Don't Look Up: Hyperobjects and Bland Branding

Chloe Preece
ESCP Business School

Don't Look Up: Hyperobjects and Bland Branding

Markets, Globalization & Development Review

Don't Look Up: Hyperobjects and Bland Branding

Introduction

Meh. My response to *Don't Look Up* is a resounding 'meh.' A satire of our consumer culture's celebrity worship, we see clickbait take the place of investigative reporting, political gamesmanship and tech tycoons commandeer public discourse and all of it, wrapped into a rather obvious allegory for the climate crisis. Directed by Adam McKay and featuring Leonardo DiCaprio, Jennifer Lawrence, Meryl Streep and Cate Blanchett, this star-studded Netflix production has the best of intentions. Astronomy grad student Kate Dibiasky (Lawrence) discovers a comet which, according to calculations conducted with the help of Dr. Randall Mindy (DiCaprio), a Michigan State University astronomy professor, is heading straight for Earth with the odds for planet extinction set at 99.78%, giving the world six months and 14 days to attempt to prevent this collision. "Call it 70% and let's just move on," says President Orlean (Streep). The scene is set for a tense resolution.

The satiric tone is dialled high here and at times, the film is, admittedly, very funny – notably when absolute chaos reigns and DiCaprio screams 'we're all going to die" at full volume on *Sesame Street*. Yet somehow, this film rings hollow and perhaps this is why responses to it have been polarised, as illustrated by a Rotten Tomatoes rating of 55%. Critics have been, on the whole, rather venomous with *The Guardian's* Charles Bramesco (2021) summing the film up as a "toothless comedy that has both the tone and reach of a political Facebook meme sent by a well-meaning elder relative, the point less to critique than reaffirm that we all hate the same sorts of people." *Rolling Stone* called it "one man's wake-up-sheeple howl into the abyss" and "a disaster movie in more ways than one" (Fear 2021). The word 'smug' is littered across the reviews, leaving the question of how exactly to create a blockbuster film about the most serious issue humanity has to contend with, unanswered. The National Board of Review, however, named the film one of the top films of 2021 and it received best picture nominations from the Golden Globes and the Critics Choice Movie Awards. Audiences have been similarly divided, many finding it boring and accusing it of preaching-to-the-choir while others (particularly those working in the climate movement), have praised the film. In any case, it is Netflix's second most watched film ever (Buxton 2022) which is, in itself, an achievement given its message.

Celebrity Branding: A Howl into the Abyss

Don't Look Up is, in effect, the product of the discourse it satirises. Its anti-aesthetic of neutral images, the editing for short attention spans (to the extent of changing scene mid-sentence), the celebrity feast of flashy performances and the simplistic pathos-driven narrative ring somewhat hollow. As a slightly excessive (coming in at 2 hours 25 minutes) mess of exuberant actor freakouts and mashup political characters, the comet as climate change metaphor could not be clearer, unless the comet had a banner, that is. Rather than underwhelming or overwhelming, it is just a case of 'whelming,' providing no real sense of the complexity of the politics involved or of where actual political opposition could emerge. In its emptiness, however, the film encapsulates our bland, branded brandscape where every statement reads as an empty promise which ends up backfiring (Sobande 2019) and where consumers have become allergic to marketing so brands are reduced to becoming engagingly unobtrusive and convincingly inevitable (Eckhardt, Belk and Wilson 2015). Our political landscape and the so-called 'culture wars' brought into view in the Anglosphere since the Brexit referendum in the UK and the election of Trump in the US, have resulted in a sense that we cannot communicate anymore, that there's no way to establish a shared reality or shared priorities as witnessed through anti-science views on vaccines and the climate (Newman 2020). Messages don't stick and they don't land (Preece, Rodner and Rojas-Gaviria 2022); it's impossible to cut through the noise of the daily outrages which are soon forgotten. *Don't Look Up* thus fails in that it doesn't make us look up. Simultaneously, it succeeds in reflecting our - and more significantly our political leadership's – catastrophic failure.

