

Toward a New (Eco)Feminist Future:
Mainstreaming Nonhuman Animals in Feminist Studies

By

priya kumar, B.Soc.Sc.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Women's and Gender Studies

Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario

© 2017
priya kumar

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Speciesism is a feminist issue	5
1.1 Women’s movements	5
1.2 Women’s studies: From streets to classrooms.....	8
1.3 Institutionalization of women’s studies.....	10
1.4 Developments in ‘Western’ feminist scholarship.....	12
1.5 Ecofeminism.....	16
1.6 Looking back, looking forward: The ‘animal’ question	23
1.7 Conclusion.....	35
Chapter Two: Methodological considerations	38
2.1 Researcher’s positionality.....	38
2.2 Conceptual framework	41
2.3 Research design	42
2.4 Introductory courses	43
2.5 Data collection: Syllabi	44
2.6 Data analysis: Syllabi	45
2.7 Data collection: Survey	46
Chapter Three: Findings	48
3.1 Syllabi review: Course components	48
3.2 Course syllabi: Findings	51
3.3 Survey findings.....	56
3.4 Discussion.....	64
3.5 Toward a new (eco)feminist pedagogy	73
3.6 Implications of findings.....	74
3.7 Limitations and further research.....	74
3.8 Conclusion.....	76
Appendix A: Observation table	85
Appendix B: Survey online consent form	86
Appendix C: Survey questions	88
Appendix D: Authors and texts	90
Appendix E: Films	92
References	95

Abstract

This thesis proposes a new direction for foundational feminist pedagogy, with the express purpose of mainstreaming a consideration of nonhuman animals in foundational feminist studies pedagogy. Ecofeminists have effectively situated speciesism – the systematic discrimination against nonhuman animals based on a belief in human superiority over all else – as a structural oppression, one that intersects with other forms of oppression such as racism and sexism. However, this is not reflected in the introductory course which is a crucial pedagogical site. Findings from a document review of forty-five introductory courses and a survey of instructors that have recently taught such courses suggest that feminist studies, in Canada, is human-centered, producing incomplete analyses of intersectionality and oppression which will lead to incomplete strategies for change. This thesis presents a vision for a new feminist future with the hope that it will expand the scope of feminist pedagogy, broadening our understanding of oppression, and lead to comprehensive strategies for change.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of my family and their unwavering conviction in my aspirations. I am grateful to Dr. Irena Knezevic who has supervised this thesis for her invaluable support and advice, for always being available for a ‘chat’, and, above all, for believing in my vision. I am also grateful to Dr. Amrita Hari who has co-supervised this thesis for her invaluable support and encouragement. I am especially thankful to my supervisors for pushing me to think beyond what I had thought I was capable of.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Grace Adeniyi Ogunyankin for her valuable advice, raising important questions, and the opportunities to present my work in her undergraduate courses.

These two years of being a full-time graduate student would not have been possible without the support of my partner and the loves of our lives, Chloé and Luna.

Introduction

What's feminism got to do with it? This is not a parody of the 1984 Tina Turner classic but a question I am often asked, by feminists and others, about the topic of this research project. Let me begin by sharing that the introduction to women's studies course I took, ten years ago, led me to finding *my* feminism. Where my peers were identifying as radical and liberal feminists, I remember struggling to define myself. That struggle ended when I read an excerpt from *A Letter from a Birmingham Jail* by Martin Luther King Jr. (1963), an early reading in the course. As I read the words "[i]njustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere" I understood what my feminism had to be (I still do not use a prefix to describe my feminism). These words have continued to deeply inform my thought and action and, eventually, led me to adopt ethical veganism. Veganism is a way of life, which includes practices and attitudes, informed by the concept of compassion and rejection of exploitation of nonhuman animals in all forms. However, in popular understanding it has become associated, primarily, with practising a plant-based diet or as a 'dietary choice' (it is also routinely considered as a 'dietary restriction'). I prefer to use the term 'ethical veganism' to describe the rejection of nonhuman exploitation in all forms accompanied by actively working toward the elimination of all forms of oppression through various forms of activism and advocacy. This distinction is not meant to undermine those who are not involved in activism, (veganism for any reason ultimately benefits nonhuman animals) but to make clear that veganism is *not* a dietary choice, but a political one.

It became clear to me that I could not be an advocate for justice when I was perpetrating injustice in consuming the flesh of nonhuman animals and other products of their suffering. Likewise, ethical veganism deeply informed my feminism in that it helped me understand that dualist (male/female, man/woman, nature/culture, reason/emotion, masculine/feminine,

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

human/animal etc.) and centric thinking (androcentrism, anthropocentrism, heterocentrism, ethnocentrism etc.), the basis for all oppression, must be challenged in *all* forms. To challenge sexism without challenging racism, for instance, is insufficient. Similarly, challenges to sexism and racism are ineffective without challenging speciesism as they are all rooted in dualist and centric thinking which serve to oppress one group to benefit another.

The term 'speciesism' was coined by a British psychologist and animal rights advocate, Richard D. Ryder, and first appeared in a pamphlet, in 1970, to protest animal experimentation. It was first used in Ryder's 1975 book *Victims of Science: The Use of Animals in Research*. It was then made popular by Australian philosopher Peter Singer (2016) who argued

...we commonly ignore or discount the interests of sentient members of other species merely because they are not human, and that this bias in favour of members of our own species is, in important respects, parallel to the biases that lie behind racism and sexism.
(p. 31)

In her essay on critical Human-Animal Studies (HAS), Potts (2010) describes speciesism as “the taken-for-granted belief that humans are superior to and have the right to dominate all other creatures, and that ‘humanity’ alone bears the hallmarks of intelligence and sentience” (p. 292). Speciesism includes behaviours, practices and attitudes which claim billions of nonhuman lives (Animal Equality, n.d.), annually, for the purposes of food alone. Hundreds of millions of nonhuman animals (Animal Equality, n.d.) are exploited or killed, annually, for fashion, sport, entertainment, cultural and ritualistic traditions and medical, academic and cosmetic research. Where ecofeminists have effectively located speciesism as a structural oppression (Adams, 1990, 1991, 2010; Donovan, 1991, 2006; Gaard, 1993, 2002, 2011; Gruen, 1993, 1996, 2009; Seager, 2003a, 2003b; Spiegel, 1996) others have located speciesism as an issue of justice (Stănescu, 2013; Jones, 2015).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

The aim of this thesis is to mainstream a consideration of nonhuman animals in foundational feminist studies pedagogy. My focus on the introductory course is, in part, due to the role it played in making me aware of my responsibility as an agent of change. Learning to think and act critically, to question the status quo, and being prepared to unlearn were important lessons I took from the course. It also informed my decision to pursue the discipline further. Most importantly, in addition to shaping my understanding of the world around us, these lessons also contributed to a critical examination of my relationship with fellow human and nonhuman beings.

As my feminism has evolved over the years, I have come to believe, firmly, that feminist thought and praxis, committed to elimination of all forms of discrimination, must include *all* those that are oppressed. By extension, feminist pedagogy should include a consideration of nonhuman animals and speciesism, as a structural oppression, in strategies for change. Such a consideration must begin at the foundational level of feminist pedagogy and consider nonhuman animals on their own terms. Commenting on a rights-based approach, which informs much of contemporary animal advocacy work, MacKinnon (2004) argues

the primary model of animal rights to – one that makes animals objects of rights in standard liberal moral terms – misses animals on their own terms, just as the same tradition has missed women on theirs ... seeking animals rights on “like us” model of sameness may be misconceived, unpersuasive, and counterproductive. (p. 264)

The good news is that ecofeminists have made significant contributions to feminist scholarship in considering nonhuman animals, on their own terms, apart from their value and likeness to us.

Where ecofeminist scholarship has effectively demonstrated that speciesism is a structural oppression, one that is clearly linked to the founding tenets of feminist thought, I wanted to explore if this is reflected in foundational feminist studies pedagogy. The purpose of this thesis, therefore, was to explore if and to what extent nonhuman animals are considered in

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

feminist studies curricula. To understand the landscape of foundational feminist studies in Canada, I conducted a document review of syllabi introductory courses. I also conducted a survey of instructors who have recently taught an introductory course to further understand how they conceptualize courses and what they consider to be important topics to include (and exclude) as part of their teaching.

With this research project, I hope to offer a new direction for feminist studies pedagogy, one that expands its scope and broadens our understanding of oppression. To accomplish this goal, in Chapter 1, I present an overview of socio-political developments that led to the formation of women's studies as a discipline. I will begin by highlighting some key developments in 'Western' feminist scholarship, which will be followed by a discussion of the emergence of 'Western' ecofeminist thought and pertinent developments that foregrounded species as a category of analysis and nonhuman animals as deserving of critical feminist consideration. Chapter 2 offers a discussion of the conceptual framework and methods used to carry out this research project. Chapter 2 also includes a brief discussion on the significance of introductory courses in feminist studies. Finally, in Chapter 3, I present my findings from a document review of course syllabi of introductory courses in Canada and a survey of instructors that have recently taught an introductory course. I conclude this chapter with a discussion on why foundational feminist pedagogy must include a consistent consideration of nonhuman animals and my vision for a new feminist future.

Chapter One

Speciesism is a feminist issue

As an outcome of what is commonly known as the ‘second wave’ of feminism the formation of women’s studies, as a discipline, can be best described as a form of scholarly resistance. This chapter begins with a brief overview of the socio-political developments of the ‘second wave’ that led to its creation, as a discipline. I will then present a brief discussion of some important developments in ‘Western’ feminist scholarship before turning my attention to a discussion on the emergence of ecofeminist thought and pertinent developments that situate oppression of nonhuman animals as a feminist issue.¹ I will conclude this chapter with a statement on why a consistent consideration of nonhuman animals is warranted in foundational feminist studies pedagogy.

1.1 Women’s movements

Women’s movements of the 1960s (commonly referred to as the ‘second wave’ of feminism) were critical of the social, political, and economic climate that persisted, despite the gains made by ‘first-wave’ feminists.² According to Robbins, Luxton, & Eichler (2008), “a revitalized women’s equality movement and a new, more radical women’s liberation movement galvanized thousands of women who enthusiastically assumed women could and should challenge all areas of men’s privilege” (p. 12) Women’s movements in Canada and the U.S. not only emerged around the same time but also experienced similar significant legislative developments that led to changes, particularly with respect to women’s social and political

¹ The overview presented here focuses on the developments in Canada and the U.S. In her original essay, “Under Western Eyes” (1988) Mohanty noted that she uses the term ‘Western feminism’ to draw attention to the remarkably similar effects of various analytical categories and even strategies which codify their relationship to the Other in implicitly hierarchical terms” (p. 62). It is with this understanding that I use the term ‘Western’, recognizing that ‘Western’ feminist thought, as Mohanty has also argued, is not a monolith (1988).

² The first wave of feminism focused on attaining legal rights for women, particularly the right to vote.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

position. These changes were possible because of pressure from individual women and collective efforts. Women in Canada and U.S. mobilized by forming organizations and groups to challenge sexism in existing institutions and services (Robbins et al., 2008) and “groups of female students and faculty mobilized at the grassroots to expose the blatant sexism that ordered women’s experiences inside and outside the college classroom” (Loss, 2011, p. 296).

Before instrumental developments such as the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada (RCSWC) (1970) (hereafter the Commission) and Title IX (1972), in U.S., came in to effect, Canadian and U.S. women were largely confined to “so-called feminine fields of study like education, social work, home economics, and nursing” (Loss, 2011, p. 296). The objective was to develop “women’s predispositions and qualifications to prepare them for their roles as mother, wife, and housewife” (Robbins et al., 2008, p.9). Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments Act was ground-breaking federal legislation that “irrevocably altered the gender politics of American higher education” as it had “far-reaching implications for all aspects of university life—from the professoriate and student services to athletics— covering as it did ‘any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance’” (Loss, 2011, p. 296). In Canada, the Commission, described as a “gigantic national consciousness-raising exercise” (MacIvor, 1996, p. 80), “gave Canadian women unprecedented opportunities for community building ... as they collaborated within and across regional, professional and social boundaries ...” (Ursula Franklin as cited in Luxton & Eichler, 2006, p. 81).³ The mandate of the Commission was to “inquire into and report upon the status of women in Canada, and to recommend what steps might be taken by the Federal Government to ensure for women equal

³ Luxton and Eichler (2006) quote Franklin from a paper she submitted to a workshop they conducted, as part of their study. This workshop comprised of “about thirty faculty members who had been involved in the development of feminist scholarship and Women’s Studies ...” (p. 80) and included participation via paper submissions by those who could not attend.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

opportunities with men in all aspects of Canadian society” (RCSWC, 1970, p. vii) and listed nine areas of concern (Williams, 1990).⁴ The Commission issued its report in 1970 with 167 recommendations on various issues like equal pay, maternity leave, and birth control and received a mixed response that included differences and disagreements particularly “between groups of English-Canadian, French-Canadian, and Aboriginal women” who “disagreed on the recommendations and even on the Commission itself” (MacDonald, 2013, p. 384). Furthermore, the report of the Commission was not unanimously seen as “a model of feminist social change” (Williams, 1990, p. 727) for its underlying assumptions and premises and for its “production and use of a univocal ‘women’s’ truth” (p. 728), “[rendering] invisible the social and political realities of racialized Canadians” (p. 750). Nevertheless, the Commission “opened many possibilities, stimulated a lot of activities and the beginnings of institution building ...” (Kaplan et al. as cited in Luxton & Eichler, 2006, p. 82).

