A Defense of Ecofeminism:
Re-Examining the Clayoquot Sound Peace Camp

by

Kayla Hofman
B.A.H., Queen's University, 2015

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Political Science

We acknowledge with respect the Lekwungen peoples on whose traditional territory the university stands and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

Supervisory Committee

A Defense of Ecofeminism:
Re-Examining the Clayoquot Sound Peace Camp

by

Kayla Hofman
B.A.H., Queen's University, 2015

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Will Greaves, Department of Political Science
Supervisor

Dr. Mara Marin, Department of Political Science
Departmental Member

Abstract

The relationships between gender and the environment have been explored most fully throughout the field of ecofeminism, which examines environmental problems through the lens of gender, revealing the ways that the oppression of women and the exploitation of nature are conjoined and mutually reinforcing. However, ecofeminism has often been ignored, re-named, or subjected to critiques of gender essentialism. As a result, I return to the 1993 Clayoquot Sound protests on Vancouver Island, British Columbia to re-examine the theory and praxis of ecofeminism. I argue that the main environmental organization, the Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS), consciously invoked ecofeminist principles of equality, consensus and non-violence to direct the camp and campaign. Ecofeminism within Clayoquot Sound kept gender equality at the forefront of the environmental movement while challenging traditional hierarchical power relations and systems of dominance that many social movements experience. Clayoquot Sound was therefore a watershed social movement that integrated a gendered perspective into environmental discourse, analysis, and action. I urge further research and reflection among both activists and academics regarding the intersections between environmentalism and feminism, especially in today's worsening climate crisis.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to give my deepest thanks and appreciation to my committee. To Dr. Will Greaves, thank you for your consistent support, I appreciate your many insights and encouragement. To Dr. Mara Marin, thank you for pushing my work to a place of deeper analysis. And finally, I want to thank Dr. Kara Shaw for agreeing to be my external examiner; your keen insights, knowledge, and feedback have been invaluable to the final product of this thesis.

To Debra, thank you for the hours of virtual study dates, planting of countless trees, and for constantly inspiring me to do and be better. To Rachel, thank you for your constant suggestions and encouragement, for being the only person willing to read my entire thesis, and for always being down to go get ice cream. To Johnny, Jennie, Esther, Montana, Joey, Jess and many others, thank you for always checking in and helping me get through these past two years. Completing this program and this thesis would not have been possible without you.

And finally, to Eric – I couldn't have done any of it without you. Thank you for always cheering me on and for putting up with hours of endless, rambling discussions around ecofeminism and Clayoquot Sound. You inspire me, always.

Chapter One: Introduction

During the summer of 1993, over 800 individuals were arrested during the Clayoquot Sound protests on Vancouver Island, British Columbia. Thousands of activists gathered to protest the clear-cutting of the old-growth forest, marking one of the largest incidents of civil disobedience in Canadian history. As a result, the Clayoquot Sound protests became a watershed moment for the Canadian environmental movement (Barman, 2007). The main environmental group in the region, the Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS), set up a peace camp as the organizing site of the blockades, involving a ramshackle of trailers and tents in a clear-cut nicknamed the "Black Hole." The peace camp was described by both media accounts and protestors as an ecofeminist peace camp. However, as Niamh Moore argues, "Although Clayoquot has garnered some attention in academic writings on environmental politics, the ecofeminist dimensions of the campaign remain largely unexplored" (2015, p. 4). As will be examined throughout this thesis, many feminists remain wary of the field of ecofeminism (Sandilands, 2008; Moore, 2015; Hunnicutt, 2019). Ecofeminism is a branch of feminism which evolved in the 1970s and 1980s to address the interconnected relationship between gender and the environment. Although ecofeminism includes a plurality of perspectives, most ecofeminist theorists and practitioners believe, similar to many other feminisms, that today's capitalist society reflects paternalistic and patriarchal values, which accordingly governs the structure and function of basic institutions, including the family, government and politics, and economic form and practice (Shiva et al., 2014, p. xix). However, ecofeminists differ from other feminisms by asserting that the domination and exploitation of women is interconnected to the domination and exploitation of nature.

Ecofeminists therefore seek to combine scholarship and activism around the belief that the subjugation of both women and nature are connected under the same system of oppression and privilege. As Karen Warren (2000) maintains, it is no coincidence that the Earth and nature are personified as female, and images of nature are often used as metaphors for femininity.

Niamh Moore (2015) argues that although ecofeminism once offered huge promise, it is common today for feminists who work on the intersections of feminism and the environment to avoid the term at all costs. Ecofeminism has long been the subject of critique due to charges of gender essentialism. In the 1980s and 1990s, critics claimed that ecofeminism promoted the idea that women were biologically and spiritually "closer to nature," and therefore better positioned than men to "save" the planet (Moore, 2015, p. 10). Beginning in the 1980s, research from various fields of study, including postcolonial, poststructuralist, and queer studies joined with feminist programs to criticize essentialism within feminist movements. These scholars had spent years challenging the biological association between women and nature as limiting to women's progress and equality, and they continued to work to destabilize and diversify binary, restrictive categorizations, and essentialist conceptualizations (Mickey & Vakoch, 2018, p. 3). Accordingly, they criticized the ecofeminist view that women should be conceived in terms of their reproductive, nurturing, and caring abilities, which naturally connected them to Mother Earth.

As a result, many feminists today remain uncomfortable with ecofeminism, as they find it difficult to imagine how one can practice a distinctly feminist environmental politics without resorting to essentialist understandings of women's 'special' relationship

to the environment (Sandilands, 2008, p. 305). Gwen Hunnicutt further maintains: "Most mainstream feminists are wary of discussing any link between women and nature … feminist theory texts rarely include sections on ecofeminism. Women's studies conferences schedule very few ecofeminist sessions" (2019, p. 15). As ecofeminism remains "openly spurned by mainstream feminism," many feminists remain hesitant to address concepts surrounding women and nature, mainly due to charges of gender essentialism (Gaard, 2011, p. 41). Productive discussions around ecofeminism and ecofeminist activism have therefore been lost within feminist academic debates that center solely around essentialist/anti-essentialist binaries (Sandilands, 2008; Moore, 2015). Accordingly, Moore argues that accusations of essentialism have limited the overall theoretical and political potential of ecofeminism and other activist feminisms, as these critiques created a "chilly research climate" for ecofeminism within the academic world (2011, p. 12).

Throughout this thesis, I seek to examine and analyze these debates surrounding ecofeminism, and question whether there are features of ecofeminism that can "helpfully be retrieved, restoring an intellectual and activist history and enriching current theorizing and activisms?" (Gaard, 2011, p. 27). Certain elements of ecofeminism have been rightfully discredited, such as the conflation of the categories of sex and gender and the homogenization of women's experiences. However, I argue that ecofeminism holds open space for important conversations and activism surrounding the necessity of integrating an environmental lens into feminist work, and vice versa. As Djoudi et. al argue, there needs to be a stronger consideration of feminist research into environmental issues, particularly in light of today's growing climate crisis (2016, p. 257). Gaard (2011)

similarly maintains that species and nature must be included as crucial analytical categories within feminist thought, and that avoiding these discussions leads to missed opportunities for feminist interventions in environmentalism. Accordingly, I seek to re-engage and promote discussion around the field of ecofeminism by returning to Clayoquot Sound as an empirical case study to examine and analyze the ecofeminist elements within the peace camp.

Yet first, it is important to define the theory of ecofeminism as it will be used within my research. Ecofeminism is not a monolithic ideology, and historically, ecofeminism has circulated within a variety of arenas, including academia, grassroots movements, conferences, books, journals and art, and can be characterized as a broad, continuously evolving social, political and theoretical movement. Given the diversity of positions, voices, and locations that ecofeminism has occupied, ecofeminism "does not lend itself to easy generalization" (Moore, 2015, p. 39). Ecofeminism can be difficult to define, as there are multiple theoretical approaches and perspectives, as well as differing ecofeminist spiritualities, activisms, and discourses. I have chosen to use Chaone Mallory's definition of ecofeminism throughout this thesis, which is as follows:

> Ecofeminism is a theoretical position and a political movement that examines environmental problems through the lens of gender, revealing the myriad ways that the oppression of women and the exploitation of the earth are conjoined and mutually-reinforcing. It is crucial to reiterate that ecofeminism as both a theory and a set of political/ethical commitments is not exclusively concerned with gender oppression and environmental exploitation but also addresses the pernicious problems of racism, classism, colonialism, heterosexism, and other oppressions. (2006, p. 36)

Following this definition, ecofeminism combines theory and activism to challenge the historically and culturally specific relations of oppression which impact both women and

nature. Further, as seen in the latter part of Mallory's definition, ecofeminism does not solely analyze women and the environment, but ideally shifts to analyze multiple interacting oppressions and the relationships between them. Ecofeminists should therefore utilize an intersectional approach that focuses on dismantling the interlocking oppressions of racism, classism, nationalism, ageism, heterosexism, and environmental degradation (Kings, 2017, p. 70).

The term intersectionality, coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, was created to highlight the failure of feminist and anti-racist discourses to capture the discrimination faced by Black women (Kings, 2017, p. 63). Historically, feminists have struggled with the notion of shared identity, as women were often assumed to be a universal group, particularly during the second wave of feminism, where a "woman" was typically categorized as a white, Western, English-speaking, able-bodied, middle class woman. Critical scholars have analyzed how women, such as women of colour or transwomen, have been left out or marginalized within these exclusionary discussions around identity (Macdonald, 2017). Intersectionality acknowledges that social categories such as race, ethnicity, ability, sexuality, indigeneity and age intersect to affect women's experiences, work, roles, and overall well-being (Williams, 2018). Intersectionality can therefore be used as an analytical tool to help understand the relationships between women and the environment, without relying on gender typing or reducing an experience to the sole category of gender. As a continuously evolving theory, I contend that ecofeminism should utilize an intersectional approach that recognizes multiples axes of oppression alongside analyses of gender and nature.

Research Design

There are two main research questions that were used to frame this project. The first question is: how did the theory and praxis of ecofeminism impact the Clayoquot Sound peace camp and protestors? In examining this question, I analyze how the Friends of Clayoquot Sound promoted ecofeminist principles throughout the daily life of camp and evaluate what challenges occurred in response. My second main question is: can certain tenets of ecofeminism be utilized to push for progressive social change and environmental justice today? In returning to analyze ecofeminism within the Clayoquot Sound peace camp, I seek to add to the work of ecofeminist theorists and practitioners who continue to demonstrate the necessity of integrating an environmental analysis into feminist work, and vice versa.

In order to explore the questions laid out above, my thesis will focus on Clayoquot Sound as an illustrative case study to analyze the ecofeminist dimensions within the protest movement. Case studies, as described by Levy (2008), involve a detailed examination of a historical episode to develop or test explanations that may be generalizable to other events. Further, illustrative case studies are "often quite brief and fall short of the degree of detail needed either to explain a case fully or to test a theoretical proposition. Rather, the aim is to give the reader a 'feel' for a theoretical argument by providing a concrete example of its application" (Levy, 2008, p. 6). My research will not analyze the entirety of the Clayoquot Sound protests; instead, the illustrative case study looks to give readers a 'feel' for how ecofeminism impacted the activism of environmentalists in British Columbia. Therefore, I use Clayoquot Sound as

an illustrative case study to demonstrate a concrete example of ecofeminism within a social movement.

To accomplish this goal, I conduct a review of both primary and secondary material surrounding ecofeminism, social movements, and Clayoquot Sound. In the first phase of my research, I analyze writings from both ecofeminists and their critics in order to understand the historical and current state of ecofeminism. Tracing the genealogy of ecofeminism will help clarify how ecofeminism became so thoroughly discredited within the academia, primarily due to arguments of essentialism. Additionally, I review secondary sources to contextualize the history surrounding Clayoquot Sound and the actions taken by the British Columbia government that led to the environmental protests at Clayoquot. I also examine the literature surrounding gender within social movements. Feminist activist and academic Srilatha Batliwala defines a social movement as "an organized set of constituents pursuing a common political agenda of change through collective action" (2012, p. 3). While such movements have occurred for centuries, the term 'social movement' is a modern invention. It is important to note that in this thesis, I focus on 'progressive' social movements, although the term social movements can also be applied to actions that pursue right-wing or conservative agendas. In the second phase of research, I examine primary sources, when possible, from protestors who were involved at Clayoquot Sound, including examining biographies and the 1998 documentary film *Fury for the Sound*. Finally, I review interview data that other scholars, such as Niamh Moore, David Tindall and Mark Stoddart have previously conducted with protestors at Clayoquot Sound and environmentalists within British Columbia. By

analyzing primary sources from individuals at Clayoquot Sound, I more fully explore how ecofeminism impacted protestors' activism.

On a reflexive note, this project cannot begin without first acknowledging that much of the thinking, research, and writing contained within these pages took place on the occupied lands of the Lekwungen peoples, the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ. I want to acknowledge my position and background: I am a settler Canadian descended from European immigrants who in the mid-19th and early 20th centuries came to the Canadian settler state. As a white, abled, cisgender woman, I am able to pursue this research from a considerably privileged position. Furthermore, I believe it is important to situate myself within this study as a self-identified social justice activist, environmentalist, and feminist. I have previously worked with marginalized and vulnerable populations in the social services sector, and my values were deeply shaped by working in a women's organization that worked to empower those who identified as female.

I also want to acknowledge a few of the limits and challenges of this research. The Clayoquot Sound protests occurred nearly thirty years ago, and therefore, the passage of time might limit how effective my analysis of ecofeminism is. Although a more recent environmental case study could have been selected, I felt it was important to return to Clayoquot Sound. I strongly believe that Clayoquot Sound has important lessons surrounding ecofeminism that the literature has thus far ignored or dismissed. Although the Clayoquot Sound protests occurred at a time when critiques of ecofeminism were at a high in the 1990s, the protests demonstrate how elements of ecofeminism can be utilized moving forward today, including raising important questions and conversations around

the intersecting dynamics of gender and nature. Additionally, I chose Clayoquot Sound as a case study because these events exceed normative understandings of both gender relations and feminist politics. For many, deforestation is not an obvious feminist issue in the way that childcare or reproductive justice might be (Moore, 2015, p. 5). Additionally, Clayoquot was not a traditional women's movement, such as previous women-only movements like the Greenham Common protests in United Kingdom. Clayoquot is therefore an intriguing, complex case study from which to study both feminism and environmentalism within a social movement that was not explicitly oriented around gender politics. Finally, I feel personally invested in this case study. Not only do I identify as an ecofeminist, but as a Canadian citizen who is currently living in Vancouver, I also felt it was important to delve into one of the largest acts of civil disobedience in Canadian history that occurred only hundreds of kilometers away from my current home.

Secondly, I wish to emphasize that this study does not look to promote a Western, ecofeminist discourse as superior over other political activisms or theories. I recognize that using Clayoquot Sound as a case study means focusing primarily on white, Westernized feminists. However, ecofeminism remains an umbrella term for a wide variety of approaches, where regional, ethnic, and cultural ecofeminist thoughts and activism can occur all over the world. Theorists and activists may differ on foundational assumptions surrounding nature, the relationship between women and the natural world, on feminist approaches, and more (Eaton & Lorentzen, 2003). I have chosen to focus on a form of ecofeminism within the Global North as viewed through the lens of the Clayoquot Sound protests. In doing so, I engage with Western individual, academic and

political bodies, who have arguably become disconnected from the natural world despite the environmental damage which threatens the entire planet.

Chapter Outline

This thesis is divided into five chapters, including the current introductory chapter. The second chapter examines a portion of the literature surrounding gender and social movements. It was only in the late 1990s that scholars began to consider gender itself as a social category to be analyzed within social movements (Taylor, 1999). By using a gendered lens, social movement scholarship can examine how gender shapes the tactics, framing, general mobilization, and intra-movement dynamics of movements. I examine how prevalent gender inequality can be within movements, as many scholars argue that women's voices and gender equality are often silenced within progressive social movements (Bell, 2016). This is particularly the case within mixed-gender movements, which often include top-down coalitions or charismatic leaders (Hurwitz & Crossley, 2019). Therefore, it is important to examine the gender hierarchies within social movements that have long been ignored by mainstream social movement theory. Additionally, in order to analyze Clayoquot Sound as an illustrative case study of an environmental and gendered social movement, I believe it is important to examine the roots of the protests. The second part of this chapter thus illustrates how tensions between the forestry industry and the environmental movement had been growing in British Columbia for decades, and how the FOCS created both a national and international campaign to draw attention to the blockade.

The third chapter traces the genealogy of ecofeminism and the surrounding theoretical debates within the academia. Ecofeminism has a varied, complex background

that dates from the 1970s, and I argue that it is critical to examine the history and internal battles within the theory to both understand and move forward from the backlash against ecofeminism. Therefore, in this chapter I analyze writings from both ecofeminists and their critics in order to understand the state of ecofeminism from the 1970s onwards. Providing this account of ecofeminism helps to outline how debates surrounding essentialism, universalism and spirituality have arguably limited the theoretical and political potential of the theory (Moore, 2015, p. 7). I also examine how ecofeminists are trying to expand the realms of possibility for the theory beyond the dichotomy of essentialism/anti-essentialism. In their more recent work, ecofeminists have pushed back by asking whether affirming a relationship between women and nature indelibly marks one as essentialist. It is important to analyze the varied, complex background surrounding ecofeminism in order to understand how the theory has developed and can move forward.

The fourth chapter analyzes Clayoquot Sound as an illustrative case study to examine ecofeminism within the peace camp. As the main environmental organization, I examine how the FOCS integrated issues of gender equality into both their internal structures and culture and external facing activism. I argue that the FOCS accordingly created an ecofeminist peace camp that encouraged and upheld values of inclusion, equality, and consensus throughout the camp. The FOCS did not depict ecofeminism as a shared identity for only women, but instead presented the theory as a way of understanding power relations and systems of dominance and subordination (Moore, 2015, p. 126). Through workshop trainings and daily discussion circles, the FOCS worked to educate protestors on the links between oppressions such as sexism, racism, and homophobia to the oppression of nature (Moore, 2015). In this way, ecofeminism

impacted protestors' activism, and many women commented on how the camp provided a transformative learning experience for them, as they began to more closely examine and critique the patriarchal relations that work to oppress both women and nature.

The fifth chapter offers some conclusions around the Clayoquot Sound peace camp and returns to the future of ecofeminism as both a theoretical and practical framework. Although the movement against old-growth forest logging in B.C. has continued, such a large, direct-action protest has not been seen since Clayoquot Sound. However, activists continue to protest against environmental degradation and the growing climate crisis, which disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized groups around the world. I argue that elements of ecofeminism can help address these crises, including promoting important conversations surrounding the intersections of feminism and environmentalism and upholding gender equality and consensus processes. Furthermore, many ecofeminists advocate for a radical, transformative change within society that challenges the current extractive ideologies and transforms the relationship between humanity and nature to one that is ecologically responsive and interconnected (Hunnicutt, 2019). This chapter also revisits the arguments surrounding ecofeminism and essentialism, as many scholars who work on the intersections of feminism and environmentalism prefer to use more neutral terminology such as 'gender and the environment' in order to escape the "dreaded term 'ecofeminism'" and the associated charges of essentialism (Mallory, 2018, p. 26). However, I follow Chaone Mallory's (2018) argument that the term ecofeminism is critical because men, women, and transgendered persons are not all situated equally in terms of environmental oppression, and ecofeminism draws attention to the anthropocentric nature of alternate feminisms.

