

Alfred Hitchcock, Humanity, and Nature: An Ecocritical Reading of *The Birds* (1963)

Ngam Paul Go-Oh¹

¹Section of Performing Arts and Cinema, Department of Arts and Archeology, Faculty of Arts letters and Social Sciences, The University of Yaoundé

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Ecocriticism Ecocinema Alfred Hitchcock <i>The Birds</i> Anthropocentrism Eco-Horror Human–Animal Relations Environmental Ethics	This article offers an ecocritical reading of Alfred Hitchcock's <i>The Birds</i> (1963), a film that has been interpreted mainly through psychoanalytic, feminist and auteurist lenses but has received comparatively little sustained attention as an environmental text. Drawing on ecocriticism and ecocinema studies, in particular Lawrence Buell's criteria for the environmental text, Val Plumwood's critique of human/nature dualism and recent scholarship on eco-horror, it examines the film's narrative structure, characterisation, setting, sound design and visual style as articulations of a deep unease about humanity's relationship with the non-human world. The study situates the film within the emerging environmental consciousness of the early 1960s, a moment shaped by Rachel Carson's <i>Silent Spring</i> (1962), and within the real ecological event of August 1961, when seabirds invaded the town of Capitola, California, a phenomenon later linked to toxic algal blooms. Through close analysis of key sequences, from the opening pet-shop scene to the unresolved final shot, the article argues that <i>The Birds</i> stages the collapse of an anthropocentric worldview that treats animals as commodities, ornaments and objects of scientific mastery. The film's refusal to explain the attacks, its dramatisation of the failure of technology and its insistence on human bodily vulnerability together unsettle the assumption of human sovereignty over nature. The article concludes that <i>The Birds</i> offers a compelling, if ambivalent, critique of humanity's disregard for the natural world, and that its open ending invites viewers to imagine forms of coexistence grounded in humility rather than domination.

1. Introduction

Few images in the history of cinema are as instantly recognisable as the crows gathering silently on the climbing frame outside the Bodega Bay schoolhouse in Alfred Hitchcock's *The Birds* (1963). Released by Universal Pictures in March 1963 and adapted by the novelist Evan Hunter from Daphne du Maurier's short story of 1952, the film follows Melanie Daniels (Tippi Hedren), a wealthy young woman from San Francisco, who travels to the coastal town of Bodega Bay to deliver a pair of lovebirds to the lawyer Mitch Brenner (Rod Taylor). Her arrival coincides with a series of increasingly violent and coordinated attacks by birds on the town's inhabitants. The attacks are never explained, and the film ends not with a resolution but with the survivors driving slowly away through a landscape occupied by thousands of waiting birds.

For six decades, criticism has tended to read the birds as something other than birds. They have been interpreted as the embodiment of maternal possessiveness and repressed desire (Wood, 1989; Žižek, 1992), as an eruption of chaotic, Dionysian nature against bourgeois order (Paglia, 1998), as a figure for Cold War apocalyptic anxiety, and as an expression of Hitchcock's lifelong preoccupation with the fragility of social complacency (Truffaut, 1984). These readings have been illuminating, but they share a common tendency to treat the non-human world of the film as a screen onto which human psychological and social dramas are projected. The birds become symptoms, metaphors or allegorical vehicles. What is lost in this movement is the most literal and, arguably, the most disturbing dimension of the film: that it is about birds, about the non-human world turning against the species that has presumed to master it.

This article proposes to recover that literal dimension through an ecocritical reading. It is based on the premise that the early 1960s marked a decisive moment in the formation of modern environmental consciousness, and that popular cinema, including the work of a director rarely associated with environmental themes, registered and dramatised these concerns. *The Birds* was in production during 1962, the year in which Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* alerted a mass readership to the devastation of bird populations by synthetic pesticides. It was also partly inspired by an actual ecological event, the invasion of the seaside town of Capitola, California, by disoriented sooty shearwaters in August 1961, which marine scientists later linked to domoic acid poisoning caused by toxic algal blooms (Bargu et al., 2012). The film thus stands at the intersection of popular entertainment, emerging environmental science and a broader cultural reassessment of humanity's place in nature.

The article pursues three questions. First, how does *The Birds* represent the relationship between humans and the non-human world, and what assumptions about that relationship does the film expose? Second, in what ways do the film's narrative, characterisation, setting and formal techniques challenge an anthropocentric worldview? Third, what ecological messages, explicit or implicit, does the film convey, and what are their limits? In answering these questions, the article argues that *The Birds* offers a compelling critique of humanity's disregard for the natural world. By emphasising both the power and the vulnerability of humans and birds, the film

unsettles the dominant anthropocentric worldview, exposes the fragility of human dominance despite technological advancement and invites viewers to reconsider the terms of their relationship with nature.

The argument proceeds in five stages. Section 2 sets out the theoretical and methodological framework, drawing on ecocriticism, ecocinema studies and the critical discourse on eco-horror. Section 3 reviews the existing scholarship on *The Birds* and identifies the gap this study addresses. Section 4 situates the film in its environmental and cultural context. Section 5, the core of the article, offers a close analysis of key sequences under six thematic headings. Section 6 discusses the significance and limits of the film's ecological vision, and Section 7 concludes.

2. Theoretical and Methodological Framework

2.1 Ecocriticism: From Literature to the Moving Image

Ecocriticism emerged as an organised field of literary study in the early 1990s. In her introduction to the foundational anthology *The Ecocriticism Reader*, Cheryll Glotfelty offered what remains the most widely cited definition: "ecocriticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment" (Glotfelty, 1996, p. xviii). Where feminist criticism examines language and literature from a gender-conscious perspective, and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of modes of production and class, ecocriticism, Glotfelty argued, "takes an earth-centered approach to literary studies" (p. xviii). Its central premise is that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and affected by it.

