Phillips, M. E. (2020). Reconnecting with nature: an ecofeminist view of environmental management. *Geographical Research: Journal of the Institute of Australian Geographers*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12388>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1111/1745-5871.12388](https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12388)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Wiley at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1745-5871.12388> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Reconnecting with nature: An ecofeminist view of environmental management

Key insights

Current conceptions of environmental management are limited and will not halt, let alone reverse, the disastrous impacts of capitalism on the planet. Ecofeminist philosophy offers a set of principles to challenge those conceptions and to build a different relationship with nature: first, developing ecocentric connections where humanity is seen as part of the web-of-life; secondly, revaluing epistemological frameworks to include what is currently denied by hyper-rationalism; and, finally, focusing on an ethic of care as a moral imperative and call for action.

Abstract

Current approaches to environmental management are critiqued as symptomatic of a capitalist system that rests on the appropriation and instrumental use of planetary resources. I argue that humanity needs to find different ways of relating to their co-members of the web of life. A set of ecofeminist philosophical principles is proposed on which to build that new relationship; the need to develop an ecocentric, as opposed to an anthropocentric, view whereby to be human is to be part of the more-than-human, the revaluation of epistemological frameworks to include what rationality currently denies and a focus on an ethic of care extended to the more-than-human as a moral imperative and as a call for action. These offer exciting possibilities to develop ecocentric connectivities within nature beyond the current limiting and damaging conceptions of environmental management.

Keywords

Anthropocentrism; ecocentrism; embodiment; ethics of care; more-than-human; materiality

1 | Introduction

Is the environment something to be managed? For ecofeminists, the very terms used in this question betray a mistaken way of thinking about the web of life of which humanity is an inherent part. The use of the word ‘environment’ suggests that humanity is separate from the natural world and the different contexts of time and place in which people operate and interact with other beings. If it is important that this ‘environment’ is regarded as something to be ‘managed’, it is also inferred that the environment is a threat, a confusion to be ordered and categorised, and that people, as superior beings, can and should control it. This worldview is inherently anthropocentric and places human interests at the forefront, and it has resulted in a ‘mainstream capitalist environmental management that does not prevent environmental problems but rather predicts, monitors and mitigates them’ (Birkeland, 1993, p.268).

Here, an alternative view will be proposed. This view does not advance specific suggestions for improving current approaches to environmental management, but rather outlines a set of ecofeminist philosophical positions to inform how ecocentric connections within nature can be developed. These positions offer exciting possibilities for developing different ways of being in and interacting with the world that go beyond current limiting conceptions including environmental management.

First, it is argued that humans, particularly in Western cultures, need to recognise how they dwell within the ‘more-than-human’. This term has become well-used across disciplines, including geography, and in a plethora of debates around the ontological and epistemological status of ‘nature’. A central focus is placed on materiality (for example, Whatmore, 2002; 2004; Barad, 2000) related to increasing anxiety about the impacts of human activities and allied to a growing awareness of the interconnectivity and complexity of all lives (Probyn, 2014). Second, I propose that we need to develop different forms of knowing grounded in the materiality of nature, including human materiality. I am calling this embodied knowledge. Third, I propose an ethics of care to lead us away from anthropocentric ethics. This ethics is also grounded in a visceral, embodied response which connects the particular to the general in what Warren (2000, p.108) has termed ‘situated universalism’.

The work develops as follows. I offer a brief history and outline of ecofeminist thought, and then turn to an ecofeminist critique of current dominant environmental management discourse and practice that operates within a capitalist system. Both capitalism and environmental management are positioned within a patriarchal logic that privileges rationality and instrumentality. I argue that to challenge this will require more fundamental attention to the systems, structures and institutions in which environmental management is produced and reproduced. Overall, the main contribution to the discipline is made through a development of ecofeminist insights as a means to change most current approaches to environmental management. These are building ecocentric connection, drawing on forms of knowledge that have been backgrounded by rational approaches and focusing on care as a moral imperative and call to action

2 | Ecofeminisms explained

Ecofeminist academics and activists gained prominence in the late 1970s and 1980s as momentum built for working in the intersections between gender and ecology, first in the United States of America and then in Australia and Europe. Existing environmental groups and scholarships were increasingly perceived as holding masculine biases such that contributions to change by women and the members of other minority groups were ignored, as were the impacts upon them of pollution and anthropocentric climate change (Sturgeon, 1997). Added to this, several women who would later identify as ecofeminists were engaged in specifically feminist direct action against, for example, clear cut logging (Moore, 2016), nuclear weapons and power, and toxic waste (Sturgeon, 1997). At the same time, scholarship developed in a broad range of disciplines across the social sciences and humanities such that some claimed ecofeminism to be the ‘third wave’ of feminism (Gaard, 2011; Thompson, 2006). It is important to note here that ecofeminist scholarship and activism have never been demarcated into separate spheres and many ecofeminists work across both in the belief that ecofeminist philosophies should be practical and practiced.

Turning now to core concepts, note that ecofeminism is not represented by one approach or set of philosophical arguments and encompasses a breadth of views. One leading ecofeminist academic, Karen Warren (2000, p.66) describes it as a quilt ‘made up of different “patches”, constructed by quilters in particular social, historical and materialist contexts’. In the same way that a quilt contains a rich variety of colours and patterns, the parameters of ecofeminism

embrace a wide range of emphases (Cuomo, 2002). However, this observation does not mean either that there is no overlap across different positions taken by ecofeminists or that they are in opposition in all aspects.

Early accounts of ecofeminism noted differences between cultural and social ecofeminism (Plumwood, 1992; see also Sturgeon, 1997, for a comprehensive history of early ecofeminisms). Cultural ecofeminists stressed historical, biological, and experiential connections between women and nature, with their joint oppression being the result of male domination and control. They sought to create and celebrate an alternative women's culture, based on women's supposed superior relation to nature, through which adherents would seek a new spiritual relationship to the planet (King, 1981; Spretnak, 1999). This version became mired in critique, often from other feminists. The fiercest of these criticized the apparent essentialism inherent in claims for women's special affinity with nature based in biologically determined and embodied experiences (Biehl, 1991). Critics argued that this assumption, and a perceived celebration of 'womanly' values such as nurturing, upheld longstanding patriarchal ideas about the flaws of the female body being grounds for dismissing women as inherently inferior (see Gaard, 2011 for a full discussion).

