Pains, Planes, and Automobiles: Extractivist Nostalgia in *Mad Men*

Verena Wurth

In "The Gold Violin," a season two episode of the period drama series *Mad Men* (2007–2015), created by Matthew Weiner, protagonist Don Draper leaves his office in the advertisement agency Sterling Cooper on Madison Avenue, New York, to take his family for a ride in his new Cadillac and have a picnic on a green. Upon their departure from their outing, Don throws his beer can towards the end of the park into the shade of the trees, and his wife Betty clears the picnic blanket by shaking it out, leaving a pile of food wrappers behind. Before getting into the car, Don orders Betty to check the children's hands for dirt—ironic, considering the pile of rubbish they leave behind (S2E7). While the family drives off, the camera continues to direct our view to the abandoned detritus, leaving the audiences with great discomfort—a discomfort that is created through the clash of the pastoral image and the Drapers' environmentally harmful behavior. The scene thus also leaves the audience questioning and criticizing the family's "(and thus, an entire generation's) utterly laissez-faire attitude to littering and the environment" (Dean).

This picnic scene is one of the most memorable instances when watching the AMC drama from an ecocritical perspective. This scene has been mentioned only in passing in a few journalistic texts (cf. Dean; CBS News), and it is striking that also in scholarly texts, discussions of environmental issues in *Mad Men* in general, and the picnic scene in particular, are rare, despite the scene's strong affective impact. One exception is an essay by Brenda Cromb, who argues that the "disjunction" depicted in the scene "does not necessarily reflect a major social upheaval, but it is still a shock that jars viewers into remembering that the past was *different*" (70). Another example is the article "The Shock of the Banal," in which Caroline Levine argues that compared to other shows from the same era, *Mad Men* puts the technique of televisual pleasure "to the best political use" (134). She contends that this pleasure is achieved through shocking the audi-

ences in depictions of the banal—like seeing Don's daughter Sally playing with a dry cleaner plastic bag over her head or the Draper family's garbage dump after the picnic. Levine maintains that such shocking images do not necessarily show viewers how much society has supposedly progressed since the 1960s; rather, they raise the question of whether change is possible at all and if so, how it happens (138f.). I agree with this claim about the complications of social progress and with her assertion that

> the show does not distance us from this past altogether, but always and significantly maintains the play of sameness and difference: after all, the impulse to exploit and vandalize the natural world remains strong, and thus the uncannily tranquil, relaxed, familiar feeling of this [picnic] scene may serve to evoke at once our own ecological habits and the ones we have left behind (Levine 142).

Mad Men, especially in the picnic scene, holds up the mirror to its audience to show how little has changed in regard to human ecological habits, in particular when it comes to littering and plastic pollution, which is an environmental problem that continues to grow in our present day.

The entire episode surrounding the picnic scene marks one of the rare moments when *Mad Men* displays some degree of critical awareness of human-made environmental destruction at the individual level. *The Guardian* critic Will Dean observes that there is a "tiny subplot" of unsustainability that runs through the episode, in which some Sterling Cooper executives think of how to "market the relatively new disposable Pampers," which are "just one of thousands of consumer goods marketed in the mid-20th century whose convenience trumped their terrible environmental impact." The fact that this observation only appears in the "Notes" section at the end of Dean's article marks it as an afterthought, which is consistent with the relatively small amount of ecocritical work on *Mad Men*, and in fact on New Golden Age TV series more generally.[1] This article seeks to begin to close this gap.

When watching the series through an ecocritical lens, it becomes apparent that there are a few subplots in the show that deal with environmental issues, but these are indeed sub-, as in minor plots. This marginalization is initially somewhat surprising, considering the often proclaimed and appraised

1 There are some exceptions, like Leyda's and Negra's article "Television In/of the Banal Anthropocene: Introduction," MacDuffie's "Seriality and Sustainability in *Breaking Bad*," and Palatinus' "Humans, Machines and the Screen of the Anthropocene."

historical accuracy of the series (Rosenheck 161). One would think that such an at-the-time nascent—if undervalued—topic would be spotlighted more in a show set during the 1960s that, over the course of its seven seasons, broaches so many other historical developments in considerable detail.[2] For example, Earth Day in 1970, a landmark event of the modern environmental movement, does not appear in the show itself, but in the DVD set paratexts for the seventh season, which teases only very committed viewers to buy the DVD and watch these extra materials "to dig deeper about the Earth Day to find its relevance to the present" (Baruah 138). Moreover, while season two is set in 1962, and while the series literariness is well known,[3] it does not reference Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*. The book, released in June 1962, is often said to have sparked the modern environmental movement (cf. Griswold). In season three, Carson is indeed mentioned—albeit only in one line—when Betty Draper joins the all-women non-profit organization Junior League to campaign against a water tank that would drain the local water reservoir ("Seven Twenty Three," S3E7).[4] Betty's neighbor's naïve-sounding comment in response to one of the Junior League women's explanation for why such a water tank poses dangers to the local environment and community ("Well said!") ridicules and plays down the issue's importance. Moreover, the storyline is overshadowed by Betty's flirt with Henry Francis, who is 'the person she knows' in the office of Republican governor Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller, and whom she offers to contact to support the women's organization's cause. This plotline narratively downplays her environmental work, suggesting that her true motivation is to fulfill her personal, romantic desire of getting closer to Henry, who becomes her second husband later in the series.

The fictional Governor Rockefeller, whose family "owns half the land" ("Seven Twenty Three," S3E7) in the area where *Mad Men* is set, apparently later agrees to Francis' appeal to support Betty's and the Junior League's conservational efforts. What this portrayal of the political figure erases from the

2 Especially the instances in which environmental matters are romanticized or ridiculed in the show, discussed later on, suggest that the marginalization of environmentalism is a not a deliberate narrative or meta-narrative choice by the creators.

3 Cf. The New York Public Library's reading list with the works read by the protagonists, including then topical releases like Frank O'Hara's *Meditations in an Emergency* (1952) (cf. Parrott).

4 Adam Rome remarks that water pollution was also a much-discussed issue in major women's magazines of the early 1960s (538)—a very minor historical parallel that the show draws.

narrative is the fact that in real life, the Rockefeller family's immense wealth is built on the large-scale extraction of oil. The historical Rockefellers' success in the industry started in 1911 with the founding of Standard Oil of New Jersey, a predecessor of ExxonMobile—a company that spread misinformation about fossil fuels and their impact on the climate (cf. Union of Concerned Scientists), and which, just like Chevron Oil, is one of Sterling Cooper clients in the series. While we do not learn much about Rockefeller beyond his extensive real estate dealings, the love story with Henry that drives this subplot, and the glamorous depiction of the show's New York setting obscure the Rockefellers' harmful extractivist history. To put it differently, this focus erases their environmental impact while it glorifies and sentimentalizes the material goods and lifestyle(s) they produced.[5]