Lawrence Buell's *The Environmental Imagination* (1995) gave the field one of its most useful analytical tools in the form of four criteria by which a text may be considered environmentally oriented: the non-human environment is present not merely as a framing device but as a presence that suggests human history is implicated in natural history; the human interest is not understood to be the only legitimate interest; human accountability to the environment is part of the text's ethical orientation; and some sense of the environment as a process rather than a constant or a given is at least implicit in the text (Buell, 1995, pp. 7–8). Buell formulated these criteria with nature writing in mind, but they offer a productive grid for reading narrative fiction and film. As this article will show, *The Birds* satisfies each of them to a striking degree, even though it was not conceived as an "environmental" film.

Greg Garrard's survey *Ecocriticism* (2012) identifies a series of tropes through which Western culture has imagined nature, including pollution, wilderness, pastoral, apocalypse, dwelling and animals. Two of these are particularly relevant here. The pastoral, which idealises rural life as a harmonious alternative to the city, and the apocalypse, which imagines the end of the world as the consequence of human transgression, structure *The Birds* from beginning to end. Garrard's account of the "animals" trope also draws attention to the ways in which representations of animals oscillate between sentimental anthropomorphism and the denial of animal agency, a tension the film exploits deliberately.

2.2 Anthropocentrism and the Critique of Dualism

A key target of ecocritical analysis is anthropocentrism, the worldview that places human beings at the centre of moral and ontological concern and regards the non-human world primarily as a resource for human use. In a much-debated essay, the historian Lynn White Jr. (1967) located the historical roots of the modern ecological crisis in an interpretation of the Judeo-Christian tradition that established a dualism of humanity and nature and insisted that it was God's will that humans exploit nature for their proper ends. Whatever the merits of White's historical thesis, his essay crystallised a question that would become central to environmental thought: whether the crisis is primarily technical, and therefore soluble by better technology, or cultural, and therefore requiring a transformation of values.

The Australian philosopher Val Plumwood (1993, 2002) developed the most rigorous philosophical critique of the dualistic logic underlying anthropocentrism. For Plumwood, the relationship between humanity and nature in Western thought is structured by a set of linked dualisms (reason/nature, mind/body, human/animal, male/female, civilised/primitive) in which the first term is defined by its exclusion and domination of the second. She identified several features of this logic, among them "backgrounding", the denial of dependency on the subordinated term; "hyperseparation", the exaggeration of differences and denial of continuity; and "instrumentalism", the treatment of the subordinated term as a mere means to the ends of the dominant one (Plumwood, 1993, ch. 2). Plumwood's later essay "Being Prey" (1996), an account of surviving a crocodile attack in Kakadu National Park, is especially pertinent to *The Birds*. In that moment, she wrote, she experienced the shock of discovering herself as food, as a body in a food chain, rather than as an inviolable human subject standing outside nature. *The Birds* stages exactly this reversal on a collective scale.

2.3 Ecocinema and Eco-horror

The extension of ecocriticism to film has produced a substantial body of work since the turn of the century. David Ingram's *Green Screen* (2000) examined the ways in which Hollywood represents environmental issues, noting the tension between the industry's commercial imperatives and the environmental messages its films ostensibly convey. Pat Brereton (2005), Robin Murray and Joseph Heumann (2009), Paula Willoquet-Maricondi (2010) and the contributors to *Ecocinema Theory and Practice* (Rust et al., 2013) have since developed a range of approaches, from thematic readings of environmental content to analyses of how cinematic form itself shapes perception of the natural world. Adrian Ivakhiv's *Ecologies of the Moving Image* (2013) argues that films are themselves ecological events, which reorganise relations between humans, non-humans and landscapes in the experience of viewing.

Of particular relevance to *The Birds* is the scholarship on what has come to be called eco-horror or "natural horror": films in which nature, often in the form of animals, turns against humanity. Stephen Rust and Carter Soles (2014) describe eco-horror as a mode that dramatises the fear of nature's revenge for human transgression, while also, at times, registering a more diffuse dread about humanity's place in a world it does not control. Murray and Heumann (2016) argue that such films frequently stage a "monstrous nature" that reflects back the destructive consequences of human behaviour. The contributors to *Animal Horror Cinema* (Gregersdotter et al., 2015) show how these films negotiate the boundary between human and animal, often exposing the violence on which that boundary rests. *The Birds* is widely regarded as the founding text of the modern animal-attack film, and it anticipates

many of the conventions that later eco-horror would make explicit, including those of *Frogs* (1972), *Jaws* (1975) and their successors. Yet, as Section 5 will argue, it is distinguished from most of its successors precisely by its refusal to explain the attacks as revenge for any particular human transgression.

2.4 Method

This study adopts a qualitative, interpretive methodology based on close textual analysis of the film, informed by the theoretical framework outlined above. Following the practice of ecocinema criticism, the analysis attends both to narrative content (plot, characterisation, dialogue) and to formal elements (mise-en-scène, framing, editing, sound) as vehicles of ecological meaning. Key sequences were selected for their thematic significance: the opening in the San Francisco pet shop; Melanie's crossing of Bodega Bay; the attack on the children's birthday party; the discovery of the farmer Dan Fawcett's body; the gathering of crows at the schoolhouse; the debate in the Tides restaurant; the gas-station fire; the final siege of the Brenner house; and the closing shot. The analysis is supplemented by reference to the film's production history, its literary source and its historical context, drawn from published interviews, biographies and the scientific literature on the 1961 Capitola event. The aim is not to claim that Hitchcock set out to make an environmentalist film, a claim that the available evidence does not support, but to show that the film, as a cultural text, articulates environmental concerns that exceed and complicate the intentions of its maker.

3. *The Birds* in Critical Scholarship

The critical reception of *The Birds* has been rich and contested. Initial reviews in 1963 were mixed, with several critics finding the romantic plot slow and the absence of an explanation for the attacks frustrating. The film's critical reputation rose steadily thereafter, in large part through the auteurist reassessment of Hitchcock led by the critics of *Cahiers du cinéma* and, in the English-speaking world, by Robin Wood.