Social ecofeminists (Plumwood, 1992) tended to focus on the social and political rather than personal and spiritual aspects of ecofeminism, although the political/spiritual binary would be critiqued by many who rejected both the argument that women are closer to nature and biologically deterministic accounts of maleness and the relations between sexes. They pointed instead to the development of dominant culture and its relationship to nature as the product of patriarchal logic expressed in the dualism of nature and reason. I return to this matter in more detail below.

More recently, MacGregor (2006) has again pointed to differences between those ecofeminist approaches focusing on care as a political imperative and part of a feminist ecological citizenship, and those espousing an ecomaternalism closer to cultural ecofeminism (see also Moore, 2008; Phillips, 2016a). My work here is influenced by social ecofeminism, although I also point to the need to revalue the body and emotions in the more-than-human in ways that would not be out of place in cultural ecofeminism. This point underlines another: that ecofeminism cannot be demarcated into clear either/or binary positions.

Other ecofeminists have focused on experiences among Indigenous peoples, including women in the global South (Mies & Shiva, 2014; Glazebrook, 2016; Arora-Jonsson & Basnett Sijapati, 2018) and first nations peoples of North America (Diamond & Orenstein, 1990). Their work pointed out that nonhumans influence and shape the world in ways unaccounted for by dominant, Western, worldviews, and some of it was rightly critiqued for idealising non-industrialised cultures and the experiences of women within them. For Donna Haraway (1989), for example, in those accounts there was little or no analysis of the historical and textual forms of power and violence built into holistic, non-western frameworks. Moreover, as Sturgeon (1997) points out, such frameworks ultimately maintain certain notions of white identity by reinstating a duality constituting Western/Indigenous identities. This outcome tends to elide difference between Indigenous groups and problematically appropriates economic, spiritual, and cultural practices for use by white, Western, urbanized, and industrialised women. As such, it constitutes an exercise of racial privilege in defining difference. Nevertheless, ecofeminist scholars sought to surface the ways in which humans and nonhumans are co-constituted in Indigenous belief systems and practices and challenged ontological splits between nature and culture that were presented as universal. I have drawn on this early and more recent work by cultural geographers to inform my thinking about a renewed set of principles for environmental management.

Clearly, then, ecofeminisms are not static; they have embraced new developments in thinking, often leading debate in areas that have since gained ascendancy elsewhere; consider, for example, current work on post-humanism and new materialism (Moore, 2016). New patches have therefore been added to the quilt, and those that have become threadbare replaced (Phillips & Rumens, 2016) such that contemporary ecofeminisms draw on and develop a range of theories including poststructural feminism (Phillips, 2016b), postcolonial theory (Wright, 2016), and animal studies (Cudworth, 2016). Shared across the quilt is a commitment to core values of care and the pursuit of justice for both human and nonhuman life. Ecofeminisms also support transformative agendas which strive to move from ‘unhealthy, life-denying systems and relationships to healthy, life-affirming ones’ (Warren, 2000, p.200) and instead create societies focused on more-than-human flourishing.

Little wonder that Plumwood (1993) argued that unhealthy and unjust systems and relationships are grounded in and produced by patriarchal logic. Such logic (re)produces and continues to rest on sets of interwoven and hierarchical dualisms such as male/female,

masculine/feminine, mind/body, rationality/emotion or human/nature. These support the construction of a “natural” order in which the privileged first terms are defined in superior opposition to the second; thus, for example, masculinity is defined as a set of characteristics which excludes and negates those perceived as feminine. The binary dichotomies between man/woman, civilized/uncivilised, and so on have perpetuated and legitimised Western power structures and favoured hegemonic masculinity because the authentically male or masculine is aligned with mind and rationality and has become coterminous with what is properly human. For Plumwood (1991, p.5), the

account [of authentic humanity] draws on the familiar view of reason and emotion as sharply separated and opposed, and of “desire”, caring, and love as merely “personal” and “particular” as opposed to the universality and impartiality of understanding and of “feminine” emotions as essentially unreliable, untrustworthy, and morally irrelevant, an inferior domain to be dominated by a superior, disinterested (and of course masculine) reason.

Thus, to be an authentic human being is to be superior to and separate from what is placed in the realms of the natural or biological, including emotions and the body. The body is to be transcended because it impedes actualisation of the “true” self of soul, mind, spirit, will, and freedom. Emotions and bodies are construed as inferior so that the idealised human subject is disembodied and disengaged, ‘free and rational to the extent that he [sic] has fully distinguished himself from the natural and social worlds’ (Taylor, 1995, p.7).

Indeed, everything that does not fit this ideal of the human is othered as non- or less-than-human, which justifies its subordination and instrumental use. This tactic includes and affects women, people of colour, people of diverse sexualities, and differently-abled as well as non-human cohabitants of the more-than-human-world. In Western cultural traditions, therefore, humans see themselves as belonging to a rational and superior sphere of ethics, technology, and culture separate from nature (Plumwood, 2002). This hubris has resulted in the denial of any inherent value in the other such that it is deemed appropriate to treat the other ‘entirely as a means to another’s ends, as one whose being creates no limits on use and which can be entirely shaped to ends not its own’ (Plumwood, 1993, p.142).

Similar critiques aimed at undermining and challenging forms of binary thinking that position humans as separate from nature have been made in relation to the Anthropocene. Indeed, the appearance of this concept highlights the contributions made by capitalism to the climate emergency and environmental degradation, and points to human activities as the primary influence on planetary systems. Pointedly, feminists have critiqued the idea as more accurately being the ‘Manthropocene’ on the basis that it continues the narration of Man as the ‘master creation, the Master of the Universe, and now its destroyer and, possibly, its saviour’ (Di Chiro, 2017, p.489).