Another major aspect in petroleum history that *Mad Men* leaves out in its later seasons is the Santa Barbara Oil Spill that occurred in 1969 in the Santa Barbara Channel and which had devastating effects on the surrounding ecosystems, akin to the Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010. Deepwater Horizon happened during the airing of the fourth season and could have served as a historic event that parallels the show's diegetic event. Yet, the catastrophe seems to have been forgotten about by the time *Mad Men*'s season seven was written: the season, released in 2014 and set in 1969, makes no mention of an oil spill—despite its significance and even though it enlivened the environmental movement in California, especially as it "offered a [radically different] reinterpretation of oil extraction as death-making" and not as an optimistic "realization of modern life," to quote environmental humanities scholar Stephanie LeMenager (69). Other than that, season seven only briefly touches upon the theme of environmentalism during the period. For example, Roger Sterling's daughter Margaret flees wedlock and motherhood to join a farm commune ("The Monolith," S7E4) and nominatively restyles herself as a

5 The show's audience is also not presented with any Chevron Oil ad campaigns, but one could only assume that such an advertisement would look like the one Geoffrey Supran and Naomi Oreskes list in their article on "The Forgotten Oil Ads That Told Us Climate Change Was Nothing," where the authors describe how a Humble Oil (now ExxonMobil) ad from 1962 subverts the devastating warning to American oil bosses that "burning fossil fuels could lead to global heating 'sufficient to melt the icecap and submerge New York'" into the power-professing slogan that "Each day Humble supplies enough energy to melt 7 million tons of glacier!" (Supran/Oreskes) The ad was originally released in *Life Magazine*, which is frequently mentioned in *Mad Men*, and the offices of which are in the same building.

flower by changing her name to Marigold. Also, Don Draper is cast as a fair-weather hippie in the series' finale, finding enlightenment through meditation in a more 'natural,' outdoor environment than his offices and homes. Yet, unlike the picnic scene, which cinematographically comments on the protagonist's lack of awareness of and involvement in environmental matters, Margaret's story is depicted with a certain amount of ridicule and insincerity.[6] Don's spiritual salvation and portrayed oneness with the environment does not escape the capitalist ideals that (parts of) the environmental movement sought to dismantle. His enlightenment goes hand in hand with creating the popular Coca-Cola 'Hilltop' ad—which is aimed at growing profit for him and his company, rather than growing "apple trees and honey bees," as the lyrics go in the ad's song. Moreover, the narrative strands remain individualistic depictions of a developing ecological consciousness, while more large-scale, systemic environmental problems and the movement as a whole are not addressed. Consequently, interpretations of environmental history that would be constructive in our current eco-crisis are not easily drawn when watching the show and would have to be accounted for by the viewer.

Such missed opportunities to engage, such brief thematizations of environmentalism in *Mad Men* call for deeper investigations of the (mis-)construction of the environmental movement's history in the show.[7] In the following, however, I focus on the inverse, namely on the question of how the series does depict structures and actions that are detrimental to the environment. Before doing so, I introduce the genre I call petro-TV as a televisual form of the literary genre of petrofiction. With *Mad Men* as an exceptional example of petro-TV, I frame the notion of an extractivist nostalgia, which denotes a form of nostalgia that romanticizes, obscures, or celebrates past forms of extractivism and from which negatively connotated affects, such as grief or guilt, are absent. In my analysis, I ask how the series represents extractivism, especially of steel, which is made from mined iron and other raw minerals, oil, and the modes of mobility fueled by oil like planes and automobiles. In contrast to these, I also examine how the series depicts a less oil-intensive mode of transport, the train. I argue that *Mad Men*'s depictions of extractive materials like steel and more refined products like cars points to such an extractivist nostalgia for the 1960s.

6 Aly Semigran, for example, interprets Marigold's escape as ridiculous.

7 Cf. Rome, who notes the marginalization of the environmental movement in historical discourse (526).

I aim to show how the series celebrates extractivism through visual aestheticizations of such 'indispensable' extractive products like steel, oil, planes, and automobiles, while a less extractivist, more collective mode of transport like the train is frequently portrayed as tedious, even painful.

Petro-TV

If one were to ask whether *Mad Men* could be considered a typical example of petro-TV, as the televisual equivalent of the literary genre that Amitav Ghosh calls "petrofiction,"[8] one would have to negate this question. The series does not deal as openly with oil as petrofictional works such as Upton Sinclair's *Oil!* (1926)—adapted for the screen as *There Will Be Blood* (2007)—, Abdelrahman Munif's *Cities of Salt* (1987), or the graphic novel *Oil and Water* (2011) by Steve Duin and Shannon Wheeler that negotiates the BP oil catastrophe. Nor, to name a televisual example, does *Mad Men* have the crude, rusty, dark aesthetics of *True Detective* (2014–19), the first season of which Delia Byrnes examines as a representation of petroculture. Despite the lack of direct oil thematization in *Mad Men*, I deem it important for petrocritical analyses to also examine cultural representations that do not as openly or visibly deal with oil, but rather do it in symptomatic ways. My approach thus aligns with Patricia Yaeger's notion of an "energy unconscious" (309), that is inspired by Frederic Jameson's "political unconscious," and Julia Leyda's concept of a "climate unconscious." Leyda too draws from Jameson, but also refers to Lawrence Buell's idea of an "environmental unconscious," both of which she uses to discuss the medium of television specifically (Leyda/Negra 78). I argue that petro-TV can appear in shiny, celebratory, and glamorous aesthetics that somewhat cover up the crude, conflictual, and exploitative connotations of oil's materiality and the processes and crises involved in its extraction, and thematically (and visually) deal with issues other than extractivism, pollution, or socio-ecological crises. If oil is kept mute (Ghosh 30) within petrotexts and is deferred through aestheticizations, like the nostalgic ones in *Mad Men*, the petroleum bases of such cultural artefacts must be made conscious through a petrocritical analysis.

8 Popular seriality studies often draw comparisons between TV series and literature. See Winckler, Reto, and Víctor Huertas-Martín, *Television Series as Literature*, for a discussion of TV as literature.

My approach to petrocultural criticism is also based on Imre Szeman's strategy of interrogating "the energy-demanding structures and categories of modernity" (146), and apprehends that "[d]espite being a concrete thing, oil animates and enables all manner of abstract categories, including freedom, mobility, growth, entrepreneurship, and the future in an essential way" (ibid.). Szeman explains that "[i]t may be reductive to position oil as the *ur*commodity that fuels" the imaginaries of capitalism and socialism, but he also stresses that it is a highly significant substance "fully deserving [of] a prominent role" (ibid. 162). Despite the high political and cultural relevance of oil in *Mad Men*, it does not surface in its material form—except in one small instance mentioned later. Instead, it is mediated, appearing only through extractive end-use products such as planes and automobiles. In this way, Szeman's framing of oil as an *ur*commodity does convince, especially if we read "*ur*" as a primordial point of origin that is veiled or forgotten—a fundament (ibid. 147) that needs to be uncovered if one is to understand the past "within which our ideas of labour and capital were born and shaped into forms on which we still rely" (ibid. 162). To put it differently, in accordance with the notion of an energy unconscious, *Mad Men* narratively buries oil either under a romantic love story between Betty and Henry as mentioned in the introduction, or under the depiction of shiny cars and glamorous planes, which will be elaborated in the following.[9] For the characters, especially for protagonist Don Draper, these petro-objects often signify freedom, mobility, or entrepreneurial and personal success (ibid. 146). In its abstract, mediated way, oil does not presented "both as problem and possibility" (ibid.), but leans heavily towards the latter—or rather, the objects fueled by oil are generally framed positively as "possibility," while the train, as a collective, lower emission means of transport is presented with negative, that is, constricting and traumatic connotations—to use Szeman's word, it appears as "problem." In the following, I will examine the celebratory depiction of 1960s petroculture and extractivism in *Mad Men*, arguing that its aestheticization of extractive materials can create an extractivist nostalgia for the period for a 21st century audience.