Art is most powerful when it is specific and yet evokes universal human feelings. Instead, the film presents us with a bland brandscape of celebrity activism with DiCaprio, who has long been an activist in the field, at the helm. The reach of these celebrities is enormous, their star power undeniable and there is no question that audience numbers were driven up due to their celebrity, yet, much like the #MeToo or Black Lives Matter positionings brands have adopted (Sobande 2019), this is performance rather than activism. Promotions for the film resulted in calls to action on Twitter by DiCaprio himself (see screenshots below) and an official action website listing a host of individual actions to prevent climate change, demonstrating a total failure to render accountable the fossil fuel companies who are the root cause of the problem. As the research well shows, individual solutions will never fix systemic problems (Kravets, Preece and Maclaren 2020). DiCaprio's brand of celebrity activism lacks any direct action (indeed critics often point out the hypocrisy of his private jet-setting ways, he was found partying with Jeff Bezos on a $150 million yacht for the New Year right after the

release of the film (Geo News 2022). Despite being a satire, the film never really confronts power.

Art is a powerful lens through which to look at ourselves (Preece and Kerrigan 2021) and in presenting us with a celebrity brandscape (O'Reilly and Kerrigan, 2013), this film's generic blandness reflects the widespread cynicism and perpetual ennui which is the result of the marketing efforts of our consumer culture. The villain of the film is billionaire tech guru Sir Peter Isherwell (Mark Rylance complete with veneers and wig as an Elon Musk-type, the closest on-screen appearance to a deepfake in Hollywood since Cher in *Mama Mia! Here We Go Again*) and his god-like algorithmic control (he can predict the exact date and cause of each human's eventual death to 96.5% accuracy). "Life, without the stress of living" is the slogan of his latest BASH product, accurately summing up much of the corporate branding efforts we see in a society where the choice, convenience and instant gratification of Amazon Prime, Uber and Deliveroo has shaped our consumption habits. The current buzzword in the tech industry is the notion of a 'frictionless' (Ash et al. 2018) experience, the removal of any barriers to access that would cause users to go elsewhere, making the technology easier than ever to use (and to stay on longer, see, for example, the effortlessness of TikTok). Yet, as convenience becomes taken for granted, additional friction could enable more mindful interactions. In concealing the assumptions and complex calculations that drive the algorithms hiding behind our interfaces, we lose the ability to question or understand them. Examples of the racial and gender bias within AI facial-recognition applications have, for example, highlighted the dangers of these frictionless systems as they perpetuate negative stereotypes and result in the disadvantage of certain populations (Akter et al. 2022, Gebru 2020). As advertising has become a source of friction, branded entertainment complements it (Stolley, Kerrigan and Yalkin

2021), delivering the branded communications front and centre in a frictionless way, no longer is it just inserted into or around the entertainment vehicle but rather, it is now *the* entertainment.

While Isherwell's BASH is the most obvious brand in the film, the entire film is branding writ large, at all levels. Meryl Streep's Trump-styled POTUS has just undergone a more authentic rebranding by no longer hiding her cigarettes: "they love that she kept it real" her son and chief-of-staff declares (played by Jonah Hill). Even the academic, horror of horrors, can be turned into a brand as Dr. Mindy succumbs to his celebrification and is anointed 'America's sexiest scientist,' destroying his own credibility in the process. Partnering with the right celebrities or ultra-rich individuals, both for President Orlean and Dr. Mindy is presented as an easy solution for saving the planet, but as we see at the end of the film, this calculation proves wrong. Blanchett's admonishment to the scientists to "keep it light" as the sex-hungry host of *The Daily Rip* is gloriously on the nose. Dr. Mindy's final defence of peer review loses out to the appeal of BASH's stock. President Orlean aborts the nuclear strike mission at the urging of Isherwell who sells his mining plan as a panacea for poverty and social injustice. In Dibiasky's words "they're gonna let it hit the planet to make a bunch of rich people even more disgustingly rich." The 'technological solutionism' narrative (Morozov 2013) of Silicon Valley wins out and the comet is deemed too valuable for future GDP to destroy, Isherwell needs to be allowed to try something incredible risky and experimental. Of course, this approach is the one commonly adopted by governments who want to avoid doing anything that would substantially hurt the bottom line of fossil fuel companies. It also reflects the uneven social relations underlying our modern technologies which are founded on asymmetric global relations of exchange (Hornborg 2014). The framing of technology as a "gift to humanity from the wealthier nations of the world" (121), obscuring the power, gender, cultural and ecological disparities that these technologies exploit is part of the unquestioned forward-looking 'development' agenda of neoliberal capitalism (Valentine 2000).