Overall, I argue that an intersectional, reflexive ecofeminist theory and praxis is needed to advocate for social and environmental justice and provide a transformative experience in today's world.

Chapter Two: Gender, Social Movements, and Clayoquot Sound

Social movement scholars and other social scientists often ignore the influence of gender on social protest. While scholars have often analyzed women's social movements, it was only in the late 1990s that scholars began to consider gender itself as a social category to be analyzed within social movements (Taylor, 1999). Therefore, in the first part of this chapter, I outline the importance of analyzing gender and structural inequalities within social movements. Many scholars argue that women's voices are often silenced within progressive social movements, particularly within mixed-gender movements (Hurwitz & Crossley, 2019). Accordingly, I have chosen to analyze Clayoquot Sound as mixed-gender environmental movement in order to examine whether it was able to make important demands and advances in favour of feminist principles and interests. Additionally, in order to properly analyze Clayoquot as an illustrative case study of a gendered and environmental social movement, it is important to first provide a background to the protests. As Levy (2008) maintains, illustrative case studies aim to give the reader a feel for a theoretical argument by giving a concrete example of its application. Therefore, in the second part of this chapter, I provide a detailed and comprehensive background of the Clayoquot Sound protests, showing how tensions between the forestry industry and the environmental movement had been growing in British Columbia for decades. Although the NDP government of British Columbia in the 1990s attempted to appease both the environmentalists and the forestry industry, it ended up sparking one of the largest civil disobedience protests in Canadian history.

Gender Within Social Movements

As Hurwitz and Crossley argue, women and transgender persons have historically been limited within both formal politics and activism, as traditionally, protest was considered a "masculine activity" (2019, p. 538). This is no longer the case, as women have taken on important, if often underrecognized, roles within social movements, including during the recent civil rights, peace, feminist and environmental movements. However, Vera Taylor (1999) argues that social movement scholars and other social scientists often ignore the influence of gender on social protest. While scholars have often analyzed women's social movements, it was only in the late 1990s that scholars began to consider gender itself as a social category to be analyzed within social movements. As Taylor argues, social movements often contain a persistent gender hierarchy that affects the mobilization, leadership patterns, strategies, ideologies, and even outcomes of movements (1999, p. 9). Social movement scholars need to pay attention to this phenomenon, as gender is "central to the emergence, nature and outcomes of social movements" (Taylor, 1996, p. 166). Bringing a gendered lens to social movement scholarship allows for an analysis of how gender identities and the structure of gender inequality shape the tactics, framing, and internal dynamics within social movements. In order to deconstruct the 'male-constructed' politics of protest, social and political theories must analyze women as political actors and examine their experiences, goals, and strategies of protest and activism.

Accordingly, a gendered lens can help scholars examine how women's voices and concerns are often ignored or silenced within social movements. Although many social movements ostensibly promote women's rights and gender justice on their agenda, this

objective often disappears due to an underlying male bias within the movement or corresponding organizations (Bhattacharjya et al., 2013, p. 278). Bell (2016) and Maleta (2019) similarly argue that women's voices are often silenced within movements, as they face male domination and oppression. Persistent masculine assumptions about the inferior place and status of women in society can thus work to frame the priorities and actions of social movements. Taylor and Hurwitz (2018) use the term 'gender conflict' as an umbrella term for conflicts that disadvantage, threaten, or harm women, genderqueer persons, and sexual minorities. Gender conflict is particularly prevalent when analyzing both historical and contemporary mixed-gender social movements (Hurwitz & Crossley, 2019). For example, Taylor and Hurwitz (2018) contend that many recent movements – including the U.S. civil rights movement, the HIV/AIDS movement, and the Occupy Wall Street movement – were characterized by gender conflict and inequality (2018, p. 334). As women's participation in these movements are marginalized, issues of gender often become siloed into a small range of 'women's issues' that get pushed aside and ignored. As a result, both activists and scholars need to advocate for more inclusive approaches within movements that acknowledge the significance and complexity of different social locations, including gender. As Bhattacharjya et al. (2013) argue, movements must include and value gender equality in order for any action or intervention around rights, democracy, or equality to be successful.

Additionally, scholars can analyze gender within movements that are not explicitly oriented around gender politics. I follow Cullen and Murphy's call to study social movements that are not rigidly defined as feminist or women's movements to examine how broader social movements can still make important demands and advances

in favour of feminist principles and interests (2017, p. 84). Therefore, I turn to Clayoquot Sound, which has been analyzed within the literature as an environmental movement focused on protesting resource extraction and clear-cut logging. However, the ecofeminist dimensions that furthered feminist principles and gender equality within the camp have often been ignored within feminist literature (Moore, 2015). Although Clayoquot Sound was a mixed-gender environmental movement, women's voices and participation were not silenced or pushed aside. Instead, the Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS) organization worked to transform the culture and power dynamics within the peace camp to keep gender equality at the forefront of the movement. In this way, the protests at Clayoquot Sound were committed to ecofeminist principles of consensus, non-violence, and gender justice. Before more closely examining ecofeminism and how the FOCS integrated these principles into the daily life of the 1993 peace camp, it is necessary to first provide a thorough background of B.C.'s old-growth forest movement in order to understand how the Clayoquot Sound protests began as a long-standing conflict between environmentalists and the logging industry.

Background to the Clayoquot Sound Protests

The province of British Columbia (B.C.) covers 95 million hectares, and is characterized by abundant forests, mountainous terrain, and the Pacific coastline. Five percent of this land base is privately owned, while the other 95% is considered 'Crown land' by the Canadian government. The Canadian Constitution states that provinces have jurisdiction over their own natural resources, and the provinces therefore determine the use of their land and regulate activities such as forest practices and mining (Wilson, 1998). B.C.'s economy is largely centered on natural resource development, including

forestry, mining, oil and gas development, fishing, and agriculture. Forests cover roughly two thirds of B.C., or around 60 million hectares, and the forestry industry first gained prominence during the 1950s-1970s when British Columbia experienced a "timber frontier" (Barman, 2007). During this time, forestry accounted for more than half of the exports originating in the province, and this economic value continued to grow throughout the second half of the twentieth century (Barman, 2007, p. 350). The Ministry of Forests' Annual Report in 1993/1994 reported that the total forest industry shipments were $13.8 billion, with direct employment averaging 101,000 jobs (Ministry of Forests, 1994). During the timber frontier, the B.C. government granted private logging companies long-term rights to harvest trees in particular areas, on the condition that they pay royalties, called "stumpage fees," to the province. One of these companies was MacMillan Bloedel, whose founder H.R. MacMillan had dominated B.C. wood sales following a merger of three pioneering forest companies in the 1950s. According to the Canadian Press, with the possible exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, no company was more closely associated with the twentieth century development of British Columbia than MacMillan Bloedel (Mertl, 1998). As logging continued at a high rate in B.C., many within the province believed the supply of forests was endless. Foresters maintained that clear-cutting and aggressive harvesting could continue at a high, sustainable rate (Kamieniecki, 2000, p. 182). Even as late as 1980, an annual report from the Ministry of Forests revealed that only one-third of logged land was being reforested, and the report claimed that "natural restocking" would be sufficient to replenish the harvested areas (Barman, 2007, p. 357).

As logging companies continued to aggressively harvest trees, the Canadian environmental movement began to form in the 1960s and ‘70s, and organizations such as the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, Greenpeace, and the Sierra Club were born. As more trees were cut down and forest ecosystems were severely impacted, tensions quickly began to escalate between the forest industry and environmentalists in B.C. Critics increasingly questioned an economic culture that depended on the continued liquidation of forests (Wilson, 1998, p. xvii). The forestry movement called for a halt to clear-cutting, arguing that it was important to conserve ecological diversity, to preserve the wilderness for future generations, and to sustain the tourism sector, as the natural wilderness of B.C. drew many visitors to the province (Wilson, 1998). When a deep recession in the 1980s led to the collapse of several large logging companies, many British Columbians began to grow concerned about the state of the forestry industry. Ecological disasters such as Chernobyl, the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and the discovery of a hole in the stratospheric ozone layer in the late 1980s led to a “green wave” as public concern for the environment increased (Harrison, 1996, p. 117). By the early 1990s, public opinion polls showed that 85 percent of British Columbians were alarmed about the number of trees being harvested and were against continued clear-cutting, despite the economic value of the forest industry to the province (Kamieniecki, 2000, p. 182).

A succession of provincial governments in B.C. worked to navigate the turbulent relationship between environmentalists and the forest industry. In 1991, Michael Harcourt of the British Columbia New Democratic Party (NDP) was elected. The NDP’s election platform was “A Better Way for British Columbia”, with a promise of “peace in the woods” that revolved around stronger environmental measures and protection of

forest industry jobs (Wilson, 1998, p. 264). The party hoped to find policy compromises that would appease both environmental and forestry industry supporters in the NDP. Both groups were essential for the NDP to win seats, with resource industry workers dominant in the rural areas in the north and east of B.C., while environmentalists were more prominent in the urban areas (Wilson, 1998). Harcourt pledged to environmentalists that the size of protected areas in B.C. would be doubled along with an abstract commitment to "improved ecosystem representation," while simultaneously promising forest workers measures to protect jobs threatened by "conservation activity" (Cashore, 2001, p. 38). Harcourt's promise of "peace in the woods" was targeted towards the clashes that were occurring between environmentalists and the forest industry workers in Clayoquot Sound, located on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

Conflict in Clayoquot Sound

Since the 1980s, one of the most contentious areas surrounding land-use conflicts in B.C. was Clayoquot Sound. Clayoquot Sound is located on the west coast of Vancouver Island in British Columbia, and is home to the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations, who have lived in Clayoquot Sound for thousands of years. Although the Nuu-chah-nulth did not sign treaties with either the British or Canadian governments, between 1882 and 1889, the Canadian government established 164 reserves on Nuu-chah-nulth territory (Magnusson, 2003). Forty of these reserves belonged to the three tribes whose ancestral lands are in the Clayoquot watershed: the Ahousaht, Hesquiaht, and Tla-o-qui-aht (Magnusson, 2003, p. 17). As seen in Figure 1.1. below, apart from the predominantly

white tourist and forestry towns of Tofino and Ucluelet, Nuu-chah-nulth communities compose almost the entire population of the area (Braun, 2002, p. 7).

Figure 1.1. Location of Vancouver Island, B.C., showing Nuu-chah-nulth traditional territories. Retrieved from Coté, 2019.

The first anti-logging blockade in Clayoquot Sound was initiated by the Tla-o-qui-aht in 1984, after MacMillan Bloedel announced plans to log more than 4,500 hectares of Meares Island, an island close to Tofino (Kuehls, 2003, p. 179). As the Tla-o-qui-aht protested logging on their unceded territory, they gained support from local Tofino residents and environmentalists, including those who formed the group the Friends of Clayoquot Sound. The Tla-o-qui-aht declared Meares Island a "tribal park," therefore claiming title to the land, and subsequently applied for and received an injunction to

prevent logging on the island until their outstanding land claims were resolved (Shaw, 2003, p. 30).

As further tensions regarding development processes in Clayoquot began to rise, a local Steering Committee on Sustainable Development worked to produce community-approved plans for the region. Fearing that the provincial government and logging companies would ignore such plans, the Steering Committee approached the government to ask for their participation in the process (Shaw, 2003, p. 32). The governing Social Credit Party of British Columbia agreed but asserted control over the committee, replacing it with the Clayoquot Sound Sustainable Development Task Force in 1989. The Task Force was to develop a consensus-based strategy surrounding logging and clearcutting in the area, and its first assignment was to determine where interim logging could occur while the sustainable strategy was created. However, this was a contentious issue and could not be resolved within the one-year time frame. The Task Force subsequently disbanded in the fall of 1990, and the Social Credit government formed the new Clayoquot Sound Sustainable Development Steering Committee in 1991. Although the Social Credit Party lost to the NDP in the fall of 1991, Premier Harcourt reconfirmed the mandate of the Steering Committee. However, the Steering Committee quickly ran into disagreements, and environmental representatives withdrew from the Committee after only four months following a decision to allow logging of several intact watersheds in Clayoquot (Wilson, 1998). Just like the earlier Task Force, the Steering Committee was disbanded in October 1992 as a result of continued deadlock. A report presented to the NDP cabinet stated:

> Opinions were sharply polarized, emotions were high and many community members were already frustrated and burned out. As

> the largest block of old-growth on Vancouver Island, Clayoquot Sound is both a key resource for the timber industry and a place of totemic importance for environmental groups and the wilderness movement. Options for deferrals or log-around 'without pain' proved to be non-existent. All of this made for an extremely narrow window for compromise and mutual accommodation. (Wilson, 1998, p. 271)

Following the failure of these two task forces, Premier Harcourt released his "compromise solution," known as the Clayoquot Sound Land Use Decision (CSLUD), in April 1993 (Shaw, 2003, p. 38). The CSLUD assigned Clayoquot Sound into different zones with differing land use intensity, including protected areas that were counterbalanced by zones designated for high-intensity resource development. The CSLUD therefore increased the number of protected hectares within Clayoquot Sound from 39,100 to 87,600 hectares, protecting a total of 33 percent of its land area (Wilson, 1998, p. 271). However, much of the newly protected area was either shoreline or bog forest, leaving many of the pristine watersheds, mountain viewscapes, and rare ecosystems unprotected (Wilson, 1998). Furthermore, the CSLUD gave MacMillan Bloedel, Canada's largest commercial logging company at the time, permission to clear-cut up to 49 percent of the Clayoquot Sound land area (Walter, 2007). Although Harcourt believed he was striking a compromise by increasing the number of protected hectares, environmentalists felt angered and betrayed. Environmentalists were further enraged when the NDP disclosed that the B.C. government had recently purchased a large block of shares in MacMillan Bloedel, becoming the largest single known shareholder and showcasing the government's conflict of interest in the region (Shaw, 2003, p. 38). As Colleen McCrory, founder of the Valhalla Wilderness Society, commented: "The gloves are off. The NDP has betrayed the environmental movement of this province and they're

going to pay for it" (Wilson, 1998, p. 271). Valerie Langer, a key campaigner for the Friends of Clayoquot Sound, stated that the organization was committed to seeing 1,000 blockaders arrested over the summer in protest of the CSLUD (Wilson, 1998). The Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations also strongly opposed the government's decision, as these lands were subject to unresolved land claims, yet the government had not included the Nuu-chah-nulth in their decision-making processes surrounding the CSLUD. Despite being billed as a compromise solution, the CSLUD upset many different individuals and organizations across the province.

The Clayoquot Sound Campaign

Organizations such as the local Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS), which had originally been formed to support the Tla-o-qui-aht at Meares Island, now gathered to protest the CSLUD. Although there were multiple environmental organizations involved at Clayoquot Sound, including the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, Greenpeace, and Forest Action Network, the FOCS were the main group to spearhead the protests. Beginning in July 1993, the FOCS set up a peace camp in Clayoquot Sound to coordinate their protests, where individuals arrived to "put their bodies on the line to save the trees" (MacGregor, 2001, p. 49). The peace camp was modelled after Greenham Common in England which, as the longest-running women's peace camp from 1981 to 2000, pressured the Royal Air Force in the UK to cease operating and testing nuclear cruise missiles (Gaard, 2011). The Clayoquot Sound peace camp was created in a clear-cut alongside an active logging road, and as a result, many protestors nicknamed the camp the "Black Hole" (Moore, 2015, p. 108). As Elizabeth May, former leader of the Green Party of Canada, writes in her primer for environmental activists: "[Valerie] Langer and

company set up a peace camp, based on the model of the women's peace protest at Greenham Common … They set up rules for peaceful coexistence. They fed and housed thousands of people in a clear-cut" (2006, p. 28). The FOCS was mainly run and organized by women leaders, and as will be analyzed further in Chapter Four, developed their peace camp following feminist principles of consensus and nonviolent direct action. The overall number of protestors far outweighed what the FOCS organizers had expected; on opening day of the protests on July 1, 1993, there were 250 people in the camp, and 13 people stood on the logging road to be arrested (Wilson, 1998). By the end of summer, 12,000 had passed through the camp, with the blockades averaging 300-400 people per day. Furthermore, over 800 people had been arrested, two thirds of whom were women (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010, p. 77).

It is necessary to recognize that the Clayoquot Sound protests are bound up in a colonial project. As Gordon Brent Ingram argues: "The 1993 conflict over Clayoquot turns out to have been a move from an older form of blatant neo-colonialism to newer forms of over-exploitation of the land and First Nations communities that are only a little less obvious" (1994, p. 43). Not only had the Nuu-chah-nulth's unresolved land claims been ignored in the CSLUD, but the environmentalists also failed to acknowledge the traditional owners and custodians of the land before initiating their blockade. Very few Nuu-chah-nulth peoples participated in the Clayoquot protests, which is a subject Braun argues has "not received the attention that it has deserved" (2002, p. 8). Historian and Indigenous scholar Jonathan Clapperton (2019) further maintains that environmentalists in Clayoquot Sound developed their own narrative where they were supporting the Nuu-chah-nulth's efforts to preserve the wilderness and save the old-growth forest. In doing

so, Clapperton argues that the protestors were practicing a form of “green colonialism,” where the environmentalists asserted their own hegemonic views of how people should or should not interact with the environment (2019, p. 193). Even when environmentalists believe they are ‘protecting’ the land, such protection often results in the displacement of Indigenous peoples and the disruption of traditional practices. As Erickson maintains, the “environment in crisis” discourse has provided a landscape for many environmental groups to justify their colonial actions (2018, p. 112). The exclusion of Indigenous people and other non-White communities in the name of “preserving wilderness” remains a contentious issue within many environmental conservation movements, including within the Clayoquot Sound protests (Erikson, 2018).

Despite their failure to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land, the FOCS created their peace camp in the clear-cut nicknamed the “Black Hole.” In addition to physically blockading the logging roads, the FOCS worked to combat MacMillan Bloedel’s narrative surrounding settlement, development, and progress in Clayoquot Sound. Industry publications, advertisements and television commercials focused on the economic progress and technological development forestry had made, while describing clear-cuts as “temporary meadows” (Moore, 2015, p. 108). In doing so, MacMillan Bloedel focused heavily on the issue of ‘jobs’ versus ‘the environment.’ Jobs referred to those in the logging industry, who were presented as locals associated with technology, development and progress, as opposed to environmentalists who were portrayed as “transient blow-ins and romantics” who wanted to preserve nature and thus prevent progress (Moore, 2015, p. 108). In this way, nature and progress were portrayed as mutually exclusive. As will be discussed in the next chapter, ecofeminist theory heavily

critiques a similar concept of Western dualisms, which value rational, masculine characteristics of science and progress over nature. Another example of how MacMillan Bloedel promoted their progress is seen in a poster hung outside their office, which depicted the felling of a giant cedar tree with the caption, “We came, we sawed, we conquered” (Moore, 2015, p. 92). Although lacking the same amount of resources and traction, the FOCS worked to challenge MacMillan Bloedel’s version of science and progress by pointing out the degradation of local environments and showcasing how the provincial government was deeply entangled in the logging industry.