9 Another example for such petro-TV in which extractivism is mediated through celebrations of petrocultural objects is *Sons of Anarchy*, in which motorcycles are revered by viewers and critics. See for example Philip Etemesi, "Sons of Anarchy: Top 10 Bikes Owned by SAMCRO Members, Ranked."

Extractivist Nostalgia

As a historical drama, *Mad Men* is often perceptibly as nostalgic about the past. This nostalgia manifests itself in the detailed interior designs, the fashion, the music, the media, the abundance of food and cocktails in fancy restaurants, or in referencing of historical events (cf. Bevan). The series does not always sentimentalize the past, however. As Trisha Dunleavy argues, the show oscillates between "deployment and critique of nostalgia" (51). Critique of nostalgia for the 1960s and early 70s, she explains, occurs especially when it comes to "social prejudices and inequities" (ibid.), for instance regarding gender or race,[10] or regarding individual actions that harm the environment, as can be seen in the picnic scene. Yet, when it comes to the larger topic of extractivism, its end-use products, and their advertisement, the TV show strongly leans towards a deployment of nostalgia for the era. The show thus projects an extractivist nostalgia that affirms fossil fuel reliance.

I develop the term 'extractivist nostalgia' out of several definitions of extractivism and nostalgia. Maristella Svampa defines extractivism as "the pattern of accumulation based on the overexploitation of generally nonrenewable natural resources, as well as the expansion of capital's frontiers toward territories previously considered nonproductive" (66). According to Jeffrey Insko, such nonrenewable resource extraction has always been facilitated by advancements in technology and includes actions ranging from "the harvesting of salt and stone to fishing; logging; the mining of precious metals like silver and gold; the extraction of hydrocarbons like coal, oil, and natural gas through a variety of techniques" (173). Ben McKay, who coined the term "Agrarian Extractivism," explains that extractivism can also entail the agricultural exploitation of resources up to the point where the soil's fertility is exhausted.[11] Insko describes the logic of extractivism as a "form of taking without giving in return" (173). Extraction, he further maintains, has "produced the modern world" with its toxic wastes and destroyed landscapes and ecosystems, while at the same time having "yielded remarkable wealth (for some)" (174). *Mad Men* prominently

10 Regarding race and racism in *Mad Men*, see Sarah Nilsen, "'Some People Just Hide in Plain Sight': Historicizing Racism in *Mad Men*."

11 McKay coined the term to describe "the dominant soy agro-industrial complex" in Latin America (see also Cristóbal Kay's foreword in McKay). For more information on global agro-extractivism, see also James Petras and Henry Veltmeyer, "Agro-Extractivism: The Agrarian Question of the 21st Century."

features this capitalist logic, as it is set in an advertisement agency that deals with clients from different extractive and producerist industries, and as it depicts the unequal distribution of the monetary "benefits of extractive practices" (ibid.) through its focus on protagonists from the white middle- and upper class. I argue that such focalization contains an element of social commentary in the way that *Mad Men* purposefully highlights this wealth and marginalizes inequality and social justice issues to also match 1960s history. However, the series still celebrates wealth, especially when it stems from, or is connected with, extractivism, as in the case of Bethlehem Steel, or the aestheticized planes and automobiles.

Such celebratory reminiscing about the 1960s expresses a form of extractivist nostalgia. In this connotation, 'extractivist nostalgia' provides a twist on Robin Murray's and Joseph Heumann's notion of "environmental nostalgia," which they define as "a nostalgia we share for a better, cleaner world" (196). Already the picnic scene suggests that the 1960s are neither better nor cleaner, and, as Carson's *Silent Spring* reveals, it is already an era of anthropogenic environmental destruction, pollution, and large-scale extraction of resources. If we take the definition of the Anthropocene as having only *started* in 1950 (National Geographic Society), then *Mad Men* begins twelve years into the Anthropocene, a temporal setting in which the fast and "dramatic increase in human activity affecting the planet" (ibid.) and this 'Great Acceleration' starts to become palpable.[12] Still, at the time in which *Mad Men* is set, agricultural and fossil fuel extractivism had not yet progressed as much as it has today. In other words, in the 1960s, the environment was considerably less burdened with the effects of extractivism, and in particular, with greenhouse gas emissions as the major driver of our current climate crisis. According to this logic, there *is* an element of going back to a "better, cleaner world" depicted in the series, to an earlier time, to an earlier stage of the Anthropocene, when much of the depletion of

12 I use Eugene Stoermer's and Paul Crutzen's term of the Anthropocene here but want to acknowledge the controversies and criticisms surrounding it. Some scholars have challenged the concept, for example regarding its white- and maleness, for instance Giovanna Di Chiroor and Kathryn Yusoff. Moreover, while I use the National Geographic Society's starting point of the Anthropocene, I also want to highlight the larger debate about its onset and stress that the extractive economies under colonialism and slavery laid the foundation for the post-World War II wealth depicted in *Mad Men*. For the first mentioning of the Plantationocene, see Haraway et al., "Anthropologists Are Talking: About the Anthropocene."

resources and much of the profit that resulted from it during the Great Acceleration largely still lie ahead. Many of its negative consequences are still far enough in the future in *Mad Men* so that, in the show's temporal setting, extractivist products and practices can be enjoyed, both diegetically by the characters and extra-diegetically by the show's audience.

Extractivist nostalgia, as I use it, bears similarities to Stephanie LeMenager's concept of "petromelancholia," which she defines in *Living Oil* as the "the grieving of conventional oil resources and the pleasures they sustained" (102). One parallel between the two concepts is that they function as "mode[s] of preserving the happier affects of the U.S. twentieth century," while the "activism" (ibid.) that LeMenager argues petromelancholia can incite is not necessarily inherent in extractivist nostalgia. Extractivist nostalgia does not entail the "conditions of grief" that were set up in the 20th century due to our "[l]oving oil" so much that its "resources dwindle" (ibid.). It is not a mourning over the loss of the oil resources and the "pleasures they sustained" (ibid.), but a nostalgia for a time when the use of these resources could still be enjoyed without reservation. Such enjoyment without reservation is also part of nostalgia. According to Svetlana Boym, "[n]ostalgia (from *nostos*–return home, and *algia*–longing)" does not just mean "a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed" and a "sentiment of loss and displacement," but also "a romance with one's own fantasy," a love that "can only survive in a long-distance relationship" (xiii). With reference to Michael Kammen, Boym calls nostalgia a "guilt-free homecoming" (xiv). The extractivist nostalgia, then, allows viewers to come home or go back to a "better, cleaner world" where extractivism and its products can be enjoyed guilt-free when watching *Mad Men*.