The tenacity of such binary thinking has affected ‘the lives and work of women, the dispossession of peoples from their land and livelihood, the destruction of natural habitat and the general degradation of the environment’ (Mellor, 1997, p.52). Plumwood (2002, p.100) has pointed out that, as well as being tenacious, ‘human-centred culture springs from an impoverished and inadequate conceptual and rational world; it is helping to create in its image a real world that is not only ecologically, biologically and aesthetically damaged, but is also rationally damaged’, creating what she called a ‘crisis of rationality, morality and imagination’ (p.98). This crisis is irrational because the hubris of Western culture and claims for superiority and exteriority in relation to nature involves taking ecological systems into account when they fail to deliver or exploiting them without respecting ecological boundaries. Such acts have endangered planetary flourishing, including our own.

The next section turns to a critique of environmental management, which is offered as symptomatic of corporate environmentalism, itself situated within a wider capitalist system. I point to its focus on instrumental, technical means of relating to nature as insufficient to avoid global catastrophe. Indeed, environmental management displays many of the characteristics of the forms of logic that are heavily critiqued by ecofeminist scholars.

3 | ‘Manstream’ environmental management

As ecofeminist economists and political scientists have pointed out, environmental management operates within a capitalist system that is a manifestation of and cannot function without being underpinned by the patriarchal logics unpaid outlined above. Elements such as reproduction, the body, the non-human, and the labour of those demarcated into nature’s sphere become invisible inputs to a rationalised, capitalist economy that appropriates them

(Biesecker & von Winterfeld, 2016; Mies, 1986; Salleh, 2009). Based on two assumptions that growth can be limitless and that the expansion of commodities and capital can, likewise, stretch to infinity, the capitalist economy depends on the resources and labour of the ‘undeveloped other’ and on the dualisms central to patriarchal logic (Mies and Shiva, 2014, p. 39; see also Salleh, 2003).

In response, efforts have been made to develop greener forms of capitalism to mitigate its impacts (Christoff, 1996; Newell & Paterson, 2010). It has been argued that natural resources and ecosystems will be conserved by privatising and marketising them, thus bringing them into systems of capital accumulation (Böhm *et al.*, 2012). Two associated but unsuccessful hopes have been that technological innovation will develop less damaging production methods and that restructuring will ‘shift the emphasis of the macro-economy away from energy and resource intensive industries towards service and knowledge intensive industries’ (Gouldson & Murphy, 1997, p.75). Thus, Böhm *et al.* (2012) demonstrate how monetising ecological resources has resulted in both minimal mitigation of environmental damage and increasing flows of assets, wealth, and income to a small elite and to richer countries. Moreover, technological/market solutions to, for example, loss of species are unavailable; innovation is likely to be resisted by powerful vested interests (such as fossil fuel industries) who could lose out; and, led by increased production and consumption, economic growth cancels out gains in eco-efficiency (Janicki, 2008). Little wonder that ecofeminist critics have pointed to the ways in which capitalism is harnessing ‘the global ecological crisis to revive its failing financial system. Whereas environmental degradation was once seen as imposing a limit on economic accumulation, the new ‘green economy’ appears to offer a rationale for extending market activity’ (Goodman & Salleh, 2013, p.411; see also McCarthy & Prudham, 2004).

Corporate environmentalism is one expression of efforts to ‘green’ capitalism. This movement has been defined as ‘organization-wide recognition of the legitimacy and importance of the biophysical environment in the formulation of organization strategy and the integration of environmental issues into the strategic planning process’ (Banerjee, 2002, p.181). In practice, the biophysical environment has long been considered in terms of the strategic use of environmental policy to enhance competitive advantage. For example, Hart’s natural-resource-based view of the firm. Hart (1995, p.986) propounds a ‘theory of competitive advantage based on the firm’s relationship to the natural environment’ and in

doing so regards the natural environment, climate change, and environmental degradation as either placing constraints on business operations and thus posing a challenge to those operations, or as offering opportunities to increase profitability. This approach is visible in most businesses' interactions with the environment such that it is commonplace to read exhortations to "unlock business value" using environmental strategies (Mosher & Smith, 2015) or to emphasise opportunities for growth in climate change mitigation. (For examples, see the work of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development or the We Mean Business Coalition.ⁱ)

Within this broader field of capitalocentric activity, environmental management covers a diverse set of activities and practices involving equally diverse individuals and groups often holding contradictory views. However, as Prasad and Elmes (2005a) point out, environmental management constitutes a discernible institutional field, once defined by DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.148) as a set of organisations or organisational functions 'that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life; key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products'.

Relatively mainstream, business-oriented participants predominate in this institutional field and are generally motivated by a perceived need to develop policy and practice in the nexus of business, government, and the environment. Wider considerations of humanity's place within nature tend not to feature. Prasad and Elmes (2005b) also note how the discourses of environmental management feature a strong focus on practical relevance in resolving problems arising from environmental issues. The approaches that emerge from these discourses are presented as reasonable and achievable steps to a more sustainable future and an important part of their reasonableness is that they work within existing political and economic systems rather than challenge them. For example, one registered charity working on circular economies in the United Kingdom, which is known as WRAPⁱⁱ (2013), offers a list of the potential benefits of implementing an environmental management system that include reductions in costs of raw materials, waste disposal and insurance premiums, increased profitability, competitive advantage, and increased sales derived by promoting green credentials. There is no mention of anything that falls outside a win-win scenario, where the primary winner is the organisation itself.

Thus, environmental management is positioned as an economically utilitarian service whose practitioners can make business cases (Jong *et al.*, 2014; Phillips, 2019) and be pragmatic in ways that foster compromise rather than promote strong ideological positions. An emphasis on the need to collaborate with a range of stakeholders confers social legitimacy through the co-production of strategies. However, these approaches limit the development of more ecologically viable visions by inhibiting alternatives that might challenge the status quo (Prasad & Elmes, 2005b). In addition, nature is given no voice or inherent value but is always represented by a range of competing interests. The resulting compromises between the standpoints of groups and organisations get shaped by the most powerful in ways that suit them best (Forbes & Jermier, 2010). It has been noted that while environmental management ameliorates the worst environmental impacts resulting from industrialisation, it tends to foster “greenwashing”, a process in which companies and products are promoted for being green, even as business continues as usual (Newell & Paterson, 2010). Thus, the ways in which environmental managers address environmental issues are legitimised but that is achieved by political manoeuvring rather than by addressing fundamental challenges to achieve sustainable forms of production and consumption (Levy, 1997).