Contrary to assumptions that women’s movements in Canada, in 1960s and 70s, were primarily middle-class, “working-class and socialist feminist activists developed a strong feminist presence in the labour movement and a significant working-class orientation in the women's movement” (Luxton, 2001, p. 64). Luxton (2001) notes that a Canadian nationalist movement, fuelled by anti-Vietnam war protests, specifically influenced the Canadian radical protest movements, including women’s movements, contributing to critiques of imperialism and capitalism. The Canadian Women's Educational Press Collective identified a key distinction between the and Canadian movements, noting that:

⁴ The nine areas were: Federal laws and practices concerning political rights of women; the present and potential role of women in the labour force "including the special problems of married women"; "measures that might be taken... to permit the better use of the skills and education of women"; Federal labour laws and regulations; laws, and policies germane to the employment and promotion of women by the Federal Government; Federal taxation pertaining to women; marriage and divorce; women under the criminal law; immigration and citizenship (RCSWC as cited in Williams, 1990, p. 744).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

... Canadian women more uniformly developed an analysis of their oppression based on a class notion of society. This was an important development . . . because the Marxist perspective has since been central to the development of the Canadian women's liberation movement. (as cited in Williams, 1990, p. 733)

There were other reasons that the Canadian women's movements were distinct from the women's movements in the U.S. A federated state structure, varied economies and provincial, territorial and municipal legislation, diverse "linguistic, racialized, ethnic, or national cultures" and "patterns of settlement" not only meant that a pan-Canadian feminist movement was unlikely (Luxton, 2001, p. 65) but also that a "belief in undivided sisterhood was never very marketable in Canada" (Hamilton & Barrett as cited in Luxton, 2001, p. 66). Robbins et al. (2008) note:

Even though the Canadian and Quebec movements could rally together on initiatives, the question of national identities, the issues of linguistic and cultural differences, and the lack of networks among different women's groups imposed other constraints on the development of the Canadian women's movements . . . Both groups, however, struggled with class issues and often failed to recognize the specific discrimination that Aboriginal women, women of colour, lesbians, and immigrant women would mobilize around . . . Nevertheless, the political mobilizations and the massive social changes in the lives of girls and women were the crucible of feminist scholarship and women's studies in the universities. (p. 23-24)

It is evident then that a singular women's movement did not exist, contrary to recollections of 'the women's movement' in Canada (or anywhere else). In the next section, I turn to a discussion on how political developments, emanating from women's movements, manifested in academic discussions and pertinent institutional changes.

1.2 Women's studies: From streets to classrooms

There is extensive literature on the many challenges of establishing women's studies in Canada and U.S. (Nemiroff, 1989; Eichler, 1990a, 1990b, Eichler & Tite, 1990; Lenton, 1990; Tite & Malone, 1990; Kolodny, 2000; Luxton, 2001; Boxer, 2002; Kitch, 2002; Bromley & Ahmad, 2006, 2013; Eichler & Luxton, 2006; Christiansen-Ruffman, 2007; Robbins et al., 2008;

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Hobbs & Rice, 2011; Loss, 2011; Agathangelou et al., 2015; Wood, 2015; Olwan et al., 2016; Thorpe et al., 2016; O’Sullivan, Bryant, & Hewett, 2016). Boxer (2002) observed that, occasionally serving as a “proxy for affirmative action”, universities tended to ‘add’ women’s studies to the curriculum, to “meet the spirit if not the letter of government mandates, as well as some academicians’ desires to include women more fully in institutional life” (p. 44).⁵ The author notes that “[w]omen’s studies grew out of the needs and experiences of women and reflected the spirit of a certain time in history” (Boxer, 2002, p. 47). Women’s studies classes became spaces for consciousness-raising (hooks, 2000; Loss 2011) and students found women’s studies courses “ripe with possibilities for intellectual and personal emancipation” (Loss, 2011, p. 301).

With the expansion of the education sector, in the 1960s and 70s, due to increased federal spending in post-secondary education (Robbins et al., 2008), women not only entered colleges and universities in large numbers but they also developed “increasingly sophisticated critiques of the traditions of formal knowledge” as they “confronted the deeply entrenched sexism in the universities and colleges” (Luxton, 2001, p. 67). Luxton and Eichler (2006) recall that in the 1960s there were very few women faculty; universities had “a curriculum that basically ignored women and gender issues, and an institutional climate that was deeply sexist, sometimes misogynist” (p. 79). Women’s studies “was *not* the result of academic efforts” (Maria Mies in Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 36) but developed as the academic arm of women’s movements (Lenton, 1990; Robbins et al., 2008; Agathangelou, Olwan, Spira, & Turcotte, 2015) and appeared on the academic scene in Canada in the early 1970s (Eichler & Tite, 1990). In Canada, the discipline emerged as Canadian Women’s Studies/Recherches féministes (Christiansen-Ruffman, 2007).

⁵ The mandates were so outlined in the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women (Canada) and Title IX (U.S.).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

The first courses and programs in women's studies were developed by women, motivated by their membership in women's movements (Lenton, 1990) and the "big bulge of entries into the field happened in the 1980s" (Eichler & Tite, 1990, p. 14). According to the first report of the Canadian Women's Studies Project (CWSP), titled "Women's Studies Professors in Canada: A Collective Self-Portrait" by Eichler and Tite (1990):

[T]he most important reason for women (in and out of the university system) and men [for teaching women's/feminist studies] is, 'The subject was of interest to me'. This is followed by three other intrinsic reasons: desire to develop the area, political motivations aimed at improving the position of women, and desire to improve/challenge mainstream theories in the discipline.⁶ (p. 16)

The authors found that the professors' initial attraction to the subject area increased their political commitment to women. Lenton's (1990) study, in report five of the CWSP, found that later generations of feminists (scholars teaching their first course between 1985-88 and onwards) were less committed to 'the movement' (p. 59) whereas 'earlier generations' were "more highly motivated by political interests, including the desire to establish women's programs in universities" (p. 63).⁷

1.3 Institutionalization of women's studies

Agathangelou et al. (2015) argue that the "institutionalization of women's studies has been both a struggle and an historical process, one that continues to solidify and at times disrupt the academic-industrial complex" (p. 160). Considering the decline in political activism and in the absence of a strong feminist movement in the 21st century, some argued in favour of

⁶ The CWSP was a large-scale study, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, undertaken in the late 1980s, whose aim was to provide an analysis of a very important academic transformation by focusing on the people teaching and researching in the field. Participants comprised of 892 (790 women and 112 men) full-time, part-time and retired faculty from Canadian universities and colleges that offered at least a bachelor's degree (Eichler & Tite, 1990).

⁷ "Academic Feminists and the Women's Movement in Canada: Continuity or Discontinuity" (1990)

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

integrating the field “as fully as possible into academic structures”, to ensure women’s studies’ survival, stating, “the more institutionalization, the better” (Boxer, 2002, p. 48).

hooks (1988) identified a “schism between feminist theorizing and political practice” which she argued was “undermining feminist movement” (as cited in Lenton, 1990, p. 57). Lenton (1990) attributes this to the institutionalization of the field arguing that “[a] tendency towards an increasingly abstract theoretical discourse, in combination with the pressure to establish professional credentials, has supposedly led to a decline in political activism” with “increasing numbers of scholars [approaching] women's/feminist studies as a field of inquiry not necessarily having practical or political implications” (p. 58). Others have echoed similar concerns about efforts to ‘legitimize’ feminist scholarship, preventing feminist academics from getting too political (Lenton, 1990; Robbins et al., 2008; Bromley & Ahmad, 2013). Furthermore, these concerns also led debates on re-naming programs and departments that originally began as women’s studies.

In her study entitled *What's in a Name? Women's Studies or Feminist Studies*, Eichler (1990b) argued, “women’s studies tends to be associated with adding women in” whereas “feminist studies is seen as implicitly transformative” (p. 45). Several participants (faculty in women’s studies programs) in Eichler’s study argued in favour of re-naming the discipline as ‘feminist studies’ noting its transformative goals, informed by feminist politics and practice, with one calling it a ‘fighting label’, for its ability to pose a direct challenge to the academic structure (1990b). Her study also found that compared to feminist studies, women’s studies are considered ‘institutionally safer’ (Eichler, 1990b). Debates arose in the 1980s to add ‘gender’ to women’s studies due to concerns that women’s studies programs were not broad enough (Bromley & Ahmad, 2013).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Institutionalization of the field and, in particular, changing university climate due to reduced federal spending and subsequent increase in public-private partnerships have led to concerns about the associated costs. Bromley and Ahmad (2013) have argued that corporatization of universities in Canada, which began in the 1980s, has led to women's studies programs undergoing relentless and escalating attacks as Canadian universities move to 'trim the fat' in economically tougher times, defined by a politics of neoliberalism and corporatism. Citing Chandra Mohanty's description of corporate restructuring of universities as "the combination of 'a market ideology with a set of material practices drawn from the world of business'" (as cited in Bromley & Ahmad, 2013, p. 38), the authors argue that many universities have been following a 'market-driven agenda', part of a 'business-model' wherein

[p]rofessors become mere service providers and revenue producers. Students are constructed as consumers who are no longer expected to value knowledge for knowledge's sake, but rather seek only knowledge that can be applied to their individual employment possibilities in the 'new' economy. (Bromley & Ahmad, 2013, p. 38)

Elsewhere the authors have argued that the neoliberalization of universities led to policing and controlling of feminist scholars, feminism(s), and knowledge production (Bromley & Ahmad, 2006; 2013).

1.4 Developments in 'Western' feminist scholarship

While this overview is not exhaustive, it provides a contextual account of some of the major developments to illustrate the complex dynamics of the discipline. For the purpose of this study, I will highlight a few significant developments in feminist scholarship.

Mohanty (1988) has argued that "[feminist scholarship] is best seen as a mode of intervention into particular hegemonic discourses (for example, traditional anthropology, sociology, literary criticism, etc.), and as a political praxis which counters and resists the totalizing imperative of age-old 'legitimate' and 'scientific' bodies of knowledge" (p. 62). An

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

early goal of women's studies was a focus on 'women' as a core category of analysis to address their absence from the curriculum, ensuring an understanding of patriarchy and the impact of socialization on women (Nemiroff, 1989). However, deeper academic entrenchment that accompanied its status as a discipline with its own theory and methodology led to "set of analytic categories beyond 'women' as a population—including gender as a relational category or a marker of human differentiation, sexuality and sexual orientation, masculinity, and even the deconstruction of the content of the category women" (Wood, 2015, p. 398).

Gender, as a core concept, gained a foothold in feminist scholarship in the 1970s (Christiansen-Ruffman, 2007, Robbins et al., 2008, Wood, 2015).⁸ However, where it gained popularity in U.S. and some European contexts, in Canada the focus was clearly on research 'by, for, about and with women' (Christian-Ruffman, 2007). Some scholars have cautioned against an unexamined expansion of women's studies noting that gender, where used to replace women as a core category, narrows feminist conceptual and political domains, ignoring women's political agency (Christiansen-Ruffman, 2007). Commenting on the longstanding naming debate (women's studies to women's and gender studies/gender studies), Bromley and Ahmad (2013) have cautioned against the use of gender as a 'catch-all term' and replacing women's studies with gender studies as it not only risks depoliticizing and dehistoricizing women, supporting the neoliberal agenda in creating a 'marketable degree', but it also makes the field "less threatening, more 'disciplined' discipline, which then replaces the 'undisciplined' discipline of Women's Studies" (p. 34). Name changes (from women's studies to women's and gender studies, gender studies, and women's, gender, and sexuality studies) occurred in response to restructuring in the field and demands of rebranding for the academic market (Agathangelou et al., 2015, p. 158).

⁸ See Christiansen-Ruffman (2007) for a detailed discussion on gender, as a core category, in feminist scholarship and public discourse, in Canada.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Wood (2015) notes that gender, as a ‘supple category’, “denoted an expansive set of projects that was neutral enough to deter controversy at the institutional and public-funding levels” (p. 404).⁹

Disenchantment with narratives of a universal sisterhood and patriarchy as the singular source of women’s oppression paved the way for one of the most significant and persistent disruptions in ‘Western’ feminist thought: intersectionality. Cho et al. (2013) note that

[i]ntersectionality was introduced in the late 1980s as a heuristic term to focus attention on the vexed dynamics of difference and the solidarities of sameness in the context of antidiscrimination and social movement politics. It exposed how single-axis thinking undermines legal thinking, disciplinary knowledge production, and struggles for social justice. (p. 787).