In addition to fighting MacMillan Bloedel’s version of progress nationally, the FOCS spearheaded a campaign to attract worldwide attention. The Clayoquot Sound protests became a “poster child” of the international environmental movement (Barman, 2007). With news stories appearing in Canada, the United States, and Europe, Clayoquot Sound grabbed the attention of the global media in a way that no previous struggle over forestry in British Columbia had done before (Barman, 2007). Visits to the peace camp by American environmental lawyer Robert Kennedy Jr. and the rock band Midnight Oil only increased visibility. The FOCS also adopted the “Brazil of the North” campaign, where logging in Brazil was juxtaposed with logging in British Columbia. As the campaign stated: “Canada is the Brazil of the North. Brazil is losing one acre of forest every nine seconds. We’re losing one acre every twelve seconds” (Moore, 2015, p. 56). In promoting this campaign, the FOCS contested narratives of Canada as an advanced nation and undermined popular perceptions that deforestation occurs mostly in developing countries (Moore, 2015, p. 111). As B.C. was repeatedly reprimanded by the media worldwide for its handling of the protests, Premier Mike Harcourt travelled to

Europe to try to counteract these negative images (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010). The FOCS saw this as an opportunity to contest Harcourt's account of logging in British Columbia and as a chance to drum up more support for their blockade. Accordingly, Valerie Langer and Garth Lenz of the FOCS followed Harcourt on his trip, working to educate international environmental organizations about the realities of clear-cuts in B.C. Their trip made a strong impression and led to protests outside Canadian embassies in the UK, Germany, Japan, and the United States, countries where B.C. wood pulp was used to make toilet paper, newsprint, and disposable chopsticks (Moore, 2015, p. 56). The FOCS was therefore successful at spearheading both local and international campaigns to draw attention to the logging practices occurring in B.C.

While sparked by tensions between the logging industry and environmental groups, the Clayoquot Sound movement was a political attempt to achieve long lasting social change. As the Friends of Clayoquot Sound campaigner Valerie Langer stated in an interview, their goal was to change the very conditions under which society thinks about clear-cutting and harvesting (Moore, 1996b, p. 11). Many protestors flocked to Clayoquot Sound to engage in civil disobedience because they were frustrated with the limits of voting, lobbying, and letter writing, and felt they had no other choice in order to stop the logging (Moore, 2015). As Langer commented: "The blockades gave the FOCS and the environmental movement a position of power, which we didn't have previously" (Moore, 1996b, p. 13). In addition to protesting environmental degradation, the Clayoquot Sound movement made important advances in favour of feminist principles and interests. Although gender is often pushed aside or ignored in mixed-gender social movements, Clayoquot Sound was a watershed movement that promoted both gender

equality and environmental justice. However, it is common today for feminists who work on the intersections of feminism and the environment to avoid the term at all costs due to charges of gender essentialism. It is therefore important to examine the theory's history and genealogy in order to understand these critiques, and to evaluate whether scholars can utilize certain elements of ecofeminism moving forward.

Chapter Three: A History of Ecofeminism

The relationship between gender and the environment has been explored most fully in ecofeminist theory and research. As Noel Sturgeon argues, ecofeminism is a double political intervention of environmentalism into feminism and feminism into environmentalism (1997, p. 168). Ecofeminism articulates that the ideologies that authorize injustices based on gender, race and class are related to the ideologies that sanction the exploitation and degradation of the environment (Sturgeon, 1997). As discussed in the introductory chapter, ecofeminism is such a broad field that it can often be difficult to define. In their book *Ecofeminism & Globalization,* Heather Eaton and Lois Ann Lorentzen (2003) state that ecofeminism is an umbrella term for a wide variety of approaches, as ecofeminist theorists differ on foundational assumptions. These assumptions include the nature of the relationship between women and the natural world, ecological paradigms, and feminist approaches. The authors argue that ecofeminists can have Marxist, socialist, cultural, radical, or postmodernist roots, and a variety of regional, ethnic, and cultural ecofeminisms exist (Eaton & Lorentzen, 2003). Ecofeminist philosopher Karen Warren refers to the rich diversity of ecofeminist thinking as a quilt: "An ecofeminist philosophical quilt will be made up of different 'patches', constructed by quilters in particular social, historical and materialist contexts" (2000, p. 66). Accordingly, I maintain that ecofeminism should be seen as a diverse social, political and theoretical movement that is constantly changing and evolving.

As Moore (2015) argues, although ecofeminism once offered huge promise, it is common today for feminists who work on the intersections of feminism and the environment to avoid the term at all costs. Many scholars such as Sandilands (1999) and

Moore (2015) have pointed to charges of gender essentialism as the main reason why ecofeminism has become discredited within academia. Greta Gaard (2011) acknowledges that ecofeminism's history was quite often essentialist and exclusionary, especially among cultural ecofeminists who claim a biological connection between women and nature. Essentialist thinking is the belief that all members of a group share fundamental, unchanging or 'essential' qualities that underlie who they are. Gender essentialism therefore maintains that gender differences are directly determined by fixed, biological differences between men and women (Dzubinski & Diehl, 2018). Critics claim that ecofeminism promotes gender essentialism through the belief that women are inherently closer to nature due to their roles as child-bearers and child-rearers, thereby appointing them the natural carers and saviours of the planet (Mallory, 2018, p. 13). However, feminists have spent years challenging the biological association between women and nature as limiting to women's progress and equality (Heilmann, 2011). Historically, women have been labelled as inferior to men and seen as incapable of fully acting as agents of culture, society, and history due to their biology or nature. In perpetuating gendered stereotypes around women's inherent connection to the planet, ecofeminism is seen to reinforce patriarchal hierarchies through the idea that there are fixed, innate qualities between men and women, where masculine qualities such as rationality and autonomy are valued more highly than feminine traits (Phillips & Rumen, 2016, p. 2). Even if their work does not directly claim a biological association between women and nature, many feminists working on the intersections of feminism and the environment remain concerned that their work will be perceived or labelled as essentialist. Therefore, many have chosen to rename their approach in the hopes of gaining a wider audience and

escaping claims surrounding essentialism, using terms such as “feminist environmentalism” (Agarwal, 1992), “critical feminist eco-socialism” (Plumwood, 2002), or “feminist, ecological citizenship” (MacGregor, 2010).

Despite accusations of essentialism, Greta Gaard (2011) argues that ecofeminism has had a widespread influence on the humanities and social sciences, including art, philosophy, psychology, animal studies, environmental studies, queer theory, and ecocriticism, to name a few. However, few present or former ecofeminists have chronicled the history of ecofeminism due to a strong fear of “contamination-by-association” (Gaard, 2011, p. 27). I believe it is critical to analyze the history and internal battles within ecofeminism in order to uncover the roots of the backlash against ecofeminism. Therefore, in this chapter I analyze writings from both ecofeminists and their critics in order to understand the state of ecofeminism from the 1970s onwards. I provide an account of ecofeminism through tracing its genealogy, which helps to outline the debates surrounding essentialism, universalism and spirituality. I urge caution around certain facets of ecofeminism, including cultural ecofeminists’ belief that there is an essential link between women and nature that is biologically and psychologically determined. The field has rightfully struggled with criticisms around conflating the categories of sex and gender and homogenizing women’s experiences, and some of these ideas are best left in the past. However, I also examine how ecofeminists are trying to expand the realms of possibility for ecofeminism beyond the dichotomy of essentialism/anti-essentialism. In their more recent work, ecofeminists have pushed back against essentialism/anti-essentialism debates, asking whether affirming a relationship between women and nature indelibly marks one as essentialist. Ecofeminists are raising

important questions surrounding the intersections between feminism and environmentalism, while simultaneously challenging assumptions of essentialism in the field. It is therefore important to analyze the varied, complex background surrounding ecofeminism in order to understand how the theory has developed and can move forward.

The Origins of Ecofeminism

Scholars such as Noel Sturgeon (1997) and Niamh Moore (2015) have traced the genealogy of ecofeminism, arguing that a genealogy helps tease out ecofeminism's shifting meanings, re-namings, and mutations since the 1970s. The term "ecofeminist" was first introduced by French feminist Francoise D'Eaubonne in her 1974 book *Feminism or Death*, where she linked the oppression and domination of all marginalized groups, including women, children, and the poor, to the oppression and domination of nature. D'Eaubonne celebrated the connection between women and nature as a way to fight back against centuries of patriarchal cultural and economic control (Sandilands, 1999, p. 6). D'Eaubonne's writings encouraged other scholars in the United States to investigate the link between gender and the environment, and Susan Griffin's *Woman and Nature* (1978), Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* (1978), and Carolyn Merchant's *The Death of Nature* (1980) were early foundational texts in ecofeminism. Collectively, these ecofeminist writers began to develop a theory of the interconnected domination of women and nature within the structure of patriarchal social conventions.

Although most ecofeminists agree that the domination and exploitation of women is connected to the domination and exploitation of nature, as with feminism itself, ecofeminism is made up of many divergent strands. Ecofeminist theorists have investigated the connections between women and nature from different cultural,

historical, psychological, spiritual, and political perspectives. For example, American ecofeminist Carolyn Merchant and Australian philosopher Valerie Plumwood analyze the historical lineage of the women-nature linkage. Merchant is one of the earliest ecofeminist thinkers to investigate how the Scientific Revolution changed the dynamic between nature and science (Banerjee & Bell, 2007). In her book *The Death of Nature*, Merchant (1980) argues that prior to the 16th century, societies were built around integrated, closely knit social ties based on an embodied connection between nature and humans. However, the Scientific Revolution in the 16th and 17th centuries fostered a separation of nature from culture, creating a belief that women and nature worked in opposition of men and culture (Merchant, 1980). Merchant (1980) analyses the imagery surrounding the earth, arguing that the Scientific Revolution transformed the image of nature into a force that is wild and uncontrollable, or as something that needed to be 'tamed' and 'controlled' by scientific production. For example, the earth was capable of rendering violence through storms and droughts, and should therefore be controlled by the 'man of science.' Similarly, women were conceptualized as witches who "raised storms, caused illnesses … and killed babies" (Merchant, 1980, p. 127). Merchant argues that the subjugation of nature and women were integral to the Scientific Revolution, as values of scientific progress and control were promoted. Overall, Merchant challenges the idea that the Scientific Revolution was a marker of progress, instead articulating how 17th century science should be implicated in the ecological crisis, the domination of nature, and the devaluation of women.

Valerie Plumwood (1993) similarly argues that there is a history of domination and alienation of women and nature in Western culture and philosophy, specifically seen

in Western hierarchical dualisms. Dualisms are the process by which contrasting concepts, such as masculine and feminine gender identities, are constructed as oppositional and exclusive (Plumwood, 1993, p. 31). For example, men are defined as active, and women passive; men are intellectual, and women intuitive; men are inexpressive, and women emotional; men are strong, and women weak, etc. In these inherently gendered dualisms, the man is treated as the primary model, and the woman is constructed as the Other (Plumwood, 1993, p. 32). A logic of identity exists through the discourses, institutions and material practices that rest on these hierarchical dualisms, such as mind/body, culture/nature, masculine/feminine, and human/nature (Phillips & Rumens, 2016, p. 2). The culture/nature dualism has functioned historically to assign higher status, value, and prestige to male-identified traits of culture, while assigning lower status, value and prestige to female-identified traits of nature. Plumwood argues that ecofeminism advocates for a society where both women and men challenge the dualized conception of human identity and develop an alternative culture which recognises human identity as continuous with nature. As Plumwood writes: “One essential feature of all ecological feminist positions is that they give positive value to a connection of women with nature which was previously, in the West, given negative cultural value and which was the main ground of women’s devaluation and oppression” (1993, p. 8). In advocating to revaluate the connection between women and nature, Plumwood does not suggest reinstalling fixed binaries, but rather she aims to directly challenge the oppressiveness of dualistic hierarchies that dominate the core of Western philosophy. Gaard similarly argues that one of the main tasks of ecofeminism has been to expose “these dualisms and the ways in which feminizing nature and naturalizing women

have served as justification for the domination of women, animals, and the earth" (1993, p. 5). Both Merchant and Plumwood believe that that categories of 'woman'/'man' and 'nature'/'culture' have been socially constructed in ways that devalue both women and nature. Overall, these scholars believe that Western, patriarchal visions of science and philosophy came to dominate women and nature through male developed and controlled logics and technologies.

Other ecofeminists analyze the women-nature linkage through the lens of cultural feminism, drawing heavily on influences from American feminism in the 1970s. Following the lead of second-wave feminist theorists such as Simone de Beauvoir, radical feminist analyses fought against forms of domination by focusing on women's differences from men. These cultural feminists explored the idea that women's differences might be a source of strength; rather than rejecting feminine characteristics, they looked to celebrate qualities such as intuition, care, nurture, emotions, and the body. Therefore, cultural feminists give a positive value to the feminine and the natural, the very qualities that have often been devalued due to their cultural and historical association with women (Plumwood, 1993). The linkage between women and nature is important in cultural feminism, as nature often refers to the experience of reproduction and the inherent bodily connection to the planet. Accordingly, nature is frequently referred to in distinctly female terms, such as 'Mother Earth', the 'virgin forests', or the 'rape of the wild' (Sandilands, 1999, p. 16). Women and nature are therefore seen to be inherently connected, where women have a stronger, more natural connection to the earth due to their reproductive abilities. Following an 'ecomaternalist' perspective, some cultural ecofeminists believe that women are more concerned about the environment than

men (Stoddart & Tindall, 2011). Ecomaternalism, as termed by Sherilyn MacGregor (2006), asserts that women are more accustomed to considering the needs of their children and the well-being of those around them, and as a result, believes that women are more likely to become aware of environmental degradation and take actions to fix it. Ecomaternalist discourse uses words such as 'earthcare' as a metaphor to create a feminist political project for social and ecological change, framing women's activism through the language of caring, nurturing, and concern for the future (Stoddart & Tindall, 2011). Therefore, cultural ecofeminists believe that women have a greater propensity to care for nature due to their roles as mothers and caregivers. Some cultural ecofeminists also seek to recover women and earth-based spiritualities as alternatives to the "god-the-father-based religions" (Carlassare, 1999, p. 94). These cultural ecofeminists celebrate the relationship between women and nature through a revival of ancient rituals centered on goddess worship, the moon, and the female reproductive system. These rituals are seen as a way to re-envision nature and women as powerful forces. In seeking to upend the negative association of women with nature, cultural ecofeminists accepted the biological personality traits assigned to women, but claim these connections to be positive. However, as will be discussed more below, this positive revaluing of the qualities associated with 'woman' led many feminists to question whether ecofeminism is inherently feminist at all, or whether ecofeminism instead works to perpetuate essentialist stereotypes.

As various strands of ecofeminism developed in the 1980s and 1990s, many academic and activist literatures continued to promote ecofeminism, highlighting the global diversity of the movement *(*Moore, 2015). Influential anthologies began to appear

in the 1980s that emphasized the collaborative nature of ecofeminist projects across the world. These works, such as Judith Plant's *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* (1989) included voices from various cultures and emphasized women's involvement in ecological and health-related programs around the world. As Petra Kelly wrote in the foreword to *Healing the Wounds*: "This is a book about global ecological sisterhood!" (1989, p. ix). Diversity was seen as an important element of feminism during the early 1990s, and diversity within ecofeminism suggested the movement was not dogmatic and could embrace difference (Moore, 2015). This diversity was often made manifest through listing places or organizations where ecofeminist activism was understood to be emerging around the world. Activism is widely perceived as a defining feature of ecofeminism, and women were applauded for taking increasingly prominent roles in the peace, anti-nuclear, health and ecology movements. For example, scholars often listed the Kenyan Greenbelt Movement, the Women's Pentagon Actions, the Love Canal Homeowners' drive against toxic waste, the Chernobyl campaigns, the Japanese women's consumer movements, and the Chipko Movement in India as prominent ecofeminist movements. This range of positions, voices, and locations was viewed positively, and as Shiva et al. (2014) write, ecofeminists should strive to build alliances with other victims of the capitalist patriarchal system, including workers, peasants, and Indigenous peoples. Many ecofeminists continue to advocate for an outward political focus on both the local and global in order to build an international, grassroots movement, celebrating ecofeminism as both an academic and activist movement.

Early Critiques of Ecofeminism

However, ecofeminism quickly faced mounting criticisms, as many scholars rightfully saw evidence of ecofeminism's ongoing and persistent gender essentialism. Critiques around the idea that women are biologically closer to nature and thus better positioned to save the environment remain one of the largest controversies within ecofeminism. Beginning in the 1980s, research from various fields of study, including postcolonial, poststructuralist, and queer studies joined with feminist programs to criticize essentialism within feminist movements. These scholars worked to destabilize and diversify binary, restrictive categorizations, and they expressed the dangers around the essentialist conceptualizations within the woman/nature analogy (Mickey & Vakoch, 2018, p. 3). Accordingly, they criticized the ecofeminist view that women should be conceived in terms of their reproductive, nurturing, and caring abilities, which naturally connected them to Mother Earth (Estévez-Saá & Lorenzo-Modia, 2018). Statements like "our wounded planet needs [the] healing touch of women" and "women have a special relationship with nature" caused concern among many critical scholars (Agarwal, 2001, p. 12). Critics believed that by focusing on the attribution of fixed, innate qualities for men and women, ecofeminism was equating sex and gender while simultaneously eradicating critical differences like race and class. As Sandilands observed: "This articulation of ecology with neo-conservative discourses on the family is truly frightening in its implications for women. It is a naturalized morality tale of private women embodying particularistic, nuclear-family-oriented, antifeminist, heterosexist, and ultimately apolitical interests" (1999, p. xiii). Scholars such as Merchant (2005) and MacGregor (2006) are critical of the discourse surrounding ecomaternalism and the

metaphor of 'earthcare.' As Merchant (2005) observes, such an ethic of care advances an essentialist belief that women's nature is to nurture. If women believe they are "by nature" more caring, emotional, and nurturing than men, this creates a trap whereby they are cementing their own oppression in a patriarchal society (Merchant, 2005, p. 195). Likewise, MacGregor asks: "How can women enter the realm of the political through a window of care and maternal virtue? How is this feminist? And how, if at all, is it political?" (2006, p. 58). Feminists and other critical scholars saw the traditional connection between women and nature as an instrument of oppression and a relic of the patriarchy. Critics argue that ecofeminist theory tends to promote essentialized constructions of nature and womanhood wherein both are linked as either victims or "Earth Mothers" (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010).