For Purser *et al.* (1995, p.1058) the environmental management paradigm assumes both that ‘humans are above nature and that nature is an object—an assemblage of things—which obeys immutable laws, and that those laws can be discovered and subsequently used for human advantage’. Thus, as well as representing the interests of the most powerful and with the most to lose from more radical challenges, environmental managers work through an appeal to rationality by focusing on scientific and technical solutions delivered by indicators, benchmarks, and standards (Birkeland, 1993; Freimann & Walther, 2001).

That critical view of environmental management is supported by geographers such as Richard Howitt (2001), who argues that a technocentric approach is deeply flawed despite claims that it is objective and value-free because of its emphasis on quantification, and in spite of the fact that proponents do not question a guiding principle that environmental management is supposed to produce resources for the market more effectively and efficiently. In this way, the “science” of environmental management disenfranchises those who have most to lose from overexploitation and overproduction, including Indigenous peoples and ecosystems. Little wonder that Howitt (2001, pp.5, 10) has called for ‘the myth of objective and neutral resource management’ to be abandoned and replaced with a form of environmental

management that measures success in terms of ‘social justice, ecological sustainability, economic equity, and cultural diversity’.

On this understanding, environmental management aims not at the flourishing of nature for nature’s sake, but rather at the conservation of ecosystems to promote human interests. It supports a view of humanity as outside and superior to the natural world, which justifies the subordination and instrumental use of nature. Nature is cast, first, as ‘natural resources’ as if it were the property of humans, or, second, as ‘ecosystem services’ reduced to taken-for-granted outputs from a planetary machine. This kind of environmental management privileges rationality as worthy of consideration resulting in conferring ‘exclusive or arbitrarily preferential consideration to human interests as opposed to the interests of other beings’ (Hayward, 1997, p.51).

In ecofeminist terms, environmental management thus is a manifestation of instrumental rationality, where nature is merely a means to achieve rational ends—an economic object defined by traditional managerialist concerns—and any fundamental consideration of humanity’s place in the web of life is omitted. The focus on technical fixes, measurement, and regulations is not without relevance, but it omits fundamentally important things—namely: recognising how the human is inherently interconnected with the web of life; valuing ways of knowing that are beyond rationality; and a having a foundational ethical imperative based on care.

In what follows, then, I outline an approach that ‘recognises and accommodates the denied relationships of dependency and enables us to acknowledge our debt to the sustaining others of the earth’ (Plumwood, 1993, p.196). Instead of asking ‘what more can we take from the Earth?’ and ‘how can we ensure that we can continue taking into the future’, the approach encourages us instead to ask, ‘what does the Earth want of us?’.

4 | An ecofeminist alternative

In this section, I propose three philosophical positions that would challenge the environmental management paradigm. First is the need to develop an ecocentric view whereby to be human is to be part of the more-than-human. Second is the imperative to develop ways of knowing that do not supplant rationality, but rather broaden our

epistemological frameworks to include what rationality currently denies. Third is a call to action to extend an ethic of care to the more-than-human as a moral imperative.

4.1 | Humanity as part of the web of life

An ecofeminist view does not regard nature as something exterior to be managed but would seek to challenge and subvert binary thinking so that people find again their place as participants in the fabric and processes of the planet. One way to develop a sense and experience of ourselves as inside the more-than-human is to reconnect to our bodies and through them, to the rest of the planet. To illustrate, western publics have become largely insulated from the weather and the seasons, and, for most thus far, from the more serious impacts of the climate emergency (Phillips, 2016b). Thus, for Neimanis and Walker (2013, p.2), it is necessary that we ‘reimagine climate change and the fleshy damp immediacy of our own embodied existences as intimately imbricated’ rather than distance ourselves physically and emotionally from the impacts of human activity on nature and on other humans. We also need to recognise that ‘humans are always in composition with nonhumanity, never outside of a sticky web of connections or an ecology [of matter]’ (Bennett, 2004, p.365). Haraway (2008, pp.3–4) describes humans as ‘co-beings of the world’ and points out that:

... human genomes can be found in only about 90 percent of all the cells that occupy the mundane space I call my body; the other 10 percent of the cells are filled with the genomes of bacteria, fungi, protists ... I am vastly outnumbered by my tiny companions; better put, I become an adult human being in company with these tiny messmates. To be one is always to *become with* many. (emphasis in original)

Recognising how humans are embedded in a wider biosphere might be devalued in Western culture but has long been a fundamental element of Indigenous cultures and societies. Critiques regarding the appropriation of Indigenous knowledges as a form of colonisation and of the establishment of a Western/Indigenous binary have been noted earlier in this paper and by geographers such as Sundberg (2014). However, recent works in cultural geography such as that by Wright *et al.* (2012) or Thomas (2015) point to a need to open up to more-than-human subjectivities and agencies that destabilise the boundaries between human and nonhuman and challenge the privileging of Western epistemologies. Being open to and valuing the insights thus gained is considered next. Thereafter, I consider what it means to

become aware of the substantial interconnections between human corporeality and the more-than-human world, and to become aware of our shared bodily precarity. Recognising this precarity fosters openness to the more-than-human, which could destabilise the culture/nature binary to develop forms of knowledge and ethical positions that can better equip us to deal with the ecological realities with which we are faced (Alaimo, 2009).

4.2 | The importance of embodied knowledges

Direct, lived, and sensual experience foster our capacity to understand, embrace, and act upon the idea that ‘human corporeality in all its material fleshiness is inseparable from “nature” or “environment”’ (Alaimo, 2008, p.238): to paraphrase an enduring feminist slogan, the personal is ecological (Stevens, 2012). This point underscores the importance of listening to our own bodies as a counter-practice to a culture in which such knowledge has been partial or ignored.

Here, then, is an epistemology that embraces rather than denies emotion as a valuable means by which to learn, and which challenges ideas that knowledge is disembodied, transcendent, and complete. This is not to overturn the binary that positions rationality and objectivity against subjectivity but is to value embodied and emotional experience as means to develop knowledge of the more-than-human. Glazebrook (2005) has termed this form of embodied knowledge a new gynocentric, eco-logics.