The term was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) in her article “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color”, which developed “important connections among the core ideas of community organizing, identity politics, coalitional politics, interlocking oppressions, and social justice” (Collins, 2015, p. 10). However, Collins (2015) reminds us that the emergence of the term should not be mistaken (as it usually is) for the emergence of intersectionality itself for intersectional organizing and activism had already been advanced by women of colour, in the U.S., and the fields of race/gender/class studies. It has been suggested that intersectionality is “the most important theoretical contribution that women’s studies, in conjunction with related fields, has made so far” (McCall, 2005, 1771). Despite its definitional problems (Collins, 2015) and methodological complexities (McCall, 2005), it is fair to describe intersectionality as a game-changer in that it led to a serious rethinking of identity and oppression, effectively challenging the notion of a universal sisterhood. Importantly, intersectional theory also conclusively demonstrated that there is not a

⁹ Wood (2015) defines ‘supple object’ as “an analytic category that is molded in the practice of research, in ways that are amenable to the explanatory, political, and organizational aims of practitioners, and that are in turn understood very differently based on these uses” (p. 391).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

one-size-fits-all feminism, ushering feminist thought into a new era of *feminisms*. The value of intersectionality lies in the very dilemma of defining it:

[i]ntersectionality can be conceptualized as an overarching knowledge project whose changing contours grow from and respond to social formations of complex social inequalities; within this overarching umbrella, intersectionality can also be profitably conceptualized as a constellation of knowledge projects that change in relation to one another in tandem with changes in the interpretive communities that advance them. (Collins, 2003, p.5)

In problematizing the very category of ‘woman’ that has hitherto been a focus of feminist politics of representation, postmodern feminism is yet another important intervention in feminist thought. In highlighting the contribution of postmodernism to feminist thought, Lee argues that “[w]hile the political and social roots of identity politics are often historical, postmodernism, a relatively recent intellectual phenomenon, has quite literally provided the language to challenge any appeal to commonality as politically suspect” and that “the political viability of feminism lies in scrutinizing the very notion of womanhood as a hegemonic construct that violently obliterates irreducible differences among individuals” (2001, p. 36).

According to Eichler and Luxton (2006), an achievement of feminist scholarship that can be claimed across the various disciplines is epistemological and methodological in that feminist scholars have been successful in challenging the “notion of universal man, of the unattached (male) individual who can observe the world objectively” (p. 85). Additionally, an important achievement of feminist scholarship is in its challenge to the notion of primacy of ‘man’ over all that is associated with the feminine and the nonhuman, under the aegis of ecofeminism. It is this achievement, that I turn my attention to in the following section.

1.5 Ecofeminism

The emergence and subsequent developments in ecofeminist thought have been well documented.¹⁰ The scope of this discussion is to cover the breadth of literature and debates in ecofeminist thought to highlight key developments in the field; to underscore that speciesism is a structural oppression *and* a feminist issue; and to emphasize the significant gap between ecofeminist scholarship and mainstream feminist pedagogy. The discussion, as it relates to key developments, includes an overview of important contributions made by ecofeminist theorizing to analyses that undertake serious considerations of nonhuman animals; an intersectional analysis of speciesism and one or more forms of human oppression, is common to the literature reviewed here.

The term ‘ecological feminism’ was coined by French writer Françoise d'Eaubonne “to signify the conjoining of radical ecological and feminist thinking in a variety of perspectives, which sought to eliminate gender inequalities and hierarchies in a way that valued the environment and articulated parallels between women’s and environmental exploitation” (Buckingham, 2004, p. 155). Early conceptualization of ecofeminism linked domination of women with the domination of nature, focusing on “values and activities associated with women, including childbearing and nurturing” (Thompson, 2006, p. 508). A principal ecofeminist concern is dualistic thinking (man/woman, reason/emotion, culture/nature, human/animal) and the ways in which “feminizing nature and naturalizing or animalizing women has served as a justification for the domination of women, animals, and the earth” (Gaard, 1993, p.5). Warren

¹⁰ Greta Gaard (2011) offers an excellent discussion on the emergence of and developments in the field in “Ecofeminism Revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and Re-placing Species in a Material Feminist Environmentalism”. Her essay examines the historical foundations of North American ecofeminism since the 1980s and unearths the roots of antifeminist backlash against ecofeminism and feminist and environmentalist resistance to association with ecofeminism. Her essay is a survey of major works and developments, over three decades, in ecofeminism and its variants like feminist environmentalism.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

(1987) has attributed this to a ‘patriarchal conceptual framework’, characterized by ‘value-hierarchical thinking’, that “takes traditional male-identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions as the only ... [giving] higher status or prestige to ... what has been traditionally identified as ‘male’” (p.6). She has called this patriarchal value-hierarchical thinking the *logic of domination* (Warren, 1987) which “explains, justifies, and maintains the subordination of an ‘inferior’ group by ‘superior’ group on the grounds of the (alleged) inferiority or superiority of the respective group” (p. 6).

Warren (1997) has noted that “[j]ust as there is not one feminism, there is not one ecofeminism or one ecofeminist philosophy” (p. 4). According to Kheel (2008), ecofeminism:

can be described at the broadest level as a loosely knit philosophical and practical orientation linking the concerns of women to the larger natural world. More specifically, ecofeminism examines and critiques the historical and mutually reinforcing devaluation of women and nature with a view to transforming existing forms of exploitation (p. 9).

While it emerged as a feminist theoretical framework in the 1970s, ecofeminism has its roots, like intersectionality, in the work of women outside the academy as evinced in examples of resistance by rural women in the Chipko movement in India and by Kenyan women in the Green Belt movement.¹¹ Thus, like intersectionality, ecofeminism not only exemplifies theory informed by praxis but it represents one of the most vital interventions in feminist thought.

Early ‘Western’ ecofeminist conceptualizations faced strong criticism from mainstream and ecological feminists alike (Wilson, 2005; Merchant, 2006; Thompson, 2006; Kheel, 2008;

¹¹ Loosely translated, ‘chipko’ (Hindi) means to embrace. It was a form of resistance, which began in the Garhwal region of India in the 1970s, to commercial felling of trees, which caused significant ecological degradation, threatening the livelihoods of many. Women would form circles around the trees or hug them to prevent them from being felled for commercial purposes. The movement was a response, based on non-violent Gandhian resistance (*satyagraha*), to the destruction of the ecologically sensitive Himalayan region, which also threatened local communities whose survival depended on the forests (Shiva & Bandyopadhyay, 1986). The Green Belt Movement, led by Wangari Maathai “emerged as a response to environmental degradation in postcolonial Kenya”, operating as “praxis to resist environmental and political oppression, empowering rural women to enact a political consciousness toward democracy and environmental justice” (Hunt, 2014, p. 235).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Gaard, 1993, 2001, 2011a; Seager, 2003b). In particular, ecofeminism was criticized by mainstream feminists for essentializing spirituality that gendered the Earth as female (Thompson, 2006; Gaard 2011a) and led to “elite, apolitical retreat and individual salvation rather than inspiring engaged struggles for local, community-wide, and global eco-justice” (Gaard, 2011a, p. 38). Thompson (2006) has argued that “[e]cofeminism, because of its predominantly white, middle-class ethos and uptake, was seen as irretrievably marred by essentialism about women and by regional-, class-, and ethnocentrism” (p. 507). These charges led some, engaged in ecofeminist work, to fear ‘contamination-by-association’ such that they renamed their approaches to ‘ecological feminism’, ‘feminist environmentalism’, ‘social ecofeminism’, ‘critical feminist eco-socialism’ or ‘gender and the environment’ (Gaard, 2011a).¹² These criticisms were not without merit. In drawing attention to the diversity of the category of ‘woman’ and to the dangers of essentializing women and their relationship to nature (well-meaning as they may have been) Agarwal’s work (1992; 2001) makes an important contribution to ecofeminist thought. Some ecofeminist insights, emphasizing women’s ‘special’ relationship with nature, not only further perpetuated prescriptive notions of womanhood, focusing on the role of women as child-bearers, caregivers and earth-healers, but they also conflated ‘women’ as a ‘unitary category’ (Agarwal, 1992). It is important to note that ecofeminists too were critical of such insights. According to Bruckner (2006):

[s]ocial ecofeminists generally find the essentialist position problematic as it reinscribes the equation of the feminine with emotion, irrationality, and the body. While attractive to radical ecofeminists and those who practice Goddess worship (and a persuasive rallying point for activists), locating women as privileged repositories of ecological awareness simply inverts the very dualities that ecofeminism rejects. (p. 77)

¹² The term ‘feminist environmentalism’ was coined by Bina Agarwal, writing in the rural Indian context, to describe her approach that was distinct in its critique of ecofeminist insights on the special relationship of women to nature and the dangers of such insights to further marginalize rural women in the ‘third world’ (Agarwal, 1992). This term was subsequently adopted by feminist geographers and economists (Gaard, 2011a).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Such assumptions about women also had international policy implications, especially in non-Western rural contexts, which led to concerns about “schemes [that] increase women’s work burden, without any assurance of their share in resources, or of men sharing [their] workloads” (Agarwal, 2001, p.12). Rural women’s indigenous knowledge of the land is acquired by “everyday contact with and dependence on nature’s resources” (Agarwal, 1992, p. 142). However, their knowledge is systematically devalued and dismissed as is glaringly evident in their exclusion from decision-making in development and conservation efforts (Agarwal, 1992; 2001; Mies & Shiva, 1993; Curtin, 1997; Shiva; 1997). According to Vandana Shiva, “[t]he patriarchal world view sees man as the measure of all value, with no space for diversity, only for hierarchy” (Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 164). As women’s knowledge is based on diversity, it is not only excluded from development and conservation strategies, it is also devalued as non-work and non-knowledge (Mies & Shiva, 1993). Buckingham (2004) has argued

[although] significant strides have been made to incorporate women’s and gender issues within certain policy areas at both the global and the local level” that “real obstacles prevent structural changes to social systems to ensure that equality and feminist concerns are routinely part of environmental decision making. (p. 153)

These real obstacles stem, in part, from a lack of political will at the local, national, and international levels and policies informed by neoliberalist, rationalist ideas of development that often ignore ecological concerns.

Another charge leveled at ‘Western’ ecofeminism was that it failed to recognize that patriarchal domination was not the singular source of oppression for many women. Women of color, in experiencing domination by not only white men but also men of color (who also experience domination by white men) and white women, perceived their inequality differently than did white women (Taylor, 1997). Struggles associated with gender overshadowed other struggles in feminist and ecofeminist movements. However, the activism of women of color,

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

engaged in the environmental justice movement, adopted a ‘multiple-foci’ approach that “incorporated aspects of civil rights, feminism, ecofeminism, environment, and labor” (Taylor, 1997, p. 65). As Taylor (1997) has observed, some women of color in the environmental justice movement saw themselves as social justice activists and resisted environmental, feminist or ecofeminist labels. Gaard (2001) proposes that

[t]o become better allies cross-culturally, antiracist feminists and ecofeminists need to improve and expand our knowledge and understanding of nondominant cultures by reading about those cultures, building working relationships and friendships across the boundaries of culture, and visiting other cultural and ethnic communities in a way that best positions us to learn. (p. 22)

‘Western’ articulations of ecofeminism have also been criticized for how some proponents of spiritual and social ecofeminisms have invoked Indigenous cultures and beliefs (Gaard, 1993; Kheel, 1993, 2008; Smith, 1997; Sturgeon, 1997; Wilson 2005).¹³ For instance, some Aboriginal cultures conceptualize ‘Mother Earth’ as an active and dynamic agent, with whom both women and men share a connection (albeit in distinct ways), and land as integral to their being (Wilson, 2005).¹⁴ However, spiritual ecofeminists have used the image of ‘Mother Earth’ in a way that has led to the association of the women and nature with passivity and that excludes men from nature (Wilson, 2005).¹⁵ Wilson (2005) has argued that in ‘blending’ Indigenous perspectives within ‘Western’ ecofeminist discourses, “cultures and histories have been appropriated in a manner that not only misrepresents Aboriginal cultures but also silences Aboriginal peoples” (p. 348). Similarly, Sturgeon (1997) has argued “much of ecofeminist discourse about Native American women silences their voice even while idealizing them” (p.

¹³ I use the word Indigenous here to refer to Indigenous peoples and/ or knowledges, internationally. Elsewhere, this term appears in the context of the works reviewed in this study.

¹⁴ Wilson (2005) uses the terms Indigenous, in the international context, and Aboriginal, when referring to Anishinabek (Ojibway and Odawa peoples).

¹⁵ The men interviewed by Wilson (2005) expressed that they shared a strong connection to ‘Mother Earth’.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

269). According to Smith (1997), mainstream society, including some ecofeminists, tend to portray Native peoples as having a romantic past and as having no place in modern society thereby reinforcing primitivist stereotypes about them.

Linking his previous work on ‘responsible knowing’ with environmentalism, Buege (1997) has proposed an ecofeminist position which he calls ‘environmentally responsible knowing’, in the context of the Inuit in the Canadian Arctic. This position addresses primitivism on the part of some, to highlight that in addition to being antiracist, anticlassist, and antisexist, “ecofeminism must also be antiprimitivist” (p. 103). Responsible knowing, he notes “focuses upon individual people as knowers who have a responsibility to obtain and use knowledge in activities in which they participate and are accountable for that knowledge” (Buege, 1997, p. 103). There are five pillars of ‘responsible knowing’, namely: knowers, emotions, understanding, normative realism, and community (Buege, 1997), each situating the subject, the Inuit in this case, as central to knowing.¹⁶

Calling attention to the failure of ‘Western’ ecofeminism in recognizing the oppressions experienced by Native American women, owing to colonization, Smith (1997) noted that while sexism is the most pressing concern for some women, it is not so for Native American women, leading to their dismissal of feminism. The author has argued “it is essential that ecofeminist theory more seriously grapple with the issues of colonization, particularly the colonization of Native lands, in its analysis of oppression” (Smith, 1997, p. 22).