The absence of guilt in extractivist nostalgia in comparison to (petro)melancholia also impedes the "incitement to activism" (102) that LeMenager describes. In the series, the depiction of petroculture does not call for activism to end extraction through feelings of grief or guilt. Quite the opposite: Petroculture and its objects are celebrated in the narratives and depicted for the viewer to nostalgically long for and enjoy without reservation, at least on screen. In comparison to petromelancholia then, extractivist nostalgia points to absences in texts rather than to presences and serves especially as a tool to analyze works that do not as openly deal with (oil) extractivism and environmental issues.[13]

13 Petromelancholia on the other hand seems to be useful for works that address petroleum more directly (cf. LeMenager, especially chapter 3).

In *Mad Men*, depictions of 'natural' or 'exterior' environments are rare, which also means that the series does not present its viewers with images and sites of extraction. In accordance with its televisual genre, much of *Mad Men* is filmed in studios and the cast, especially in earlier seasons, usually roams through the smoky offices of Sterling Cooper or stuffy suburban family homes. In some rare instances, we see Betty outside, horseback riding or driving her car to the supermarket, but she is mostly confined to the inside of her home. There, it seems like the furthest she can break out is her impeccably kept, Lynchian suburban lawn, as she does in "Shoot" (S1E9), where, in lieu of taking up her modeling career again and starring in a Coca-Cola campaign—which features a family having a picnic—she shoots the neighbor's pigeons dead.

Scenes that could cause feelings of guilt or grief in the show's audience, for example of ruined landscapes or sick workers, are left out. Another reason why such petromelancholic affects are not (necessarily) evoked in the viewer is that the violence of the Anthropocene that is depicted in the series can be too banal to be noticed. In her article on "The Banality of the Anthropocene," Heather Anne Swanson explains that

> [f]or many living in precarious situations, the Anthropocene is already life-altering, life-threatening, and even deadly. It comes in the form of a massive flood or a rising tide that takes their homes away. Or as an oil well that poisons the river on which they depend. But for others, especially the white and middle-class of the global North, the Anthropocene is so banal that they *do not even notice it*. It is the green front lawn, the strip-mall parking lot, the drainage ditch where only bullfrog tadpoles remain. (n.p. italics mine)

While Swanson discusses the Anthropocene in its contemporary manifestation here, the negative effects of extractivism, anthropogenic destruction, and climate change were already palpable in (and before) the 1960s, with the synthetic pesticides that Carson discusses, oil spills, or the pollution that "exacerbated [...] structural inequalities [...] along racial and ethnic lines" (Insko 174). As mentioned before, these effects are conspicuous in very few instances in *Mad Men*, for example when plastic pollution occurs or when the Junior League women try to stop the draining of three million gallons of water from the local reservoir for industrial purposes. Generally, however, the large-scale and relational effects of the Anthropocene and the concomitant extractivism are not flagged as problematic by the series, let alone by the characters themselves. More detailed environmental storylines could have the potential to raise the

audience's awareness of extraction and its disastrous effects, but because of the scarcity of such storylines, the audience's environmental awareness or feelings of petromelancholia are not easily raised when watching the show and demand further cognitive and analytical labor.

Aestheticization of Extractivism

Don's pitch for his proposed Bethlehem Steel advertising campaign illustrates this unawareness of extractivism and ecological destruction. In a meeting with the boss of the Pennsylvanian company, Don explains that "we," meaning the modern citizens of the 1960s "take for granted the things we need the most: water, oil, electricity […] steel" ("New Amsterdam," S1E4). Here, Don lists extractivist products of the Anthropocene, the greenhouse gas emission drivers, which go hand in hand with the "massive amounts of toxic waste, destroyed local ecosystems, [and] degraded landscapes" (Insko 174). Like the fictional inhabitants of New York in the series, who never actually take notice of the Bethlehem Steel out of which their city is built, the audience also does not get to see the real urban landscape and the raw materials that Sterling Cooper advertises, nor their sites of extraction. These non-fictional places that are part of the series' larger ecosystem, like the cityscape or the Bethlehem Steel mines, are not presented. Only the stylishly furnished Madison Avenue high-rises, which are constructed from this steel, are shown from the inside, as well as the further-mediated depiction of Bethlehem Steel in Sterling Cooper's advertising artwork. The underlying extractivist basis of this built environment is perceived as a given, disregarded, and it disappears under the selective historical narration. This narration of extractivist nostalgia creates, through blinkered aestheticizations, a longing for a place or past in which Anthropocene destruction does not seem to exist (yet).

Moreover, the things "we" need the most that are taken for granted—so much so, that they are not even mentioned by Don—are clean air and intact ecosystems that sustain human existence and ways of living. Instead, *Mad Men* often focuses on the things that suggest the "concentrated wealth in the hands of the few" (Insko 174), generated through extractivism, rather than depicting or referencing anthropogenic destruction or the cataclysmic and interconnected effects of extractivism. What we do see is a capitalist, extractivist aesthetics; a nostalgia for unhalted 'progress,' a linear, capitalist accumulation of wealth that builds upon the exploitation of resources, feeding into U.S. Ameri-

can mythologies of expansion and extraction. In the series, this extractivism is disguised through an aestheticized representation of the material wealth and lifestyle it enables. The Rockefeller's extractivist operations are hidden behind the romance plot between Betty and Henry that takes place in the wealthy, suburban setting. In the case of Bethlehem Steel, it is the product of extractivism itself, steel, that is aestheticized through advertising and that aims at increasing Sterling Cooper's and Bethlehem Steel's profit, and thus at further pushing and legitimizing the extraction of natural resources.

One instance when oil makes an appearance on the show occurs in "The Better Half" (S6E9), as Don runs into his now ex-wife, Betty, at an Esso (a Standard Oil/ExxonMobil) gas station. In this scene, petroleum does not emerge in its liquid form and we do not see any of the protagonists getting gas, but it appears as black stains on the shirt of the station attendant. Not only is the greasy substance placed into the background because it is mixed with the blueness of his fabric, but it also merely serves to highlight the attendant's sleazy behavior, as he lecherously stares at Betty leaning over her car window. His harassing stares at Betty's body as well as the more incredulous ones by Don who takes up the same viewpoint, and the camera's slow move up her naked legs, are a classic example of the male gaze that also directs the viewer to adopt the men's objectifying perspective. The presence of oil—already muted through its appearance in stain-form—is obscured by the clichéd way in which Betty is presented and almost vanishes because of the filmic centralization of her sexually aestheticized body.

Modes of Transport: Train

Another facet of such aestheticization of extractivism relates to its end-use products, in particular, to the modes of mobility represented in the show. The audience is not presented with images of extraction itself, but it sees products that rely on extraction, namely the end-use products which Heather Anne Swanson would view as ubiquitous in the banal Anthropocene of the 21st century, but which were often reserved for members of the white middle class in the 1960s. The show presents these products, these fossil-fueled cars and kerosene-powered planes, through a form of nostalgic aestheticization that celebrates the luxurious products and individualized modes of mobility, which are detrimental to environmental well-being. It presents the audience with ex-

tractivist-nostalgic sets, and with denigrating depictions of more collective, lower emission modes of transportation, like the train.