In addition to questions of essentialism, ecofeminism also faced criticisms of universalism, racism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, and naiveté. In the early 1980s, questions were raised about ecofeminism's ability to incorporate experiences of environmental degradation from outside the confines of white, middle class, North American culture. Wilmette Brown's 1986 essay "Roots: Black Ghetto Ecology" suggests the inaccessibility of ecofeminism to poor Black women. Brown explores the environmental degradation of the "ghetto", where high rates of cancer abound, and she argues that there is a "malignant kinship" between racism, sexism, economic exploitation, and ecological destruction (1986, p. 7). Therefore, as Sandilands (1999) contends, Brown points out the increasing need to incorporate race and class alongside analyses of gender and nature within ecofeminist analyses. Additionally, critics looked at issues surrounding universalism, or the focus of ecofeminism and other feminisms on the presumed unity of

women as a social category and identity. Women are often categorized as a universal group, where the experiences of white, Western, English-speaking, able-bodied, middle class women were assumed to be universal for all women. Critical scholars have analyzed how women, such as women of colour or transwomen, have been left out or marginalized within these exclusionary discussions around identity (Macdonald, 2017). Sandilands (1999) maintains that ecofeminism tends to promote a personalized identity politics that focuses on the unity of the female identity. Likewise, Agarwal (2001) critiques the essentialism of the unitary category "woman" within ecofeminism, arguing that women cannot be posited as a unitary category within a country, let alone across the world. Skeptics also questioned ecofeminism's idea of a grassroots, activist movement that celebrates a 'global sisterhood' across the planet. They argued that ecofeminism instead was a popular movement among Western, middle-class, white women, who had turned ecofeminism into a consumer spirituality of becoming "Earth Mothers" to save the planet (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010, p. 83). As a result, ecofeminism was framed as a Westernized theory for those who already possess privilege and status.

Issues of cultural appropriation also abounded within ecofeminism, as many early ecofeminists hailed environmental activism in the Global South as paradigmatic. This was often seen in ecofeminism's most frequently cited "success story", or the Chipko movement in India (Kao, 2010, p. 627). In Chipko, a predominantly female group of peasants successfully prevented the felling of trees by "tree-hugging," or stopping the loggers with their bodies. In idealizing Chipko as a symbolic representation of ecofeminism, Indian women were characterized as "pure" beings who had caring, respectful knowledge on how to save the planet (Sandilands, 1999, p. 55). Similarly,

ecofeminists often presented Indigenous holistic practices as “ecologically noble” (Wilson, 2005, p 349). This discourse was criticized as being colonial and patriarchal, as Indigenous practices and knowledges are held within a primitivist stereotype while leaving little room to examine the current ways in which Indigenous peoples connect with nature (Wilson, 2005). Despite numerous references to Native American spirituality and writers, Sturgeon (1999) notes that few chapters in ecofeminist texts are actually written by Indigenous writers. Sturgeon maintains that “much of ecofeminist discourse about Native American women silences their voices even while idealizing them” (1997, p. 269). Wilson argues that rather than using their cultures and histories, ecofeminists and other scholars should listen to Aboriginal voices when analyzing the women-nature analogy through an Indigenous lens (2005, p. 338). In attempting to promote the activism of women in the Global South or Indigenous practices, many ecofeminists ended up reproducing the very essentialist and dualistic ways of thinking they wanted to disrupt. Therefore, critics such as Huey-li Li (1993) have questioned whether ecofeminism has made universalistic claims that cannot adequately account for cultural differences, arguing that many scholars have utilized a Western theoretical model of ecofeminism that has been assumed to hold for all or most cultures.

Scholars such as Plumwood (1993) have mounted a defense against criticisms of cultural universalism, arguing that it is important to recognize that the dualism surrounding nature/culture is specifically a feature of Western thought. Women are not always aligned with nature, and Plumwood acknowledges that in certain cultures, such as in New Guinea, men are the ones associated with the forest and the wild land (1993, p. 11). Therefore, Plumwood argues that the alignment of women with nature cannot be the

entire basis and source of women's oppression, since women often stand in relatively powerless positions even in cultures that have not made the connection of women to nature or which have a different set of gendered dichotomies. However, the association of women with nature and men with culture can still be seen as providing much of the basis of the cultural elaboration of women's oppression in the West, and of the particular form that it takes in the Western context. Kao (2010) further addresses critics who suggest that ecofeminist theory is limited in scope by arguing that it is important for ecofeminists to present their theoretical analyses in more context-specific ways. For example, Heather Eaton has acknowledged that ecofeminism represents "Euro-Western cultural analyses, and even then only in a limited way" and has noted that "ecofeminism operates differently in Christianity than in Buddhism, and in Kenya than in Chiapas, and in some places does not work at all" (2005, p. 33). Kao further argues that the model of Western society has been and is still in the process of being projected upon the world through the ongoing legacy of imperialism, the impact of multinational corporations, and other processes of globalization (2010, p. 620).

Ecofeminism was further criticized for becoming an academic theory that was solely debated by elite scholars, rather than focusing on both political action and theory (Kings, 2017, p. 69). Although activism was widely perceived as a defining feature of ecofeminism, debates surrounding essentialism created a division between feminist theory and feminist activist practice (Sturgeon, 1997). Tension regarding the relationship between academia and activism has run through mainstream feminism and ecofeminism in recent history, and as Moore argues, the tension between theory and activism was created and exacerbated by anti-essentialism debates (2015, p. 50). Beginning in the

1990s, scholars began to focus on categorizing and typologizing ecofeminism as a way to manage the range of meanings of ecofeminisms. For example, Carolyn Merchant defined three distinct types of ecofeminism in her book *Radical Ecology* (2005): liberal, cultural, and social/socialist ecofeminisms. As Merchant argues, she uses these categories to illustrate different approaches to the way women have been concerned with improving the human/nature relationship, and to show how each approach has contributed to an ecofeminist perspective (2005, p. 197). However, in Noel Sturgeon's influential work *Ecofeminist Natures,* she argues that the goal of typologizing ecofeminism is merely to produce the "best" form of ecofeminism, or one that is a non-essentializing theory (1997, p. 178). When scholars typologize ecofeminism, it results in a separation of "anti-essentialist" and "essentialist" ecofeminisms, or "good" and "bad" types of ecofeminism. Moore similarly argues that the practice of typologizing has created a practice of defining ecofeminism "through the conceptual binary of essentialism or anti-essentialism," and that focusing solely on one or the other is unhelpful (2011, p. 10). As Moore contends, typologizing signaled the moment when ecofeminists succumbed to narratives of essentialism, and ecofeminism became defined through the dualism of essentialism/anti-essentialism (2015, p. 54). Over a relatively short period of time, open-ended questions of women and nature and feminism and environmentalism collapsed into a matter of attributing essentialism or anti-essentialism. Carlassare similarly argues that a "taxonomy" of ecofeminism is problematic, as different positions in ecofeminism are not always neatly divided or have developed from each other in a mappable way (1999, p. 91). She argues these taxonomies tend to excessively separate different forms of ecofeminism, overemphasizing or obscuring the many complex connections and areas of

overlap between and within them. Taxonomies also can synthesize heterogenous perspectives into a single coherent position, and Carlassare maintains it is important to be aware of who is doing categorizing and look at what is being overlooked or marginalized in the process (1999, p. 91).

A Further Defense of Ecofeminism

As debates surrounding essentialism, universalism, and racism raged around ecofeminism, many theorists began to shift further in response to the criticisms. It became increasingly apparent to ecofeminists that race and class needed to be considered alongside gender and nature in analyses of oppression and programs for change. Ecofeminists also began to realize that not all women were affected in the same way by ecological degradation, and similarly, that not all women viewed nature through the same lens. Vandana Shiva's 1998 book *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India* represents an important shift in ecofeminist analysis, where she argued that the oppression of women and nature should be linked to capitalism, racism, and colonialism. Ecofeminists began to incorporate an intersectional analysis to understand gender in relation to class, race, sexuality, indigeneity, age, and ecology. As Kings argues, intersectionality "promises to avoid the common traps of essential difference by looking beyond the categories which dominated essentialism debates in the 1980s and 1990s" (2017, p. 66). Some feminists have expressed concern regarding the broadness of intersectional approaches, noting that one must address a seemingly endless, overwhelming list of intersections to use intersectionality 'correctly.' Judith Butler contends that many scholars add an 'etc.' after feminist lists (ex: sexism, classism, speciesism, homophobia, etc.), and sees it an a "sign of exhaustion" on the part of

feminists (1989, p. 143). However, intersectionality can still act as an important analytical tool or lens to aid critical thinking on ecofeminist debates. Using intersectionality as an analytical tool can help to clarify the relationship that women have with the environment, without relying on gender typing or reducing an experience solely to the category of gender. Thus, a woman's relationship with the environment should not be valued as 'natural' or completely dependent on her gender, but needs to be analyzed through the factors of class, race, sexual orientation, age, caste, and more.

As Kings (2017) argues, while it is important to acknowledge that early ecofeminist scholars did not adopt intersectionality as the conceptual tool we know today, there are still many examples within early ecofeminism that show how scholars engaged with the multiple dimensions of social categories. For example, Plumwood claimed that gender, race, class and nature were the "tectonic plates of liberation theory," and that when the plates come together, the resulting tremors could "shake the conceptual structures of oppression to their foundations" (1993, p.1). Kings also maintains that ecofeminism is a continually evolving theory-in-progress, and that as an academic and activist tradition, it will continue to adapt according to the changing political and environmental landscape in which it finds itself (2017, p. 82). While intersectionality does not offer a complete, infallible solution to the problems of difference, it does offer a way to take into account the differing nature of social categories and their influence on both identity and discrimination. Intersectionality can illuminate how different forms of disadvantages can act as a method of silencing the most vulnerable and oppressed within communities. Intersectionality can help turn ecofeminism into a 'good' feminist theory as defined by Judith Butler and Joan Scott, who argue that a 'good feminist theory'

generates discussion, analysis and research, while opening up the floor for feminists to proceed into areas that had previously been constrained (1992, p. xiii). I therefore argue that ecofeminism, as both a theory and praxis that upholds breaking free of patriarchal oppression, should work to employ an intersectional approach that focuses on dismantling the interlocking oppressions of racism, classism, nationalism, ageism, and heterosexism.

In addition to utilizing intersectionality to address many previous critiques of ecofeminism, many scholars argue that accusations of essentialism have limited the potential of ecofeminism to grow as a theory and activist tradition. After the 1990s, many feminist scholars assumed that any activity labelled ecofeminist was tainted, and misconceptions abounded where ecofeminists were labelled as "tree-hugging, tofu-eating hippies" (Jiménez Rodríguez, 2016, p. 381). As Gaard (2011) notes, charges of gender essentialism were accurately leveled at cultural feminists, who embraced the embodied connection surrounding women and their connection to nature. Most "ecofeminism bashing" uses cultural feminism and out-of-context quotes to prove how ecofeminism is essentialist; however, these critics do not acknowledge how ecofeminism has evolved and transformed over the years (Jiménez Rodríguez, 2016, p. 382). Many critics continue to read ecofeminism simplistically and inaccurately, and Erika Cudworth maintains that allegations of essentialism are often based on cursory readings and de-contextualization of ecofeminist writings (2005, p. 103). Gaard similarly argues that gender essentialism is often associated with the entire, diverse body of thought, yet this produces a logical fallacy where a part is misrepresented for the entire whole (2011, p. 32). As a result, scholars such as Gaard (2011) and Moore (2015) argue that essentialist charges have

limited the theoretical and political potential of ecofeminism. While it is important to take the risk of essentialism seriously, critiques of essentialism have created a "chilly research climate" that adversely affects the development of ecofeminist theory and research (Moore, 2011, p. 12). Ecofeminists have become so enmeshed in defending their work against charges of essentialism that little energy remains for articulating and working through alternative accounts of women and nature (Moore, 2015, p. 62).

The adverse reaction to essentialism also led to a decline in ecofeminist writings or publishing in academia. In the 1990s, Sturgeon argues that there is an "establishment feminist backlash" against ecofeminism, resulting in a lack of ecofeminist writing in prominent feminist journals (1997, p. 167). Sturgeon also offers examples from her own career, where a feminist mentor advised her to delete the term 'ecofeminism' from the title of her papers and job applications (1997, p. 167). As recently as 2010, Gaard writes that it was nearly impossible to find a single essay or section devoted to ecofeminism in most introductory anthologies used in women's studies, gender studies, or queer studies (2011, p. 31). Furthermore, Gaard (2011) argues that postmodern feminist works have been almost entirely anthropocentrically focused, as feminists have concentrated on human categories and failed to consider the environment, nature, and ecological concerns. As Gaard maintains, "Interest in human bodies was seen as suitably political [for feminists] – interest in animal bodies and nature was not" (2011, p. 41). Therefore, many feminist scholars remain hesitant to investigate or study topics surrounding gender and the environment, for fear of this established feminist backlash. Environmental scholar Chaone Mallory argues that the scholars who apply feminist understandings to environmental issues often do not mention the term ecofeminism or the past three

decades of ecofeminist theorizing (2018, p. 23). In order to avoid the "dreaded term 'ecofeminism,'" many scholars working on the intersections of feminism and the environment use designations such as 'feminist environmental politics,' 'feminist ecology,' or 'gender and the environment' (Mallory, 2018, p. 26). For example, feminist phenomenologist Bonnie Mann strongly articulates for a "feminist environmental politics" in her 2006 book *Women's Liberation and the Sublime: Feminism, Postmodernism, Environment,* without once mentioning the history of ecofeminism. However, Mann does include a reference to Mies and Shiva's foundational ecofeminist text *Ecofeminism* (1993) in a footnote, demonstrating that she was aware of the field. As Mallory (2018) argues, scholars are renaming their approaches to distinguish their work from essentialist feminisms and therefore gain a wider audience. However, this results in the appropriation of ecofeminist ideas by other feminist authors.

In spite of ecofeminism's turbulent history, scholars such as Eaton and Lorentzen (2003) and Phillips and Rumen (2016) argue that ecofeminism is more important now than ever. As Eaton and Lorentzen argue, the literature shows that environmental problems in most parts of the world disproportionately affect women. As early as 1989, the United Nations observed: "It is now a universally established fact that it is the woman who is the worst victim of environmental destruction. The poorer she is, the greater is her burden" (in Eaton & Lorentzen, 2003, p. 2). This claim revolves around the intersecting environmental, sociopolitical and economic structures that negatively impact many women's lives. Phillips and Rumen similarly maintain that the exploitation, subordination and appropriation of women and the natural world are interconnected and are only worsening due to society's dominant economic and political ideologies. The authors

therefore argue that a more radical approach is needed to connect the human and more-than-human world (2016, p. 5). The necessity of ecofeminism as both theory and praxis in today's worsening environmental crisis will be further discussed in this thesis.

I view ecofeminism as a diverse, flexible field that works to build a more sustainable, just world through a concern for nature and for equity within and between all species. The history of ecofeminism is notably complex, due to the theory's diverse nature and the swift revisioning the theory underwent in a relatively short amount of time. As mentioned above, a variety of regional, ethnic, and cultural ecofeminisms exist, and Carlassare (1999) maintains that one of ecofeminism's biggest strengths is that it remains an open, flexible political and ethical alliance that does not invoke any shared, singular theoretical framework or epistemology. Ecofeminist researchers should remain sensitive to the circulation of power in today's culture, language and history, and seek to intervene in forms of domination whereby both women and the environment are oppressed and degraded.

However, many ecofeminist scholars and activists have been rightly criticized for the dangers surrounding issues of gender essentialism and universalism. For example, many ecofeminists focused on the presumed unity of women as a social category and identity, therefore failing to acknowledge that women can also be the oppressors of other women (Hunnicutt, 2019). While essentialist and universalist notions do still exist within certain branches of ecofeminism, and indeed within today's very society, it is also important to recognize that many ecofeminist theorists and practitioners have undergone a swift and sound revisioning, where they continue to encourage conversations around women and nature in a reflexive manner (MacGregor, 2006). As Estévez-Saá and

Lorenzo-Modia argue, ecofeminism has become "perhaps the most sophisticated and intellectually developed branch of environmental criticism" (2018, p. 111). As a result, I believe there are elements of ecofeminism that can be used by both scholars and academics to investigate and pursue the interconnected relation between women and nature. Notably, ecofeminists scholars and activists continue to advocate for and bring feminist political theories and voices into the study of environmental topics (Weiss & Moskop, 2020). Additionally, ecofeminism, as a gendered, ecologically informed perspective, can use its understanding surrounding the domination of women and nature to uphold important questions surrounding the very structure of our society, including questioning today's capitalist, colonial structure. I therefore urge feminist scholars to engage with ecofeminist ideas surrounding the interconnected oppression between women and nature and the desire to end ecological degradation and foster social egalitarianism.

However, as Eaton and Loretzen write in their anthology: "Ecofeminism remains largely a theoretical conversation … while there are many grassroots activist women's organisations resisting the negative effects of globalisation, these activities do not provide the primary data for ecofeminist discourse" (2003, p. 5). Accordingly, it is necessary to integrate ecofeminists' academic inquiry with grassroots environmental activism. Moore (2015) argues that ecofeminism's lack of attention to empirical research is disappointing, and as a result, my contribution aims to help rectify this gap by looking into women's lived experience. The stories of women's lives have been undertheorized in ecofeminism, and I therefore seek to examine the experiences of women protestors in the 1993 Clayoquot Sound peace camp. By analyzing ecofeminism as it occurred throughout the

peace camp, I can more fully examine the theory and praxis of ecofeminism in order to analyze how the movement can be utilized in the present.

Chapter Four: Ecofeminism and the Clayoquot Sound Peace Camp

As ecofeminist Greta Gaard writes, the Clayoquot Sound protests were not only a contest over nature, but also a contest over gender (2011, p. 39). Although Clayoquot Sound has been examined as an environmental movement within academic writings, the ecofeminist dimensions of the camp have not been significantly explored (Moore, 2015). I therefore follow Niamh Moore's (2015) argument that it is necessary to return to the Clayoquot Sound protests as a site to analyze ecofeminism and long-standing debates in feminism surrounding essentialism. I utilize Clayoquot Sound as an illustrative case study to show how the movement adopted an ecofeminist praxis to highlight the importance of women's rights and gender justice, as well as promoting women into prominent leadership roles and positions. Although gendered conflicts and other tensions were common within the peace camp, this merely demonstrates how complex and entangled gender relations and feminist politics are. Through a close examination of the ecofeminist peace camp at Clayoquot Sound, I argue that ecofeminist politics should not be so easily reduced to essentialism or universalism.

Ecofeminism was a shared concern for many who came to protest and became a central motive in how the Clayoquot Sound camp and campaign were organized (Moore, 2015). Accordingly, I examine the Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS) to see how this grassroots organization integrated issues of gender equality into both their internal structures, processes, and culture and their external facing activism. The FOCS grounded their campaign in feminist principles of non-violence and consensus decision making, and in order to educate protestors about these values and create a sense of community within the camp, the FOCS created daily discussion circles and workshops. These forums

offered participants a chance to explore topics surrounding ecofeminism, gender equality, constructions of masculinity, and more. I argue that this transformative learning encouraged protestors to closely examine and critique patriarchal conventions and power relations within society that worked to both oppress women and nature. Some scholars maintain that the most important effects of social movements may be indirect and revolve around changing people's minds and ideas through discursive engagement (Bahu, 2011), and the FOCS worked tirelessly to engage and educate protestors through the daily discussion circles and nonviolence workshops. By using feminist theory and principles to keep gendered claims at the forefront of the environmental protest, the FOCS created an ecofeminist peace camp that had an impactful experience upon many protestors.