The film therefore cuts close, perhaps too close to the truth and although it was made before the pandemic, the pandemic has only served to illustrate just how accurately it has captured the chaos and confusion of the willful denialism we are living with at all levels of society: individual, government and business; the exhaustion and anger we feel as world-ending events come and go leaving us desensitised, anxious and turned off. *Don't Look Up* provides no solutions, it brings nothing new to the table at a time when the film's insanity and frenzied editing pales in comparison to our reality. It's funny but we're living through it which suddenly, makes it less funny, it provides no distraction from our existence. In fact, President Trump's 2018 video trailer for the press ahead of his meeting with Kim Jong-un is just as (or perhaps even more)

absurdly Hollywood (see The Guardian (2018)'s the action-movie style trailer: Trump says he played to Kim) succumb to the enticing allure of branding, *Don't Look Up* is more of the same. Kravets' (2021) recent study of popular laughter as an incongruous, paradoxical defamiliarisation of the familiar is at play here, yet, little is revealed in the process of watching this film, the laughter has been bled dry to be replaced by a sense of complacent knowingness, it is canned if you will. The generic stock footage that is the lifeblood of branding is shown to have slowly turned human existence into a bland nothingness where comfort outweighs any future risks, no matter how significant (Wu 2018).

Technosolutionism aside, it is clear that branding trumps science in *Don't Look Up*. Perhaps, rather than nods to the failure of a Green New Deal, it is the role of industry which comes to the fore in how the production of scientific knowledge can be manipulated and 'unmade.' Of course, this once again echoes our reality. The original pioneers of branding were Big Tobacco (Brandt 2012) who sponsored study upon study in order to confuse consumers about the dangers of smoking and distort the emerging science. Time and time again, we see that it is only when the science become incontrovertible that corporates switch products, e-cigarettes for Big Tobacco or in the case of the fossil fuel companies, 'alternative' forms of energy. Just as BASH knows how their customers will die, so too did Big Tobacco. The critique of marketing and branding in the film is not subtle; Isherwell asks his aides: "are we sure that the video of the puppy on the rooster is optimising our prepubescent sense memory consumer sector?" In an age where the corporate tools of branding have filtered down to the individual person, however, the underlying industry mechanics and global kleptocracy architecture are largely ignored (both in the film and in reality), while the Twitter-sphere agonises about 'cancel culture' naming and shaming individuals (deservedly or not). We certainly need to 'look up' but it is not happening; the system wants to kill us and we are letting it. In what Jäger (2022) terms hyper-politics, despite intense politicisation there is little "organised conflict of interests that we might once have described as politics in the classical twentieth-century sense," we're missing out on the big picture. The film certainly makes the case that we have evolved past the point of collective action. It simultaneously asks us to pay attention while also telling us that it won't matter. There is a profound cynicism at the heart of our reality which *Don't Look Up* captures in its apolitical view of politics where all government is in the corrupt pocket of business and all elites are indifferent, there is no nuance. The film is wild in the sense that it ends up proving its critique unintentionally, it raises the question as to whether satire is even possible in today's world. How do you find the humour in our absurd reality? How do you heighten what is already at peak intensity? Much like the salad served at the end of the

film, *Don't Look Up*'s message is wholesome but surely, we'd all rather be eating something else as our last meal?