Especially in the earlier seasons, Don Draper does not take the car, but the train to work, which is a more environmentally-friendly transport modality than the car or the plane. Yet, the train is used less and less frequently throughout the later seasons, the reasons being not just his move to the city, his increasing wealth and social status, or the historic reality in the early 1960s, when train passenger numbers declined and the number of passenger trains dropped by half between 1950 and 1970 (Britannica). The train holds negative connotations for Don in the early seasons, which are expressed in multifarious ways: It is depicted as restrictive, it threatens Don's identity, and it is a site of the reemerging trauma of his agricultural past. All these observations lead to the conclusion that the retrospective depiction of the train is far from nostalgic in Boym's sense of longing but agrees more with the protagonist's own definition of nostalgia.

The first, most obvious function of the train is that it takes Don to and from work. As such, this man-in-the-gray-flannel-suit mode of transport robs Don of his individuality. On the train, he meshes into the army of uniformly dressed businessmen who travel with him on this parochial connection between the office in the glamorous city and the stuffy family homes in the commuter belt. For Don, this home is located in Ossining, Westchester County, a small village that also serves as the fictional location in the stories of John Cheever. Cheever apparently inspired *Mad Men* creator Matthew Weiner, who once remarked that he chose the village for the same reason the short story author and novelist did: because of the maximum-security prison Sing Sing (Scholl). Against this institutional background, the train to Ossining becomes a symbol of confinement for Don, a forced return to a suburban nightmare that he flees so frequently. This implication of the train as (a threat of) imprisonment—in comparison to the car signaling freedom—is made manifest in episode three, when Don's train journey to work is interrupted by an unwelcome person from his past. Larry Kryszinski, a former army buddy, calls upon the protagonist repeatedly, but does not use the name familiar to the viewer and instead identifies him as Dick Whitman—the identity he has set aside to be able to escape his past and start a new, more successful life under the name of Don Draper. After Kryszinski repeatedly shouts out Don's bygone name, Don finally agrees to take up a short chitchat, but keeps looking around nervously during their talk, making sure nobody notices him being 'misnamed.' Don is clearly affected by paranoia during this occurrence, as it could put his rags-to-riches narrative, his profes-

sional success, and, ultimately, his freedom at risk. In this way, the train does not only literally connect the city with Ossining but could also figuratively lead Don straight into Sing Sing. Thus, it also serves as a site that reminds him of committing identity theft, the central crime on which his new life, and the series' narrative is based.

While Don's (mis)naming as Dick Whitman in this instance does not disclose his criminal offense to anyone familiar on the train, his unease about public transportation is repeated in the series. The train is not just immuring, but also a site of shame and trauma for Don, as it is a reminder of Dick Whitman's Depression adolescence in both psychological and historical terms—two implications that are intertwined in this context. Seeing it as an icon of a bygone era, the train reminds the protagonist of his poverty-stricken agricultural life in 1930s Illinois, where he had grown up as the son of a deceased prostitute and an alcoholic farmer, and had spent an unhappy, violent childhood full of loss and displacement. When he was ten years old, his father was killed by a kick from his own horse, which meant that his stepmother Abigail could not keep the farm and had to move into a brothel with Dick and his younger brother. These memories, manifested in fragmented flashbacks, do not address the precise course of events that lead to the family's eviction—after all, a young child would not know much about its family's exact financial circumstances. Although leaving the farm is not directly linked with the larger agricultural and economical changes in the run up to and after the Great Depression (the primary reason being the death of father Archibald), and despite the lack of information given about the era, the flashbacks do reference the dire socio-economic realities that many farmers faced in the 1930s due to the higher demands in produce and the concomitant rise in extractivist, industrial, and agricultural practices.[14] In other words, the Whitman family in *Mad*

14 Robin Fanslow explains that the recession after World War I led to a decrease in farm crop prices, which forced farmers to "increase their productivity through mechanization and the cultivation of more land. This increase in farming activity required an increase in spending that caused many farmers to become financially overextended" (n.p.)—a situation further aggravated by the stock market crash in 1929. As a result, many independent farms had to be given up, and "tenant farmers were turned out when economic pressure was brought to bear on large landholders" (ibid.). Simultaneously, heightened farming activities, such as intensified agricultural extraction, put a great "strain on the land"—a development that resulted in devastating dust storms during the Dust Bowl (ibid.). Moreover, the many small-scale farms were incorporated by larger, more productive, and mechanized farms, so that the percentage of work-

Men are not directly forced to leave their farm due to the financial overextension then common amongst other farmers (Fanslow) resulting from industrialization, mechanization, and other extractivist developments in agriculture. Still, with the depiction of the father as a destructive alcoholic and the general storyline of dispossession, this personal tragedy expresses the often-devastating situation of farmers in the 1930s. Again, we do not learn many details about what life at the farm was like during the Great Depression, except about Archibald's hostility towards a "hobo" who is taken in, fed, and given work by Abigail. The critical economic situation is alluded to—the family's visitor is "embarrassed to ask" for food, considering "we all have it hard right now" ("The Hobo Code," S1E8)—but the more substantial narrative point of these flashbacks is to explain that the self-designated "gentleman of the rails" from New York City plants the seed of the idea of a free life in young Dick Whitman. Like for this gentleman, the train becomes Don's opportunity of escape and freedom from his adolescent hardships, but it also remains a reminder of his murky personal history, even in his new life.

The train is also the site where Don last sees his younger brother Adam, the only beloved member of his family, after his return from the Korean War and his concomitant adoption of a new identity. The fact that Adam also sees *him* from the train station platform, and thus realizes that Dick Whitman is not dead in the casket that had just been delivered to the family but continues to live as someone else, makes Don's identity change shameful: deception with respect to the law *and* to his loved one ("Nixon vs. Kennedy," S1E12). Adam's recognition only temporarily spoils Don's journey towards starting a new life of his own—a lady on the seat next to him urges him to "[f]orget that boy in the box" (ibid.) and buys him a drink, thus marking the beginning of his sexual

---

force employed in agriculture halved from 1900 to 1930, and the number of farms decreased by 63 percent, while the average size of farms rose by 67 percent between 1900 and 2000. These few large farms have also shifted towards becoming more "specialized," to use the U.S. Department of Agriculture's phrasing (Dimitri/Effland/Conklin 2). In other words, these industrial farms practice extractivist, monocultural agriculture and only produce one commodity in the 21st century, compared to five different goods in 1900—a development towards monoculture that reflects the "production and marketing efficiencies gained by concentration on fewer commodities" (ibid.). Moreover, "farm price and income policies […] have reduced the risk of depending on returns from only one or a few crops," such as the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) in 1933, which regulated "commodity-specific price supports and supply controls" (ibid. 2, 9).

sprees. Yet, the memory of this moment at the train station hurts Don and continues to do so up until the later seasons: The gaze on the platform comes back as a flashback to haunt Don's new life, and the memory of his brother reappears in person, as Adam accidentally comes across Don's picture in a magazine and tries to invade and harm his carefully developed new life by tracking him down at his office ("5G," S1E5). Read in this way, Don's etymological error of defining nostalgia as a "pain from an old wound" ("The Wheel," S1E13) later in the show has some truth to it, but also Boym's framing of the concept clarifies the scene. Don misses his brother but does not long for returning home to him, because he knows that this fraternal home that Adam imagines never existed. Moreover, he does not long for his past life that is signified by the train in the series, because he knows that his way of life—and the story in general—depends on a "[n]ostalgic love" that "can only survive in a long distance relationship" (Boym xiii). If the home from the past that "no longer exists" (ibid.), and the people that belong to it creep into the present, Don's survival cannot be ensured. Also, the cinematography of the scene at the train station expresses nostalgia in Boym's sense, as the two frames outside and inside of the train can be read as a "double exposure, a superimposition of two images—of home and abroad, past and present, dream and everyday life" (xiv): The audience sees the "past" Dick Whitman in the coffin outside taken "home," and the "present" (xiii f.) Don Draper on the train. If the one invaded the other, Dick's new life as Don would be harmed.