¹⁶ Responsible knowing, according to Buege (1997) includes: 1) ‘knowers’: those that know in particular contexts and become environmentally responsible by developing relationships with their environments; 2) ‘emotions’: emotions are central to cognitive practice and an essential component of oppressed people’s knowledge of their world; 3) understanding: a complex way of knowing that involves undertaking a holistic picture of the various individual facts and processes as they relate to one another 4) ‘normative realism’: to understand the world as it is, not how we want it to be; 5) ‘community’: sharing knowledge with others and recognizing community as an important structure for gathering and transmission of knowledge to future generations and people outside the community.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Gaard (1993) has highlighted the prevalence of heteronormativity in the larger cultural context and ecofeminist theorizing, noting that Western cultural constructions that render nature as passive, lead to feminization of nature and the subsequent masculinization of culture, wherein “the human-nature relationship becomes one of compulsory heterosexuality” (Gaard, 1993, p. 304). She argues that feminizing the Earth anthropomorphizes nature, which is “disrespectful in the same way that racism is disrespectful, for it seeks to understand another not on her or his own terms but as a projection of ourselves” (Gaard, 1993, p. 305). Where ecofeminists challenged the various dualisms that justified oppression of one group by another, Gaard (1997) identified the absence and, in some instances, the incompleteness of an effective ecofeminist analysis of the heterosexual/queer, reason/erotic, reason/whiteness and emotion/non-white ‘vertical’ (ranked) dualisms. She has argued that any theory of ecofeminism can be truly inclusive when it considers insights of queer theory (and vice versa); a queer ecofeminist perspective, as a logical development of ecofeminism, views dismantling these dualisms as integral to the project of ecofeminism and examines the way queer individuals and persons of color, in Western cultural ideology that values the white heterosexual male, are feminized, animalized, eroticized, and naturalized (Gaard, 1997). Elsewhere, Gaard (2011b) offers a brief but useful discussion on ecophobia and erotophobia to highlight the intersection of speciesism and heterosexism.¹⁷ In light of the critiques discussed here, it became clear that ecofeminism had much work to do. In the next section, I present a discussion on how ecofeminists responded to these critiques and how they addressed the nonhuman animal question.

¹⁷ Gaard defines erotophobia as “a fear of the erotic so strong that only one form of sexuality is overtly allowed; only in one position; and only in the context of certain legal, religious, and social sanctions” (2011b, p. 125). While Gaard does not define the term ‘heterocentrism’, it is understood as ideology and the implicit assumption that all people are heterosexual. Ecophobia, as defined by Simon Estok, is “an irrational and groundless hatred of the natural world, as present and subtle in our daily lives and literature as homophobia and racism and sexism” (as cited in 2011b, p. 125).

1.6 Looking back, looking forward: The ‘animal’ question

Early ecofeminist considerations of nonhuman animals were subsumed under critiques of naturism. The word ‘speciesism’ was contentious for some ecofeminists due to its association with the animal rights movement, which they viewed as “perpetuating patriarchal discourse regarding rights” (Adams, 1991, p. 138). Vegetarian ecofeminism, as it emerged in 1990s and developed over the next decade, was not only attentive to the critiques of ecofeminism but responded by foregrounding species (previously only implicit in ecofeminist analyses on oppression of nature), “as [it] addressed the intersections of feminism, ecology, race, class, gender, and nation through a variety of issues ...” (Gaard, 2011a, p. 36). These issues included nonhuman animal experimentation and the myth of animals’ willing sacrifice; industrialized nonhuman animal food production and its reliance on undocumented immigrant workers who often work in precarious conditions and risk deportation should they report these conditions; plant-based diets in the context of social and environmental justice and human and nonhuman animal health; hunting and the social construction of masculinity; animal rights campaigns that perpetuate racism and sexism; essentialism of gendering Earth as ‘mother’; and uses of truncated and decontextualized narratives of ethical decision-making leading to what can appear to be competing issues among oppressed groups like women, indigenous peoples, nonhuman animals, and immigrants, to name a few (Gaard, 2011a).

Vegetarian ecofeminism has its roots in “experience of sympathy for nonhuman animals, contemporary animal liberation theories, the countercultural movements of the 1960s and 1970s, and decades of activism and thought in feminism” (Gaard, 2002, p. 118). Vegetarian ecofeminists have “emphasized the oppression of nonhuman animals (speciesism) as implicit within an ecofeminist analysis, arguing that speciesism functions like and is inherently linked to

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, and naturism” (Gaard, 2002, p. 117). Where animal advocates identified, and organized against the oppression of animals it was the work of vegetarian ecofeminists like Carol J. Adams (1990), Josephine Donovan (1990) Greta Gaard (1993; 2002) and Lori Gruen (1993) that “led to an analysis of the structures of power that speciesism represents and reinforces” (Gruen, 2009, p. 169).

Gruen (1996; 2009) and Gaard (2002) have effectively employed Iris Marion Young’s (1990) analysis of “Five Faces of Oppression” to emphasize oppression of nonhuman animals.¹⁸ Young (1990) posits a set of five conditions – exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, violence – and argues that the “presence of any of these five conditions is sufficient for calling a group oppressed” (p. 64). According to Young (1990), exploitation “occurs through a steady process of the transfer of the results of the labour of one social group to benefit another” (p. 49). Whereas the scope of Young’s analysis is limited to oppressions experienced by humans, Gruen (1996) has extended the concept of exploitation to include nonhuman animals. She illustrates how they are exploited by describing the plight of cows, hens, and sows in factory farming:

Intensively reared dairy cows are so overworked that they begin to metabolize their own muscle in order to continue to produce milk, a process referred to in the industry as ‘milking off their backs’. Sows are completely confined for their entire lives and repeatedly artificially inseminated so as to produce pigs for consumption. Hens are kept in extremely small cages and have their life cycles controlled to produce the maximum amount of eggs at the smallest cost to producers. (Gruen, 1996, p. 443)

Similarly, Gaard (2002) extends Young’s (1990) analysis of marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence to nonhuman animals arguing that nonhuman animals experience all five conditions, as outlined by Young. Nonhuman animals according to Gaard (2002) experience marginalization through confinement in zoos; powerlessness “at the hands of

¹⁸ See Young’s *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (1990).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

humans who hold life-or-death decision-making power over them on multiple levels” (p. 132); cultural imperialism through domestication, which denies them their natural urges; and violence through meat-eating, hunting, and experimentation.

In *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and Animal Slavery* (1996) (originally published in 1988), Spiegel offers a powerful account of the connection between human and nonhuman oppression through an analysis of the trans-Atlantic slave trade and what she calls ‘animal slavery’.¹⁹ Spiegel (1996) argues that moral disqualification, based on rationalist thinking, has been used, historically, to exclude nonhuman animals and humans (although some were not viewed as such) viewed as racially inferior. Perhaps responding, in part, to the dominant animal rights discourses premised on rights-based and utilitarian perspectives, Spiegel (1996) argues

[i]t is only an anthropocentric world view which makes qualities possessed by humans to be those by which all other species are measured. If the earth was suddenly colonized by a species more powerful and bellicose than human beings, they could just as easily use attributes special to themselves when devising their ranking system. (p. 23)

In my view, the most important contribution of this book is that it situates speciesism as a foundational oppression. This is evident in Spiegel’s argument that “the domination of animals, which was honed to a clumsy science centuries before black slavery in America began, was in many cases used as a prototype for the subjugation of blacks” (1996, p. 30). She illustrates this with numerous examples of the parallels between the (mal)treatment of nonhuman animals and enslaved persons, through institutionalized cruelty.²⁰ Spiegel’s (1996) work, while controversial and sure to irk some, is an important contribution to understanding that it matters not *who* the

¹⁹ Although this is not an ecofeminist text, it offers an important analysis of the similarities between human and nonhuman oppressions, highlighting the intersection of racism and speciesism.

²⁰ Spiegel (1996) refers to various examples that include the branding and auctioning of nonhuman animals and enslaved persons; similar contraptions used to limit the movement of nonhuman animals and enslaved persons; and parallels between nonhuman animals used as test subjects and involuntary experimentation on enslaved persons. Examples also include how enslaved persons were animalized through language (terms like buck, fox, coon, brute were used to describe them) and, like nonhuman animals, were treated as property.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

oppressed are because “any oppression helps to support other forms of domination” (p. 30).

Recognizing that the intention of such a ‘dreaded comparison’ will not be apparent to some,

Spiegel (1996) argues

Comparing the suffering of animals to that of blacks (or any other oppressed group) is offensive only to the speciesist: one who has embraced the false notions of what animals are like. Those who are offended by comparison to a fellow sufferer have unquestioningly accepted the biased worldview presented by the masters. To deny our similarities to animals is to deny and undermine our own power. It is to continue actively struggling to prove to our masters, past or present, that we are *similar to those who have abused us*, rather than to our fellow victims, those whom our masters have also victimized. (p. 30)

Here Spiegel not only highlights the parallels between the suffering of humans and nonhumans but also illuminates the internalization of abuse by the oppressed.

A significant vegetarian ecofeminist text is Adams’s (1990) controversial and widely cited book *The Sexual Politics of Meat* that firmly situated the oppression of nonhuman animals and women, as rooted in patriarchy, emphasizing the Western cultural association of virility and masculinity with eating ‘meat’. An important contribution of this work is her conceptualization of the ‘absent referent’ (Adams, 1990). She argues that “[t]hrough butchering, animals ... in name and body are made absent *as animals* for meat to exist” (p. 40) highlighting the power of language which “can make animals absent from a discussion of meat because the acts of slaughtering and butchering have already rendered the animal as absent through death and dismemberment” (p. 68). Women, Adams (1990) argues, become absent referents when their literal experience of sexual violence is “applied metaphorically to other instances of violent devastation, such as the ‘rape’ of the earth ...” (p. 43). Nonhuman animals are also rendered ‘absent referents’ in non-food industries that profit from their bodies, including medical and cosmetic research, fashion, and entertainment. They suffer in deplorable conditions to produce non-food commodities. The animal hide industry works in collaboration with the dairy and meat

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

industry to meet the demands of the multi-billion-dollar fashion industry. Reptilian bodies are bred exclusively for luxury fashion goods such as bags, shoes, wallets, belts, and home décor. Nonhuman animals that we often live with, as companions, such as dogs, cats, rabbits, rats, are exclusively bred and forced to undergo painful, and often fatal, ‘quality assurance’ tests in the beauty industry.

Adams’ (1990) focus, she notes, is the overlapping oppressions of women (sexism) and animals (speciesism) but, importantly, her work lacks an effective discussion of other categories of analyses, including race, that interlock with sexism and speciesism. While she acknowledges that dominant groups make other oppressed groups ‘absent referent’ and that addressing the issue of race is “neither easy nor simple” (p. 152), the absence of a comprehensive discussion of multiple, intersecting oppressions in Adams’ (1990) discussion is remarkable.²¹ Nevertheless, it remains an important contribution to our understanding of patriarchy and to feminist analyses of oppressions, in situating vegetarianism as a form of political resistance against patriarchal consumption of the bodies of women and nonhuman animals.

Writing twenty years after *The Sexual Politics of Meat* was first published, Adams (2010) presented her reflection essay on the same wherein she examined key insights from the book. An important contribution of this essay is Adams’ concept of ‘retrograde humanism’ which describes the “resistance to the decentering of the human being” (Adams, 2010, p. 302). Retrograde humanists, Adams (2010) argues “[believe] that humans are the teleological fulfillment of evolution” (Adams, 2010, p. 311).²² Another important contribution of this essay is

²¹ Adams (1990) acknowledges that such an analysis is needed and directs the reader to Spiegel’s *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and Animal Slavery*, originally published in 1988.

²² I can confirm that every animal advocate on the frontline has, at least once, encountered ‘retrograde humanism’ in questions like “why are you not protesting human rights violations”? Or “why aren’t you saving innocent babies from murder”? (referring to pro-choice campaigns).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

her declaration that “veganism is a boycott” (p. 306), reaffirming it as a political act rather than a ‘personal choice’. Adams (2010) also draws the reader’s attention to the complacency on the part of some animal rights organizations toward other liberatory movements arguing, “these animal activists believe they are in some untouchable zone because they are the ‘voice of the voiceless’ which problematically, to begin with, accepts a human-centered definition of voice” (p. 311). This is an important observation made by Adams (2010), as such complacency ignores the interconnectedness of oppressions. Interestingly, this re-visit also does not effectively address the issue of race (or other analytical categories).

I would add here that the complacency, in animal rights movements, that Adams (2010) refers to is also reflected in the sometimes overt and, at times, covert racism in ‘Western’ animal rights discourses. This is evident in the appropriation of veganism, as a lifestyle, and the animal liberation movement as uniquely ‘Western’, reviving the civilized/savage dualism which has been used, systematically, to usurp land (including natural resources and nonhuman inhabitants) and colonize peoples. Examples of such appropriation are evident in some grassroots campaigns and on social media against so-called ‘barbaric’ practices like the dog meat trade in some East- and Southeast Asian cultures and halal and kosher practices of animal slaughter.²³ These slaughter practices are denounced as inhumane in comparison with accepted methods of slaughter in industrialized nations; it is suggested, in these contexts, that ‘barbarity’ is endemic to these cultures. The term ‘humane’ is often used, by those decrying slaughter practices in other cultural contexts, to advocate for reducing suffering of nonhuman animals, raised for food. It is irrelevant how nonhuman animals are killed, how quick their death is, or how little they suffered; that they *are* killed is the issue. In other words, the notion of ‘humane slaughter’ is an oxymoron.