A Disaster: Hyperobjects

In line with the adoption of new ontologies, including the non-representational (Hill, Canniford and Mol 2014), the more-than-representational (Preece et al. 2022) and the post-human (Campbell, O'Driscoll & Saren, 2010), some marketing researchers have adopted an object-oriented ontology (OOO) (Franco, Canniford and Phipps 2022). OOO posits that humans are guilty of reducing everything to our own perspective of it and seeks to move away from the traditional anthropocentric ways of thinking and acting about the world. In considering any 'thing' an object, whether living, non-living or artificial, OOO is interested in exploring the agency and 'private lives' of these objects extending beyond the purview of human conception (Preece and Kerrigan 2021). Eco-philosopher Timothy Morton takes this 'flat' ontology and conceptualises the 'hyperobject' an object which is 'hyper' in relation to some other entity, it is "massively distributed in time and space" (Morton 2013). Hyperobjects are so big and so unfathomable that they don't even seem fully real. Morton (2013) discusses global warming as a hyperobject extraordinaire, an object which is not easy to see directly and which cannot be touched, although it will shape our lives and out-live us and its consequences will be felt long after we are gone. Hyperobjects have certain common properties according to Morton: they are viscous so they 'stick' to us whatever we do, wherever we are; they are non-local in that their effects are globally distributed through a huge tract of time; they involve different temporalities than the human-scale ones we are used to (we cannot simply reach for the categories of time, space, boundedness or structure that we are used to in discussing them so they are often invisible to humans for stretches of time). Finally, they demonstrate their effects inter-objectively (i.e. they can be detected in a space that consists of interrelationships between properties of objects).

Hyperobjects are therefore slippery, they disappear into a vanishing point, their vastness stymie attempts to represent them, including in art and storytelling. We see them only as they emerge in fragments, defying traditional modes of thinking and leaving us disoriented as they threaten our survival. McKay was so inspired by Morton's work that he named his production company Hyperobject Industries in 2019 (indeed Morton and their artistic collaborators have been deploying the phrase "we are the asteroid" since 2018 (YBCA 2020)). In creating the object of the comet as the star of the film, McKay knowingly elides the messiness of climate science, the comet is simple, incontestable (although of course it is contested in the film) and on a predictable schedule, more significantly, unlike global warming it is visible. Although this attracted criticism in the press, McKay posits that

the hyperobject is not global warming but rather "a massive, shifting system of careerism, profitisation, politics and leveraged power" (Goldfarb 2021).

Critiques of Morton have suggested that calling global warming a hyperobject risks obfuscating the problem, rendering any question of responsibility and agency impossible to begin with. Indeed, this is the emptiness at the heart of the film, the politics of the hyperobject are shared equally in this 'flat' ontology (Neyrat 2018). Frantzen and Bjering (2020: 105) argue that it is not about blaming an "abstract, unified humanity" or indeed, individual celebrities, but rather about the capitalist system and the 20 fossil fuel companies who produce more than one-third of all greenhouse gas emissions. The term hyperobject serves to make abstraction concrete yet class conflict vanishes from analysis. What we have is not a politics of care (The Care Collective 2020) but rather a politics of care-lessness (Hutton, 2019). For all its progressive messaging, the film centres around the United States and all the heavy-hitters are white, making Ishaan Khatter's cameo as a vlogger pointing out that the US didn't invite any other countries to participate in its space mission to save the planet particularly noteworthy. As Hutton (2019) shows, the marketplace excludes and creates and reproduces inequalities in resources, power and status and of course, as the effects of global warming become more pronounced it is clear that just as with the pandemic, we're not all in this together. Those who have contributed least are bearing the brunt of the crisis. These blind spots in the film's civic ambitions reflect the inside-Hollywood tunnel vision that it mocks. The limitations of a capitalist machine like Netflix in sending a political message are clear. Gender and social class, however, are engaged with in a slightly more subtle way; Dibiasky being portrayed as hysterical and turned into a meme resonates with female academics and activists whose knowledge is sidelined. Similarly, a major part of Dibiasky and Mindy's problem in convincing the president – and the world – of the problem is that they come from a non-Ivy League university. Again, the individual delivering the facts is as important, if not more important as the facts themselves, in line with the person branding rhetoric.