To sum up, the train takes Don back to his yesteryears as Dick Whitman, who is caught in the tight structures of a family that has never really been his own, with a father figure that seems to despise him and leaves him little room for personal growth or developing individual interest. This personal lack of individuality is not just reflected in Don's flashbacks of his provincial history in which freedom of opportunity seemed hard to reach, but also in the train's structure itself, as a collective, uniform mode of transportation. The scene in which Kryszinski bumps into Don on the train portrays well this double function of the train as both a place where Don is haunted by his past life and as a place that structurally disallows individuality. Before Kryszinski approaches him, Don studies a successful ad from his business rival in a magazine: the famous Lemon VW ad that casts the German cars ironically as flawed vehicles ("Marriage of Figaro," S1E3). What the encounters with both Kryszinski and the ad that embitters Don during his following work meetings highlight is not the competition between Sterling Cooper and other advertising agencies, but the competition between collective travel on a train and the more individual-

ized and individualist mode of travel in a car. Similar to Don's childhood living in poverty with his restrictive family, no individual decisions of direction are possible on a train which runs on pre-configured rails, suggesting that there is no room for individualism, whereas the popularity of the automobile mode of transportation is grounded in its individual autonomy when it comes to reaching one's destination. Moreover, petrocultural commodification plays an important role here: When roads "replaced train tracks as the nation's circulatory system and in its metaphoric vocabulary," personal mobility was made into "a form of consumption" (Marling 58). Marling's remark also feeds into the U.S. American capitalist ideology that *Mad Men* often affirms: Trains are not a prestigious commodity you can buy or own like a car—and therefore also do not fit into the advertising logic that Don follows.

Modes of Transport: Planes and Automobiles

The chic airplanes with luxurious interior designs, and the streamlined, now vintage, automobiles that are frequently used by the characters in the show are modes of mobility that better fit into the capitalist ideology of commodity consumption than the train. In Julia Leyda's words, these petrocultural products rehash a kind of All-American "geographical mobility […] [that] comes to symbolize a particularly modern, American, and 'Western' freedom" (25). Yet, as Dipesh Chakrabarty explains, such a "mansion of modern freedoms stands on an ever-expanding base of fossil-fuel use" (208). As mentioned before, the resource extraction and the oil that is necessary to fuel these petrocultural products is, to borrow Don's expression, "taken for granted" and remains largely invisible in the series. We never see the oil refineries—not even in the flashbacks to Don's past in Illinois, the state with the fourth highest capacity in refining crude oil (U.S. Energy Information Administration). This lack of visibility and thematization in the show conceals the Anthropocene to especially those white and middle class Americans who use these petrocultural products, and whose ignorance Heather Anne Swanson laments. Moreover, extractivism is disguised through a blinkered, even glorifying focus on the aircrafts and automobiles from the era, which are presented by means of nostalgic aestheticization.

Mad Men does contain some stories of harmful, even fatal aviation accidents, however. One example to be mentioned here is the story of account executive Peter Campbell, whose father died during the crash of an American Air-

lines flight ("Flight 1," S2E2). Despite the death of a family member, Pete does not grieve but uses this tragedy to convince the American Airlines executive to hire the agency, as he knows how prestigious the national airline would be on Sterling Cooper's client portfolio. More generally, aviation is presented as highly esteemed, in accordance with its apprehension of the time: Commercial aviation increased in the 1950s and remained an extremely luxurious and "stylish experience" (Bilstein) in the 1960s. Accordingly, flying is highly embellished in vintage aesthetics in the series and depicted as a departure into a modern world. This celebration is well visible in the promotional campaign for the seventh season, which is, according to the AMC clip, "all up in the air," and where the cast members are all photographed in bright, gaudy colors at the airport, looking polished, chic, and relaxed (Ockenfels and Guardian staff).

In season three, the celebration and aestheticization of aviation and air travel, although presented in a slightly different fashion, is even more prominent. The business trip to Baltimore that Don takes with Salvatore Romano (Sterling Cooper's art director) seems more like leisure time than work. The two drink and smoke on a plane that is tinted in friendly sunlight, which seamlessly fits into the chipper atmosphere on their descent into Friendship (sic) International Airport. They carelessly joke around, while the (stereotypically sexualized) stewardess waits on them with extra dedication and personal care. She asks them if they would like a refill before the landing, to which Salvatore responds: "Don't you need something to run the plane?" ("Out of Town," S3E1). With this joke, Salvatore equates the fossil-fuel powered machine with their alcoholized bodies, suggesting that both run on the same combustible. Thus, he humanizes the machine—comparable to Pete's favoring of having an airline on the portfolio rather than grieving his deceased father. The conflation of the plane and the men's identity in this scene is, moreover, reminiscent of Cara Daggett's concept of petro-masculinity, which suggests that "fuels mean more than profit; fossil fuels also contribute to making identities" (25)—in this instance, not a social, but a very much corporeal identity.

Such a connection between fossil fuel's end-use products and petro-masculine identity is also frequently apparent with regard to automobiles. When Dick Whitman begins his new life as Lieutenant Don Draper, he first works in a used-car dealership, trying to solidify his new identity. Soon, however, Anna, the wife of the real Don Draper, discovers her husband's impersonator there and confronts him with identity theft ("The Gold Violin," S2E7). Five episodes later, we find out that his strategy of consolidating his new life was to use Anna's late husband's serial number to get a driver's license ("The Mountain King,"

S2E12). Again, harking back to the concept of petro-masculinity, this marks an instance where Don's identity relies heavily on automobility: Without a driver's license, without being able to drive, the new Don Draper would not be able to attain his full-fledged personhood and would not be on his way to becoming a successful businessman.

The flashback to Anna's discovery occurs in response to Don's visit at a car dealership, where he takes a first look at his 1962 Cadillac Coupe de Ville—a scene that is hard to surpass when it comes to fetishizing petrocultural objects. It starts with a close-up of the shiny wheel, after which the camera moves right towards the back fender in rhythmic accord with Don's slow footsteps. Don almost dances around the car accompanied by a soft string-quartette Muzak melody, and the camera moves back left to follow him, granting the viewer an extra-long look at the car's smoothly shaped, shiny wings. Then the frame cuts to a wider angle, to enable us to see the spotless car in its full, cornflower blue bloom. The car salesman strikes up an aphoristic conversation with Don and tells him that the Dodge he drives at the minute is "wonderful if you want to get somewhere," but that the Coupe de Ville is "for when you've already arrived" ("The Gold Violin," S2E7). In relation to the protagonist, this line suggests that the car would further solidify both his position and his identity; he doesn't have to escape anymore and doesn't have to prove himself anymore—a surety that is also signified by the slowness of Don's footsteps, suggesting he has indeed arrived and does not have to go anywhere. To use Bert Cooper's words, who is one of the founders of Sterling Cooper's and Don's senior, Don can simply "take [his] seat" amongst "the few people who get to decide what will happen in our world" (ibid.) and enjoy his stolen life as Don Draper—an identity that this car enables and consolidates.