Wood's influential reading, first published in 1965 and revised in *Hitchcock's Films Revisited* (1989), interpreted the birds in relation to the emotional failures of the central characters. The attacks, in this account, externalise the possessiveness of Lydia Brenner (Jessica Tandy), Mitch's widowed mother, the emotional shallowness of Melanie and the instability of relationships built on complacency and the evasion of responsibility. Wood insisted that the birds should not be reduced to a single symbolic meaning, but his reading nonetheless placed the human drama at the centre and treated the birds as a disruptive force whose significance lies in what it reveals about human beings.

Psychoanalytic criticism developed this line further. Slavoj Žižek (1992) influentially read the birds as the embodiment of the maternal superego, the jealous, incestuous force of Lydia's jealousy that intervenes whenever Melanie and Mitch move closer together. Raymond Durnat (1974) and later critics drew attention to the film's patterns of looking and being looked at, while feminist critics examined the punishment of Melanie, whose sexual independence is apparently disciplined by the attacks and who ends the film catatonic and dependent. Camille Paglia's monograph for the British Film Institute (1998) offered a characteristically provocative alternative, reading the film as a celebration of the "chthonian", the primeval, amoral energy of nature, and of the glamorous female persona that Hedren embodies.

Other scholars have situated the film historically. Critics have connected the film's imagery of siege and aerial attack to Cold War anxieties about nuclear war and to the memory of the Blitz, which Hitchcock, a Londoner who emigrated in 1939, did not experience directly but which his British contemporaries, including du Maurier, did. Du Maurier's original story, set in post-war Cornwall, makes the analogy explicit: its protagonist, a disabled war veteran, boards up his cottage against the birds as the nation once braced against bombing raids, and the story's radio broadcasts fall silent as the country is overwhelmed.

Within this extensive literature, explicitly ecocritical readings remain relatively few and largely brief. The film is regularly cited in ecocinema and eco-horror scholarship as a foundational example of "nature strikes back" cinema (Murray & Heumann, 2016; Rust & Soles, 2014), and some commentators have noted the coincidence of its release with the publication of *Silent Spring*. Yet sustained analyses that read the film's form and narrative systematically through ecocritical theory are rare. The dominant interpretive tradition has tended, as noted in the introduction, to subordinate the birds to the human drama. This article addresses that gap. It does not dismiss psychoanalytic or feminist readings, which remain valuable, and Section 6 returns to the feminist critique in particular. It argues instead that the film's environmental dimension is not a secondary or merely incidental feature but a central structuring element that has been obscured by the habit of reading the non-human as a metaphor for the human.

4. Historical and Environmental Context

4.1 Environmental Consciousness in the Early 1960s

The early 1960s are often identified as the moment at which modern environmentalism emerged as a mass movement in the United States. Post-war prosperity had been built in large part on the intensification of agriculture, the expansion of the chemical industry and the rapid suburbanisation of the landscape. By the late 1950s, scientists and naturalists had begun to document the ecological costs of these developments, among them the widespread use of DDT and other synthetic pesticides, radioactive fallout from atmospheric nuclear testing, and the degradation of rivers, wetlands and coastlines.

Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, serialised in *The New Yorker* in June 1962 and published in book form in September of that year, brought these concerns to a mass audience. Its opening chapter, "A Fable for Tomorrow", imagines an American town in which the birds have disappeared: "It was a spring without voices" (Carson, 1962, p. 2). Carson's central argument was that the indiscriminate use of chemicals, justified by a belief in human control of nature, was poisoning entire food chains, and that birds, as highly visible and much-loved creatures at the top of many such chains, were among the first and most conspicuous victims. The book provoked a fierce campaign against Carson by the chemical industry, a presidential scientific review and, ultimately, the restrictions on DDT and the environmental legislation of the following decade.

It would be an exaggeration to claim that *Silent Spring* influenced *The Birds*: the screenplay was largely completed and principal photography under way by the time the book appeared. The significance of the conjunction is cultural rather than causal. In the same months, two of the most widely discussed cultural texts in the United States placed birds at the centre of a meditation on humanity's relationship with nature. Carson imagined a world in which human beings had silenced the birds; Hitchcock imagined a world in which the birds had turned upon human beings. The two scenarios are mirror images, and both depend on a recognition, increasingly widespread in the early 1960s, that the balance between human and non-human worlds could not be taken for granted.

4.2 *The Capitola Event of 1961*

The film's link to real ecological events is more direct. In the early hours of 18 August 1961, residents of the seaside towns of Capitola and Santa Cruz, on Monterey Bay in northern California, were woken by thousands of sooty shearwaters crashing into roofs, windows and streetlights. Birds were found dead and dying on the streets, and some were reported to have regurgitated anchovies. The event was widely reported, and Hitchcock, who owned a property in the nearby Santa Cruz mountains and had already acquired the rights to du Maurier's story, contacted the local newspaper, the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, requesting a copy of its coverage for research, a detail widely reported since and recalled by Bargu et al. (2012).

Half a century later, researchers analysing archived zooplankton samples collected in Monterey Bay in 1961 found that the local plankton had contained high proportions of diatoms of the genus *Pseudo-nitzschia*, which produce the neurotoxin domoic acid. They concluded that the 1961 seabird event was very probably caused by domoic acid poisoning transmitted through the food chain, a phenomenon not formally identified until a similar mass poisoning of pelicans in Monterey Bay in 1991 (Bargu et al., 2012). This retrospective finding is striking. The behaviour that inspired Hitchcock's fiction of inexplicable avian aggression appears to have been the result of an ecological disturbance in the marine food web, the kind of systemic, invisible process that Carson was describing in the same period and that the film itself, as Section 5 will show, refuses to name but persistently gestures towards.