The tone of the film is therefore very difficult to nail down and perhaps we are asking for too much from it. I suspect McKay himself may realise that his task is impossible. The film is frustratingly superficial, all gloss and no depth, pointing out the obvious and easy.[1] In a way, it could almost have been the product of AI, using Netflix data to combine the least risky cocktail of A-listers to ensure a guaranteed hit, touching

---

[1] In their review of *Don't Look Up*, Atik, Ozgun and Dholakia (2021) are more indulgent toward the film and its director. They argue that "characters representing the cultural and political hegemony are deliberately drawn without depth, only in cartoonish outlines, reflective of the public personas of their real-life counterparts." (p. 459).

on opportune social issues without being bogged down by any real engagement with politics. Yet, there is undeniable merit in having a film about global warming climb to second position for Netflix's most successful release, racking up more than 58 million viewing hours between January 2 and 9 2022 (Buxton 2022). The film is bland in that it has no particularly distinctive quality or specificity. For a disaster movie, however, it is a relief for it not to end in triumph. Spoiler alert: the comet does hit the earth. There is a certain satisfaction in seeing Ariana Grande, essentially playing herself, singing a song with the chorus 'we've really f***ed up." To sum up, we are well aware of the crisis, scientists have warned us but been dismissed or doubted, politicians have neglected the issue by focusing on short-term election cycles, large segments of the media have ignored it in favour of celebrity scandals and corporations are profiting by muddying the waters and thwarting any solutions. We are incredibly ill-equipped to calculate future risks; (Brownlie 2009: 405) found that "there really is only one thing you can be certain about in a forecast, and that is that it will be wrong", and in the face of inevitable catastrophe looking up is not enough, we need to care. And no, I won't be eating salad for my last meal on earth if given the option.

References

Akter, Shahriar, Yogesh, K Dwivedi, Shahriar Sajib, Kumar Biswas, Runwan J. Bandara, and Katina Michael (2022), "Algorithmic Bias in Machine Learning-Based Marketing Models," *Journal of Business Research*, 144, 201-216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.01.083

Ash, James, Ben Anderson, Rachel Gordon, Rach, and Paul Langley (2018), "Digital Interface Design and Power: Friction, Threshold, Transition," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 36 (6), 1136-1153. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818767426

Atik, Deniz, Aras Ozgun, and Nikhilesh Dholakia (2022), "Media Review: Adam McKay (2021), Don't Look Up by Netflix, 2h 18m by Adam McKay," *Journal of Macromarketing,* 42 (3), 454-460. https://doi.org/10.1177/02761467221096611

Bramesco, Charles (2021), "Look Away: Why Star-Studded Comet Satire Don't Look Up is a Disaster," *The Guardian,* December 27, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.theguardian.com/film/2021/dec/27/look-away-why-star-studded-comet-satire-dont-look-up-is-a-disaster].

Brandt, Allan M. (2012), "Inventing Conflicts of Interest: A History of Tobacco Industry Tactics," *American Journal of Public Health*, 102 (1), 63-71. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300292

Brownlie, Douglas (2009), "Tales of Prospects Past: On Strategic Fallacies and Uncertainty in Technology Forecasting," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25 (5-6), 401-429. https://doi.org/10.1362/026725709X461777

Buxton, Amy (2022), "'Don't Look Up' Officially Crowned Netflix's Second Most Watched Film Ever," *Green Queen,* January 23, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.greenqueen.com.hk/dont-look-up-netflix-film/]

Campbell, Norah, Aidan O'Driscoll, and Michael Saren (2010), "The Posthuman: The End and the Beginning of the Human," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 9 (2), 86-101. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.306

Eckhardt, Giana M., Russell W. Belk, and Jonathan A. Wilson (2015), "The Rise of Inconspicuous Consumption," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31 (7-8), 807-826. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2014.989890

Fear, David (2021), "Don't Look Up'…or You Might See One Bomb of a Movie Hurtling Right Toward You," *Rolling Stone*, December 24, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.rollingstone.com/movies/movie-reviews/dont-look-up-review-leonardo-dicaprio-jennifer-lawrence-1268779/]

Franco, Paulo, Robin Canniford, and Marcus Phipps (2022), "Object-Oriented Marketing Theory," 22 (3), *Marketing Theory*, https://doi.org/10.1177/14705931221079407