Glazebrook (2005) points to four rhythmic movements fundamental to gynocentric eco-logics. First, she highlights the importance of situatedness, and of valuing emotion and embodiment. Second, she recognises that knowledge (and nature and humans within nature) are part of a continual process where being and becoming are inseparable. Third, she acknowledges that the web of life is not reducible to human conceptions of instrumentality thus displacing humans from a central and privileged place. Finally, she displaces (but does not replace) and disrupts the ways in which ocularity is privileged in Western thought so that a full range of the human senses is employed.

Glazebrook also summarises work from within Western scientific practice among those who question the hegemony of objectivism. Her argument centres on Goethe and Heidegger and refers to Alphonso Lingis, who suggested that our knowledge of the environment should not

be confined to the rational and should include responsive, emotional engagement. This way of thinking assumes our capacity to recognise our own truths about how nature affects us: ‘It is productive of ways of knowing guided by and responsive to the physical environment in which it is practised rather than a reductive objectivity’ (Glazebrook, 2005, p.80). Nature itself is thus taken as a model for knowledge construed as organic, finite, and ever-changing rather than as universal and eternal. It bears repeating that this point does not displace the logic that dominates scientific thinking and environmental management. A place is made for such logic, but its excessive claims for universality are resisted. Instead, differences are embraced such that all epistemologies are ‘alternative’.

Earlier, I referred to the importance of ‘conversing with and walking alongside’ non-Western, Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies (Sundberg, 2014, p.33), even though ‘the question of how to learn from Indigenous worldviews without rendering them as empty signifiers, or further imposing colonial power relations, is extremely fraught and contentious’ (Thomas, 2015, p.986).

Extending the earlier work of ecofeminist and posthumanist scholars, critical geographers such as Sundberg have called for greater engagement with Indigenous communities and individuals—as intellectual and political colleagues. Engagement would take varied forms but could include Indigenous scholarship in research and in teaching and training related to environmental management. Sundberg suggests that valuing such scholarship is vital if we are to foster different ways of thinking about the more-than-human world.

Expressions of that value may involve direct collaboration, such as that described by Wright *et al.* (2012), involving four generations of Yolngu women from north Australia, and the Bawaka land itself, in research that is co-organised and that co-produces knowledge to foster Indigenous self-determination. Or it may gain expression in work such as Watson and Huntingdon’s (2008) account of a moose hunt that was co-written with a Koyukon hunter from Alaska. They refer to a ‘relational ontology’ between humans and nonhumans in which there is no clear separation between the two. Nonhumans and humans are ‘kin’ and there are ethical obligations placed on humans to kill quickly and take care of the ecosystem that nourished the animal. As Watson (2013) points out, Indigenous peoples had “governed” wildlife long before regulatory environmental management regimes emerged. Such regimes

are disenfranchising and risk supplanting Indigenous knowledges, even though they might refer to partnership or collaboration (see also Thomas, 2015).

Similar considerations can be applied to older, “local” forms of Western knowledge—such as those in farming—that have largely been supplanted by agrotechnology and agrobusiness. Isabella Tree’s (2017) account of the wilding of the Knepp Estate in Kent powerfully illustrates how humans and nonhumans can co-flourish. Holistic approaches have reversed long-term declines in insect and bird populations and in the ecosystems in which they can thrive. These approaches include rebuilding systems with natural processes and thinking of success as working with a system measured not just in terms of food output but water storage, flood mitigation, wildlife, carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling, pollination, and pollution amelioration. Using them means recognising and preserving the contexts in which animals play important roles in land management, while also providing food. Using them means rejecting mindsets that see technology exclusively as providing answers to current challenges while dismissing diverse knowledges about traditional systems. And, it means ‘yielding to nature’ (Tree, 2017, p. 307).

Those applying an invigorated environmental management would therefore recognise human corporeal openness as part of the material world. They would value both knowledges that embrace affective and embodied engagements with and of the more-than-human and different ways to understand the human within the more-than-human. On that basis, I now consider the importance of developing an ecocentric ethics to value care and loving respect for the living world. Acknowledging this love engages the imagination and the intellect, inspires belief, and galvanizes action in ways that appeals to self-interest or cold rationality cannot (Monbiot, 2015).

4.2.1 | A moral imperative for care

Rediscovering our “Earthian” place means accepting our fleshy vulnerability as interconnected to the vulnerability of nature. Barad (2007, p.384) has written about the need to take account of the materialisations in which humans and nonhumans are entangled as a form of ethics to open up ‘new configurations, new subjectivities, new possibilities’. Recognising these connections is a starting place from which to develop ethical and political positions to build new relationships within the more-than-human that are so urgently needed.

Below, then, I outline a concept of embodied care that speaks to both the ecofeminist imperative to build social, political, and economic institutions that prioritise more-than-human flourishing and the moral imperative for humanity to care for the planet in the interests of all life. This work is based on a concern to displace ‘the hubris of humanism so as to admit others into the calculus of the world’ (Braun, 2004, p.273).

First, I briefly outline the main principles of feminist care ethics. The starting place is an account of human interaction in which people are enmeshed in relationships and are not primarily rational actors who maximise their own interests. In such account, personhood is inherently relational; a becoming-in-the-world-with-others (Price & Shildrick, 2002) focused on ‘a capacity to reshape and cultivate new relations, not to ever more closely resemble the unencumbered abstract rational self of liberal political and moral theories’ (Held, 2006, p.14). The interconnections and interdependencies between persons are valued, as are processes involved in making ethical decisions grounded in context and lived experience. Note that while recognising interconnection, I stress the point that care ethics respect difference and independence in the “other”.

Care underpins human life. All humans and most other life-forms give or require care over their lifespans. For Tronto (1993, p.103):

On the most general level, we suggest that caring be viewed as *a species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our ‘world’ so that we can live in it as well as possible*. That world includes our bodies, our selves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web (emphasis in original).

Thus, care is an ongoing process that flows through the everyday. It requires an ability to care, to experience sympathy, and to demonstrate understanding and sensitivity to a situation as well as to the fate of specific and general others by imaginatively responding to situations. Qualities such as empathetic responsiveness, emotion, appropriate trust, solidarity, and shared concern are to be encouraged and developed as the hallmarks of moral capacity.