The Friends of Clayoquot Sound

The Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS) was the main social movement organization that orchestrated the Clayoquot Sound protests and played a crucial role in shaping the activism of the protestors at the peace camp. In this first section of this chapter, I examine how the FOCS evolved from a smaller, grassroots group that was focused on protesting resource extraction to an organization that was grounded in feminist and environmental justice principles. The FOCS was established in 1979 in Tofino, Vancouver Island as one of the environmental groups that joined the Tla-o-qui-aht blockade of Meares Island. As logging continued in the region during the 1980s, the grassroots organization attempted to negotiate with the B.C. government for a transition to an environmentally friendly economy and society. Although the group took part in available lobbying procedures and gained local support for their campaign, the government refused to halt logging during the negotiations process (Moore, 2015).

Frustrated with the "'talk and log process,' where we talked and they logged the whole time," the FOCS left the negotiating table and turned to direct action, setting up blockades against forestry companies in 1988, 1991, and 1992 (Moore, 2015, p. 106). Following the Clayoquot Sound Land Use Decision in 1993, Jan Bate, the director of the FOCS, maintained that the group wanted to create a "blockade that would end all blockades" (Moore, 1996f, p. 2). Accordingly, the group blockaded Kennedy River Bridge and set up the peace camp in a nearby clear-cut to enable supporters from outside Clayoquot Sound to come and join the protests.

Initially, the FOCS had little organizational structure, as volunteers chose their own level of involvement within the group. However, as the FOCS began to grow in size in the late 1980s, the group implemented significant organizational changes. As Moore argues, the most important change was a commitment to feminist principles, which the FOCS defined as a consensus decision making process and the philosophy and practice of non-violence (2015, p. 125). This shift emerged following a FOCS meeting, where a number of men dominated the meeting and prevented others from contributing to the discussion. In an interview with Niamh Moore, FOCS organizer Valerie Langer recalled how irritated many members felt, and commented:

> So, we decided at that meeting that we should begin consensus-model decision making and have a process for running our meetings … so we started at that time organizing ourselves as a consensus decision-making organization with feminist principles, and it happened to be the feminists in the group who were willing to stick it out … some of whom were men, who said 'Yeah, I agree totally'" (Moore, 1996c, p. 5).

While the FOCS' principles surrounding consensus were born out of frustration with particular men, it is important to note that feminism as practiced by the FOCS was not

understood as solely being about gender. In Langer's account, feminism is not tied specifically to women, as she included men in her understanding of who was a feminist in the group. Rather, feminism was presented as a way of understanding power relations as an interlocking system of dominance and subordination, as embodied by the men who refused to let others speak (Moore, 2015). Therefore, the FOCS' refusal of feminism as an identity politics opened up a version of feminism that instead focused on the process and practice of environmental political activism. As written at the bottom of a Friends of Clayoquot Sound Newsletter in 1993, the FOCS defined themselves as a "volunteer-run group advocating protection for the ancient temperate rainforests and marine ecosystems of Clayoquot Sound, and all of Vancouver Island. We are part of an international grassroots movement calling for a shift of consciousness in the way humans relate to the Earth" (Clayoquot Sound, 1993, p. 6). While this definition acknowledges the FOCS' environmental focus, the second sentence recalls ecofeminism's ideals surrounding an international grassroots movement that aims to shift individuals' relationship towards the environment. While the FOCS continued to focus on the environment through direct action and blockades, they also made important internal organizational changes that centered on the process and practice of feminism.

In preparing for the blockades in 1993, the FOCS built on a network of support to attract larger numbers of supporters from across the country and from nearby Oregon and Washington. The FOCS also focused on recruiting non-violence trainers, as they wanted to create direct action workshops for the camp participants (Moore, 2015, p. 127). As Valerie Langer commented, "You get the people who have some 'inner desire' to be part of a movement … and so we knew that we were going to have to define what the

movement was" (Moore, 2015, p. 127). Just as they had committed to consensus and non-violence within their own organization, the FOCS was instrumental in creating a social movement that was dedicated to the same values and philosophy. As Bhattacharjya et al. write, feminist groups and individuals play a crucial role in creating change within social movements, as they can be responsible for "gendering" the strategic direction of entire movements (2013, p. 287). The authors argue that advocates and activists must continue to "gender their movements from the inside," as this is what causes change within both the external agenda and internal workings of the movement (Bhattacharjya et al, 2013, p. 288). By committing to feminist principles of consensus decision making and non-violent direct action within both their internal and external processes, the FOCS worked to "gender" the environmental movement from the very beginning.

Ecofeminist Dimensions of the Peace Camp

As thousands of individuals travelled to Clayoquot Sound over the summer of 1993, the FOCS created and managed a collective, participatory ecofeminist peace camp**.** Although demonstrators might have arrived to protest logging and the forestry industry, ecofeminist principles were promoted from the minute an individual walked into the peace camp. The FOCS created a "Welcome Handout" that was given to individuals as they arrived, which stated the following:

> This is an action base-camp. We are here to bear witness to the destruction, to peacefully resist that destruction, and to educate ourselves and the public about these issues … We use a consensus process based on feminist principles. We believe that sexism, racism and homophobia are forms of oppression which are linked to the oppression of Nature. We strive to make Camp a safe space, free of oppression (McLaren, 1994, p. 76).

This handout is one of the best examples of how the camp organizers at Clayoquot Sound interpreted ecofeminism. Feminism was not solely linked to issues of gender or sexuality; instead, sexist, racist and homophobic forms of oppression were notably connected to the same forces that work to destroy the environment. Moore notes that connections with other "isms" and oppressions can be inferred in the Welcome Handout, as the handout's short list was not exhaustive (2015, p. 129). However, the FOCS did not acknowledge that the protests were occurring on the unceded land of the Nuu-chah-nulth peoples or draw attention to the existing colonial relationships. Although the environmentalists proposed a rhetoric of support for Native land rights, this erasure of colonialism within the handout is troubling. As Braun argues, this allowed the FOCS to speak for nature's defence and management while effectively marginalizing the Nuu-chah-nulth, who understood and related to the forest in very different ways (2002, p. 2).

Yet when focusing on issues of gender and the environment, from the beginning, the FOCS conveyed to protestors that the peace camp did not just focus on blockading logging roads, but that the camp was also a place to discuss and learn about ecofeminist values and intersecting oppressions within society. As one of the main organizers of the Clayoquot Sound peace camp, Valerie Langer maintains that she wanted to create a culture "which values women and which has values or an ethic which values the ecology" (Moore, 1996c, p. 33). Accordingly, Langer worked to promote the idea throughout camp that "women's politics and the politics of environment … overlap and are intertwined" (Moore, 1996c, p. 33). As emphasized in the Welcome Handout, the FOCS upheld ecofeminist principles surrounding an ethic that recognized and respected the connection between the women and nature**.** Tzeporah Berman, one of the FOCS

organizers, further stated in Shelley Wine's 1998 documentary film *Fury for the Sound*: "When we started the peace camp, we explicitly made feminist principles part of our structure, because if we didn't, we would be replicating the same things we were trying to change" (16:43-17:00).

Besides being stated in the Welcome Handout, ecofeminist principles were prominent throughout the daily life of the peace camp. For example, the FOCS created daily discussion circles to practice a consensus-based decision-making model. The discussion circles took place after breakfast and dinner, and all the protestors, including women, men, and children, would gather in a circle or a number of concentric circles. The morning discussion circles usually reflected on the blockade of that day, where those who had been arrested and processed at the jail would share their thoughts and experiences. Alternatively, evening circles would focus on developing a plan for the following morning's blockade. These circles had no chairperson or leader, but instead had one person who would act as a facilitator for discussion and help participants reach a consensus. Jean McLaren, one of the primary non-violence trainers at the camp, explains the term 'consensus' in her book *Spirits Rising: The Story of the Clayoquot Peace Camp, 1993:*

> Consensus is way of making group decisions by mutual consent of the participants rather than by a simple majority vote. The goal is to reach a democratic decision that everyone can live with … This does not mean that everyone is always in perfect agreement, but that the decision doesn't violate anyone's principles … Consensus used properly relies on synthesis and cooperation rather than competition for reaching group unity (1994, p. 69).

As McLaren (1994) writes, consensus at Clayoquot Sound involved cooperation with all participants to reach a decision that most agreed with. In working to find a

democratic decision, the daily discussion circles promoted equality between individuals, as women, men, and children were treated as equal participants. The FOCS' discussion circles therefore provided an inclusive way for each protestor to have an equal voice in the campaign's direction. Although at times it was difficult to reach consensus, the discussion circles remain a key example of how non-hierarchical and collective forms of decision-making were envisioned and practised at the peace camp (MacGregor, 2001, p. 49). The discussion circles also provided an opportunity for individuals to come together and explore important issues, including topics surrounding ecofeminism, masculinity, and power relations (Moore, 2015). As will be examined further below, discussions around the word 'ecofeminism' dominated circles, as well as conversations surrounding gender and sexual assault that occurred within the camp. Even though the circles invited all individuals to participate equally, some individuals struggled with the fact that the majority of leaders within the FOCS were women. However, Jean McLaren comments in an interview with Moore: "It was hard for some people, some of the guys to put up with it … but when they realized what is was and what we were doing, that we weren't trying to have power over them we were just trying to empower everyone they understood" (Moore, 1996b, p. 11). As McLaren notes, the FOCS used forums such as the discussion circles to convey to protestors that they were not working to disempower men, but rather their goal was to empower all individuals as equals. Accordingly, the FOCS developed and prioritized policies that ensured the inclusion of women's voices under the same conditions as their male peers, as well as creating opportunities for education and discussion.

Furthermore, in creating daily consensus-based discussion circles, the FOCS worked to redefine the concept of power within a social movement by creating a power they shared *with* others, rather than having power *over* others (Berman, 1994, p. 5). The FOCS' power sharing model is the opposite of the vertical politics many social movements experience, which often include hierarchal coalitions or charismatic leaders. Instead, the FOCS invoked ecofeminist, grassroots principles surrounding consensus and participatory democracy to ensure that frontline protestors had an equal say in the direction and planning of the campaign, rather than just the leaders of the FOCS. Accordingly, the ecofeminist principles promoted by the FOCS can be used to question the taken-for-granted premises of social movements framed by top-down, established political characteristics and ideologies (Salleh, 2019). As Graeber (2011) comments, the experience of watching a group of a hundred or a thousand people making collective decisions without a leadership structure can change one's most fundamental assumptions about what politics or even human life can be like.

In addition to the discussion circles, the FOCS also facilitated workshops on non-violence, which mostly took place after lunch. The workshops walked through the history, philosophy, and practice of civil disobedience, covering examples such as Gandhi and the suffragettes (Moore, 2015). During these training workshops, facilitators had to explain to participants who were eager to protest that "this isn't about tying yourself up to a tree, this isn't about lying down in front of the trucks as they're rolling towards you, it is not about independent actions. This is about a team effort, this is about people working together" (Moore, 2015, p. 134). Rather than promoting an

individualistic approach to protesting, the FOCS used the workshops to teach protestors a non-violent, community-based strategy.

Workshops provided a further opportunity for facilitators to discuss a variety of ecofeminist principles, including educating individuals about previous feminist movements and encouraging individuals to criticize the structures of power and privilege under the current patriarchal system (Moore, 2015). As protestor Miriam Leigh said, the workshops offered people a chance to think and acknowledge that "we all, y'know are all still sexist, racist, materialist, how do you change that within yourself? That was the hope for what these workshops would do" (Moore, 1996e, p. 12). Accordingly, the FOCS established spaces within the social movement for critical self-reflection, where individuals were encouraged to consider issues such as racism, consumerism, and gender inequality. In an interview with Niamh Moore, Atty Gell describes how the workshops made both men and women analyze their experiences surrounding gender inequalities within society, facilitating discussions that Atty termed a "healing experience" (1996a, p. 5). The workshops therefore became educational, transformative spaces where individuals could reflect on their own values and beliefs, as well as learning more about the FOCS' vision of protesting against environmental and gender injustices.

The discussion circles and workshops also helped protestors maintain connections and create community within the camp. Facilitators such as Jean McLaren believe it was crucial for individuals to participate in the morning discussion circle after being arrested so that they could express their feelings (Moore, 1996b). McLaren maintains that the circles had an incredibly important "grounding effect," or the chance to express one's emotions and feelings surrounding the blockade and arrest, as well as maintaining a

connection to other protestors, which was exceedingly important to the sustainability of the camp (Moore, 1996b, p. 31). In this way, the FOCS set up discussion circles not only as a way to develop principles surrounding consensus, but also to ensure that participants felt grounded and connected to other protestors.

A sense of community was important to the longevity of the protests, and the FOCS had not anticipated the sense of community that developed, with many individuals staying for weeks or months rather than the few days they had expected (Moore, 2015). Once participants came to the camp, they rapidly became involved in the hands-on work of building community, including volunteering in the kitchen to prepare food for hundreds of people, staffing the gate to welcome new arrivals, and acting as peacekeepers. As Jan Bate comments: “This was community, they learned about consensus, they learned about non-violence, they learned about communal living, and they got in touch with clear-cuts” (Moore, 1996f, p. 3). Therefore, ecofeminism at Clayoquot Sound built upon feminist values of inclusion and egalitarianism, and as protestor Mike Morell comments: “I would argue that it was an ecofeminist camp and an ecofeminist society because it was … led by ecofeminists and it was operating on ecofeminist principles” (Moore, 1996c, p. 4). From the moment an individual walked into camp, they were immersed in a form of participatory ecofeminism that focused on equality, non-violence, and transformative learning surrounding the process of political and environmental activism. As a result, the FOCS worked to ‘gender’ the social movement from within by recognizing and transforming the internal culture and power dynamics within the movement.

Difficulties within the Peace Camp

Although ecofeminism was articulated and practiced throughout the peace camp, it was the subject of constant negotiation and sometimes even overt conflict. As Moore notes, some protestors did not understand or share in the vision of ecofeminism that the FOCS were promoting, resulting in tensions over the place of feminism and gender issues at camp (2008, p. 287). For example, some participants did not agree with using the term 'ecofeminism' within the campaign. Protestor Mike Morell remembers a painfully long conversation at a discussion circle surrounding whether the word 'ecofeminism' should be included in a pamphlet (Moore, 1996d, p. 3). Although an agreement was eventually reached to include the word, Morell recalls that "the people who weren't satisfied with it crossed out ecofeminism in the pamphlet and I guess that put the issue of ecofeminism … front and center" (Moore, 1996d, p. 4). Despite an overall agreement to keep the word 'ecofeminism' within the pamphlet, a few individuals disagreed and took matters into their own hands by crossing the term out. Morell does not elaborate on why protestors did not agree with the terminology, but this example demonstrates how ecofeminism was a constant source of conversation and even conflict throughout the peace camp.

In addition to protests around the word 'ecofeminism,' Mike Morell notes that there was a "seeming endless discussion of gender issues" over the course of the summer (Moore 1996d, p. 2). For example, Jean McLaren (1994) discusses how some protestors believed the topic of gender should not be addressed throughout the camp or campaign. When a participant made a similar comment in a circle that McLaren was facilitating, she argued: "I have been in many movements for over forty years, and never was there any time to discuss gender issues. We always seemed to have to put them aside for another

time. I am willing to sit here all f*ing night if you want to talk about it" (1994, p. 33). McLaren notes from personal experience that many social movements seem to disregard the issue of gender from their movement. As an organizer and facilitator at Clayoquot, she decided that it was important to take the time to discuss gender within the circle. However, she notes the circle went on long into the night, and energy flagged for many as male participants discussed how tired they were of hearing women talk about being abused (McLaren, 1994, p. 33). McLaren (1994) also notes that no consensus or resolution was ever reached that night. Even though discussion circles provided an opportunity to discuss important issues such as gender or ecofeminism, the conversations were not always productive or valuable for the participants.

Gendered issues also arose in connection with food in the camp. The Clayoquot peace camp created the Clear-Cut Café, which won praise for producing excellent vegan food for hundreds of people daily and for creating community by enabling everyone to eat together (Moore, 2015). As participants were required to help out in the kitchen, it provided a space for volunteers to meet and get to know each other. However, as Moore (2015) observes, much of the kitchen work remained gendered, as women tended to prepare the food while most of the cooks were men. Additionally, there were rumours of a cook who had sexually assaulted a young woman at the camp (Moore, 2015, p. 135). When this woman disclosed the abuse, she was offered support from other women, who held a women's circle where they shared stories and encouragement. Women also asked their male allies to hold a men's circle to discuss questions around masculinity and power; however, some women expressed concerns that the men's circles were just a place to complain about women rather than to constructively challenge gendered roles within

society (Moore, 2015, p. 135). Many protestors believed that other issues of sexual harassment or assault occurred throughout the camp, and as participant Miriam Leigh commented, “The issue of sexism was just never, ever put to rest” (Moore, 1996e, p. 13). Although the ecofeminist camp championed feminist principles to try to acknowledge and dismantle patriarchal power relations within society, gendered issues relating to sexual assault or male dominance were often at the forefront of conflicts within the camp.

Further issues arose in connection to a specific man, nicknamed “Iron Ron,” who was identified by many participants as trying to obstruct the ecofeminist ethos of the camp. Iron Ron objected to the creation of a women-only space at camp and tried multiple times to veto the idea (Moore, 2015, p. 136). In a consensus decision making model, vetoing was considered a very serious matter, and the FOCS had advised participants to work towards discussing their objections to reach a resolution rather than vetoing actions. However, Iron Ron often threatened to use his vote to stop an action, demanding that the circle pay attention towards his own individualistic views. Jean McLaren also notes that Iron Ron wrote on the inside of a toilet: “Ecofeminist Nazis. Ecofeminazis are running this camp” (Moore, 1996b, p. 33). In demanding attention and threatening to obstruct consensus in the discussion circles, Iron Ron represented the perpetuation of male dominance and hierarchical ways of decision making that is common within a patriarchal society (Moore, 2015, p. 136). Iron Ron was not the only man who caused disturbances within camp, and Mike Morrell comments that “I did become impatient with … the defensiveness on the part of men” when ecofeminists discussed the pervasiveness of male domination within society (Moore, 1996d, p. 4). Morell acknowledges that while he was more interested in environmental politics than

gender, he noticed how often men would react negatively when ecofeminists brought up issues surrounding the domination of women and nature. Morell began to address these men using "techniques that I learned in Jean's peacekeeping workshops … by talking to people, trying to understand and acknowledge their motivation, and also refer them to the overall purpose of the camp" (Moore, 1996d, p. 7). Morell used tenets of ecofeminism and the techniques learned within the non-violent training workshops to have open, educational conversations with other men. As Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue, environmentalism can work as a site where men encounter feminist politics, leading some to transform their understanding of gender privilege and inequality.