²³ In many cases, condemnation of speciesist practices in other cultural contexts often entails a sweeping condemnation of whole cultures and peoples, in the guise of concern for nonhuman animals.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Feminist theorizing of speciesism has not only broadened our understanding of oppression, it has also made significant contributions to animal advocacy that include important critiques of the works of Tom Regan and Peter Singer, two influential figures in ‘Western’ contemporary animal rights discourse (Gruen, 1993; Seager, 2003a, 2003b; Gaard, 2002; Donovan, 1990, 2006; Kheel, 2008). Although distinct in their approaches, both Regan and Singer share a mutual disdain for expressions of caring for nonhuman animals as proposed in ‘care-based theory’ developed by feminists (Seager, 2003a).²⁴ Donovan (1990) acknowledges that rights-based and utilitarian perspectives offer some useful arguments in favour of ethical treatment of nonhuman animals. Importantly, she argues

it is possible – indeed, necessary – to ground that ethic in an emotional and spiritual conversation with nonhuman life-forms ... We should not kill, eat, torture, and exploit animals because they do not want to be so treated, and we know that. *If* we listen, we *can* hear them. (Donovan, 1990, p. 375) [emphasis mine]

And feminists did. A significant contribution to considerations of nonhuman animals is feminist animal care theory, which emerged in response to a utilitarian conceptualization of animal rights rooted in enlightenment/rationalist tradition (Donovan, 2006). Such a conceptualization, feminist animal care theorists argue, privileges reason (rights-based theory) or mathematical calculation (utilitarianism); it is dismissive of emotional responses of empathy and compassion as “relevant ethical and epistemological sources for human treatment of nonhuman animals (Donovan, 2006, p. 306). Donovan (2006) has argued, “as a strategy, evoking sympathy for an oppressed group has historically been an effective means of arousing moral indignation against oppressive practices” (p. 314). However, she is quick to remind us that advocating for nonhuman animals

²⁴ Seager (2003a) argues that Reagan and Singer have embraced what Susan Bordo (1986) has called ‘masculinized Cartesian thought’ in their approach to animal rights. Their rejection of feminist ‘care-based theory’ is based on rationalism (and subsequent repudiation of emotion or sentimentality, commonly associated with women), as advanced by the Enlightenment thinkers like René Descartes.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

based only on reason (as did rights-based and utilitarian theorists) or emotion is limiting and proposes, instead, a ‘dialogical ethic’. A dialogic ethic, according to Donovan (2006), must be based on not just caring about the ‘welfare’ of animals but about “what they are telling us” (p. 305); it focuses on the wishes of the animals (to not be killed, beaten, milked, plucked, violated, tested upon, forced to perform tricks etc.). Donovan’s conceptualization of ‘dialogic ethic’ is informed by Georg Lukács’ articulation of standpoint theory.²⁵ Most notably, she proposes that we “shift the epistemological source of theorizing about animals to the animals themselves” (p. 305-6) by extending feminist standpoint theory to animals. According to Donovan (2006)

[w]hen the theory is applied to animals, it is abundantly clear that they are commodified and quantified in the production process—even more literally so than the proletariat, whose bodies at least are not turned into dead consumable objects by the process, though they may be treated as mechanical means.

In the case of animals, as they are unable to organize in resistance to their objectification, Donovan (2006) argues, “it is clear that human advocates are required to articulate the standpoint of the animals ... and organize against the practices that reify and commodify animal subjects” (p. 320).

Like Donovan (1990), Kheel (2008) advanced a similar critique of animal rights discourses informed by utilitarianism and rights-based theory. Singer’s “idea of a shared capacity of humans and other-than-humans” (Kheel, 2008, p. 17) and Regan’s idea of nonhuman animals as having ‘inherent value’ based on ‘moral considerability’ which makes them ‘subjects of a life’ (Kheel, 2008) only serves to anthropomorphize nonhuman animals. Anthropomorphizing them as such reifies human-ness as the ultimate standard of being. An important contribution made by Kheel (1985; 2008) is her conceptualization of a ‘holist ecofeminist philosophy’. It is an

²⁵ In *History and Class Consciousness* (1971) (*Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* [1923]), Lukács “posited that the proletariat evinces a particular and privileged epistemology because of its commodification or reification in the capitalist production process” (Donovan, 2006, p. 319).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

approach based on a holism that “perceives nature ... as comprising individual beings that are part of a *dynamic* web of interconnections in which feelings, emotions, and inclinations (or energy) play an integral role” (Kheel, 1985, p. 141). Elsewhere, she has elaborated

[a] holist ecofeminist philosophy ... is a ‘way of life’ or a mode of consciousness ... It is an invitation to dissolve the dualistic thinking that separates reason from emotion, the conscious from unconscious, the ‘domestic’ from the ‘wild’, and animal advocacy from nature ethics. (Kheel, 2008, p. 251)

In her tribute to Kheel, Gruen (2012) highlights the importance of her work and that it led to many feminist thinkers to examine their own commitments to the nonhuman world.

Like vegetarian ecofeminism, feminist environmentalism has also highlighted the connection between speciesism and forms of human oppression. Seager (2003a) notes that feminist environmental scholarship and grassroots activism on animal rights hinge on three main concerns: “elucidating the commonalities in structures of oppressions across gender, race, class, and species; developing feminist-informed theories of the basis for allocating ‘rights’ to animals; and exposing the gendered assumptions and perceptions that underlie human relationships to nonhuman animals” (p. 168). Reiterating the interconnectedness of human and nonhuman oppressions, Seager (2003a) urges us to consider the cultural, class, racialized and gender contexts under which food is produced, alluding to the exploitation by the ‘food’ industry of non-human and human animals alike (p. 173).

Although feminist theorizing on overlapping oppressions of nonhuman animals and humans has been around since the 1980’s, this has not led to a mass change among feminists. In fact, such theorizing has been met with responses ranging from elaborately written criticisms that often include a distortion of ecofeminist insights to plain disgust.²⁶ In an essay inspired by a

²⁶ Kathryn Paxton George (1994) presents an elaborate critique against vegetarianism as a feminist ideal, for the sake of nonhuman animals, in “Should Feminists Be Vegetarians?” wherein she appears to conflate the theorizing of utilitarianism, by Peter Singer, and rights-based theory, by Tom Regan, with feminist calls for veganism. Her

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

personal encounter, Twine (2010) addresses responses of ‘disgust’ on the part of some feminists to comparisons of nonhuman and human oppressions.²⁷ He argues, “this disgust response is paradigmatic of a certain feminist disavowal of ecofeminism misread as a stereotypical representation of essentialist thinking” (p. 397). He makes an important observation, one highlighted by Gaard’s (2002) discussion of the contentious relationship that some feminists have with animal liberation efforts that analogize nonhuman and human oppressions:

[t]he agenda of ecofeminists such as Carol J. Adams and Josephine Donovan in juxtaposing ‘animals’ and ‘women’ is not the debasement of women but the explication of relations of power that intersect gender and species. Yet I think the disgust response ... may capture well more general feminist assumptions over ecofeminism as an antiquated essentialist romantic movement perhaps best left in the 1970s. (Twine, 2010, p. 400)

Building on ecofeminist insights, recently developed fields of inquiry like feminist animal studies (FAS) have facilitated the “awareness of species as an unexamined dimension in climate change” (Gaard, 2015, p. 20). FAS scholars have made important contributions to critiques of industrial animal food production, calling it a failure of reproductive and environmental justice, in “linking the exploitation of sexuality and reproduction across species as a feature of the colonialist and techno-science worldview” (Gaard, 2015, p. 26).

arguments are largely based on these theories and selective scientific scholarship on nutrition. She also falsely accuses ‘vegans’ of “[lobbying] for universal all-plant diets” (p. 421) and attributes a range of assumptions onto them, implying that a) they are insensitive to those, for various circumstantial reasons, are unable to adopt a vegan diet b) that they display class bias and ethnocentrism in promoting a plant-based diet and c) that ethical vegetarianism upholds male domination.

Similarly, in “The Feminist Connections between Women and Animals” (1996) Beth Dixon dismisses the ecofeminist discussions that focus on what she calls “symbolic connections between women and animals” (p. 181) and does not view nonhuman animals, as she claims ecofeminists do, as being oppressed in the way that women are (this is not what ecofeminists have argued). While she rightly notes that feminists have obligations to “liberate any oppressed population” (p. 181) she distorts ecofeminist insights on intersecting oppressions by arguing that they are only concerned with the overlapping oppressions of women and nonhuman animals.

²⁷ Twine’s (2010) essay is in response to ‘disgust’ expressed by a feminist academic colleague upon seeing Twine carrying a copy of the book *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (1995) by Carol Adams and Josephine Donovan.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Through a postcolonial ecofeminist reading of Mi'kmaq legends, Robinson (2013) proposes “a basis for a veganism rooted in Aboriginal culture” (p. 189). She argues that the construction of an ‘Aboriginal veganism’ faces two substantial barriers:

the first being the association of veganism with whiteness ... [w]hen veganism is constructed as white, Aboriginal people who eschew the use of animal products are depicted as sacrificing our cultural authenticity... A second barrier to Aboriginal veganism is the portrayal of veganism as a product of class privilege... This argument assumes that highly processed specialty products make up the bulk of a vegan diet. (p. 189-190)

The construction of veganism as unsuitable for the world's poor, Robinson (2013) argues, assumes that poverty is synonymous with abandonment of ethics and ignorant of plant-based food practices of some impoverished peoples of the world. The impact of colonization has vastly changed the landscape of Indigenous ways of life, literally and metaphorically, that included traditional farming, hunting and fishing. Robinson (2013) notes that the reinterpretation of tradition and malleability of ritual enabled Aboriginal peoples to survive the various colonial ills. Similarly, in calling for new ways of adaptation needed to face the “increasing individuality of urban life” she argues

[w]ith the adoption of a vegan diet our meal preparation and consumption can become infused with transcendent significance, as we recall our connection with other animals, our shared connection to the Creator, and prefigure a time when we can live in harmony with the animals, as Glooscap did before the invention of hunting.²⁸ (Robinson, 2013, p. 194)

Importantly, Robinson (2013) reminds us that “in many Indigenous origin stories the idea that humans were the last species to arrive on earth was central; it also meant that humans arrived in a state of dependence on an already-functioning society with particular values ethics etc.” (p. 25).

²⁸ In the Wabanaki telling of “Glooscap and His People”, Glooscap's nemesis Malsum turns the animals against him which leads him to declare them ‘man's’ servants that shall provide food and clothing to humankind (Robinson, 2013).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Elsewhere, Robinson (2014) has elaborated on the Mi'kmaq cultural view of nonhuman animals, as persons, and the role of reciprocity in the animal–human relationship through the concepts of respect and honor. She notes that the Mi'kmaq culture views animals as “self-aware rational beings whose existence is *for themselves* rather than *for us*” (Robinson, 2014, p. 674). According to Mi'kmaq worldview, a heavily animal-derived diet is reconciled in the Mi'kmaq belief that animals sacrifice themselves willingly to become food (Robinson, 2014). While the perception that nonhuman animals offer their lives willingly is contentious, to say the least, Robinson argues, “this dynamic is at least open to possibility of refusal on the part of the animal ... [undermining] the widespread view that humans have an innate right to use animal flesh as food” (2013, p. 191-192).

In her comparative analysis of the conceptualization of agency in the epistemological-ontological (Euro-Western) and Place-Thought (Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe cosmologies) frames, Watts (2013) argues “[in the former] agency has erroneously become exclusive to humans, thereby removing non-human agency from what constitutes a society” (p. 20).²⁹ In Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe perspectives, ‘society’, she notes, revolves around interactions between female, animals, the spirit world and the mineral and plant world (Watts, 2013). Whereas vegetarian ecofeminists such as Donovan (2006) have argued that nonhuman animals require human advocates to organize against exploitation of nonhuman animals, the Indigenous perspectives presented here, predating ‘Western’ rationalist and ecofeminist thought, view nonhuman animals as autonomous beings that possess agency. However, while it is not clear why a being, capable of refusal and possessing such agency, would willingly sacrifice herself

²⁹ Place-Thought “is based upon the premise that land is alive and thinking and that human and nonhumans derive agency through the extensions of these thoughts” (Watts, 2013, p. 121).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

these Indigenous perspectives effectively undermine the rationalist views of the nonhuman world as a domain to be conquered and dominated.

In a review of ecofeminist developments over three decades (1980s-2010), Gaard (2011a) writes about the absence of ecofeminist insights in recent feminist scholarship and praxis and the importance of recovering them. She argues that while ecofeminists have listened to their feminist (and other) critics, by incorporating materialist feminist insights, feminists have not accorded the same to ecofeminists, leading to “[a] human-centered (anthropocentric) feminism that has come to dominate feminist thinking in the new millennium effectively marginalizing feminism’s relevance” (Gaard, 2011a, p. 32). She calls for employing an ‘intersectional ecological-feminist’ approach which will frame issues ranging from global gender justice and climate justice to interspecies justice and indigenous rights, and many more, in such a way that “people can recognize common cause across the boundaries of race, class, gender, sexuality, species, age, ability, nation” in addition to “[affording] a basis for engaged theory, education, and activism” (p.44). This approach informs the direction for feminist pedagogy proposed in this study.