Ideas about the world as a web of relationships resonate with an ecofeminist emphasis on an ecocentric ethos. Ecocentrism espouses a view of the world as ‘an intrinsically dynamic, interrelated web of relations’ (Eckersley, 1992, p.49). Ecofeminism is a holist philosophy where individual beings and wider ecologies have inherent value and where the relationships that sustain life are recognised (Plumwood, 1993), and thus it is appropriate to foreground the moral significance of care. For ecofeminism, caring is grounded in ‘values typically unnoticed, underplayed, or misrepresented in traditional ethics (e.g. values of care, love, friendship, and appropriate trust). These are values that presuppose that our relationships to others are central to an understanding of who we are’ (Warren, 2000, p.100).

For many ecofeminist philosophers, the ability to empathise through care is essential for ethical motivation, deliberation, and practice (for example Curtin 1991; Warren, 2000). Ethical action should be located in care-sensitive ethics in which such sensitivity determines how principles such as duty, utility, or justice can provide guidance. Appropriate principles account for the extent to which care practices are reflected, created, and maintained in a given context. Care practices maintain, promote, or enhance the flourishing of relevant parties. Practices causing unnecessary and avoidable harm to selves and relevant others, including ecosystems, are not care practices and neither are those that oppress or exploit others or violate their rights. Warren (2000, p.108) has termed such practices ‘situated universalism’ to flag how overarching ethical principles are not jettisoned but rather incorporated into a wider view of what should be considered for ethical reflection.

Of particular importance to ecofeminist care-sensitive ethics are the ways in which the flourishing of the particular, including the self, are connected with the well-being of the general (Curtin, 1991; Gaard, 1993; Plumwood, 1993; Warren, 2000). To care about and understand the specific environmental, social, and economic struggles experienced by humans and other life forms requires an understanding of the ways in which those issues stem from socio-economic and political systems. To care about and understand wider systemic issues is to be aware of their impacts on experiences. Thus, for example, environmental management and adherence to environmental standards such as ISO14001 should result in specific measures to reduce pollution embedded in organisational checks and procedures. However, the focus still tends to be on end-of-pipeline technical fixes (Frieman & Walther, 2001) motivated by the need for a business case (Phillips, 2019), rather than on a deeper challenge to the structures of modern capitalism. In this case, a deeper understanding of the

way that environmental management is situated in wider socio-economic and political frameworks could result in more effective ways to sustain planetary well-being.

To challenge the instrumental focus on appeals to economic and technical rationality the ecofeminist emphasis on care as a means to link ethics and practice has been augmented by recent work on the embodied dimensions of care (for example, see Phillips, 2019). These are the visceral and material experiences that connect humans to near and distant others, both human and non-human. Indeed, Hamington (2004) defines care as ‘a complex weaving of imaginative processes with embodied practices’ and draws attention to the interplays between mind and body that enable the development of empathy and understanding. These interplays and their effects produce forms of knowing that do not dismiss the rational but extend beyond it by valuing elements that ‘cannot be fully articulated according to the demands of objectivity’ (Glazebrook, 2005, p.80). Such embodied, situated knowledge can be gained from direct experience of concrete others (Benhabib, 1992) and combines with empathetic imagination to move beyond direct experience. The other is also encountered indirectly, for example through social media, news reports or the growing body of art engaging with environmental issues (Gayá & Phillips, 2015). Direct or not, encounters stimulate embodied feeling and caring imagination so that we hear and respond to the plights of distant others who are parts of the webs of interconnections in which we are situated; for example, we feel for individuals experiencing food poverty or ecosystems (including their humans) affected by severe weather events (Hamington, 2004). In short, embodied care is not reduced to individual experience but works with the imagination to overcome the limitations of individual physical existence and enables us to reach out to the Other over time, space, and difference (Hamington, 2004). Hence the values generated by individual emotional experience can be applied more widely ‘as a way of thinking ethically and acting responsibly in an increasingly interconnected world’ (Milligan & Wiles, 2010, p.742).

5 | Conclusion

In this work, I have not set out a blueprint specifically aimed at how environmental management can be reimagined. Rather I have considered how humans (primarily in the West) can start to find ways ‘of belonging differently in the world’ (Gibson-Graham, 2011, p.1) by recasting the self as ‘a self-in-relationship with nature, formed not in the drive for

mastery and control of the other but in a balance of mutual transformation and negotiation' (Plumwood, 2006, p.142).

What I have therefore proposed is an interconnected set of three philosophical arguments that should underpin a more positive imaginary of an ecology of self in relationship with the more-than-human. The first argument is that people recognise that we are part of a web of life and now bear responsibility for the flourishing of all beings with which we share the planet. To be human is to share the vulnerability of other organic life forms and to understand that our fates are ineluctably intertwined. The second argument is that we need to accept our materiality and should value embodied knowledge deepened through visceral, emotional engagements with the world. This imperative challenges and extends current ideas about rationality that focus on objectivity, a universalising science, and the technical. Those ideas have led humans to believe that we are separate from and superior to the world of the natural and can reduce it to a set of resources to be used for our ends. The third argument is that an ethics of care is important if we are to forge an integrative understanding of the relationships between humans and the more-than-human and of embodiment. Such an ethic of care combines situated and embodied knowledge of the specific with a caring imagination so that care is extended to more distant others. It also recognises the iterative links between the local and directly-experienced and wider systems, structures, and institutions.

I therefore offer this paper as a starting point and suggest that more action-oriented and practice-focused research needs to be undertaken to flesh out how the radical re-imaginings presented here can crystallize into institutions and practices. The critiques made of capitalism and of corporate environmentalism suggest that real change can only come from major systemic transformation and the development of alternative economic systems, political institutions, and modes of organisation. To consider environmental management in isolation from that imperative is akin to rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. However, as Gibson-Graham (2011) tell us, we must look in the here and now, at forms and practices in a range of initiatives, often small and local, that currently exist as possibilities for a different future. There are no standard recipes to guide us how these alternatives might evolve but they could be used to develop ways of working with and for nature that are focused on social, cultural and environmental flourishing and less on growth and profitability. Cultural geographers and others have done important work showing how, for example, partnerships with Indigenous peoples and those with older, local forms of Western knowledge can be

developed in genuinely respectful ways. Such work needs to be continued and drawn together with that on alternative systems and organisations to provide case studies of sites where practices and values challenge the norms of environmental management and which, in Gibson-Graham's (2011) terms, are openings for a politics of possibility. That work is necessary but not sufficient. One of the enduring messages from many ecofeminists is the importance of activism in bringing about change, so scholars should be considering how to be active beyond the academy to meet current, existential threats to the more-than-human.