Although there was a variety of gendered issues within the Clayoquot Sound peace camp, I argue that ecofeminist principles and strong leadership from the FOCS kept these issues from marginalizing women's participation in the movement. Despite the disagreements that arose, discussions surrounding gender and equality continued to be debated and explored in these broader, mixed-gender spaces, as men and women explored their different perspectives, hopes, and fears. Even though conversations surrounding gender and power may have been difficult, the discussions and participatory circles kept gender from being siloed into a small range of 'women's issues,' where they might have lost importance within the social movement (Bhattacharjya et al., 2013). Instead, the FOCS' strong leadership and commitment to ecofeminism allowed gender and equality to retain a prominent place within the environmental movement. Therefore, discussions surrounding ecofeminism, sexism, and the patriarchal society were continuously addressed and discussed by the FOCS and participants, pushing individuals

to reflect on larger-scale gendered power dynamics seen both within the peace camp and larger societal structures.

Personal Narratives

Despite many of the conflicts that arose, personal narratives from protestors demonstrate how important Clayoquot and the ecofeminist peace camp was to them. Many women activists from the peace camp published their own stories and accounts of the protests, including *Clayoquot: The Sound of My Heart* (1996) by Betty Krawczyk, who joined the protests at 65 years old, was arrested, and later spent four and a half months in jail, and *Spirits Rising: The Clayoquot Sound Peace Camp* (1994) by Jean McLaren, who writes about the daily life at the peace camp. Media accounts also acknowledged the significance of ecofeminism at Clayoquot, including a headline from the *Vancouver Sun* newspaper titled: "Eco-Feminists Run 'Peace Camp' At Clayoquot Sound" (Moore, 2008, p. 286). An award-winning documentary film *Fury for the Sound: The Women of Clayoquot* was directed and produced by Shelley Wine in 1998, featuring a diverse array of women participants who discussed their motivations, fears and triumphs surrounding the protests and life at camp. As Moore notes, Wine's documentary brought many of the values and ideals of the Clayoquot campaign into the living rooms of those who never made it to the camp (2008, p. 287). The film locates Clayoquot Sound within a history of women's activism that incorporates the Indian Chipko movement and the North American suffrage movement, thereby articulating a strong connection between feminist and environmentalist political identities (Tindall & Stoddart, 2010).

Additionally, Wine's documentary demonstrates how women at the peace camp often experienced barriers to their participation, including gendered, race, class or age

related oppressions. For example, Wine's film shows male forestry workers and police officers positioned against women in the blockades. During a women's only blockade, officials threatened that they would place their children in foster care if the women did not give up and go home (MacGregor, 2001, p. 49). Protestor Jay Gell recalls that the police never threatened to call social services during mixed gender blockades. He maintains that the inequalities the women's blockade faced sparked conversations within the camp about "things that have for many, many years been pushed under the rug" (Moore, 1996e, p. 6). While Jay does not elaborate on this sentence, he alludes to discussions surrounding gender equality and privilege. As Jay demonstrates, experiences such as what happened at the women's only blockade caused both women and men to think critically about the connection between environmental and feminist struggles, even if feminism was not originally on their political agenda. As Catriona Sandilands argues, environmental activism is an important site through which women are able to develop not only a politicized understanding of environmental issues, but also a sense of themselves as political actors, including "a profound realization of the inequitable and confining gender relations that organize their lives" (2008, p. 311). Therefore, many individuals began to realize that the same patriarchal, hegemonic forces that were threatening them or their families were the same forces that were threatening to degrade the environment. These direct experiences of political sexism within the protests encouraged many to think critically about the economic, social, and political relations and oppressions that affect both women and nature.

These experiences catapulted many women into action, as they began to take on more dominant leadership roles within the camp, such as in media interviews, writing

protest speeches, and creating workshops. Many women felt empowered through a solidarity with their fellow activists, and the older women often worked with the younger women to help them or to pass on some of their skills (Moore, 2015). As Valerie Langer comments: “Women are willing to pull other women to the forefront and give them the chance and say ‘you’re good, you’re good, do it, you’re good at it’ … that’s what Vicky was doing to me and that’s what I did to Tzeporah and Tzeporah will do to somebody else” (Moore, 1996c, p. 14-15). Ecofeminism as practiced at the peace camp allowed women to build a community by experiencing solidarity with other activists, and to develop a sense of themselves as political actors. As many protestors later commented, the experiences of the camp had a much more lasting experience on them than the actual experience of protesting or being arrested (Sandilands, 2008, p. 311). For example, Sherry Merk writes that being a “part of this cause” was one of the “most meaningful and fulfilling moments of my life” (2008, p. 96). Atty Gell proudly called herself an ecofeminist, saying that she identified “very strongly” with ecofeminism and women’s activism against the destruction of the environment (Moore, 1996a, p. 12). Therefore, the praxis and theory of ecofeminism as practiced by the FOCS upheld gendered issues and promoted women’s activism and leadership within the movement against further environmental degradation.

In an interview with Mike Morell, Niamh Moore (1996d) asked if he thought gender issues would have been raised as much if the camp had been largely led by men. Morell responded: “It would have been like most environmental activist gatherings, more or less dominated by men in which gender issues would have been seen as secondary, and the leadership would have … suppressed the discussion or attempted to limit it … if it

hadn't been for the largely women and largely ecofeminist leadership the gender issues wouldn't have had so much time" (Moore, 1996d, p. 10). As Morell notes, the peace camp would have looked much different if men had been in charge, as is so often the case in environmental social movements or organizations. Morell further commented: "The Friends of Clayoquot leadership, the camp leadership … [set] the tone that made the camp special. So the experience of life in that camp was for me an inspirational experience of how a society can be. And that continues to be a model for me, of what we can do if we put our minds to it and are conscious of what we're doing" (1996d, p. 23). Therefore, the FOCS' leadership in the Clayoquot Sound peace camp provided an important, impactful experience for many of the protestors. Not only did the FOCS create an alternative community where individuals participated in daily discussion circles and non-violence workshops, but protestors also learned to critically think about how gender inequality and the domination of nature are connected and should be addressed in the same system of oppression and privilege.

Returning to Gender and Nature

As discussed in Chapter Two, many mixed-gender social movements have been sites for the perpetuation of gender inequality (Hurwitz & Crossley, 2019, p. 541). However, this was not the case during the Clayoquot Sound movement. Although gendered conflicts did occur throughout the camp, the Friends of Clayoquot Sound worked tirelessly to increase the knowledge, skills, and confidence of women throughout the peace camp. For example, they created an effective facilitation method that provided women with as much power and scope to influence decisions as men had. By developing

non-hierarchal structures that emphasized group consensus and collaboration, the FOCS critiqued the traditional, male-dominated power dynamics within social movements. However, ecofeminism was not promoted as a women's-only identity, as the FOCS worked to include and encourage all participants to champion women's empowerment. For example, both Mike Morell and Jay Gell began to critically think about issues surrounding gender equality after experiences within the camp or at the blockades. Avenues such as the discussion circles and workshops encouraged difficult conversations surrounding power, privilege and equality, where protestors could hear others' points of view and take the time to critically self-reflect.

In upholding both gender equality and environmental justice, the FOCS built a social movement that was focused on creating transformative change within society. As the FOCS stated in their newsletter, they were a grassroots organization that promoted a shift in consciousness of how individuals relate to the Earth. Valerie Langer commented that she wanted to create a culture where both women and nature were valued, as "you couldn't have an ecological society and have a sexist society" (Moore, 1996c, p. 33). In advocating for gender equality and recognition of the ways that both women and nature are oppressed, Langer argued that her role is about "empowering people … to get out of this cultural morass … which is embedded in a destructive ethic and the destruction of course being part of centuries of patriarchy" (Moore, 1996c, p. 33). Langer recognized the importance of challenging both men and women to recognize the uneven power relations, gender differences and inequalities that both humans and nature face, as well as generating modes of engagement that addressed the environmental crisis.

As Moore (2015) argues, returning to analyze ecofeminism at the peace camp allows for an opportunity to re-evaluate some of the major debates and criticisms surrounding ecofeminism. Catriona Sandilands maintains that previous feminist activism, such as the women's only peace camp in Greenham Common, are frequently read as "monolithically essentialist – and thus deeply problematic – because of a perceived attachment to discourses emphasizing women's inherent pacifism and/or greater propensity to care for the world" (2008, p. 305). However, it is clear that ecofeminism at Clayoquot did not occur through a separatist, women-only peace camp or maternalist politics. The discussion circles where men, women, and children were treated as equals demonstrates how Clayoquot Sound did not focus on exclusive identities surrounding who could be a "feminist" or "ecofeminist." As Sandilands argues, the fact that ecofeminist principles of respect and nonviolence were consciously invoked and that 'nature' was the primary topic of political conversation did not stem from or result in a predominantly essentialist politics (2008, p. 307). Even though conversations surrounding women and gender were prominent throughout the camp, Moore (2015) argues that reducing Clayoquot Sound to an essentialist politics would do a disservice to both activists and to the theory. Although topics surrounding gender and nature were prominent throughout the camp, discussions around essentialist beliefs were notably absent in the interviews that Niamh Moore (1996) conducted with protestors.[1] In the interviews, I did not find examples of participants who stated that women were the natural saviours of the planet or who promoted feminism as an identity politics for women only. However, these interviews cannot claim to tell the whole story of Clayoquot

[1] For more information regarding Moore's interviews, visit https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/abouttheproject.

or of those who were involved in the campaign in various ways. For example, Moore acknowledges that she did not interview anyone who identified as Indigenous or who was from the logging industry (2015, p. 33). Although essentialist notions were absent within the interviews Moore conducted, it is important to note that these interviews only capture a partial range of viewpoints and experiences of protestors at the peace camp. Furthermore, this is not to say that all charges of essentialism in ecofeminism are incorrect or that ecofeminism is never essentialist.

In examining such claims, it is important to return to specific cases to reflexively study ecofeminism. Similar to Moore's (2015) argument, Sandilands contends that ecofeminist analysis is at its most powerful when it questions the dynamics of gender and nature as they occur in in concrete and situated places and times (2008, p. 307). Accordingly, other scholars have examined ideas of gender essentialism more broadly within the environmental movement in B.C. Mark Stoddart and David Tindall (2010) investigate a potential essentialist linkage by examining how discourses of ecofeminism were taken up and interpreted by environmental activists in British Columbia during the 1990s. They conduct a qualitative analysis of the relationship between gender, feminism, and environmentalism through interviews with members and leaders of B.C. environmental organizations, including Western Canada Wilderness Committee, the BC chapter of the Sierra Club, and Greenpeace. Their results show that most interview participants adopted a pro-feminist standpoint, supporting equal access and equity for men and women. Stoddart and Tindall (2010) point out that it was not only female environmentalists who espoused a pro-feminist standpoint, but also a significant number of male participants, similar to the Clayoquot Sound movement. For example, a male

Sierra Club member explained why he agreed with ecofeminism: "In the sense that if men are raised in a culture in which they can treat other people, i.e. women, as objects; then it's quite natural that they would also think they can treat nature as an object. It's there for the purpose of exploitation and gratification" (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010, p. 84). Therefore, many respondents supported the notion that the subordination of women within patriarchal social structures is linked to the degradation of nature, whereby both women and nature were treated as objects. These findings are consistent with the notion that there is an affinity between feminism and environmentalism as values and political identities. Notably, very few participants spoke about a natural connection between women and nature (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010).

When analyzing Clayoquot Sound, I maintain that ecofeminist theory and praxis encouraged important conversations around the intersections between women and nature, while demonstrating that such conversations can occur without gender essentialism. Although the Clayoquot Sound protests did not specifically articulate gendered claims, I argue that ecofeminism guided the FOCS to create an alternative, non-hierarchal community that focused on both gender equality and environmental action. Ecofeminist principles of respect, consensus and non-violence were consciously invoked to direct the camp and campaign, and many women became involved and played a key role in the protests and future environmental activism. Although one cannot assume that the protestors involved at Clayoquot shared a singular ecofeminist vision, the Clayoquot camp did provide an opportunity for transformative learning for all participants through non-violence workshops and daily consensus discussion circles. For example, the FOCS committed to continuing conversations surrounding gender and power, even when

gendered concerns or frustrations arose. These activities challenged traditional hierarchical power relations and systems of dominance and subordination that many social movements experience (Moore, 2015, p. 126). Furthermore, experiences of overt political sexism and racism and solidarity with other women activists propelled women to develop understanding of the connections between environmental and feminist struggles. Overall**,** the FOCS' adoption of a code of non-violence and consensus decision making grounded the campaign in feminist principles while simultaneously refusing maternalistic and essentialist rhetoric. This case study illuminates how the implementation of ecofeminist principles encouraged important, powerful conversations surrounding the interconnected oppression of women and nature, which had lasting impacts upon many protestors.

Chapter Five: Conclusions from Clayoquot Sound

In this final chapter, I conclude my analysis of the Clayoquot Sound protests and offer some closing reflections on the future of ecofeminism. The first section of the chapter examines the forestry movement within B.C., including how the protests impacted forestry practices following 1993. I argue that ecofeminist scholars and activists should continue to promote the importance of integrating an environmental lens into feminist work, and vice versa. Such a perspective is more important now than ever, as the climate crisis and environmental degradation disproportionately affects women and other marginalized groups around the world. As seen during the Clayoquot Sound protests, ecofeminist principles can work to uphold a gendered perspective within environmental discourse, analysis and action, as well as promoting more radical, structural changes within society. In the second part of this chapter, I return to arguments surrounding ecofeminism, exploring Mallory Chaone's argument as to why the very term 'ecofeminism' is important, as opposed to feminist scholars who use more neutral terms such as 'gender and the environment.' As Mallory (2006) argues, the very histories and genealogies of ecofeminism are needed to recognize the contributions the theory has made, while the term 'ecofeminism' itself argues for a more inclusive feminism, or one that exposes the anthropocentrism of other feminisms. Overall, I argue that the ecofeminism, as an intersection between feminisms and environmentalisms, holds great promise as a theory and praxis for academics and activists.

B.C.'s Old-Growth Movement

Although the movement to protect the old-growth forests began in the 1980s, the movement peaked during the Clayoquot Sound protests, which became a defining period

in B.C. ecopolitics (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010). As the Clayoquot protests continued to grow throughout the summer of 1993, the B.C. government laboured to find a solution that would appease all sides of the conflict. In October 1993, the government created an independent advisory panel that would develop standards for logging in Clayoquot Sound, known as the Scientific Panel on Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound. The Panel's mandate was to "develop world-class standards for sustainable forest management by combining traditional and scientific knowledge" (Clayoquot Scientific Panel, 1995). The panel was accordingly comprised of scientists and elders of the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council, and in April 1995, concluded its final set of recommendations for forestry in Clayoquot Sound, advocating for an "ecosystem-based" approach to logging, where logging would not damage ecosystem health (Mabee & Hoberg, 2006, p. 879). The Scientific Panel attempted to provide areas for both protection and sustainable human use, recommending that each watershed or valley in Clayoquot Sound establish "reserves" that would be off-limits to logging. The recommendations also promoted the importance of First Nations values within forest management, such as protecting cultural sites and allowing the Nuu-chah-nulth to identify culturally significant areas before forestry planning occurred (Mabee & Hoberg, 2004, p. 231). The Nuu-chah-nulth also took steps to negotiate with MacMillan Bloedel, as the company was suffering from a negative reputation and huge financial losses following the protests. In 1998, the Nuu-chah-nulth purchased 50% of the region's logging rights and created Iisaak Forest Resources, an innovative First Nations led forestry company. Shortly after its creation, Iisaak signed a Memorandum of Understanding with a variety of environmental organizations in Clayoquot Sound, promising not to log in ecologically intact watersheds;

since then, Iisaak has only undertaken small-scale, sustainable logging in the area (Tindall & Robinson, 2017). Although much of the general public saw these changes as a solution to the “War in the Woods,” many environmental critics, including the Friends of Clayoquot Sound, argued that the recommendations did not go far enough as they did not provide permanent protections for the area (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010).

Following Clayoquot Sound, the movement to protect the old-growth forest in B.C. continued. Environmentalists’ focus shifted from Vancouver Island to the central coast of British Columbia, where organizations such as the Forest Action Network and Greenpeace mobilized and sought protection of the "Great Bear Rainforest," a 6.4-million-hectare forest that covers B.C.’s north and central coast (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010). Environmentalists initially adopted the same protest tactics of civil disobedience and direct action that had been successful at Clayoquot Sound. However, due to the logistical difficulty of transporting large numbers of people to this remote area, these tactics were replaced by a market-based conservation campaign that bypassed the provincial government and instead targeted corporate consumers of B.C. forest products. Although the final agreement protecting the Great Bear Rainforest was eventually signed in 2016, environmental organizations such as the Friends of Clayoquot Sound, Greenpeace, and the Ancient Forest Alliance continue work to protect the endangered old-growth forests throughout B.C. For example, these organizations lobby the government for legislation to permanently end logging of old-growth and advocate for community forestry agreements, or area-based licenses that are managed collaboratively by local governments and First Nations groups.

The old-growth movement in B.C. continues to be an important political, economic, and environmental issue. On September 11, 2020, the current NDP government in B.C. released their Old Growth Strategic Review report, announcing the protection of nine areas in B.C. totalling 353,00 hectares. However, the government did not implement permanent protections for the old-growth forests, instead announcing that development will be temporarily deferred in the nine areas for 36 months until a new old-growth strategy can be determined. Environmental groups such as the Endangered Ecosystems Alliance and Wilderness Committee argue that this deal still preserves the core of old growth logging industry, and that deferrals are not the same as permanent protection (Pawson, 2020). Additionally, environmental groups argue that logging companies continue to "talk and log" the old-growth forests during the development of the new strategy. Therefore, activists continue to exert efforts to protect B.C.'s intact watersheds and old-growth forests; for example, a pair of Nanaimo men held a two-week long hunger strike, calling on a moratorium on old-growth logging throughout B.C. In August 2020, a blockade formed around the Fairy Creek headwaters of southern Vancouver Island on Pacheedaht territory to protect the old-growth forest in the area, as well as demanding an end to all old-growth logging in the province. This blockade is on-going at the time of writing, and over 500 people have visited the blockade and donated to the ongoing movement, which is the longest direct-action campaign on Vancouver Island since Clayoquot Sound (Arbess, 2020).

Additionally, many of the prominent women who organized the Clayoquot Sound protests are now key actors in environmental organizations that mobilize against pipelines or work to combat climate change. For example, Tzeporah Berman, who was

labelled a “whacked out nature worshipper” by the B.C. government during the Clayoquot protests (1994, p. 6), launched her career as a famous environmental activist during the peace camp. Berman went on to campaign for Greenpeace and then co-founded ForestEthics, a group committed to pressuring businesses to reduce their impact on forests. For example, Berman was instrumental in getting the lingerie company Victoria’s Secret to stop printing millions of its catalogues on virgin pulp. In 2013, Berman was nominated for Climate Woman of the year by Responding to Climate Change, as well as one of the Top Women in Sustainability (Canada) by Corporate Knights. Berman has been called “Canada’s third most famous environmentalist, trailing … David Suzuki and Green Party leader Elizabeth May” (Sniderman, 2012, p. 22). Berman’s influential career as an environmentalist began during the Clayoquot Sound peace camp, and she has stated that her environmental activism was the outcome of a “tipping point” at Clayoquot Sound, where issues like clear-cut logging grew into a mainstream Canadian issue (Hamilton, 2013).