4.3 *From Cornwall to California: Adapting du Maurier*

The transposition of du Maurier's story from Cornwall to California is also significant. Du Maurier's narrative is a stark, claustrophobic tale of rural survival with no romantic subplot. Its protagonist, Nat Hocken, attributes the attacks to a change in the weather, to an "east wind" coming from the Arctic, and the story ends with the family barricaded in their cottage, awaiting the next tide of birds, as Nat smokes his last cigarette. Hunter's screenplay (see Hunter, 1997) retains the siege structure and the open ending, but it relocates the action to a prosperous coastal community, introduces a cast of urban and professional characters, and adds the sophisticated romantic comedy of the first half. The effect of these changes is to bring the disruption of nature into the heart of affluent, modern, technologically confident America, the very society whose relationship with nature Carson was then calling into question.

5. Analysis: The Collapse of Human Mastery

5.1 *The Gilded Cage: Commodified Nature and the Anthropocentric Gaze*

The film opens on the streets of San Francisco's Union Square, where Melanie Daniels, elegantly dressed, pauses to look up at a flock of gulls circling unusually over the city. She then enters Davidson's Pet Shop, a space devoted entirely to the containment, display and sale of animals. The shop is crowded with cages of canaries, finches and parakeets, whose chirping fills the soundtrack. It is here that Melanie meets Mitch Brenner, who, mistaking her for a shop assistant, asks to buy a pair of lovebirds for his younger sister's birthday. Melanie plays along, and when a canary escapes from its cage, Mitch catches it with his hat and returns it with the ironic words, "Back in your gilded cage, Melanie Daniels."

From an ecocritical perspective, this opening sequence is not merely a romantic prelude but a carefully constructed tableau of the anthropocentric relationship with nature that the rest of the film will dismantle. In the pet shop, birds exist as commodities, ornaments and gifts. They are bought and sold, caged and displayed, valued for their colour, song and capacity to please. This is what Plumwood (1993) calls instrumentalism: the reduction of the non-human other to a means for human ends. The lovebirds, named for the romantic sentiment projected onto them, are perhaps the purest example of this logic, since their meaning lies wholly in the human emotion they are made to signify. John Berger's (1980) observation that the modern pet and the zoo animal are products of the same historical process that marginalises animals in everyday life is apposite here. The pet shop stages a world in which animals are visible only as objects of human desire and display.

Mitch's line about the "gilded cage" adds a further layer. It explicitly draws an analogy between the caged bird and Melanie herself, the pampered daughter of a newspaper proprietor whose freedom is, the line implies, decorative rather than real. The analogy anticipates ecofeminist arguments about the parallel domination of women and nature (Merchant, 1980; Plumwood, 1993), and it establishes a pattern of identification between Melanie and the birds that will recur throughout the film. It also introduces the theme of enclosure, which the film will later reverse. In the final act, it is the human beings who are trapped in a boarded-up house while the birds move freely outside: the cage has been turned inside out.

The gulls Melanie notices outside before entering the shop provide a crucial counterpoint. Unlike the caged birds inside, they are wild, numerous and unaccountably restless. The shop owner, Mrs MacGruder, remarks that there must be a storm at sea driving them inland, an explanation that domesticates the anomaly by attributing it to a familiar natural cause. From the very first scene, the film thus juxtaposes two kinds of bird: the captive bird, which confirms human mastery, and the free bird, whose behaviour cannot quite be accounted for.

5.2 *The Unsettled Pastoral: Bodega Bay*

Melanie's decision to deliver the lovebirds in person takes her north along the coast to Bodega Bay. The town, filmed partly on location, is presented in the conventions of the pastoral: a small fishing community, a schoolhouse, a general store, a farmhouse across a tranquil bay, rolling hills and an expansive sky. In Garrard's (2012) terms, the pastoral is a mode that contrasts the corruption or complexity of urban life with an idealised rural world in which human beings live in harmony with nature. Leo Marx (1964)

showed how the American pastoral is repeatedly interrupted by the intrusion of the machine into the garden. In *The Birds*, the intrusion runs in the opposite direction. Melanie arrives in her sports car, a sophisticated urban visitor, and her presence coincides with the first sign that nature in this apparent garden is not benign.

That first sign comes during Melanie's crossing of the bay in a hired motorboat. Having secretly left the lovebirds in the Brenner farmhouse, she is returning across the water when a gull swoops down and strikes her on the forehead, drawing blood. The moment is filmed with a deliberate abruptness. After a sequence of tranquil, almost idyllic shots of the bay, the gull appears from nowhere, strikes and vanishes. In its suddenness, this first attack establishes the logic that will govern the whole film: nature does not announce its intentions, nor does it behave according to the scripts that human beings have written for it.

The film's representation of Bodega Bay is crucial to its ecological critique. The town is not a wilderness but a working landscape, a place of farms, fishing boats and chicken coops, in which human beings have long coexisted with the non-human world on terms they believed they understood. The farmer Dan Fawcett raises chickens; the Brenners keep chickens of their own; the fishing community depends on the sea and its birds. When Lydia Brenner complains that her chickens will not eat their feed, she is registering a disturbance in the domestic food chain that prefigures the larger crisis. The pastoral, in other words, is shown to be a fragile human construction, a negotiated settlement with nature whose terms the birds abruptly revoke.

5.3 *Inexplicable Nature: The Refusal of Causality*

The most frequently discussed feature of *The Birds* is its refusal to explain the attacks. Du Maurier's story at least gestures towards a natural cause, the change in the wind. Hitchcock and Hunter remove even this. Various explanations are proposed by characters within the film, but none is confirmed, and the narrative ends without any of them being vindicated. Hitchcock himself repeatedly framed the film's theme in terms of human complacency rather than of any particular cause (Truffaut, 1984).

This refusal is often read as a sign of the film's modernist ambiguity or as a deliberate strategy of suspense. From an ecocritical perspective, however, it carries a more specific significance. The demand for explanation is itself an expression of the anthropocentric will to mastery. To explain a natural phenomenon is to bring it within the orbit of human knowledge and, potentially, of human control. By withholding explanation, the film denies its characters and its audience this form of mastery. It presents nature as what Timothy Morton (2007) might call genuinely other: not a harmonious backdrop, not a resource, not even a predictable force, but an agency that exceeds human categories.