An ecofeminist visioning of how humans can strive to build new ways of being and becoming could challenge and undermine the dualisms we currently live with and which have resulted in instrumental and mechanistic models, such as environmental management, that have not mitigated disastrous outcomes for the more-than-human. To paraphrase Plumwood (2007), we have to imagine and develop different ways to live within the more-than-human built on foundations of respect, care, and love that leave behind our high energy, high consumption, and hyper instrumental societies—or we may not survive unscathed.

References

- Alaimo, S., 2008. Trans-corporeal feminisms and the ethical space of nature'. In: S. Alaimo and S. Hekman, eds. *Material Feminisms*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, pp.237–64.
- Alaimo, S., 2009. Insurgent vulnerability and the carbon footprint of gender. *Kvinder, Kon & Forskning*, 3(4), pp.22–35.
- Arora-Jonsson, S. and Basnett Sijapati, B., 2018. Disciplining gender in environmental organizations: The texts and practices of gender mainstreaming. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(3), pp.309–25.
- Banerjee, S.B., 2002. Corporate environmentalism: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(3), pp.177–91.
- Barad, K., 2003. Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs*, 28(3), pp.801–31.
- Barad, K., 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Benhabib, S., 1992. *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Bennett, J., 2004. The force of things: Steps to an ecology of matter. *Political Theory*, 32(3), pp.347–72.
- Biehl, J., 1991. *Rethinking ecofeminist politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Biesecker, A. and Von Winterfeld, U., 2016. Regeneration in limbo: Ecofeminist perspectives on the multiple crisis and social contract. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds, *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. London: Routledge, pp.76–94.
- Birkeland, J., 1993. Some pitfalls of ‘manstream’ environmental theory and practice. *The Environmentalist*, 13(4), pp.263–75.
- Böhm, S., Misoczky, M.C. and Moog, S., 2012. Greening capitalism? A Marxist critique of carbon markets. *Organization Studies*, 33(11), pp.1617–38.
- Braun, B., 2004. Querying posthumanisms. *Geoforum*, 35(3), pp.269–73.
- Christoff, P., 1996. Ecological modernisation: ecological modernities. *Environmental Politics*, 5(3), pp.476–500.
- Cudworth, E., 2016. Ecofeminism and the animal. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds., *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp.38–56.
- Cuomo, C., 2002. On ecofeminist philosophy. *Ethics and the Environment*, 7(2), pp.1–11.
- Curtin, D., 1991. Toward an ecological ethic of care. *Hypatia*, 6(1), pp.60–74.
- Diamond, I. and Orenstein, G.F., eds., 1990. *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Di Chiro, G., 2017. Welcome to the white (M)Anthropocene? In: S. MacGregor, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Environment*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 487–506.
- DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W.W., 1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), pp.147–60.
- Eckersley, R., 1992. *Environmentalism and Political Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Forbes, L.C. and Jermier, J.M., 2010. New corporate environmentalism and the ecology of commerce. *Organization and Environment*, 23(4), pp.465–81.
- Freimann, J. and Walther, M., 2001. The impacts of corporate environmental management systems: A comparison of EMAS and ISO 14001. *Greener Management International*, 36(Winter), pp.91–103.
- Gaard, G., 1993. Living interconnections with animals and nature. In: G. Gaard, ed., *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp.1–12.

- Gaard, G., 2011. Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting essentialism and re-placing species in a material feminist environmentalism. *Feminist Formations*, 23(2), pp.26–53.
- Gayá, P. and Phillips, M.E., 2015. Imagining a sustainable future: Eschatology, Bateson's ecology of mind and arts-based practice. *Organization*, 23(6), pp.803–24.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K., 2011. A feminist project of belonging for the Anthropocene. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 18(1), pp.1–21.
- Glazebrook, T., 2005. Gynocentric eco-logics. *Ethics and the Environment*, 10(2), pp.75–99.
- Glazebrook, T., 2016. Climate adaptation in the Global South: Funding women's farming. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds., *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.111–31.
- Goodman, J. and Salleh, S., 2013. The green economy, class hegemony and counter-hegemony. *Globalizations*, 10(3), pp.411–424.
- Gouldson, A. and Murphy, J., 1997. Ecological modernisation: Economic restructuring and the environment. *The Political Quarterly*, 68(5), pp.74–86.
- Hamington, M., 2004. *Embodied Care: Jane Addams, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Feminist Ethics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Haraway, D., 1989. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, D., 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hart, S.L., 1995. A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), pp.986–1014.
- Hayward, T., 1997. Anthropocentrism: A misunderstood problem. *Environmental Values*, 6(1), pp.49–63.
- Held, V., 2006. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political and Global*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Howitt, R., 2001. *Rethinking Resource Management: Justice, Sustainability, and Indigenous Peoples*. Routledge, New York.
- Janicke, M., 2008. Ecological modernisation: New perspectives. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(5), pp.557–65.
- Jong, P., Paulraj, A. and Blome, C., 2014. The financial impact of ISO 14001 certification: Top-line, bottom-line, or both? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(1), pp.131–49.
- King, Y., 1981. All is connectedness. In: L. Jones, ed., *Keeping the Peace*. London: Women's Press, pp.40–63.