Key FOCS organizer Valerie Langer also continues to pursue environmental activism. Langer co-founded ForestEthics alongside Berman and played a lead developer role in the creation of the Great Bear Rainforest agreement. Twenty years after Clayoquot Sound, Langer reflected on the impacts of the protests: “Over a period of six months the region became an icon for environmental awakening. Clayoquot symbolized all that was wrong with industrial logging and was a touchstone for people’s hope for change. It shook the province, inspired people to action … Reaction to the 1993 Clayoquot decision transformed the local conflict into a movement with reverberations to this day” (Times Colonist, 2013). Langer continues to participate in this movement, as seen in 2014 when

she and four other former Clayoquot Sound protestors were arrested on Burnaby Mountain for protesting the Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. Although the pipeline protests were organized differently and fought against issues of climate change and carbon emissions rather than deforestation, the tactics and passion on Burnaby Mountain recall those of Clayoquot Sound (Keller, 2014). Women such as Tzeporah Berman and Valerie Langer therefore remain highly visible figures in the B.C. environmental movement who continue to exert a strong influence on the movements' priorities and strategies (Stoddart & Tindall, 2010). Accordingly, the Clayoquot Sound peace camp created and shaped a generation of strong, environmental women leaders who continue to promote ecological and social justice today.

Today's Climate Crisis

As within B.C., activists across Canada and globally continue to protest environmental degradation and the climate crisis, as seen through recent movements like the 2019 student climate strikes and Extinction Rebellion. While these movements are increasingly important, I maintain that conversations and activism surrounding the intersections between feminism and environmentalism must continue to be prioritized. Phillips and Rumens argue that a deployment of radical ideas, strategies and politics such as ecofeminism that reconnects humans and the environment is needed now more than ever (2016, p. 5). As mentioned in Chapter Three, environmental problems in most parts of the world fall on the poorest and most vulnerable people around the world (Cuomo, 2011). Climate change has caused increasing temperatures, rising sea levels, and more frequent and severe events such as heat waves, droughts and storms, which will unevenly impact women as compared to men. As ecofeminist Greta Gaard points out: "Make no

mistake: women are indeed the ones most severely affected by climate change and natural disasters, but their vulnerability is not innate; rather it is a result of inequities produced through gendered social roles, discrimination, and poverty" (2015, p. 23). As Gaard (2015) makes clear, women are not vulnerable due to biological traits, but rather through the systemic and structural barriers they face within society. For example, the feminization of poverty means that women usually make less money than men, and often have to shoulder the double burden of working and completing domestic roles such as cooking, cleaning, and caring for children, elders and the ill (Bell, 2016, p. 6). Poverty reduces the ability for of women to choose healthy working and living conditions, and female headed households are more likely to be found in polluted and environmentally degraded areas (Bell, 2016, p. 5). Additionally, the deepening economic vulnerability and environmental pressures caused by climate change makes women more vulnerable to all forms of violence, including domestic violence, sexual assault, forced prostitution, and child marriage (Shiva et al., 2014, xvi).

Further, women's voices, knowledge, and agency are often ignored in climate change policies, which tend to reflect the gendered power and privilege of male policymakers around the world (Nagel, 2012, p. 470). The dominant strategies for mitigation or adaption to climate change mainly focus on sectors such as energy, agriculture and transportation (Cutter-Mackenzie & Rousell, 2018). As a result, the social aspects of climate change, including human rights, climate justice, and gender equity are often ignored. For example, women's voices and needs remain largely absent from climate change policy reforms or in sustainability and climate change debates (Maleta, 2019). Despite the knowledge that women and other minority groups, including those

from Indigenous communities and marginalized communities, will be more vulnerable, these individuals and their needs are inadequately represented in decisions around environmental policies (Nagel, 2012). Yet as Terry (2009) maintains, there can be no climate justice without gender justice.

It is important to note that I am not constructing women and other groups solely as victims of environmental degradation; it is important not to revert to a discourse around vulnerability as this obscures women's agency, knowledge and resilience. Instead, gender must be analyzed within these structural, systemic barriers that impact both the environment and women's labour, knowledge and power (Gaard, 2015). Similarly, following an intersectional approach, all individuals will not experience environmental injustices in the same way and should not be depicted as homogenous groups. Social categories such race, ethnicity, ability, sexuality, indigeneity and age will further affect individual's work, roles, and overall well-being in relation to climate change (Williams, 2018).

I urge the importance of integrating feminist research and methodology into environmental research and policies. As Bell argues, women's organizations and gender academics have not taken a strong interest in environmental issues, just as environmentalists have not definitively taken up the issue of feminism or women's rights (2016, p. 4). Gaard (2011) argues that postmodern feminist works have been almost entirely anthropocentrically focused, as feminists have concentrated on human categories and failed to consider the environment, nature, and ecological concerns. Gaard further writes:

> It is this human-centered (anthropocentric) feminism that has come to dominate feminist thinking in the new millennium, effectively

> marginalizing feminism's relevance. The global crises of climate justice, food security, energy justice, vanishing wildlife, maldevelopment, habitat loss, industrial animal food production, and more have simultaneously social and ecological dimensions that require both ecological and feminist analyses. Ecofeminists have listened to their feminist, social ecologist, deep ecological and environmentalist critics—but have their critics been listening to ecofeminists? (2011, p. 32).

Transformative Changes

The intersections between feminism and environmentalism are more important now than ever, as ecofeminist theorists and practitioners can help challenge current orthodoxies that are cementing ecological, social and economic crises. Many ecofeminist theorists and practitioners believe that today's capitalist society reflects paternalistic, patriarchal and colonial values, which work to perpetuate both social inequality and environmental degradation. As Ariel Salleh observed almost twenty-five years ago, "The basic premise of ecofeminist political analysis is that ecological crisis is the inevitable effect of a Eurocentric capitalist patriarchal culture built on the domination of nature and the domination of Women 'as nature'" (1997, p. 12). This analysis is still relevant today, and as Mary Phillips suggests, a lack of meaningful response to ecological degradation and climate change is inevitable "within a capitalist system … that views the planet as a means to achieve economic ends" (2019, p. 1151). Current systems and orthodoxies privilege and facilitate the self-interest of humans who regard nature as a resource to be consumed, which has led to the degradation of the planet and continues to threaten all life (Phillips & Rumens, 2016). Shiva et al. (2014) argue that although capitalism has presented itself as the only viable economic order, this is a powerful myth that presents the current model as natural so it can continue without question. Accordingly, ecofeminism works to examine and challenge today's sociopolitical and economic

structures while suggesting a different, more holistic approach of interacting with the natural world (Weiss & Moskop, 2020).

I argue that returning to analyze ecofeminism within Clayoquot Sound demonstrates how principles of ecofeminism can be used to address and disrupt such dominant power relations within society (Gaard, 2011). For example, the Friends of Clayoquot Sound specifically designed the peace camp to remove traditional hierarchal leadership characteristics. In challenging the traditional concept of power, the FOCS ensured they created a power they shared *with* protestors, rather than having power *over* them (Berman, 1994, p. 5). This alterative form of organizing demonstrates the possibility of direct and participatory democracy, while rejecting principles of imposed authority, hierarchy, and oppressive leadership structures that are common within today's capitalist society. Moreover, ecofeminist principles work to uphold a gendered perspective within environmental discourse, analysis and action. During Clayoquot Sound, the FOCS looked to challenge the traditional formal and informal structures in society which often limit women's voices and participation. Accordingly, the FOCS promoted a consensus decision making model, women had equal and meaningful participation as actors, decision-makers and leaders. Although there were many gendered challenges and concerns within the movement, the FOCS encouraged these difficult conversations surrounding gender and the structure of power and privilege to allow for different perspectives and points of views to be heard and digested. Even more importantly, issues of gender were not siloed or pushed aside as merely 'women's issues,' which can often occur in mixed-gender social movements. Although integrating gender equality within social justice issues can require huge amounts of energy and

perseverance, ecofeminist tenets can provide the resources and strategies to challenge the dominant ideologies within society which oppress both women, nature, and other marginalized groups within society. As seen throughout the Clayoquot Sound peace camp, ecofeminist theorists and practitioners can implement measures such as non-hierarchal leadership structures and consensus processes to promote gender and ecological equality and challenge society's current neoliberal, capitalist orthodoxies.

Furthermore, ecofeminists advocate for an ecologically sustainable, holistic ideology that values both humans and the more than-human world. While a critique of capitalism is necessary, it is not sufficient to address the current crisis; in order to prevent ecological destruction, ecofeminist activists and scholars believe it is necessary to change the relationship between humanity and nature to one that is ecologically responsive and interconnected (Hunnicutt, 2019). As Bell (2020) argues, ecofeminism advocates for an ethic surrounding care, responsibility, and justice for both the human and more-than-human world. To support such a radical structural and institutional change, Bell (2020) contends that there must be a transformation in the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours of individuals. To facilitate this change in individuals' beliefs and behaviours, the FOCS created an alternative community at Clayoquot Sound, where participants who arrived to protest deforestation had to abide by a set of ecofeminist principles around non-violence, consensus, and equality that formed the foundation of the community and the context within which individuals protested. As seen within the "Welcome Handout," the peace camp was created to be a free, safe space where individuals could explore how sexist, racist and homophobic forms of oppression were connected to the same forces that work to destroy the environment. Additionally, the goal of the Clayoquot Sound movement

was not to simply halt MacMillan Bloedel from logging trees in the specific area of Clayoquot Sound. Instead, the FOCS looked to change the very conditions under which the protestors and society thought about clear-cutting and harvesting (Moore, 1996b, p. 11). As stated in their newsletter, the FOCS wanted to create a radical transformation and shift of consciousness in the way that humans relate to the Earth (Clayoquot Sound, 1993). The Clayoquot Sound movement was therefore a political attempt to achieve long lasting political, social, and ecological change. Accordingly, the ecofeminist values and principles promoted by the FOCS throughout the camp influenced protestors and created a transformative experience for many individuals. As Phillips argues, such "transformational spaces" can help highlight the importance of reflexive self-awareness and empathetic identification to build institutional and social structures that seek social and ecological change (2019, p. 1160). For many protestors, Clayoquot Sound was a transformative space that launched their desire to fight for change, including environmental leaders such as Tzeporah Berman and Valerie Langer who continue to be active within the environmental movement. The field of ecofeminism therefore offers a gendered, ecologically informed perspective around the unjustified domination of women, animals and nature (Sandilands, 2008). For those looking to create a world where humans and the more-than-human world are considered equal, ecofeminism advances important conversations and action around caring for the environment and community.

Although ecofeminism raises critical questions surrounding the interconnected oppression of women and nature, it is also important to acknowledge that portions of ecofeminism have rightfully been dismissed due to charges of gender essentialism and

cultural appropriation. I stress the necessity to be reflexive and self-critical surrounding the association between ‘women’ and ‘nature’, which can at times be romantic and essentializing. Additionally, in order to develop a deeper analysis, understanding, and commitment of ecofeminism, the previously discounted voices, perspectives, and knowledge of women, Indigenous peoples, and other marginalized communities must be upheld. Although the FOCS failed to acknowledge the Nuu-chah-nulth as the traditional custodians and owners of the land, I urge ecofeminist scholars and practitioners today to ensure that ecofeminism is shaped by and in alliance with Indigenous groups. In practicing an intersectional approach and recognizing Indigenous sovereignty, ecofeminists theorists and practitioners must work in partnership with Indigenous peoples and uphold and recognize Indigenous laws, values, customs, and traditions.

As Weiss and Moskop (2020) argue, it is important to continue to bring feminist political theories and voices into the study of environmental topics. Although this thesis is mainly targeted towards a feminist theoretical audience, well as engaging briefly with activism and social movement scholarship, I urge further research regarding how ecofeminism can be utilized more fully within environmental research and activism. As Weiss and Moskop argue, both environmental and feminist movements can expand “based on the knowledge of the other, and create something new in their synergy, where each becomes incomplete and even unimaginable without the other” (2020, p. 11). Ecofeminism does not offer an all-encompassing solution towards solving environmental degradation, but instead offers a systematic attempt to bring together the necessary threads involving gender and nature. Ecofeminists will have much to contribute to both scholarly and activist works by implementing an intersectional approach and recognizing

how racism, classism, colonialism, and other oppressions impact and shape the domination and subordination of both women and the environment. As a diverse, multi-issue field, ecofeminism continues to raise important questions and conversations surrounding the intersections of feminism and environmentalism by offering a range of radical ideas, activism and politics to reconnect humans to the environment and to challenge the current extractive ideologies that oppress both nature and marginalized groups (Phillips & Rumens, 2016, p. 5).

Returning to Ecofeminism

Not only does the peace camp remain an important empirical case study to examine the principles of ecofeminism, but Clayoquot Sound also remains a productive place to revisit the ongoing challenges in ecofeminism around the place of gender essentialism (Moore, 2015). Critics claim that ecofeminism promotes gender essentialism through the belief that women are inherently closer to nature due to their roles as child-bearers and child-rearers, thereby appointing them the natural carers and saviours of the planet (Mallory, 2018, p. 13). As Sandilands notes, many feminists today remain uncomfortable with ecofeminism, as they find it difficult to imagine how one can practice a distinctly feminist environmental politics without resorting to essentialist understandings of women's 'special' relationship to the environment (2008, p. 305). This calls into question how many critics have unfairly labelled and dismissed ecofeminism, therefore limiting the theoretical and political potential of the field. Although earlier branches of ecofeminism, such as cultural feminism, gave a positive value to the feminine and natural values, other branches of ecofeminism have since undergone a swift and thorough revisioning. There are many ecofeminist theorists and practitioners,

including Moore (2008, 2015), Sandilands (2008), Gaard (2011, 2015, 2017), Mallory (2006, 2018), and more who are productively challenging assumptions surrounding essentialism, and working to convey the potential of integrating a feminist analysis into environmental work, and vice versa.

As Moore (2015) contends, one of the ecofeminism's biggest flaws is not surrounding gender essentialism, but rather the theory's untimeliness. Although ecofeminism emerged around the 1970s, it is more commonly located in the 1980s and 1990s. By this time, feminism as a whole had evolved into a more sophisticated, progressive version where the naivete and essentialism of the 1970s had been removed (Moore, 2015, p. 219). Yet in the 1980s and 1990s, ecofeminism brought up the question of women and nature at a time when feminism was focused on rejecting the biological determinism of women. Moore argues that ecofeminists' insistence on re-opening supposedly closed questions around women and nature posed a threat to the progressive narrative of feminism (2015, p. 220). Therefore, feminists were quick to label ecofeminism as essentialist and dismiss it altogether. Although there are certainly elements of ecofeminism that need to be left in the past, I argue that ecofeminist activists and scholars should continue to raise important questions and push for change surrounding the intersections between feminism and environmentalism. As Greta Gaard states: "Despite the fact that our eco-feminist foremothers may have been entrenched in essentialist ideology in their formulations, we believe their questions were the right ones. What can feminist thinking offer in response to the many global crises we face today including massive development, deforestation, animal torture, extinction, habitat loss, pollution, and global warming?" (2011, p. 46). As Gaard mentions, although earlier

ecofeminists may have drawn on essentialist notions of women, they were critically examining and asking the right questions. A robust, critical ecofeminism is needed to encourage the integration of feminism into environmentalism and vice versa, especially in light of the current environmental crisis.

Many recent scholars use terms such as 'environmental feminism' or 'gender and the environment' to apply feminist understandings to environmental issues without mentioning the term ecofeminism. However, Mallory (2018) argues that the histories and genealogies of ecofeminism are important in recognizing the contributions the theory has made to the development of feminism, including the connections between violence against women, the earth and animals. As Gaard argues: "As a community of radical scholars and eco-justice activists, what have we lost by jettisoning these earlier feminist and ecofeminist bodies of knowledge?" (2011, p. 27). Additionally, rather than using more neutral terms such as 'gender and the environment,' Mallory (2018) contends that the very term 'ecofeminism' is important, as it allows individuals to connect feminism and environmentalism where neither term is subordinate to the other. Mallory (2018) further defends the critical force of the term "eco*feminism,*" because men, women, and transgendered persons are not situated equally in terms of environmental oppression. Similarly, she advocates for the political force of the "*eco*feminism," as it insists on a more inclusive feminism, or one that exposes the anthropocentrism of other feminisms (2018, p. 27). Modern feminism has focused primarily on human categories with little concern for the environment. Gaard maintains that humans have historically set themselves above nature, maintaining an "ecological superiority of humans," and feminism has continued to ignore the connection between women and nature (2011, p.

32). Yet it is imperative to focus on the interconnectedness of all humans and nature in order to enact gender, racial, and inter-species justice. Therefore, rather than using more neutral terminology such as 'gender and the environment,' the term ecofeminism is important, as it works to promote the critical and political force of the theory and expose the anthropocentrism of other feminisms.

I agree with scholars such as Mallory, Gaard and Sandilands who maintain that the move to rename the theory is unnecessary. Karen Warren compares ecofeminism to the process of quilting, as the appearance of ecofeminism is constantly evolving (2000, p. 67). The patches of the 'ecofeminism quilt' are created by the diversity of perspectives and multitude of opinions that the theory encompasses. Charges of gender essentialism that were leveled at cultural ecofeminism have continued to haunt the entire body of ecofeminist theory, and as a result, many ecofeminists spend their time defending their work, leaving little energy for articulating and working through alternative accounts of women and nature (Moore, 2015). Some ecofeminists vocally insist that their work is anti-essentialist, yet this insistence does not mean they will gain "a place at the feminist table" (Moore, 2015, p. 31). Emphatic anti-essentialism can instead shut down productive feminist debate and discussion, and as Hemmings argues, essentialism is not a problem that can be resolved once and for all (2005, p. 130). Renaming the discipline or insisting on anti-essentialism will not allow these scholars to escape questions of essentialism. Instead, it is important to address the historical nature and continuing narrative of essentialism within feminism and encourage ecofeminism to be a site of ongoing reflexivity over topics of 'women' and 'nature' (Mallory, 2018, p. 23). Discussions

around ecofeminism must continue, especially as the intersections between feminism and environmentalism have become increasingly relevant in today's world.

As Gaard argues, ecofeminism is a movement for justice, and at its heart is the centrality of praxis, or the necessary linkage of intellectual, political, and activist work (2017, p. 115). Ecofeminism has never solely been concerned with theory; ecofeminist theories extend into theoretical and philosophical discourse, but they are also linked to action and forms of activism, insisting on the need for solidarity and coalition-building to create progressive environmental change and gender equality. As such, activism should be central to, not separate from, ecofeminist theorization. According to Morrow, the ability to incorporate such divergent approaches makes ecofeminism "fertile ground for the combination of macro and micro concerns that are required to address climate change" (2017, p. 400). Although feelings of inequality surrounding privilege can persist between activists and academics, Mallory argues that academic work is "integral to creating the ethical-epistemological shift needed to transform today's ecologically-destructive, capitalist, patriarchal society, but only if done self-reflexively and in dialogue with the worlds of activism" (2006, p. 34). Academics have the potential to contribute to eco-activist work and to incorporate ecofeminism as a developing social theory into a discourse that helps both activists and intellectual leadership bring about much-needed social change. As Patricia Hill Collins argues, social theories such as ecofeminism do not simply study oppressions such as racism, heteropatriarchy or classism, hoping to mitigate the damage done by such systems by producing "ever more eloquent analyses of oppression" (2019, p. 290). Instead, Hill Collin (2019) maintains that the most meaningful social theories work to change these systems of oppression, whether it is

through ideas and arguments or through political action. As Phillips and Rumens argue, the rich diversity of ecofeminist thinking can be used to traverse disciplines and geopolitical locations, and to address a broad catalogue of contemporary concerns, including animal rights and activism; community-based, participative research; colonializing, majority world development; and the management of nature and the ways in which the natural world and its degradation are represented in popular culture (2016, p. 18). Ecofeminism is therefore a linkage of intellectual, political, and activist work, which can challenge both women and men to generate modes of engagement that address the current environmental crisis, as well as recognizing the uneven power relations, gender differences and inequalities that both humans and nature face.