The car dealer also promises that Don would "be as comfortable in one of these [Cadillacs] as [he] would in [his] own skin." This assurance again humanizes the machine and conflates the man's identity with the petro-object, thus once more confirming Daggett's notion of petro-masculinity, that fossil fuels and the objects that rely on them make (human) identities. This verbal comparison of the car as a second skin is also confirmed visually later in the episode. Despite the aesthetic, flirtatious presentation, Don only buys the car upon his second visit, in which we see him sitting in the driver's seat, with his hands resting naturally on the wheel as if he was driving. Without taking a test drive, but with absolute assertiveness, he lets the car dealer know he would like to buy the car. The camera zooms in, so that he is perfectly embedded in the window frame of the car, his second, chrome skin. With the purchase, Don's "oil desires"

are fulfilled (Daggett 32). He now owns the car that is proof of his achievement of the American Dream, for which more generally, cheap energy and "fossil fuel consumption became necessary" (ibid.). In this way, for Don, the individualized use of fossil fuels has an extra meaning in comparison to the train, namely that of achieved upward social mobility. Moreover, in accordance with the concept of petro-masculinity, which purports that "burning fuel was a practice of white masculinity, and of American sovereignty, such that the explosive power of combustion could be crudely equated with virility" (ibid.), the car ignites Don's virility as well. This is reflected in Betty's reaction to Don showing her the new car, when she tells him that the kids won't be home for an hour and asks if Don wants to take 'her,' this new metal mistress, around the block—her breathy tone and the long kiss following her remark insinuating her desire for a sexual encounter. The female personal pronoun used by Betty moreover proves the synonymity between women and cars as objects of desire that Cecily Devereux discusses in her article "'Made for Mankind': Cars, Cosmetics, and the Petrocultural Feminine," showing how our

> relations and our gendered relationships to commodities and the identity tropes they embody have been figured as the natural outcome of oil and progress, when in fact they form a complex series of socio-cultural entanglements in the West over the last two centuries, culminating in neoliberal politics and economics (Szeman/Wilson/ Carlson 10f).

The scene with the Drapers that follows is the family picnic scene, which, aesthetically, does not contrast this petrocultural intermezzo. On the contrary, both the automobile and the picnic scene have an idyllic, sunny feel, but only the latter is depicted as an environmentally deleterious action.

Conclusion

The use of fossil fuel is not marked as environmentally deleterious in the show, but the extractivism of the 1960s is celebrated through an aestheticized depiction of the end-use products of resource extraction that, for an environmentally aware viewer in the 21st century, are the mobility products of the banal Anthropocene. In this way, the petro-TV show *Mad Men* points towards uncomfortable societal issues of the past, but to modify Amitav Ghosh's words, oil does not stink in the series. He explains that

> [t]o a great many Americans, oil smells bad. It reeks of unavoidable overseas entanglements, a worrisome foreign dependency, economic uncertainty, risky and expensive military enterprises; of thousands of dead civilians and children and all the troublesome questions that lie buried in their graves […] And to make things still worse, it begins to smell of pollution and environmental hazards. It reeks, it stinks. (30)

While the sexual harassment by the gas station attendant stinks to high heaven, the oil stains on his shirt are backgrounded against Betty's sexualized body. Neither do other extractivist products stink—Bethlehem Steel is framed as crucial for 'modern' citizens in the 1960s and is aesthetically advertised accordingly—while a more sustainable life on a farm, be it Marigold's or young Dick Whitman's, is depicted as dirty, improper, unhygienic, and thus a little titter-worthy, and environmental endeavors like Betty's are buried under the storyline of a romantic affair. By romanticizing, disguising, and celebrating 1960s fossil fuel extraction and consumption in these ways, the series creates an extractivist nostalgia, with an element of 'going back' to a fictional 'better, cleaner world'. In this world, the Anthropocene has not progressed as much, which is why the audience is still able to enjoy the luxurious aspects of modern petroculture. *Mad Men* does not suggest the obvious—that actions should have been taken back then could have prevented today's large-scale environmental destruction, which is becoming a more and more excruciating pain from a wound created in the middle of the 20th century.

References

Baruah, Debarchana. 2021. *21st Century Retro: Mad Men and 1960s America in Film and Television*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Bevan, Alex. 2013. "Nostalgia for Pre-Digital Media in Mad Men." *Television & New Media* 14 (6): 546–59. DOI: doi:10.1177/1527476412451499.

Bilstein, Roger E. "History of Flight—the First Airlines." N.d. *Britannica.com*. Accessed on September 25, 2021. https://www.britannica.com/technology/history-of-flight/General-aviation.

Boym, Svetlana. 2001. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. 2021. "Amtrak: American Railway System." Accessed December 22, 2021. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Amtrak.

Byrnes, Delia. 2015. "'I Get a Bad Taste in My Mouth Out Here': Oil's Intimate Ecologies in HBO's *True Detective*." *The Global South* 9 (1): 86–106. DOI: doi:10.2979/globalsouth.9.1.07.

CBS News. 2010. "11 Ways Living Like 'Mad Men' Could Kill You." *CBS News*, July 27, 2010. Accessed December 17, 2021. https://www.cbsnews.com/pictures/11-ways-living-like-mad-men-could-kill-you/12/.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2009. "The Climate of History: Four Theses." *Critical Inquiry* 35 (2): 197–222. DOI: doi:10.1086/596640.

Cromb, Brenda. 2011. "'The Good Place' and 'The Place That Cannot Be': Politics, Melodrama, and Utopia." In *Analyzing Mad Men: Critical Essays on the Television Series*, edited by Scott F. Stoddart, 67–78. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Daggett, Cara. 2018. "Petro-Masculinity: Fossil Fuels and Authoritarian Desire." *Millennium* 47 (1): 25–44. DOI: doi:10.1177/0305829818775817.

Dean, Will. 2009. "Notes from the break room: The Gold Violin.". *The Guardian*, March 25, 2009. Accessed on September 22, 2021. https://www.theguardian.com/culture/tvandradioblog/2009/mar/24/mad-men-television-review-s2e7.

Di Chiro, Giovanna. 2017. "Welcome to the White (M)Anthropocene? A Feminist-Environmentalist Critique." In *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Environment*, edited by Sherilyn MacGregor, 487–505. London: Routledge.

Dimitri, Carolyn, Anne Effland, and Neilson Conklin. 2005. "The 20th Century Transformation of U.S. Agriculture and Farm Policy." *United States Department of Agriculture: Economic Information Bulletin*, no. 3. https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=44198.

Dunleavy, Trisha. 2019. "*Mad Men* and Complex Seriality." In *The Legacy of Mad Men: Cultural History, Intermediality and American Television*, edited by Karen McNally et al., 47–62. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Etemesi, Philip. 2020. "*Sons of Anarchy*: Top 10 Bikes Owned by SAMCRO Members, Ranked." *Screen Rant*, October 1, 2020. Accessed on December 19, 2021. https://screenrant.com/sons-anarchy-top-samcro-member-bikes/.