Frantzen, Mikkel K. and Jens Bjering (2020). "Ecology, Capitalism and Waste: from Hyperobject to Hyperabject," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 37 (6), 87-109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276420925541

Gebru, Timnit (2020), "Race and Gender," In *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI*, Markus Dubber, Frank Pasquale and Sunit Das (Eds.), 251-269. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geo News (2022), "Leonardo DiCaprio Gets Called out for Boarding Superyacht: 'Eco-Hypocrite'," *Geo News*, January 10, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.geo.tv/latest/392622-leonardo-dicaprio-gets-called-out-for-boarding-superyacht-eco-hypocrite]

Goldfarb, Ben (2021), "How do You Make a Movie about a Hyperobject?", *High Country News*, December 31, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.hcn.org/issues/54.2/climate-change-how-do-you-make-a-movie-about-a-hyperobject]

Hill, Tim, Robin Canniford, and Joeri Mol (2014), "Non-Representational Marketing Theory," *Marketing Theory,* 14 (4), 377-394. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593114533232

Hornborg, A. (2014), "Technology as fetish: Marx, Latour, and the cultural foundations of capitalism," *Theory, Culture & Society*, *31* (4), 119-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276413488960

Jäger, Anton (2022), "From Post-Politics to Hyper-Politics," *Jacobin*, February 14, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://jacobin.com/2022/02/from-post-politics-to-hyper-politics]

Kravets, Olga (2021), "It's no Joke: The Critical Power of a Laughing Chorus," *Marketing Theory*, 21 (3), 297-315. https://doi.org/10.1177/14705931211001548

———, Chloe Preece, and Pauline Maclaran (2020), "The Uniform Entrepreneur: Making Gender Visible in Social Enterprise," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 40 (4), 445-458. https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146720930331

Morozov, E. (2013), *To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism.* Penguin: London.

Morton, Timothy (2013), Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Newman, Todd P. (2020), "The Emergence of Science as a Political Brand," *Journal of Political Marketing*," 19 (1-2), 137-152. https://doi.org/10.1080/15377857.2019.1652225

Neyrat, Frédéric (2018), Atopia: Manifesto for a Radical Existentialism. New York: Fordham University Press.

O'Reilly, Daragh and Finola Kerrigan (2013), "A View to A Brand: Introducing the Film Brandscape," *European Journal of Marketing*, 47 (5/6), 769-789. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561311306868

Preece, Chloe and Finola Kerrigan (2021), "Creative Destruction: Problematising Cultural Value through an Art-Object-Oriented Ontology," In *Exploring Cultural Value: Contemporary Issues for Theory and Practice,* Lehman, Kim; Fillis, Ian & Wickham, Mark (Eds.). Emerald Group Publishing.

———, Victoria Rodner, and Pilar Rojas Gaviria (2022), "Landing in Affective Atmospheres," *Marketing Theory*, 22 (3), https://doi.org/10.1177/14705931221076561

Sobande, Francesca (2019), "Woke-Washing: "Intersectional" Femvertising and Branding "Woke" Bravery," *European Journal of Marketing*, 54 (11), 2723-2745. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0134

Stolley, Katharina? Finola Kerrigan, and Cagri Yalkin (2021), "Branded Entertainment: A Critical Review," In *the Routledge Companion to Media Industries*, McDonald, Paul (Ed.), 372-381, London: Routledge.

The Care Collective (2020), The Care Manifesto, London: Verso.

The Guardian (2018), "The Action-Movie Style Trailer Trump Says He Played to Kim," *The Guardian,* (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2018/jun/12/the-action-movie-style-trailer-trump-says-he-played-to-kim-video]

Valentine, J. (2000), "Information technology, ideology and governmentality," *Theory, culture & society*, 17 (2), 21-43. https://doi.org/10.1177/02632760022051095

Wu, Tim (2018), "The Tyranny of Convenience," *The New York Times*, February 16, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/16/opinion/sunday/tyranny-convenience.html]

YBCA (2020), "We Are the Asteroid: Art and the Ecological Crisis," *YBCA Zine,* April 22, (accessed May 1, 2022), [available at: https://ybca.org/we-are-the-asteroid-art-and-the-ecological-crisis/]