1.7 Conclusion

hooks (1991) has argued, “[t]heory is not inherently healing, liberatory, or revolutionary. It fulfills this function only when we ask it to do so and direct our theorizing towards this end” (p. 2). Therefore, for feminist theorizing on nonhuman animals to be liberatory, an important first step is addressing the glaring gap between theory and praxis. By extension, feminist pedagogy, as praxis, must include nonhuman animals in our considerations on oppression. To devise effective strategies for change, we must begin by obtaining a holistic understanding of oppression.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Feminist studies, which emerged as a form of resistance, has continued its tradition of identifying, exposing, and challenging oppressive ideologies and structures of oppressions, in pedagogy. Where ecofeminist theorizing on nonhuman animals has made significant contributions to animal advocacy and fields of critical inquiry like FAS, it is remarkable that these contributions remain largely absent in feminist pedagogy. A consistent consideration of nonhuman animals and their oppression is not only compatible with the goals of feminist pedagogy but also necessary. In so far as human-specific oppressions are concerned, feminist pedagogy, as praxis, has kept pace with developments in feminist scholarship. These developments, through the incorporation of intersectional and critical analyses, have made their way into introductory courses enabling students to develop critical analytical skills, allowing them to identify and challenge discrimination in various forms. Lynda Birke reminds us that “[o]ne of the strengths of feminist thought is that it is never ‘just’ about women: it is a critical discourse that tends to ask uncomfortable questions about everything” (as cited in Gaard, 2002, p. 117).

The ecofeminist literature presented here amply demonstrates that consideration of nonhuman animals is of feminist import and, by extension, that exclusion of speciesism from discussions of oppression is antithetical to feminist goals of justice and social change. It also demonstrates that critical analyses of structural oppressions that exclude speciesism are incomplete, at best. I argue that continuing in this direction will only produce incomplete solutions. Furthermore, by effectively situating speciesism as structural oppression the literature supports my objectives of ‘mainstreaming’ nonhuman animals in feminist studies and offering a new direction for feminist pedagogy. A discussion of speciesism, as a structural oppression, must be introduced at the foundational level of learning. In order to achieve this goal, it is important to

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

understand the pedagogical landscape of introductory courses in feminist studies. In Chapter 2, I will discuss the conceptual framework and methodology I used to explore how introductory courses are designed and taught in Canada.

Chapter Two Methodological Considerations

2.1 Researcher's positionality

The aim of this thesis is to contribute to mainstreaming consideration of nonhuman animals in feminist studies with the express purpose of addressing all forms of discrimination and, in doing so, offer a vision for a new feminist pedagogical future. It is informed by my commitment to an anti-discrimination feminism and ethical veganism and the knowledge I have gained from my engagement in grassroots organizing against various forms of nonhuman exploitation. My engagement with grassroots organizing has included marches against slaughterhouses, demonstrations against so-called amusement parks that exploit nonhuman animals for entertainment and businesses that sell fur, and vegan outreach. I have observed that grassroots campaigns tend to follow a rights-based approach and rely on tactics that are dictated by the aim to quickly capture attention of passersby and spectators, as time is of the essence. These tactics usually include provocative images of nonhuman animals exploited by the meat, dairy, fur and 'entertainment' industries, chants (some inspired by civil rights movements), and leaflets containing statistics and facts pertaining to exploitation of nonhuman animals in food and non-food industries. A common communication strategy used by activists is the juxtaposition of images of 'companion animals', such as dogs and cats, with those of 'food animals', such as cows and pigs, in an attempt to remedy the disconnect that allows for some nonhuman animals to be protected and others to become consumable. It is important to note here that grassroots efforts, in focusing on a rights-based approach and not a welfarist approach, advocate for ending nonhuman animal suffering. Whereas the focus of a welfarist approach is on improving conditions and treatment of nonhuman animals used for various purposes, a right-based approach demands an end to the use of nonhuman animals.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Understandably, given that the task at hand is to communicate effectively in a short time span, activists employ methods that do not allow for comprehensive discussions and critical analyses. Often, attempts to convey a counter-message of compassion for nonhuman animals employ what can be described as strategic anthropomorphism: attributing human characteristics and qualities to nonhuman animals, to evoke empathy. Usually, anti-speciesist campaigns use examples that highlight similarities between human and nonhuman motherhood, familial ties and bonding, caring for young, and displays of affections. This also includes drawing parallels between human and nonhuman suffering (specifically between racism and speciesism). Although strategic (and often effective), these tactics reinforce a consideration of nonhuman animals that is not on their own terms. A limitation of this approach is that it tends to focus on those nonhuman animals whom we perceive as sharing emotional and intellectual similarities with humans or those whom we see as 'cute'. It is important to recognize that this is, in part, because some nonhuman animals like large land and marine mammals (polar bears, whales, elephants, horses etc.) capture popular imagination more than reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates. While ethical vegans and animal advocates recognize dung beetles and lobsters just as they recognize an elephant or a humpback whale, as subjects of life, these beings are not generally the subject of grassroots campaigns whose focus tends to be mainly on nonhuman animals exploited in the meat, dairy, fur and entertainment industries.

Vegan outreach focuses on nonhuman animals that are exploited or killed for food. The aim is to disseminate information, via leaflets and dialogue, on plant-based alternatives to meat, milk, and eggs, highlighting environmental and health benefits of plant-based eating. An important part of vegan outreach is to make the public aware of conditions in which nonhuman animals are forced to live on farms and dispel myths about 'humane meat'. While outreach

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

occurs all year round, efforts are stepped up around big holidays such as Thanksgiving, Easter, and Christmas with a focus on making compassionate food choices via plant-based alternatives to meat, poultry and dairy. As with other forms of activism, vegan outreach largely focuses on some nonhuman animals. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that these forms of activism have a shared goal of eradicating oppression of nonhuman animals.

I have also observed that veganism and animal advocacy are assumed to be ‘Western’ phenomena. This is further reflected in the absence, in many grassroots campaigns, of Indigenous perspectives on relationships between humans and nonhumans; the Hindu philosophical concept of *ahimsa* (although one can often find the word tattooed on white activists); or an acknowledgment of the ‘non-Western’ origins of ethical vegetarianism. To expose cruelty toward nonhuman animals some activists deem whole cultures to be ‘backward’, ‘primitive’, ‘barbaric’ or ‘uncivilized’ for their exploitation of nonhuman animals through culture or context specific practices. When such pernicious attitudes are identified and called out, the response is often that concern for nonhuman animals supersedes cultural sensitivity because ‘humans are terrible’. Put simply, this is racism, under the guise of misanthropy, because the same treatment is not meted out to all humans guilty of exploiting nonhuman animals. For instance, the dog meat festival in Yulin, Guangxi is routinely invoked by many activists to condemn the People’s Republic of China (PRC), and its peoples, as a cruel and inhuman nation. What gets ignored is the tireless work of local activists, often risking their own safety, in rescuing hundreds of dogs from slaughter, each year. According to the Canadian Coalition for Farm Animals (n.d.), 665 million nonhuman animals are killed in Canada, annually, in the food industry alone. However, it is rare to find similar condemnation of Canada, as a nation, for the massive scale of slaughter that occurs here. My point here is not that Canada, as a nation, should

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

be subjected to a sweeping condemnation or that speciesism in one cultural context can be justified by speciesism in another. It is simply to highlight that members of a movement that claims to be anti-discriminatory must be careful to not engage in *any* form of discrimination because a) racism is not a response to fighting against speciesism and b) engaging in discriminatory behavior by any one fighting against any injustice only serves to undermine their cause. Similarly, those that identify as feminists and advocates for social justice must work toward the elimination of *all* forms of oppression and discrimination, regardless of one's species-membership. Challenging any oppression that impacts human individuals and groups is undermined when we fail to recognize oppressive practices against nonhuman individuals and groups.

My objective to situate speciesism, as a form of structural oppression, and species, as a category of intersectional analysis, deserving of critical consideration in feminist studies, is an exercise in pedagogical activism. It is to underscore that nonhuman animals, as Alice Walker has unequivocally stated, “exist for their own reasons” (as cited in Spiegel, 1996, p.14). Furthermore, the purpose of situating speciesism as such is to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of oppression that could lead to the development of effective strategies to challenge the same.

2.2 Conceptual framework

I used an ‘intersectional ecological-feminist’ approach, as articulated by Gaard (2011a), to a) to design questions for the survey b) to conduct a document review c) to interpret the data and d) to interpret the findings in my discussion. Gaard (2011a) argues that this approach frames issues ranging from global gender justice and climate justice to interspecies justice and indigenous rights, and many more, in such a way that “people can recognize common cause across the boundaries of race, class, gender, sexuality, species, age, ability, nation” in addition to

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

“[affording] a basis for engaged theory, education, and activism” (p.44). Furthermore, the underlying theme in the works on ecofeminism, discussed in Chapter 1, is the use of an intersectional lens to emphasize the interconnectedness between human and nonhuman animal oppressions. This is consistent with my own approach to feminism and feminist praxis which views 1) *all* oppressions as interconnected and 2) speciesism as *unfeminist*.

2.3 Research design

Gaard (2002) has argued that “[f]eminism’s commitment to inclusiveness has meant (ideally) that when a disenfranchised group is recognized, responding to and including the concerns of that group subsequently influences the shape of feminist theory” (p. 128).

Nonhuman animals have been recognized by activists and scholars alike as a ‘disenfranchised group’. Ecofeminist scholarship has effectively demonstrated that speciesism is a form of oppression, one that is clearly linked to the founding tenets of feminist thought. Is this reflected in foundational feminist studies pedagogy? The purpose of this thesis is to explore if and to what extent nonhuman animals are considered in feminist studies curricula.

In addition to conducting a literature review to present the breadth of scholarship on ecofeminism and its successive branches (see Chapter 1), I conducted a document review of course syllabi to gain a broad understanding of the topics and themes of pedagogical importance, and a survey of instructors who have recently taught introductory courses in feminist studies in Canada. Surveys are useful for descriptive, explanatory and exploratory purposes, for collection of original data to “describe a population too large to observe directly”, and for “measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population” (Babbie, 2013, p. 261).

2.4 Introductory courses

An introductory course in feminist studies aims to familiarize students with key concepts and issues in the area, usually through an interdisciplinary and intersectional approach. It plays a significant role in encouraging critical thinking, and is also influential in shaping lifelong understandings of issues of justice, feminisms, gender, race, sexuality, class, ability, relations of power, activism and organizing for social change, to name a few. Moreover, an introductory course is also a critical space where we can collaboratively learn *and*, more importantly, unlearn. Introductory courses, it has been argued, “have the most direct and lasting effect beyond the university” (Helen Hok-Sze Leung as cited in Thorpe et al., 2016, p. 60). Furthermore, an introductory course in feminist studies “provides an important space where difficult questions are often asked and where contentious, but crucial, debates can and do take place” (Olwan et al., 2016, p. 11). In my aim to contribute to the mainstreaming of nonhuman animals in feminist studies, I hope to evoke a re-examination of our relationship, as feminist scholars, students and activists, with nonhuman animals and afford them consideration as a marginalized group that experiences oppression, solely because of their membership in a nonhuman species.

Given the significance of introductory courses and their lasting influence on students, conducting the document review was an important exercise. It helped me in understanding which debates are taking place, what kinds of issues are being considered and if there are any gaps, by way of exclusions and absences. However, a document review does not reveal how these issues are selected. Therefore, conducting the survey was important to gain valuable instructor insights into how courses are conceptualized and what topics are considered important to include (or exclude). Together the findings from the document review and survey responses allowed for greater understanding of introductory courses as they are currently taught.

2.5 Data collection: Syllabi

To gain an understanding of how introductory courses are being taught in Canada, I collected syllabi for introductory courses and conducted an anonymous online survey of instructors who have recently taught an introductory course in women's and gender/feminist studies. The purpose of this exercise was to understand the key concepts and themes and whether speciesism and nonhuman animals are considered in feminist studies curricula. I contacted forty-nine institutions based on information available on Universities Canada's (formerly Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC)) website and a list provided by the Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes (WGSRF).³⁰

The response to my information requests was overwhelming. Of the forty-nine institutions I had contacted, I received course information in the form of syllabi and course outlines from twenty-seven institutions for forty-five introductory courses, taught at the first and second year levels. I must note here that in response to my information requests several instructors shared words of encouragement and enthusiasm for my project in describing it as "interesting", "fascinating" and "timely". Several instructors also expressed their interest in reading this thesis upon completion. One instructor asked for my suggestions for a reading list and key thinkers in the area as they were considering teaching a course on ecofeminism.

³⁰ WGSRF is a "Canadian-wide, bilingual, professional association of Women's and Gender Studies practitioners in Canada" (Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes, n.d.).

2.6 Data analysis: Syllabi

I conducted a content analysis of the course syllabi and outlines, which I will present in Chapter 3. The purpose of this exercise was to obtain a broad understanding of the content being taught, the themes and foci of introductory courses, and if scholarship on nonhuman animals were considered as part of curricula. I then developed an observation table (Appendix A), comprising sixteen broad themes, based on a close reading of the syllabi. Fourteen themes (themes 1-14) emerged in my examination of the documents; these themes were common to all or most of the courses. I chose these themes based on the topics covered by assigned texts and film screenings, guest lectures, and assignments and activities in each course. This selection of themes was, in part, informed by the authors whose works were considered in courses. For instance, ‘Masculinities’ as a theme emerged due the presence of works by Raewyn Connell, James Messerschmidt, Michael Kimmel and Jack Halberstam. Similarly, ‘Social, popular and cultural construction of gender/race/sexuality/bodies’ emerged as a theme because courses considered works by Judith Butler, Audre Lorde, C.J. Pascoe, Eli Clare, and Ivan Coyote, to name a few. The films included in the syllabi also helped in determining some themes that were not clearly stated as topics under consideration. For instance, ‘environmental issues: human impact and ecological degradation’ emerged as a theme because some courses included videos and films featuring activists like Vandana Shiva, Marilyn Waring and Wangari Maathai. In particular, I examined the documents for presence (and absence) of ecofeminist content and consideration of nonhuman animals (themes 15-16) and whether they were included in discussions of intersectionality, oppression, power, justice, and privilege.