The film's key dramatisation of this theme is the long sequence in the Tides restaurant, which follows the attack on the schoolchildren. Here, in a confined space, a cross-section of the community assembles and debates what is happening. The sequence is structured almost as a map of competing human discourses about nature, each of which proves inadequate.

The first discourse is scientific. Mrs Bundy, an elderly amateur ornithologist, insists that birds are not aggressive creatures and that it would be impossible for different species to flock together and attack in concert. She speaks with the authority of expert knowledge, citing the long history of birds on Earth and the number of species and individuals in the United States. Her confidence is a form of what Plumwood (2002) describes as a rationalist stance of mastery: nature is knowable, classifiable and therefore predictable. Mrs Bundy's knowledge is genuine, and her respect for birds is evident, yet the film's events refute her assurances even as she voices them. The point is not that science is worthless, but that a science which assumes the stability and predictability of the natural world is unequal to a nature in crisis.

The second discourse is religious and apocalyptic. A drunken patron at the bar repeatedly declares that it is "the end of the world" and quotes from the Hebrew prophets. His interventions are presented as comic, yet they articulate the apocalyptic register that the film increasingly adopts. Garrard (2012) argues that apocalypse is one of the most powerful and ambivalent tropes of environmental discourse: it mobilises fear of catastrophe but risks fatalism. The drunk's pronouncements embody this ambivalence; he names the scale of the crisis while offering no response to it.

The third discourse is instrumental and exterminatory. A travelling salesman dismisses the birds as dirty, messy animals and proposes simply to wipe them out with guns. His response exemplifies the logic of domination in its crudest form: what cannot be controlled must be destroyed. It is significant that the film gives this view to a character presented as boorish and self-interested, and that the events that follow demonstrate its futility. Technology and violence, as Section 5.4 shows, prove powerless against the birds.

The fourth discourse is the search for a scapegoat. After the gas-station fire, a frightened mother who has been sheltering with her children turns on Melanie, accusing her of having brought the attacks with her: "I think you're the cause of all this. I think you're evil!" This moment is often read in psychoanalytic or feminist terms, as the projection of social anxiety onto an outsider woman. Ecocritically, it reveals another characteristic human response to environmental crisis: the attempt to locate its cause in a single, external and punishable agent rather than in the system of relationships in which all are implicated. The accusation is irrational, but it is no more irrational than the other explanations offered in the restaurant; it merely reveals most nakedly the need to make the crisis intelligible in human terms.

Taken together, the Tides sequence presents the inadequacy of all available human frameworks for understanding a nature that no longer behaves as expected. The film offers no fifth, correct discourse that would resolve the debate. Its silence on this point is its most radical gesture. It suggests that the crisis cannot be resolved by explanation alone, and that what is required is a more fundamental shift in humanity's posture towards the non-human world.

5.4 *Technology and the Fragility of Human Dominance*

If *The Birds* denies its characters the mastery of knowledge, it equally denies them the mastery of technology. A consistent pattern in the film is the failure of the technological devices on which modern human beings depend for their sense of security and control. The most spectacular instance is the gas-station fire. While the debate continues in the Tides restaurant, a gull strikes an attendant who is filling a car, knocking him unconscious; petrol spills across the street towards a man who, unaware of the danger, lights a cigar. The petrol ignites, the man is engulfed, and the fire spreads to the station, which explodes. The sequence is a striking

condensation of the film's critique. The infrastructure of the automobile age (the petrol, the pumps, the car), which in mid-century America symbolised freedom, mobility and prosperity, becomes the instrument of human destruction. The birds do not need to destroy the town; they need only to disrupt the human technological system at a single point, and that system destroys itself.

The sequence culminates in one of the most celebrated shots in the film: a sudden cut to an extreme high-angle view of the burning town, seen from far above, as if from the perspective of the birds. Gulls glide into the frame from behind the camera and descend towards the fire. The shot, often called Hitchcock's "bird's-eye view", is analysed further in Section 5.6. Here it is sufficient to note that it reverses the visual hierarchy of the film to this point. The human world, which has been the centre of the narrative, is suddenly seen as small, burning and exposed beneath a sky the birds command.

Other technologies fail in more intimate ways. Melanie, seeking shelter from the attack, takes refuge in a glass telephone booth, the emblem of modern communication. The booth becomes a trap, a transparent cage in which she is besieged by gulls that crack the glass, an inversion of the pet-shop cage of the opening scene. The telephone itself proves useless. Cars, which offer escape, are shown as vulnerable: during the attack on the schoolchildren, the children flee on foot, and in the final sequence the Brenners' car can only creep slowly away. The radio, consulted in the boarded-up house for news, offers only uncertain reports of attacks spreading elsewhere, echoing the falling silent of the BBC in du Maurier's story. The house itself, the most basic human technology of shelter, is barricaded with wooden boards, and the birds break through the doors and the roof.

These failures do not amount to a rejection of technology as such. They dramatise instead what Lynn White (1967) and later environmental thinkers identified as a central illusion of modernity: the belief that technical capacity confers control over nature and therefore security from it. The film shows that technological systems are themselves embedded in, and dependent upon, the natural world, and that a disturbance in that world can turn them into sources of vulnerability. In this sense, *The Birds* anticipates the insight, central to later theories of risk and of the Anthropocene, that modern societies are endangered not despite their technological power but in part because of it.

5.5 Vulnerability, Bodies and the Reversal of Predation

A further dimension of the film's ecological critique concerns the human body. In the anthropocentric worldview, the human being occupies the top of the food chain; human bodies are not prey. *The Birds* systematically dismantles this assumption through its insistence on wounds, blood and, above all, eyes.

The pivotal moment is Lydia's discovery of Dan Fawcett's body. Visiting his farmhouse to ask about her chickens' feed, she finds the bedroom wrecked, the window broken and dead birds strewn across the floor. The farmer lies against the wall in his pyjamas, and the film cuts in three shots, each closer than the last, to his face, revealing empty, bloodied eye sockets. Lydia flees, silent and horrified. The image is among the most shocking in Hitchcock's work, and its power derives in part from the specific violation it represents. The eye is, in Western culture, the organ of mastery: of observation, surveillance and knowledge. To have one's eyes pecked out by birds is to be reduced from the subject who sees to the body that is consumed.

