and at worst an indulgence permitted by the very privilege whose consequences the crisis exposes. The objection deserves more careful response than it usually receives. It is true that no novel has yet stopped a coal mine and that no poem has yet replaced a piece of climate legislation. It is also true, however, that the political conditions in which mines are stopped and legislation is passed are themselves dependent upon a cultural imagination that fiction, among other forms, both reflects and shapes. The relationship between literature and political change is rarely direct and almost never instantaneous, but it is not for that reason a trivial relationship.

What literature in particular can do, and what *The Overstory* exemplifies, is the production of the longer durations of attention without which serious ecological perception is not possible. Climate change is, in Rob Nixon's well-known formulation, a form of slow

violence. Its effects unfold across timescales that the conventional structures of public communication, the news cycle, the electoral term, the daily news bulletin, are not equipped to register. A flood is reported; the slow displacement of millions of people from coastal regions over decades is not. A fire is broadcast; the gradual transformation of an entire ecosystem into a different kind of biome is not. The temporal mismatch between the violence and its representation is itself one of the structural features of the crisis, and it has consequences that no amount of urgency in any single news cycle can correct.

The novel, by its own peculiar economy of attention, is one of the few cultural forms capable of working at the time-scale of slow violence. It can hold a single situation in attention across hundreds of pages and across years of represented time. It can move between the geological and the personal without losing the thread of either. It can, in particular, perform the imaginative labour of placing the human life span within the much longer lives of the ecological systems by which the human is sustained, and it can do so without the impatience that the shorter forms of public communication impose. Powers' novel undertakes precisely this labour. Its structural commitment to the time of trees, which is sometimes the time of centuries and sometimes the time of millennia, places the reader's attention into registers of duration that the climate strike, however indispensable, cannot reach.

This is not to elevate the novel above the protest, nor to suggest that literary attention is the more serious of the two responses. The relation is one of complementarity, not hierarchy. The strike supplies what the novel cannot, namely the urgent, embodied, immediately visible insistence that the situation is not normal and will not be allowed to be treated as such. The novel supplies what the strike cannot, namely the long, interior, patient attention to the moral textures of a crisis that will not be resolved by any single intervention. To read youth climate activism alongside *The Overstory* is therefore to recognise that ecological dissent operates across at least two registers simultaneously. It is loud and it is slow; it is public and it is interior;

it is collective and it is individual. The strength of the current moment is that both registers are in operation at once.

The argument, then, is not that literature is a substitute for action, nor that action would benefit from being more literary in its idiom. It is that the cultural conditions of effective climate response include, among other elements, a literature capable of expanding the imaginative coordinates within which response is conceived. Without such a literature, action tends to narrow into a series of crisis responses, each occasioned by the latest event and each forgotten when the news cycle moves on. With it, action can take its place within a longer, deeper account of what is happening and of what is at stake. The novels that we have begun to call climate fiction, of which *The Overstory* is among the most significant, are part of the infrastructure of any serious long-term ecological politics.

8. Conclusion

The argument advanced in this essay has been that youth climate activism, considered as a cultural form rather than as a sequence of political demands, constitutes one of the most distinctive grammars of dissent that the present century has so far produced, and that Richard Powers' The Overstory operates as its most fully developed literary correlate. The novel and the movement share more than a thematic concern with the natural world. They share a structural conviction that the ecological crisis is, first of all, a crisis of perception, that to address it adequately requires the redistribution of moral attention across species and across generations, and that the institutions of late industrial modernity are not, in their present configuration, capable of the redistribution that is required. From this shared conviction follow the shared features that the essay has tried to describe: the politicisation of grief, the testimonial use of the body, the critique of anthropocentrism, and the insistence that the question of ecological justice cannot be separated from the question of who is permitted to count as a moral subject.

What such dissent refuses, in both its activist and its literary form, is the suggestion that the climate crisis can be safely managed within the existing terms of political and economic life. It refuses delay, which presents itself as prudence; it refuses denial, which presents itself as scepticism; it refuses extraction, which presents itself as growth; and it refuses, perhaps most importantly, the false promise that the costs of the present can be quietly transferred to a future that is somehow imagined to be more capable of bearing them. The strike and the novel both insist that this future is not a separate place into which problems can be moved. It is the same place, inhabited by particular persons and particular forms of non-human life, all of whom are now in the process of arriving.

Read together, the youth climate movement and *The Overstory* therefore reveal that ecological dissent is not only, or even primarily, a struggle over environmental policy. It is a struggle over perception, over memory, over responsibility, and over the right to imagine that a livable future is still a coherent thing to imagine. The strike supplies the urgency without which such imagination would dissolve into reverie; the novel supplies the duration without which urgency would collapse into noise. Neither replaces the other. Both are needed, and the cultural moment in which they have arisen together is one that students of contemporary literature, of politics, and of the environment will be returning to for some time. The unfinished question, in the end, is not whether the climate will change. It is whether the political and imaginative cultures upon which response depends can change quickly enough, and on a deep enough register, to meet the change that is already underway. The novel and the movement together suggest that such change is at least conceivable. Whether it will arrive in time is the question that the present must answer in its own conduct.

Conflict of Interest: The corresponding author, on behalf of second author, confirms that there are no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Works Cited

Butler, Judith. *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*. Harvard University Press, 2015.

Cunsolo, Ashlee, and Neville R. Ellis. "Ecological Grief as a Mental Health Response to Climate Change-Related Loss." *Nature Climate Change*, vol. 8, no. 4, 2018, pp. 275–81.

Fridays for Future. "Who We Are." *Fridays for Future*, fridaysforfuture.org. Accessed 18 March 2026.

Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2012.

Ghosh, Amitav. *The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable*. University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Heise, Ursula K. *Imagining Extinction: The Cultural Meanings of Endangered Species*. University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Hickman, Caroline, et al. "Climate Anxiety in Children and Young People and Their Beliefs about Government Responses to Climate Change: A Global Survey." *The Lancet Planetary Health*, vol. 5, no. 12, 2021, pp. e863–e873.

Iovino, Serenella, and Serpil Oppermann, editors. *Material Ecocriticism*. Indiana University Press, 2014.

Morton, Timothy. *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*. University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

Nixon, Rob. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard University Press, 2011.

Powers, Richard. *The Overstory*. W. W. Norton, 2018.

Simard, Suzanne. *Finding the Mother Tree: Discovering the Wisdom of the Forest*. Knopf, 2021.

Thunberg, Greta. *No One Is Too Small to Make a Difference*. Penguin, 2019.

Trexler, Adam. *Anthropocene Fictions: The Novel in a Time of Climate Change*. University of Virginia Press, 2015.

Wohlleben, Peter. *The Hidden Life of Trees: What They Feel, How They Communicate*. Translated by Jane Billinghurst, Greystone Books, 2016.