2.7 Data collection: Survey

To further explore how introductory courses are designed and taught and to supplement my document review of course syllabi, I developed a survey for course instructors. The purpose of this survey was to further assess 1) if and to what extent they consider scholarship on speciesism to be part of foundational content in feminist studies, and 2) what rationales the instructors use to include (or exclude) such scholarship in their pedagogy.

Participants. Participants of this survey were instructors who have recently taught introductory courses in women's and gender/feminist studies at Canadian universities. This strategy, known as purposeful selection, entails the deliberate selection of settings, persons, or activities to provide information particularly relevant to one's questions and goals (Maxwell, 2013, p. 97). Upon obtaining clearance from the Carleton University Research Ethics Board (CUREB-A), I developed the survey in Qualtrics, a web-based tool, hosted on the company's server in the U.S. The survey was anonymous and did not collect any identifying information. As an added layer of security, the collection of IP addresses was disabled in the survey. On September 23, 2016, I sent an email with the survey link and survey information directly to instructors, where contact information was publicly available. Where such information was not readily available, I contacted program officers, via email, at respective institutions with a request that the email, with the survey link and survey information, be forwarded to instructors who have recently taught introductory courses in women's and gender/feminist studies programs. I used the list provided by the WGSRF which included departmental key contacts to ensure that I reached every relevant institution.

The welcome page for the survey was a consent form (Appendix B) which explained the purpose of the study. By clicking 'CONTINUE' at the bottom of the welcome page participants

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

consented to participation in the survey. Participants were informed, via the welcome page, that they could refuse to answer any of questions and that they could withdraw from the survey at any given time, for any reason, up until clicking the ‘SUBMIT’ button. As the collected data was anonymous, participants could not withdraw after clicking the ‘SUBMIT’ button. In cases where participants withdrew from participation before clicking the ‘SUBMIT’ button responses were destroyed. Upon completion of the survey, a page thanking them for their participation was displayed. The survey was open for a month (Sept. 23-Oct. 23, 2016), including one reminder on October 13, 2016, for completion of the survey.

The survey was completed by sixteen participants. Nine individuals did not complete the survey; their responses were not included. Given that there is a total of forty-nine institutions that could conceivably be included in the study, this response rate allowed for what constitutes a representative sample. Cook, Heath, & Thompson (2000) have noted that “that sample representativeness is more important than sample size” (p. 828).

Survey Questions. The survey was developed with the goal to understand the following (Appendix C):

- 1) key themes/concepts included in the course.
- 2) how these key themes/concepts were selected.
- 3) what instructors consider to be canons in teaching women’s and gender/feminist studies.
- 4) if ecofeminism is included as a major theme in the course.
- 5) if scholarship on nonhuman animals is included in the course.
- 6) if a discussion on speciesism is included in the course.
- 7) expected learning outcomes in the course.

In addition, the survey invited instructors to contribute any further comments to the survey. In Chapter 3, I will present my findings from the survey and document review.

Chapter Three Findings

Chapter 1 suggests that speciesism is a feminist issue, but one still absent in foundational feminist pedagogy. In this chapter, I will present findings from my review of course syllabi and the survey before turning my attention to a discussion of directions for the future.

3.1 Syllabi review: Course components

In my review of the course syllabi, the significance of intersectional and critical understanding of sex and gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, class, disability, globalization, oppressions, privilege, power, and resistance is clearly reflected in course components that comprise a) learning outcomes outlined in the syllabi b) course content (texts, screenings, and guest lectures) and c) assignments. I will present a brief discussion of each of these components before turning my attention to the findings of my review of the course syllabi and the survey.

Learning Outcomes. Expected learning outcomes, as outlined in the syllabi, are important to understanding how these courses are designed and highlight their importance as sites of lasting influence. In identifying expectations that stress the importance of developing critical thinking and writing skills, it is implied that students will carry the knowledge and skills gained in these courses with them, going forward. They also shed further light on the significance of and focus on critical, intersectional understandings of pertinent issues. The following ‘objectives’ are common to the courses reviewed here:

- familiarity with key concepts and terms in the field
- intersectional and critical understanding of: feminisms, oppression, patriarchy, power, privilege, difference, normativity, agency, colonization, globalization, violence, resistance, and social justice

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- familiarity with local and transnational movements and organizing
- familiarity with various feminist theoretical perspectives
- developing critical reading, writing, thinking and research skills
- challenge traditional assumptions about gender, sex, race/ethnicity, sexuality
- social awareness through feminist perspectives
- ability to link theory with praxis

Course Content. The significance of intersectional, and interdisciplinary, understandings of sex and gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, class, disability, globalization, oppressions, privilege, power, and resistance is clearly reflected in the course content which includes the assigned texts, films shown in class, and guest lectures. The sampling of course content included here is also to highlight the emphasis on introducing students to diverse perspectives. The observation table (Appendix A) further demonstrates that issues pertaining to nonhuman animals are not given consistent importance in introductory courses.

Texts (Appendix D). The texts sampled here show that issues pertaining to gender, race, sexuality, masculinity, patriarchy, social constructionism, indigeneity, colonialism, globalization, and organizing for social change are consistently included in most or all courses. In particular, the works by bell hooks (in fifteen courses), Jessica Valenti (in eleven courses), Peggy McIntosh (in nine courses), Patricia Hill Collins (in seven courses) demonstrate the importance placed by instructors on fostering an intersectional understanding of pertinent issues.

Films (Appendix E). Although, discernible patterns did not emerge in the selection of films and videos included in courses, it is important to note that the titles sampled here demonstrate the significance of introducing students to diverse voices on pertinent issues.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Remarkably, courses that did include ecofeminist content through texts, did not necessarily include relevant films.

Guest Lectures. Guest speakers included members of the faculty at the respective institutions, across disciplines, and community leaders with expertise on subjects of import to gender, race, sexuality, indigeneity in Canada, policy, women's work and activism. Widely-known speakers include Pam Palmater, Mi'kmaq and member of the Eel River Bar First Nation in northern New Brunswick and well-known lawyer and professor, currently teaching at Ryerson University; Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg and member of Alderville First Nation, writer, artist and professor, currently teaching at Ryerson University; and Catherine Martin, member of the Millbrook Mi'kmaq First Nation Community in Nova Scotia and an award-winning independent filmmaker (*The Spirit of Annie Mae*, 2002).

Assignments. Assignments in the courses include critical reflections on course readings and films and pertinent concepts and issues; research essays; group presentations; in-class responses; editorials; quizzes; lecture, film (shown in class) and outside event reports; blog posts; letters of praise or protest to the government, an NGO, a political leader, a university, corporation or an individual person; image analysis; journal entries; and midterm and final exams. Students are expected to critically apply their knowledge of course materials in each assignment. In particular, five courses included the following:

- an assignment that required students to develop a list, over the course of the term, of 'heroines', women whose actions they found to be significant. Students were asked to choose one such 'heroine' and prepare a short paragraph about her and the significance of her actions. These short paragraphs were then added to a booklet "aimed at telling young women about these heroines".

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- an assignment that required students to contribute two media items, pertinent to the course, which would be added to a class scrapbook.
- community service learning, wherein students could choose to work with selected organizations that work around racism, sexism, ableism, homophobia, transphobia, gender and/or feminism. This included submitting a 1-page reflection on the student's experience working with the chosen organization.
- an assignment that allowed students to produce a creative work on a theme, based on course readings or in-class screenings, of their choice. This included writing a poem, a song, a poster or a feminist advertisement. an autobiographical essay that asked students to introduce themselves and what matters to them with respect to justice. Another assignment in this course required small groups of students to meet with the instructor to discuss social injustices that they have observed around themselves, to engage in a conversation about those injustices.

The inclusion of such assignments reveals the instructors' intent in challenging students to not only think critically but also creatively and apply knowledge gained the course in innovative ways. Most importantly, these assignments allow students to understand the importance of practical applications of theory and practices informed by theory.

3.2 Course syllabi: Findings

In my review of the course syllabi I found that discussions of women's movements, intersectionality patriarchy, feminist resistance, activism and organizing for social change, patriarchy, social justice movements of the past and present, critical concepts and historical and contemporary examination of sex and gender, media and cultural representations of sex, gender and sexuality, power, oppression and injustice, and masculinities are common themes in

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

introductory courses taught in Canada. Of particular importance to my study are the following findings:

- a) all forty-five courses include an intersectional focus; discussions of power; discussions of patriarchy; and discussions of oppression and privilege
- b) ten courses included ecofeminist content with a focus on women’s relationship with nature, gender and development, and food security
- c) while none of the courses included a discussion of speciesism as an oppression or as part of their intersectional analyses or as an issue of justice it is reasonable to conclude, based on assigned readings from ecofeminist and environmentalist perspectives, that six courses may have included a limited discussion of nonhuman animals.

Below are my observations (Table 1) (see Appendix A) on a) ten courses that included a discussion of ecofeminism and b) six courses that may have included a limited discussion on nonhuman animals.

Table 1

Ecofeminism	Nonhuman animals
<p><u>S3</u>: TED Talk by Vandana Shiva on ecological crises, under a discussion of transnational feminisms, titled “Solutions to the Food and Ecological Crisis Facing Us Today” (2012). This talk focuses on the food crises in India caused by destructive agricultural practices, led by neoliberal policies; the harms of capitalist patriarchal thought on the human condition and the environment; a mechanistic view of the world that ignores the interconnections of all life on the planet; and a ‘monoculture of the mind’ which has led to starvation and farmer suicides in India; and the ecocide perpetrated by such views and actions (TEDxTalks, 2012).</p>	
<p><u>S9</u>: <i>Taking Root: The Vision of Wangari Maathai</i>, a documentary on Maathai’s “personal journey in</p>	

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

<p>the context of the turbulent political and environmental history of her country” (“The Story”, n.d.). This documentary focuses on Maathai’s grassroots efforts to empower local women who went on to working “successively against deforestation, poverty, ignorance, embedded economic interests, and political repression, until they became a national political force” (“The Story”, n.d.).</p>	
<p><u>S12</u>: assigned readings include a chapter on feminist leadership on the world stage, in <i>The Global Women’s Movement Origins, Issues and Strategies</i> (2004), by Peggy Antrobus. This chapter includes a discussion of women’s efforts against environmental degradation through well-known examples like the Chipko Movement (India); UN conference on Environment and Development (UNCED); a brief discussion of the early work of ecofeminist, environmental activist and Vandana Shiva; and myths about environmental degradation that target the poor and marginalized communities.</p>	
<p><u>S24</u>: assigned reading by Rosemarie Tong on Ecofeminism (4th Ed.) in <i>Feminist Thought</i> (2013), under discussion of ecofeminism.</p>	<p><u>S24</u>: nonhuman animals may have been discussed, based on an assigned reading by Rosemarie Tong on Ecofeminism in <i>Feminist Thought</i>.</p>
<p><u>S25</u>: assigned reading by Rosemarie Tong on Ecofeminism (4th Ed.) in <i>Feminist Thought</i> (2013), under discussion of ecofeminism.</p>	<p><u>S25</u>: nonhuman animals may have been discussed, based on an assigned reading by Rosemarie Tong on Ecofeminism in <i>Feminist Thought</i>.</p>
<p><u>S26</u>: assigned reading of David Suzuki’s <i>The Legacy</i> (2010), under discussion of environmental issues and ecofeminism. This short reading focuses on the value of listening to our elders, gaining from their wisdom and knowledge for a sustainable and harmonious living, our impact on the environment, and a vision for a sustainable future.</p>	<p><u>S26</u>: nonhuman animals may have been discussed, based on an assigned reading of <i>The Legacy: An Elder’s Vision for Our Sustainable Future</i> by David Suzuki (2010).</p>
<p><u>S27</u>: assigned reading by Mies and Shiva on Ecofeminism in <i>Feminisms and Womanisms: A Women’s Studies Reader</i> (2004) by Althea Prince and Susan Silva-Wayne (Eds.) under a discussion on ‘looking back and looking ahead’. The course also discusses Marilyn Waring’s ideas on global economics, premised on ideologies that devalue women’s work and fuel environmental degradation, and the way forward for a sustainable. This discussion included an article by Waring (2003), titled “Counting for Something! Recognising Women’s Contribution to the Global Economy through Alternative Accounting Systems”, on the realities of women’s</p>	<p><u>S27</u>: nonhuman animals may have been discussed, based on an assigned reading by Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva on <i>Ecofeminism in Feminisms and Womanisms: A Women’s Studies Reader</i>.</p>