This reversal resonates powerfully with Plumwood's (1996) account of "being prey". The experience she described was not only one of physical danger but of a sudden, overwhelming ontological shock: the discovery that the human being, who had imagined herself standing outside the food chain as an observer of nature, was in fact part of it, edible like any other animal. *The Birds* stages this shock repeatedly. The children at the birthday party, the schoolchildren fleeing down the hill, Annie Hayworth (Suzanne Pleshette) lying dead outside her house, and finally Melanie herself in the attic are all reduced to bodies under attack. The human claim to exceptional status is shown to have no purchase on the birds.

The attic sequence, in which Melanie, alone and with only a torch, is attacked by birds that have broken through the roof, is the climax of this theme. Hitchcock filmed the scene over several days using live birds that were thrown at and attached to Hedren, an ordeal she described in later years as among the most gruelling experiences of her career (Spoto, 1983; McGilligan, 2003). Whatever one makes of the ethics of its production, which the feminist critique discussed in Section 6 rightly questions, the scene's effect on screen is of a sustained, relentless assault in which the human body is overwhelmed and rendered helpless. Melanie emerges in a state of shock, unable to speak, her elegance and self-possession destroyed. The figure first seen in the pet shop, master of a world in which birds were ornaments, has been reduced to a condition of utter vulnerability.

It is important, however, to note that the film also emphasises the vulnerability of the birds. Dead birds litter the floors after each attack: in the Brenners' living room after the sparrows pour down the chimney, in Fawcett's bedroom, on the ground outside the schoolhouse. Birds break their necks against windows and doors. The film thus resists a simple reversal of the hierarchy in which birds become the new masters. Both humans and birds are shown to be mortal and vulnerable, caught up in a violent disturbance whose origin neither controls. This double emphasis on vulnerability, I suggest, is the basis of the film's most significant ecological insight: a recognition of shared creaturely exposure that undermines the hyperseparation of human and animal on which anthropocentrism depends.

5.6 Cinematic Form as Ecological Perception

Ecocinema scholarship has emphasised that a film's environmental significance lies not only in its content but in its form, in the ways it organises perception and directs attention (Ivakhiv, 2013; Rust et al., 2013). *The Birds* is notable for formal choices that themselves unsettle the human-centred perspective of conventional narrative cinema.

The first of these concerns sound. Unusually for a Hollywood film of its period, *The Birds* has no conventional musical score. Hitchcock's regular composer, Bernard Herrmann, served as sound consultant, while the soundtrack itself was created by the German composers Oskar Sala and Remi Gassmann using the Mixtur-Trautonium, an electronic instrument capable of producing synthetic bird cries, wing beats and ambient textures. The absence of music has a profound effect. In classical Hollywood cinema, the score typically guides the viewer's emotional response and aligns it with the human characters. In *The Birds*, the soundtrack is dominated instead by the sounds of the birds themselves, or their electronic simulacra, which are by turns piercing, cacophonous and, in the most unnerving moments, silent. The non-human world thus colonises the aural space normally reserved for human emotion. Most

remarkably, the silences, as in the long sequence in which Melanie waits on a bench outside the school while crows gather unseen behind her, become as threatening as the noise. The film teaches its audience to listen to the non-human world with a new and anxious attention. The second formal element is point of view. As noted above, the high-angle shot over the burning town effectively adopts the perspective of the birds. This shot is exceptional in the film but significant in its implications. For a moment, the camera abandons the human eye level that has anchored the narrative and assumes a perspective from which the human world appears small and remote. It is an instance of what ecocinema critics have described as the capacity of film to decentre the human subject and to propose, however briefly, other modes of perception (Ivakhiv, 2013). The shot does not grant the birds subjectivity in any anthropomorphic sense; we do not know what, if anything, they intend. Rather, it reveals the human world from an outside position, as one element in a larger landscape.

The third formal element is the strategy of accumulation. The schoolhouse sequence offers the clearest example. Melanie sits smoking on a bench while, behind her, a single crow lands on the climbing frame. The film cuts between Melanie, absorbed in her thoughts, and the frame, on which, with each return, more crows have gathered, until it is black with birds. The children's song from inside the schoolhouse, a nonsense rhyme with endless repetitive verses, accompanies the sequence. Only when Melanie follows the flight of a single crow and turns does she see the gathered mass. The sequence makes the viewer complicit in Melanie's inattention: we, like her, are watching the human figure while the non-human world assembles behind her. Formally, it enacts the slow, cumulative and initially unnoticed character of ecological change, a process rather than an event, which Buell (1995) identifies as one of the marks of the environmental text. The crisis does not arrive in a single moment; it gathers, out of sight, until it is overwhelming.

5.7 *The Open Ending and the Ethics of Coexistence*

The final sequence of *The Birds* is among the most daring endings in classical Hollywood cinema. After surviving the night's siege, Mitch opens the front door at dawn to find the land around the house covered with birds, perched on every surface, quiet, watching. He brings the car round, and the family, carrying the traumatised Melanie, move slowly and silently towards it, careful not to provoke the birds. Before leaving, Cathy (Veronica Cartwright), Mitch's young sister, asks whether she may bring the lovebirds, observing that they have not harmed anyone. Mitch agrees. The car pulls away down the road under a vast, luminous sky filled with birds, and the film ends. Hitchcock removed the conventional "The End" title, leaving the narrative suspended.

Ecocritically, this ending is rich in significance. First, it denies any restoration of human mastery. The family does not defeat the birds; they leave, slowly and humbly, through a landscape the birds now occupy. The final image reverses the opening, in which birds were contained in the human world of the pet shop; now the humans are contained in the car, passing cautiously through the world of the birds. In Plumwood's (2002) terms, the human hyperseparation from nature has been abolished: the family can survive only by moving with care, attention and restraint within an environment they no longer control.