Overall, my work offers insights into the potential of ecofeminism, as viewed throughout the 1993 Clayoquot Sound protests. The intersections between feminism and environmentalism are more important now than ever in light of today's climate crisis, and ecofeminists continue to advocate for the necessity of integrating an environmental lens into feminist work, and vice versa. As seen throughout the Clayoquot Sound peace camp, the FOCS implemented ecofeminist principles to promote gender equality, processes of consensus and nonviolence, and non-hierarchal leadership structures. Moreover, discussions around ecofeminism allowed protestors to critically think about how gender inequality and environmental degradation are connected and should be addressed in the same system of oppression and privilege. Accordingly, ecofeminists should continue to raise important questions surrounding the intersections between feminism and environmentalism, while simultaneously challenging assumptions of essentialism in the field. Principles of ecofeminism can therefore work to address and disrupt dominant

power relations within today's patriarchal society, while advocating for a holistic, transformative change to reconnect humans to the environment (Gaard, 2011). Overall, a contemporary, intersectional ecofeminist approach could work to address issues of environmental and social justice in such a way that people can recognize common cause across boundaries of race, class, gender, sexuality, species, age, ability, and nation, thereby creating a basis for engaged theory, education and activism in today's increasingly unequal, capitalist society.

References

Agarwal, B. (1992). The gender and environment debate: Lessons from India. *Feminist Studies, 18*(1), 119-158.

Agarwal, B. (2001). A challenge for ecofeminism: Gender, greening and community forestry in India. *Women & Environments International 52/53,* 12–15.

Arbess, B. (2020, November). Fairy Creek blockades. Retrieved from https://www.focusonvictoria.ca/forests/32/.

Bahu, M. (2011). Women's movements, representation and civil society. In S. Weldon, (Eds.), *When protest makes policy: how social movements represent disadvantaged groups* (pp. 129-148). University of Michigan Press.

Banerjee, D., & Bell, M. (2007). Ecogender: Locating gender in environmental social science. *Society & Natural Resources, 20*(1), 3-19.

Barman, J. (2007). *The West beyond the West: A history of British Columbia* (3rd ed.). University of Toronto Press.

Batliwala, S. (2012). Changing their world: Concepts and practices of women's movements. *Association for Women's Rights in Development*, 1-87.

Bell, K. (2016). Bread and roses: A gender perspective on environmental justice and public health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(10), 1- 18.

Bell, K. (2020). Working-class environmentalism: An agenda for a just and fair transition to sustainability. Springer International Publishing.

Berman, T. (1994). Takin' it back. In T. Berman, G.B. Ingram, M. Gibbons, R.B. Hatch, L. Maingon, & C. Hatch (Eds.), *Clayoquot & dissent* (pp. 1-7). Ronsdale Press/Cacanadadada.

Bhattacharjya, M., Birchall, J., Caro, P., Kelleher, D., & Sahasranaman, V. (2013). Why gender matters in activism: Feminism and social justice movements. *Gender & Development, 21*(2), 277–293.

Braun, B. (2002). *The intemperate rainforest: Nature, culture, and power on Canada's West Coast.* University of Minnesota Press.

Brown, W. (1986.) Roots: Black ghetto ecology. In L. Caldecott & S. Leland (Eds.), *Reclaim the Earth: Women speak out for life on Earth* (pp. 73–85). Women's Press.

Butler, J. (1989). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. Routledge.

Butler, J., & Scott, J. (1992). *Feminists theorize the political.* Routledge.

Carlassare, E. (1999). Socialist and cultural ecofeminism: Allies in resistance. *Ethics and the Environment, 5*(1), 89-106.

Cashore, B. (2001). *In search of sustainability: British Columbia forest policy in the 1990s*. UBC Press.

Clayoquot Sound – On the brink of preservation! (1993, April). *Friends of Clayoquot Sound Newsletter,* 1-6.

Clapperton, J. (2019). Environmental activism as anticonquest: The Nuu-chah-nulth and environmentalists in the contact zone of Clayoquot Sound. In J. Clapperton & L. Piper (Eds.), *Environmental activism on the ground: small green and Indigenous organizing* (pp. 181-205). University of Calgary Press.

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829-859.

Coté, C. (2019). hishuk'ish tsawalk—Everything is one. Revitalizing place-based Indigenous food systems through the enactment of food sovereignty. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 37-48.

Cudworth, E. (2005). *Developing ecofeminist theory: The complexity of difference*. Ebsco Publishing.

Cullen, P., & Murphy, M. (2017). Gendered mobilizations against austerity in Ireland. *Gender, Work and Organization, 24*(1), 83–97.

Cuomo, C. (2011). Climate change, vulnerability, and responsibility. *Hypatia, 26*(4), 690-714.

Curnow, J., & Helferty, A. (2018). Contradictions of solidarity: Whiteness, settler coloniality, and the mainstream environmental movement. *Environment and Society*, *9*(1), 145–163.

Cutter-Mackenzie, A. & Rousell, D. (2018). Education for what? Shaping the field of climate change education with children and young people as co-researchers. *Children's Geographies,* 1-15.

Daly, M. (1978). *Gyn/Ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism*. Beacon Press.

Dauvergne, P. & Lister, J. (2010). The prospects and limits of eco-consumerism: shopping our way to less deforestation? *Organization & Environment, 23*(3), 132-154.

Dauvergne, P. & LeBaron, G. (2014). *Protest Inc.: The corporatization of activism*. Polity Press.

D'Eaubonne, F. (1974). *Le feminism ou la mort* [*Feminism or death*]. Pierre Horay.

Djoudi, H., Locatelli, B., Vaast, C., Asher, K., Brockhaus, M., & Basnett Sijapati, B. (2016). Beyond dichotomies: Gender and intersecting inequalities in climate change studies. *Ambio, 45*(S3), 248-262.

Dzubinski, L., & Diehl, A. (2018). The problem of gender essentialism and its implications for women in leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 12*(1), 56-61.

Eaton, H., & Lorentzen, L. (2003). *Ecofeminism and globalization: Exploring culture, context, and religion.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Eaton, H. (2004). A vision of transformation: Ecofeminist spiritualities in Canada. In M. Hessing, R. Raglon, & C. Sandilands (Eds.), *This elusive land: Women and the Canadian environment* (pp. 300-315). UBC Press.

Erickson, B. (2018). Anthropocene futures: Linking colonialism and environmentalism in an age of crisis. Environment and Planning: Society & Space, 38(1), 111-128.

Estévez-Saá, M., & Lorenzo-Modia, M. (2018). The ethics and aesthetics of eco-caring: Contemporary debates on ecofeminism(s). *Women's Studies, 47*(2), 123-146.

Fairy Creek Blockades. (2021). Code of conduct. Retrieved from https://www.fairycreekblockade.com/code-of-conduct.

Gaard, G. (1993). *Ecofeminism: Women, animals, nature.* Temple University Press.

Gaard, G. (2011). Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting essentialism and re-placing species in a material feminist environmentalism. *Feminist Formations, 23*(2), 26–53.

Gaard, G. (2015). Ecofeminism and climate change. *Women's Studies International Forum, 49*. 20-33.

Gaard, G. (2017). Posthumanism, ecofeminism, and inter-species relations. In S. MacGregor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of gender and environment* (pp. 115-129). Routledge.

Graeber, D. (2011). "On playing by the rules: The strange success of #OccupyWallStreet." *Open Democracy.*

Griffin, S. (1978). *Women and nature.* Harper & Row.

Hamilton, G. (2013). UBC bestows doctorate on 'whacked-out nature worshipper' Tzeporah Berman. *Vancouver Sun.*

Harrison, K. (1996). *Passing the buck: Federalism and Canadian environmental policy*. UBC Press.

Harter, J.H. (2005). Environmental justice for whom? Class, new social movements, and the environment: A case study of Greenpeace Canada, 1971-2000. *Environmental History, 10*(2), 83-119.

Heilmann, A. (2011). Gender and essentialism: Feminist debates in the twenty-first century. *Critical Quarterly, 53*(4), 78-89.

Hemmings, C. (2005). Telling feminist stories. *Feminist Theory, 6*(2), 115-139.

Hill Collins, P. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hunnicutt, G. (2019). *Gender violence in ecofeminist perspective: Intersections of animal oppression, patriarchy and domination of the earth*. Routledge.

Hurwitz, H. & Crossley, A. (2019). Gender and social movements. In D. Snow, S. Soule, H. Kriesi & H. McCammon (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 537-552). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Ingram, G.B. (1994). The ecology of a conflict. In T. Berman, G.B. Ingram, M. Gibbons, R.B. Hatch, L. Maingon, & C. Hatch (Eds.), *Clayoquot & dissent* (pp. 9-71). Ronsdale Press/Cacanadadada.

Kamieniecki, S. (2000). Testing alternative theories of agenda setting: Forest policy change in British Columbia, Canada. *Policy Studies Journal, 28*(1), 176-189.

Kao, G. (2010). The universal versus the particular in ecofeminist ethics. *The Journal of Religious Ethics, 38*(4), 616-637.

Keller, J. (2014, November 26). Kinder Morgan protest joined by Clayoquot Sound activists. *Huffpost.* https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2014/11/26/kinder-morgan-protest-clayoquot-sound_n_6227114.html

Kelly, P. (1989). Foreword: Linking arms, dear sisters, bring hope! In J. Plant (Eds.), *Healing the wounds: The promise of ecofeminism* (pp. ix-xi). New Society Publishers.

Kings, A. (2017). Intersectionality and the changing face of ecofeminism. *Ethics and the Environment, 22*(1), 63-87.

Krawczyk, B. (1996). *Clayoquot: The sound of my heart*. Orca Book Publishers.

Kuehls, T. (2003). The environment of sovereignty. In W. Magnusson & K. Shaw (Eds.) *A political space: Reading the global through Clayoquot Sound* (pp. 179-197). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Li, H. (1993). A cross-cultural critique of feminism. In G. Gaard (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals, nature* (pp. 272–294). Temple University Press.

Levy, J. (2008). Case studies: Types, designs, and logics of inference. *Conflict Management and Peace Science, 25*, 1–18.

Mabee, H.S & Hoberg, G. (2004). Protecting culturally significant areas through watershed planning in Clayoquot Sound. *The Forestry Chronicle 80*(2), 229-240.

Mabee, H.S & Hoberg, G. (2006). Equal partners? Assessing comanagement of forest resources in Clayoquot Sound. *Society and Natural Resources, 19*(10), 875-888.

MacDonald, F. (2017). Knocking down walls in political science: In defence of an expansionist feminist agenda. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 50*(2), 411-426.

MacGregor, S. (2001). Fury for the Sound: The women at Clayoquot. *Women & Environments International Magazine, 52,* 49.

MacGregor, S. (2006). *Beyond mothering earth: Ecological citizenship and the politics of care.* UBC Press.

MacGregor, S. (2010). Earthcare or feminist ecological citizenship? *Femina Politica,* 22-31.

Magnusson, W. (2003). Introduction: The puzzle of the political. In W. Magnusson & K. Shaw (Eds.) *A political space: Reading the global through Clayoquot Sound* (pp. 1-21). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Maleta, Y. (2019). *Feminism, republicanism, egalitarianism, environmentalism: Bill of rights and gendered sustainable initiatives*. Routledge.

Mallory, C. (2006). Ecofeminism and forest defense in Cascadia: Gender, theory and radical activism. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism, 17*(1), 32-49.

Mallory, C. (2018). "What's in a name? In defense of ecofeminism (not ecological feminisms, feminist ecology, or gender and the environment): Or 'why ecofeminism need not be ecofeminine—but so what if it is?'" *Ethics & the Environment* 23(2): 11–35.

Mann, B. (2006). *Women's liberation and the sublime: Feminism, postmodernism, environment.* Oxford University Press.

May, E. (2006). *How to save the world in your spare time*. Key Porter Books.

McLaren, J. (1994). *Spirits rising: The story of the Clayoquot peace camp, 1993.* Pacific Edge.

Merchant, C. (1980). *The death of nature: Women, ecology, and the scientific revolution* (1st ed.). Harper & Row.

Merchant, C. (2005). *Radical ecology: The search for a livable world* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Merk, S. (2008). Love song to Clayoquot Sound. In C. Lowther & A. Sinner (Eds.), *Writing the West Coast: In love with place* (pp. 91-98). Ronsdale Press.

Mertl, S. (1998, January). BC history bound up with MacMillan Bloedel. *Canadian Press NewsWire.*

Ministry of Forests. (1994). Economics and trade annual report. *British Columbia's Ministry of Forests.* Retrieved from https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/pubs/docs/mr/annual/ar_1993-94/ann5.htm.

Moore, N. (1996a, July 3). *Oral history interview with Atty Gell* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/41.

Moore, N. (1996b, July 10). *Oral history interview with Jean McLaren* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/50.

Moore, N. (1996c, August 14). *Oral history interview with Valerie Langer* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/46.

Moore, N. (1996d, September 6). *Oral history interview with Mike Morell* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/51.

Moore, N. (1996e, September 7). *Oral history interview with Miriam Leigh* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/47.

Moore, N. (1996f, September 23). *Oral history interview with Jay Hamburger* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/42.

Moore, N. (1996g, September 27). *Oral history interview with Jan Bate* [Interview]. Clayoquot Lives: An Ecofeminist Story Web. https://clayoquotlives.sps.ed.ac.uk/items/show/35.

Moore, N. (2008). Eco/Feminism, non-violence and the future of feminism. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *10*(3), 282–298.

Moore, N. (2015). *The changing nature of eco/feminism telling stories from Clayoquot Sound*. UBC Press.

Morrow, K. (2017). Changing the climate of participation. In S. MacGregor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of gender and environment* (pp. 398–411). Routledge.

Nagel, J. (2012). Intersecting identities and global climate change. *Identities*, *19*(4), 467–476.

Phillips, M. (2019). "Daring to care": Challenging corporate environmentalism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 156*(4), 1151-1164.

Phillips, M., & Rumens, N. (2016). *Contemporary perspectives on ecofeminism*. Routledge.

Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. Routledge.

Plumwood, V. (2002). *Environmental culture: The ecological crisis of reason.* Routledge.

Salleh, A. (1995). Nature, woman, labor, capital: Living the deepest contradiction. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism, 6*(1), 21-39.

Salleh, A. (1997). *Ecofeminism as politics: Nature, Marx, and the postmodern*. Zed Books.

Salleh, A. (2019). Ecofeminist sociology as a new class analysis. In K. Dorre & B. Aulenbacher (Eds.) *Global Dialogue, International Sociological Association Newsletter, 9*(1).

Sandler, R., & Pezzullo, P. C. (2007). *Environmental justice and environmentalism: The social justice challenge to the environmental movement.* MIT Press.

Sandilands, C. (1999). *The good-natured feminist: Ecofeminism and the quest for democracy*. University of Minnesota Press.

Sandilands, C. (2008). Eco/Feminism on the edge. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *10*(3), 305–313.

Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound. (1995). *Sustainable ecosystem management in Clayoquot Sound: Planning and practices.* https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/library/documents/bib12571.pdf.

Shaw, K. (2003). Encountering Clayoquot, reading the political. In W. Magnusson & K. Shaw (Eds.) *A political space: Reading the global through Clayoquot Sound* (pp. 25-66). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Shiva, V., Mies, M., & Salleh, A. (2014). *Ecofeminism* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

Sniderman, A. S. (2012). Powered down: B.C. environmental iconoclast Tzeporah Berman's last Canadian project could have changed Canada's climate politics, say many top activists. So why did it flop? *This (Toronto), 45*(5), 22.

Stoddart, M., & Tindall, D. (2010). Feminism and environmentalism: Perspectives on gender in the BC environmental movement during the 1990s. *BC Studies, 165*, 75-100.

Stoddart, M., & Tindall, D. (2011). Ecofeminism, hegemonic masculinity, and environmental movement participation in British Columbia, Canada, 1998–2007: "Women always clean up the mess". *Sociological Spectrum, 31*(3), 342-368.

Sturgeon, N. (1997). *Ecofeminist natures: Race, gender, feminist theory, and political action*. Routledge.

Taylor, V. (1996). *Rock-a-bye baby: Feminist, self-help, and postpartum depression.* Routledge.

Taylor, V. (1999). Gender and social movements: Gender processes in women's self-help movements. *Gender and Society*, *13*(1), 8–33.

Taylor, V., & Hurwitz, H. (2018). Women occupying Wall Street. In H. McCammon & L.A. Banaszak (Eds.), *100 years of the nineteenth amendment: An appraisal of women's political activism* (pp. 334-355). Oxford University Press.

Terry, G. (2009). No climate justice without gender justice: An overview of the issues. *Gender & Development, 17*(1), 5–18.

Times Colonist. (2013). Comment: 1993's Clayoquot summer was a game-changer. Retrieved from https://www.timescolonist.com/opinion/op-ed/comment-1993-s-clayoquot-summer-was-a-game-changer-1.109649

Tindall, D. & Robinson, J. (2017). Collective action to save the ancient temperate rainforest: Social networks and environmental activism in Clayoquot Sound. *Ecology and Society 22(*1), 40-54.

Walter, E. (2003). From civil disobedience to obedient consumerism? Influences of market-based activism and eco-certification on forest governance. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 41*(2/3), 532-565.

Walter, P. (2007). Adult learning in new social movements: Environmental protest and the struggle for the Clayoquot Sound rainforest. *Adult Education Quarterly, 57*(3), 248–263.

Warren, K. (2000). *Ecofeminist philosophy: A Western perspective on what it is and why it matters*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Weiss, P., & Moskop, W. (2020). Ecofeminist manifestos: Resources for feminist perspectives on the environment. *Women's Studies International Forum, 83*, 1-11.

Williams, L. (2018). Climate change, colonialism, and women's well-being in Canada: What is to be done? *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 109*(2), 268–271.

Wilson, J. (1998). *Talk and log: Wilderness politics in British Columbia, 1965-96*. UBC Press.

Wilson, K. (2005) Ecofeminism and First Nations peoples in Canada: Linking culture, gender and nature. *Gender, Place & Culture, 12*(3), 333-355.

Wine, S. (1998). *Fury for the Sound: The women at Clayoquot*. Canada: Tell Tale Productions.