Fanslow, Robin A. 1998. "The Migrant Experience: Voices from the Dust Bowl: The Charles L. Todd and Robert Sonkin Migrant Worker Collection, 1940 to 1941." *Library of Congress*, June 4, 1998. Accessed on December 13, 2021. https://www.loc.gov/collections/todd-and-sonkin-migrant-workers-from-1940-to-1941/articles-and-essays/the-migrant-experience/.

Ghosh, Amitav. 1992. "Petrofiction: The Oil Encounter and the Novel." *The New Republic*, March 2, 1992, 29–34.

Griswold, Eliza. 2012. "How 'Silent Spring' Ignited the Environmental Movement." *The New York Times*, September 21, 2012. Accessed on December 18, 2021. https://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/23/magazine/how-silent-spring-ignited-the-environmental-movement.html.

Haraway, Donna, et al. 2015. "Anthropologists Are Talking: About the Anthropocene." *Ethnos* 81 (3): 535–64.

Insko, Jeffrey. 2021. "Extraction." In *The Cambridge Companion to Environmental Humanities*, edited by Jeffrey Cohen and Stephanie Foote, 170–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kay, Cristóbal. 2020. "Foreword." In McKay, 2020. n.pag.

LeMenager, Stephanie. 2014. *Living Oil: Petroleum Culture in the American Century*.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levine, Caroline. 2013. "The Shock of the Banal: *Mad Men*'s Progressive Realism." In *Mad Men, Mad World: Sex, Politics, Style, and the 1960s*, edited by Lauren M. E. Goodlad, Lilya Kaganovsky, and Robert A. Rushing, 133–44. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Leyda, Julia. 2016. *American Mobilities: Geographies of Class, Race, and Gender in US Culture*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Leyda, Julia, and Diane Negra. 2021. "Television In/of the Banal Anthropocene: Introduction." *Screen* 62 (1): 78–82. DOI: doi:10.1093/screen/hjab006.

MacDuffie, Allen. 2020. "Seriality and Sustainability in *Breaking Bad*." *Cultural Critique* 106 (1): 58–89. DOI: doi:10.1353/cul.2020.0002

Marling, William. 1995. *The American Roman Noir: Hammett, Cain, and Chandler*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

McKay, Ben M. 2020. *The Political Economy of Agrarian Extractivism: Lessons from Bolivia*. Black Point: Fernwood Publishing.

Murray, Robin L., and Joseph K. Heumann. 2009. *Ecology and Popular Film: Cinema on the Edge*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

National Geographic Society. 2019. "Anthropocene." Accessed on September 24, 2021. https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/anthropocene/.

Nilsen, Sarah. 2014. "'Some People Just Hide in Plain Sight': Historicizing Racism in *Mad Men*." In *The Colorblind Screen: Television in Post-Racial America*, edited by Sarah Nilsen, 191–218. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Ockenfels, Frank, and Guardian staff. 2014. "*Mad Men* Season Seven: New Photos Show Bright Future—in Pictures." *The Guardian*, March 14, 2014. Accessed on September 25, 2021. https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-r

adio/gallery/2014/mar/14/mad-men-season-seven-new-photos-bright-future-gallery.

Palatinus, David L. 2017. "Humans, Machines and the Screen of the Anthropocene." *Americana E-Journal of American Studies in Hungary* 13 (2), http://americanaejournal.hu/vol13no2/palatinus.

Parrott, Billy. 2012. "The 'Mad Men' Reading List." *The New York Public Library*, February 27, 2012. Accessed on November 6, 2022. https://www.nypl.org/blog/2012/02/27/mad-men-reading-list.

Petras, James, and Henry Veltmeyer. 2014. "Agro-Extractivism: The Agrarian Question of the 21st Century." In *Extractive Imperialism in the Americas*, edited by James Petras et al., 62–100. Leiden: BRILL.

Rome, Adam. 2003. "'Give Earth a Chance': The Environmental Movement and the Sixties." *Journal of American History* 90 (2): 525–54. DOI: doi:10.2307/3659443,

Rosenheck, Mabel. 2013. "Swing Skirts and Swinging Singles: *Mad Men*, Fashion, and Cultural Memory." In *Mad Men, Mad World: Sex, Politics, Style, and the 1960s*, edited by Lauren M. E. Goodlad, Lilya Kaganovsky, and Robert A. Rushing, 161–80. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sannwald, Daniela. 2014. *Lost in the Sixties: Über* MAD MEN. Berlin: Bertz + Fischer.

Scholl, Diana. 2009. "Live Like a Mad Man." *Westchester Magazine*, October 20, 2009. Accessed on December 13, 2021. https://westchestermagazine.com/life-style/history/live-like-a-mad-man/.

Semigran, Aly. 2014. "Why Roger's Daughter Margaret on 'Mad Men' Could Prove the Deadly Megan/Sharon Tate Theory Right." *Bustle*, May 5, 2014. Accessed on December 18, 2021. https://www.bustle.com/articles/23346-why-rogers-daughter-margaret-on-mad-men-could-prove-the-deadly-megansharon-tate-theory-right.

Supran, Geoffrey, and Naomi Oreskes. 2021. "The Forgotten Oil Ads That Told Us Climate Change Was Nothing." *The Guardian*, November 18, 2021. Accessed on December 06, 2021. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/nov/18/the-forgotten-oil-ads-that-told-us-climate-change-was-nothing?utm_source=instagram&utm_campaign=oilads.

Svampa, Maristella. 2015. "Commodities Consensus: Neoextractivism and Enclosure of the Commons in Latin America." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 114 (1): 65–82.

Swanson, Heather A. 2017. "The Banality of the Anthropocene." *Society for Cultural Anthropology*, February 22, 2017. Accessed on July 28, 2021. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/the-banality-of-the-anthropocene.

Szeman, Imre. 2013. "How to Know About Oil: Energy Epistemologies and Political Futures." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes* 47 (3): 145–68. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/542312.

Szeman, Imre, Sheena Wilson, and Adam Carlson, eds. 2017. *Petrocultures: Oil, Politics, and Culture*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Union of Concerned Scientists. 2007. "ExxonMobil's Disinformation Campaign." *Smoke, Mirrors & Hot Air: How ExxonMobil Uses Big Tobacco's Tactics to Manufacture Uncertainty on Climate Science*. Union of Concerned Scientists. http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep00046.7.

U.S. Energy Information Administration. 2021. "Illinois State Energy Profile." Accessed on December 14, 2021. https://www.eia.gov/state/print.php?sid=il.

Weiner, Matthew, creator. 2007–2015. *Mad Men*. New York, NY: AMC.

Winckler, Reto, and Víctor Huertas-Martín, eds. 2021. *Television Series as Literature*. Springer eBook Collection. Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Yaeger, Patricia, et al. 2011. "Editor's Column: Literature in the Ages of Wood, Tallow, Coal, Whale Oil, Gasoline, Atomic Power, and Other Energy Sources." *PMLA* 126 (2): 305–26. DOI: doi:10.1632/pmla.2011.126.2.305.

Yusoff, Kathryn. 2018. *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.