Second, the lovebirds are given a remarkable final role. They are the birds of the pet shop, products of the commodified and sentimental relationship with nature that the film's opening established. Yet Cathy's plea for them, grounded in the simple ethical observation that they have done no harm, suggests the beginnings of a different relationship. The child does not ask whether the lovebirds are useful or beautiful; she argues for their inclusion on the grounds that they are innocent, that they too are vulnerable creatures deserving of care. In the midst of an apocalyptic confrontation between humans and birds, this small gesture refuses the logic of collective guilt and enmity that the salesman and the frightened mother had voiced in the Tides restaurant. It proposes, in embryonic form, an ethics of discrimination and care rather than of domination or extermination. That this ethic is voiced by a child, the character least invested in the adult world of mastery, is surely significant.

Third, the openness of the ending implicates the audience. Because no explanation is given and no resolution reached, the viewer leaves the film with the question unresolved. The film does not tell us what humanity must do; it leaves us inside the crisis, in the slow car moving through a landscape that is no longer ours alone. In this respect, the ending fulfils the third of Buell's (1995) criteria: human accountability to the environment becomes part of the text's ethical orientation, not because the film assigns blame, but because it leaves the burden of response with the viewer.

6. Discussion: Reach and Limits of the Film's Ecological Vision

The preceding analysis has argued that *The Birds* articulates a sustained critique of anthropocentrism. This argument must, however, be qualified in several respects.

First, the film's ecological vision is ambivalent rather than programmatic. Hitchcock was not an environmentalist, and the film's primary commercial and aesthetic aim was to produce suspense and terror. As Ingram (2000) has argued of Hollywood more generally, the industry's representation of nature is shaped by generic conventions and commercial imperatives that may sit uneasily with environmental meanings. *The Birds* frames nature, for much of its running time, as a hostile and terrifying force, and it is possible to argue that such representations reinforce rather than challenge an adversarial view of the non-human world. The eco-horror genre that the film helped to inaugurate has frequently been criticised on these grounds, since films in which animals become monstrous attackers may encourage fear and hostility towards real animals (Gregersdotter et al., 2015). The present reading has suggested that *The Birds* largely escapes this charge, precisely because of its refusal of explanation, its emphasis on shared vulnerability and the ethical gesture of its ending. But the tension is real and should not be dissolved.

Second, the film's ecological critique is inseparable from its gender politics, and here a feminist and ecofeminist perspective is indispensable. The analogy between Melanie and the caged bird, established in the opening scene, is extended throughout the film in ways that are troubling. Melanie, the independent, wealthy and sexually assertive woman, is repeatedly associated with the arrival of the birds, accused of causing them and, in the attic sequence, subjected to a protracted assault that leaves her silenced and dependent. Feminist critics have read this trajectory as a punitive narrative in which female autonomy is disciplined. The account given by Hedren herself of her treatment during the production, including the use of live birds in the attic scene, adds a further dimension to this critique (Spoto, 1983). An ecofeminist reading, informed by Plumwood's (1993) argument that the domination of

women and the domination of nature are linked through a shared dualistic logic, would note that the film both exposes and reproduces that logic. It exposes the cage, but it also places the woman inside it. Any assessment of the film's environmental ethics must therefore acknowledge that its critique of human mastery over nature does not extend unambiguously to a critique of male mastery over women.

Third, the very openness that gives the film its critical force also limits its capacity to articulate a positive environmental ethic. The film diagnoses a crisis in the relationship between humans and nature, but it offers little indication of what a restored or transformed relationship would look like. The lovebirds of the final scene gesture towards an ethics of care, but they remain caged. One might argue that this is the film's honesty: in 1963, as now, a sustainable relationship between human societies and the non-human world remained to be imagined. One might equally argue that the film's apocalyptic mode, like much environmental apocalypticism, risks producing paralysis rather than action (Garrard, 2012).

Notwithstanding these limits, the film's relevance has arguably increased since its release. The scientific reinterpretation of the Capitola event as a case of toxic algal bloom poisoning (Bargu et al., 2012) has given the film's premise an uncanny retrospective plausibility, since harmful algal blooms have become more frequent and widespread in many coastal regions. More broadly, ornithologists have documented a dramatic decline in bird populations: one widely cited study estimated a net loss of nearly three billion breeding birds in North America since 1970 (Rosenberg et al., 2019). In this context, the mirror-image relationship between *The Birds* and *Silent Spring* acquires a new resonance. The contemporary crisis is closer to Carson's silent spring than to Hitchcock's avian insurrection, but both texts confront their audiences with the same fundamental recognition: that human beings cannot dominate, commodify and disregard the non-human world without consequence.

Finally, the reading proposed here has implications beyond the study of Hitchcock. It demonstrates the value of returning to canonical films with ecocritical questions, and of attending to the literal non-human presences that interpretive traditions have often treated as metaphors. It also suggests that ecocinema criticism need not confine itself to explicitly environmentalist films or documentaries. Some of the most searching reflections on the relationship between humans and nature may be found in popular genre cinema, where environmental anxieties are expressed obliquely, through the conventions of horror, suspense and melodrama. This insight is relevant to film cultures far beyond Hollywood, including the many national and regional cinemas of the Global South in which questions of land, animals, extraction and environmental change are increasingly pressing and are often worked through in popular genres rather than in self-consciously ecological films.

7. Conclusion

This article has offered an ecocritical reading of Alfred Hitchcock's *The Birds*, arguing that the film, long interpreted mainly through psychoanalytic, feminist and auteurist frameworks, also constitutes a significant environmental text. Situated in the early 1960s, at the moment when Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* brought the fate of birds to the centre of public concern, and partly inspired by a real ecological event later traced to a disturbance in the marine food web, the film dramatises the collapse of an anthropocentric worldview.