- Levy, D., 1997. Environmental management as political sustainability. *Organization and Environment*, 10(2), pp.126–47.
- MacGregor, S., 2006. *Beyond Mothering Earth: Ecological Citizenship and the Politics of Care*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- McCarthy, J., and Prudham, S., 2004. Neoliberal nature and the nature of neoliberalism. *Geoforum*, 35(3), pp.275–83.
- Mellor, M., 1997. *Feminism and Ecology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Mies, M., 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. London: Zed Books.
- Mies, M. and Shiva, V., 2014. *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.
- Milligan, C. and Wiles, J., 2010. Landscapes of care. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(6), pp.736–54.
- Monbiot, G., 2015. Why we fight for the living world: It's about love, and it's time we said so. *The Guardian*, accessed 21 July 2017 at: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/16/pope-encyclical-value-of-living-world>.
- Moore, N., 2008. Eco/Feminism, non-violence and the future of feminism. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10(3), pp.282–98.
- Moore, N., 2016. Eco/feminist genealogies: Renewing promises and new possibilities. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds., *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.19–37.
- Mosher, M. and Smith, L., (2015). *Sustainability Incorporated: Integrating Sustainability into Business*. SustainAbility, accessed 1 August 2019 at: <http://sustainability.com/our-work/reports/sustainability-incorporated/>
- Neimanis, A. and Walker, R.L., 2014. Weathering: Climate change and the ‘thick time’ of transcorporeality. *Hypatia*, 29(3), pp.558–75.
- Newell, P. and Paterson, M., 2010. *Climate Capitalism: Global Warming and the Transformation of the Global Economy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, M.E., 2016a. (2016) Embodied care and planet Earth: Ecofeminism, maternalism and post-maternalism, *Australian Feminist Studies*, 31(90), pp. 468–85.
- Phillips, M.E., 2016b. Developing ecofeminist corporeality: Writing the body as activist poetics. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds., *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.57–75.
- Phillips, M.E., 2019. ‘Daring to care’: Challenging corporate environmentalism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), pp.1151–64.

- Phillips, M.E. and Rumens, N., 2016. Introduction. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds., *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.1–16.
- Plumwood, V., 1991. Nature, self and gender: Feminism, environmental philosophy and the critique of rationalism. *Hypatia*, 6(1), pp.3–27.
- Plumwood, V., 1992. Feminism and ecofeminism: Beyond the dualistic assumptions of women, men and nature. *The Ecologist*, 22(1), pp.8–13.
- Plumwood, V., 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London: Routledge.
- Plumwood, V., 2002. *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*. New York: Routledge.
- Plumwood, V., 2006. Feminism. In: A. Dobson and R. Eckersley, eds., *Political Theory and the Ecological Challenge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.51–74.
- Plumwood, V., 2007. A review of Deborah Bird Rose's Reports from a Wild Country: Ethics of Decolonisation. *Australian Humanities Review*, 42(August), pp.1–4.
- Prasad, P. and Elmes, M., 2005a. A response to Tim Newton. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(4), pp.885–87.
- Prasad, P. and Elmes, M., 2005b. In the name of the practical: Unearthing the hegemony of pragmatics in the discourse of environmental management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(4), pp.845–67.
- Price, J. and Shildrick, M., 2002. Bodies together: Touch, ethics and disability. In: M. Corker and T. Shakespeare, eds., *Disability/Postmodernity: Embodying Disability Theory*. London: Continuum, pp.62–75.
- Probyn, E., 2014. Women following fish in a more-than-human world. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 21(5), pp.589–603.
- Purser, R.E., Park, C. and Montuori A., 1995. Limits to anthropocentrism: Toward an ecocentric organization paradigm? *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), pp.1053–89.
- Salleh, A., 2003. Ecofeminism as Sociology. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 14(1), pp.61–74.
- Salleh, A., 2009. Ecological debt: Embodied debt. In: A. Salleh, ed., *Eco-sufficiency and Global Justice*, London: Pluto Press, pp.1–40.
- Spretnak, C., 1999. *Resurgence of the Real: Body, Nature and Place in a Hypermodern World*. New York: Routledge.
- Stevens, P., 2012. Towards an ecosociology. *Sociology*, 46(4), pp.579–95.
- Sturgeon, N., 1997. *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory and Political Action*. London: Routledge.

- Sundberg, J., 2014. Decolonizing posthumanist geographies. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(1), pp. 33–47.
- Taylor, C., 1995. *Philosophical Arguments*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Thomas, A.C., 2015. Indigenous more-than-humanisms: relational ethics with the Hurunui River in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 16(8), pp.974–90.
- Thompson, C., 2006. Back to nature? Resurrecting ecofeminism after poststructuralist and third-wave feminism. *Isis*, 97(3), pp.505–12.
- Tree, I. 2018. *Wilding: The return of nature to a British farm*. London: Picador.
- Tronto, J.C., 1993. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.
- Warren, K., 2000. *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What It Is and Why It Matters*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Watson, A., 2013. Misunderstanding the ‘nature’ of co-management: A geography of regulatory science and Indigenous knowledges (IK). *Environmental Management*, 52(5), pp.1085–102.
- Watson, A. and Huntington, O.H., 2008. They’re here—I can feel them: The epistemic spaces of Indigenous and western knowledges. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 9(3), pp.257–80.
- Whatmore, S., 2002. *Hybrid Geographies: Natures, Cultures, Spaces*. London: Sage.
- Whatmore, S., 2004. Humanism’s excess: Some thoughts on the ‘post-human/ist’ agenda. *Environment and Planning A*, 36(8), pp.1360–63.
- WRAP, 2013. *Your Guide to Environmental Management Systems*. Accessed 24 July 2019 at: <http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/WRAP%20EMS%20guide%20June%202013.pdf>.
- Wright, L., 2016. The township gaze: A postcolonial ecofeminist theory for touring the new South Africa. In: M.E. Phillips and N. Rumens, eds., *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.150–68.
- Wright, S., Lloyd, K., Suchet-Pearson, S. Burarrwanga, L., Tofa, M. and Bawaka Country, 2012. Telling stories in, through and with country: Engaging with Indigenous and more-than-human methodologies at Bawaka, N.E. Australia. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 29(1), pp.39–60.

ⁱ The World Business Council for Sustainable Development is a CEO-led organisation of some 200 international companies – see <http://www.wbcsd.org>. The We Mean Business Coalition was formed in June 2014 and is made up of over 500 global companies – see <http://www.wemeanbusinesscoalition.org/>.

ⁱⁱ See WRAP/org.uk: ‘WRAP is a registered charity. It works with businesses, individuals and communities to achieve a circular economy through helping them reduce waste, develop sustainable products and use resources in an efficient way’.