The analysis has traced this collapse through several interconnected dimensions. The opening pet-shop sequence establishes the commodification and containment of nature as the baseline of modern human relations with the non-human world, a baseline the film proceeds to invert. The setting of Bodega Bay presents a pastoral landscape whose apparent harmony proves fragile. The film's refusal to explain the attacks, dramatised in the Tides restaurant debate, exposes the inadequacy of scientific, religious, exterminatory and scapegoating responses to environmental crisis. The failure of technology, most spectacularly in the gas-station fire, reveals the fragility of human dominance despite technological advancement. The insistence on wounded bodies and on the reversal of predation dismantles the human claim to exceptional status, while the equal emphasis on dead and injured birds establishes a shared creaturely vulnerability. The film's formal strategies, its electronic soundscape, its bird's-eye view and its logic of accumulation, decentre human perception and teach a new attention to the non-human world. Finally, the open ending, with its image of humans moving humbly through a landscape they no longer control and its small ethical gesture towards the innocent lovebirds, invites viewers to reconsider their relationship with nature.

The film's ecological vision is not without its limits. It is ambivalent, shaped by generic and commercial imperatives, entangled with a troubling gender politics, and more effective at diagnosing a crisis than at imagining its resolution. Yet these limits do not diminish its significance. *The Birds* offers a compelling critique of humanity's disregard for the natural world, emphasising, through the power and vulnerability of both humans and birds, the need for environmental stewardship and for a form of coexistence with the non-human world grounded in humility rather than domination. In an era of accelerating biodiversity loss and ecological disruption, the image with which the film ends, a small human vehicle moving cautiously through a world it does not own, appears less like a fantasy of horror than a reminder of the condition from which any genuine environmental ethics must begin.

References

- [1] Bargu, S., Silver, M. W., Ohman, M. D., Benitez-Nelson, C. R., & Garrison, D. L. (2012). Mystery behind Hitchcock's birds. *Nature Geoscience*, 5(1), 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1360>
- [2] Berger, J. (1980). Why look at animals? In *About looking* (pp. 1–26). Pantheon Books.
- [3] Brereton, P. (2005). *Hollywood utopia: Ecology in contemporary American cinema*. Intellect.
- [4] Buell, L. (1995). *The environmental imagination: Thoreau, nature writing, and the formation of American culture*. Harvard University Press.
- [5] Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Houghton Mifflin.
- [6] du Maurier, D. (1952). The birds. In *The apple tree: A short novel and some stories*. Victor Gollancz.
- [7] Durgnat, R. (1974). *The strange case of Alfred Hitchcock, or the plain man's Hitchcock*. MIT Press.
- [8] Garrard, G. (2012). *Ecocriticism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [9] Glotfelty, C. (1996). Introduction: Literary studies in an age of environmental crisis. In C. Glotfelty & H. Fromm (Eds.), *The ecocriticism reader: Landmarks in literary ecology* (pp. xv–xxxvii). University of Georgia Press.
- [10] Gregersdotter, K., Höglund, J., & Hällén, N. (Eds.). (2015). *Animal horror cinema: Genre, history and criticism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [11] Hunter, E. (1997). *Me and Mr. Hitchcock*. Faber and Faber.

- [12] Ingram, D. (2000). *Green screen: Environmentalism and Hollywood cinema*. University of Exeter Press.
- [13] Ivakhiv, A. (2013). *Ecologies of the moving image: Cinema, affect, nature*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- [14] Marx, L. (1964). *The machine in the garden: Technology and the pastoral ideal in America*. Oxford University Press.
- [15] McGilligan, P. (2003). *Alfred Hitchcock: A life in darkness and light*. ReganBooks.
- [16] Merchant, C. (1980). *The death of nature: Women, ecology, and the scientific revolution*. Harper & Row.
- [17] Morton, T. (2007). *Ecology without nature: Rethinking environmental aesthetics*. Harvard University Press.
- [18] Murray, R. L., & Heumann, J. K. (2009). *Ecology and popular film: Cinema on the edge*. State University of New York Press.
- [19] Murray, R. L., & Heumann, J. K. (2016). *Monstrous nature: Environment and horror on the big screen*. University of Nebraska Press.
- [20] Paglia, C. (1998). *The birds*. British Film Institute.
- [21] Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. Routledge.
- [22] Plumwood, V. (1996). Being prey. *Terra Nova*, 1(3), 32–44.
- [23] Plumwood, V. (2002). *Environmental culture: The ecological crisis of reason*. Routledge.
- [24] Rosenberg, K. V., Dokter, A. M., Blancher, P. J., Sauer, J. R., Smith, A. C., Smith, P. A., Stanton, J. C., Panjabi, A., Helft, L., Parr, M., & Marra, P. P. (2019). Decline of the North American avifauna. *Science*, 366(6461), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaw1313>
- [26] Rust, S., Monani, S., & Cubitt, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Ecocinema theory and practice*. Routledge.
- [27] Rust, S. A., & Soles, C. (2014). Ecohorror special cluster: "Living in fear, living in dread, pretty soon we'll all be dead." *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 21(3), 509–512.
- [28] Spoto, D. (1983). *The dark side of genius: The life of Alfred Hitchcock*. Little, Brown.
- [29] Truffaut, F. (1984). *Hitchcock* (Rev. ed., with the collaboration of H. G. Scott). Simon & Schuster.
- [30] White, L., Jr. (1967). The historical roots of our ecologic crisis. *Science*, 155(3767), 1203–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.155.3767.1203>
- [31] Willoquet-Maricondi, P. (Ed.). (2010). *Framing the world: Explorations in ecocriticism and film*. University of Virginia Press.
- [32] Wood, R. (1989). *Hitchcock's films revisited*. Columbia University Press.
- [33] Žižek, S. (Ed.). (1992). *Everything you always wanted to know about Lacan (but were afraid to ask Hitchcock)*. Verso.
- Filmography
- [34] Hitchcock, A. (Director). (1963). *The birds* [Film]. Alfred J. Hitchcock Productions; Universal Pictures.