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

<p>contributions to the economy and alternative ways of accounting. The course also included a required viewing of a feature-length documentary on Waring titled <i>Who's Counting? Sex, Lies and Global Economics</i> (1995) in which Waring “demystifies the language of economics by defining it as a value system in which all goods and activities are related only to their monetary value” and one that devalues women’s unpaid work (“Synopsis”, n.d.).</p>	
<p><u>S28</u>: assigned reading on “Gender and Environmental Change” in <i>Gender: In World Perspective</i> (3rd edition) (2015) by Raewyn Connell & Rebecca Pearse (Eds.).</p>	<p><u>S28</u>: nonhuman animals may have been discussed, based on an assigned reading on “Gender and Environmental Change” in <i>Gender: In World Perspective</i> (3rd edition) (2015) by Raewyn Connell & Rebecca Pearse (Eds.).</p>
<p><u>S34</u>: "Alternatives to Globalization: Women Small-Scale Farmers and Local Food Systems," by Martha McMahon in <i>Women in a Globalizing World: Transforming Equality, Development, Diversity and Peace</i> by Angela Miles (Ed.) (2013), under a discussion on class. The discussion also included a required viewing of a talk by Vandana Shiva “Growth = Poverty” (2013). This talk by Shiva focuses on the detrimental impact of the neoliberal ideology of ‘growth’ (also known as ‘development’) that disproportionately affects communities that depend on a healthy ecosystem for their livelihoods; the rampant environmental degradation caused by irresponsible extraction of natural resources that includes water, minerals and timber; the exploitation of ecosystems rich in natural resources in ‘developing’ nations by ‘developed’ nations, premised on the notion that these transactions enable growth and participation in the global economy for ‘developing’ nations; and the ‘poverty in food’ caused by destructive agricultural practices, led by neoliberal policies, which then cause the health of the ecosystem to decline. Shiva attributes these errors to a capitalist patriarchy.</p>	
<p><u>S38</u>: assigned reading on “Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing” by Rosemary Radford Ruether in <i>Women's Studies in Religion</i> by Kate Bagley and Kathleen McIntosh (Eds.) (2007), under a discussion on spirituality and ecofeminism.</p>	<p><u>S38</u>: nonhuman animals may have been discussed, based on an assigned reading on “Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing” by Rosemary Radford Ruether in <i>Women's Studies in Religion</i> by Kate Bagley and Kathleen McIntosh (Eds.) (2007)</p>

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

An unexpected finding, in this review, was the presence of content possibly pertaining to environmental degradation in two courses that did not include ecofeminism or environmental issues, as major themes. One course, under a discussion on ‘consumption and production in the lives of women’, included a viewing *The Story of Stuff* (2007) which “exposes the connections between a huge number of environmental and social issues, and calls us together to create a more sustainable and just world” (“The Story of Stuff”, 2007) and *The Story of Cosmetics* (2010) which “examines the pervasive use of toxic chemicals in our everyday personal care products, from lipstick to baby shampoo” (“The Story of Cosmetics”, 2010). In another course, Ana M. Juarez’s (2002) article titled “Ecological Degradation, Global Tourism, and Inequality: Maya Interpretations of the Changing Environment in Quintana Roo, Mexico” was included as an assigned reading under a discussion of travel and tourism. This article, focusing on the perspective of indigenous Mayas, “documents and describes the process of ecological degradation and the rise of the tourist industry in Tulum, Quintana Roo, Mexico” (Juarez, 2002, p. 113). The presence of a discussion on ecological degradation is significant here as it exposes the various harms caused by mass tourism on subsistence-based economies; livelihoods of those that rely on the land; and on local biodiversity. Also significant is the absence, in this course, of a larger discussion of the impact (loss of habitat and life) of ecological degradation on nonhuman animals.

As the literature in Chapter 1 demonstrates, ecofeminist analyses, informed by intersectionality and other feminist theories, firmly situate speciesism as a structural oppression and of feminist import. Importantly, Spiegel’s (1996) account of parallels between human and nonhuman slavery has located speciesism as a foundational oppression. However, this is not consistently reflected in foundational pedagogy in feminist studies.

3.3 Survey findings

Of the sixteen participants who completed the survey, four responded that they included ecofeminism as a major theme in the courses they taught. Four other participants responded that they included scholarship on nonhuman animals. Four participants also responded that they included a discussion on speciesism in the courses they taught. The survey also asked participants to provide a brief rationale as to why they included or excluded scholarship on nonhuman animals. Participants responded that they excluded such content a) due to time (single term) and scope constraints b) because they did not see a connection between feminism and nonhuman animal rights c) because discussion on ecofeminism focused on humans and d) because their university offers relevant courses at the upper level.

In response to a question on major themes included in courses, participants noted the following: overview of women's movements and women's studies, intersectionality, indigenous issues, colonialism, imperialism, patriarchy, racism, sexism, sexuality, (dis)ability, hetero-/cisnormativity, religion, art, social constructionism, violence, neo-liberalism, capitalism, globalization, social justice, feminist activism, feminist pedagogy, oppression, privilege, and transnationalism. Two participants mentioned that they included environmental issues and only one mentioned that they include nonhuman animals.

In response to a question on how course themes were selected, participants responded that selection was based on learning outcomes; area(s) of expertise and broader interest; assigned textbook(s); 'being inclusive'; yearly theme for the course; availability of topics geared toward first-year courses; areas of the discipline with major theories and body of evidence.

The survey asked participants what they considered to be canons in teaching women's and gender/feminist studies; if this has changed; if any have become irrelevant; and how this

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

impacted their teaching. All participants responded that they did not think in terms of canons. However, while they did not consider anything to be particularly canonical, they included key concepts that include: gender, race/ethnicity, age, class, disability, religion, patriarchy, social constructionism, intersectionality, activism, various feminisms, sexuality, social justice, bodies, indigeneity, and globalization. The following responses illuminate their resistance to canons:

I believe that the whole point of women's studies and of feminist pedagogy is NOT to have canons, I do see more and more activist writings becoming historical documents to be studied, and I do this in my classes.

I think that Women's and Gender Studies resists canons. That said, there are a number of ideas that I think are central to the training of first year students - generally I think the first year course has to introduce students to the main questions and theoretical perspectives of our field ... What I see as fundamental to first year training has certainly changed - for instance, I no longer introduce students to feminism through the categories of Marxist, liberal, and radical; trans issues have become increasingly central to teaching first year students, and students are also coming with a heck of a lot of knowledge about feminism that they are collecting from the internet.

I have never thought in terms of canons. For me, women's and gender studies is a dynamic field and as practitioners, it is our responsibility to remain current in the discipline.

I am not sure I consider anything in particular a canonical *sine qua non*, but I do have the sense that there has been a recent expansion to cover critical animal studies and disability studies and that I have not personally managed to incorporate those things.

Responses also suggest that very little has become irrelevant in feminist studies. This is a stark reminder that while much work has been done with respect to social, political and cultural change, much still needs to be done. One participant responded

intersectionality and the importance of addressing interconnections of oppression and the potential for alliances against oppression are central in my teaching. I'm sure that some areas of emphasis have changed over time, I'm not sure what has become irrelevant, sadly.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

It is clear from these responses that despite concerns around its institutionalization and academization, as discussed in Chapter 1, feminist studies remains committed to its origins as a form of resistance. It challenges the notion that despite relentless attacks on feminist studies programs in universities dictated by economic and a politics of neoliberalism and corporatism (Bromley & Ahmad, 2013) instructors have not relented by adopting a business-model approach to pedagogy. The resistance to canons, as expressed by participants, and evolving curricula not only highlight that feminist studies pedagogy strives to be inclusive but that it is also open to interventions. This finding is significant for my study as it offers the promise of expanding pedagogical scope to include nonhuman animals, consistently.

Ecofeminism as a major theme. The survey asked participants if they included ecofeminism as a major theme in their courses. If they responded ‘yes’, they were asked to provide a brief explanation of their understanding of ecofeminism and the texts they used in their courses to teach this topic.

I present feminist encounters with the environment and use my text which includes a section on the subject. I tend not to go deeply into ecofeminism per se but into environmental concerns and the feminists who work in the area.

Indigenous scholars have brought in key concepts and necessities to thinking about ecofeminism but also when considering refugee and immigrant pressures, living at the margins here and the lack of food security...

The logic of domination that structures gender oppression, racism, sexual oppression, and so on also structures our relationships with nonhuman animals and the environment. Ecofeminism problematizes the logic of domination in a fuller sense than some other approaches. [I include the] ecofeminism chapter from Rosemarie Tong's book *Feminist Thought*. It includes thinkers such as Karen Warren, Mary Daly, Starhawk, Vandana Shiva, many others... Also I have included, in various semesters, essays by Carol Adams, Karen Warren, and Vandana Shiva. I also routinely teach Marge Piercy's novel *Woman on the Edge of Time*.

Inclusion of non-human animals and physical environments in the matrix of oppressions that feminism seek to address in its social justice/social change work. Have used Carol Adams (*Sexual politics of meat*) and Vandana Shiva (videos/documentary).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Although these responses offer some optimism, they also highlight that ecofeminist contributions are not consistently considered as important inclusions in foundational pedagogy. The literature review in Chapter 1 has amply demonstrated the importance of such contributions. However, while all courses, reviewed in this study, considered various oppressions it is important to note that the absence of a consistent consideration of speciesism will only produce incomplete analyses, leading to incomplete strategies for change. If the goal of introductory courses, as highlighted in the learning outcomes, is to foster critical and intersectional thought and action it is especially important that students are presented with complete narratives of the similar ways in structural oppressions operate.

Where participants responded that they did not include ecofeminism as a major theme they were asked to respond to these follow-up questions: a) if they had included it in the past and b) if they changed their mind about including it any longer. The responses included a) that ecofeminism was never included as a major theme b) that it was mentioned briefly and c) that relevant content was not taught under ecofeminism but under other discussions, such as globalization, Indigenous issues, capitalism, and neo-liberalism. One participant responded:

My first-year course doesn't include any real schools or streams of feminism. I do include ecofeminism in my feminist theory teaching and am in the process of changing my syllabus to make it MORE prominent, since I think ecofeminism and issues concerning the human/animal boundary are more relevant than ever. Having said that, I am troubled by the overly human-centric focus of my first-year course. For example, I haven't dedicated much time to human-on-animal violence in our violence sections, and I think that's a real problem--just one of many. I have talked about gender and climate change/environmentalism, but that is as close as I come. Other than talking about animal rights as a commitment of first-wave feminism, I haven't really done anything. I think I have real work to do in this area.

Another participant responded:

Ecofeminism figures in our discussions of Marilyn Waring's work, where unpaid labour and the environment are both the focus. Issues of relationships with the natural world figure in many other parts of the course, but these are not usually specifically under the

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

rubric of ecofeminism (they figure in discussions of capitalism, resource exploitation, globalization and neo-liberalism, in discussions of spirituality, bodily autonomy, and Indigenous sovereignty and in a few other places).

Nonhuman animals. The survey asked participants if their courses included scholarship on nonhuman animals. A follow-up question asked them to provide a brief rationale for excluding or including such scholarship. Below are some responses to why such scholarship and discussion were excluded:

I'm ashamed to say that the general exclusion of non-human animal issues has been more or less a default position caused by the compression of the term. I have no way to rationalize it.

At this introductory level, we are fortunate if the students begin to grasp the human issues involved in feminist studies. I only have "x" amount of time and resources for this group and there isn't enough space/time to develop the level of analysis/thought to incorporate the nonhuman issues in any substantive way (in my opinion).

While I see a plausible connection between gendered, class, racialized freedom and ecological or species freedom discourses, I don't see the necessary connection between feminism in particular and non-human animal rights. It's just not part of the intro course mandate and it's not part of my own scholarly toolbox or commitments in social justice activism terms, except in a general anti-industrial food systems practice.

We have senior courses taught by an expert in this field in our program. I think that speciesism and ecofeminism are valuable fields of study, but they are not foundational to my understanding of WGS education and so, when I make decisions about what to include and exclude in the first year class, this falls on the exclude pile (as do many valuable topics) ...

There is so much else to cover ... but I am not opposed to inclusion of the theme and I might incorporate it in the future somehow. Right now, I am more focused on human animals.

While we address ecofeminism in the intro course, the emphasis in the introductory class is on broader environmental issues (not specific to non-human animals). Our university offers a separate course entirely on Ecofeminist theory (which is generally offered once per year) in which issues of non-human animals are explored in greater detail.

The exclusion is simply due to the focus of the course as an history of actions by feminists as an introductory level. If there were room to discuss ecofeminists, the sexual politics of meat, it would be possible to include ...

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

In light of the ecofeminist contributions to feminist scholarship, that spans three decades, and the emergence of fields like FAS, it is remarkable that connections between nonhuman animals and feminism are not evident, as expressed by one participant. As the literature in Chapter 1, effectively demonstrates, inclusion of nonhuman animals is compatible with feminist goals of challenging, resisting and organizing against *all* forms of oppression. In my view, not including nonhuman animals for reasons of time is unconvincing. It is true that a single course cannot cover all relevant topics. However, given that speciesism operates on a centric foundation, as do other isms, a discussion of oppression without speciesism is akin to a discussion of colonization without addressing racism. How effective are strategies that are uninformed by the complete story that belies that which we seek to change?

Some participants that did not include scholarship on nonhuman animals noted that they would consider including such content and discussion on nonhuman animals when revising their courses for next year. This finding is noteworthy as the survey did not ask participants if they would consider including such scholarship in the future. Some participants that included such content did so as part of discussions on intersectionality, religion, and Indigenous and/or non-Euro-centric perspectives. One participant responded that:

This topic may come up briefly when dealing with advertising, the body and the cosmetic industry's use of animals. It is also discussed briefly under the maternal feminist's concern with animal rights in the first wave movement.

Another participant that identified as vegan responded:

It isn't every semester, but it has been in some semesters (for reasons I could explain). I'm vegan, and it's the most important issue to me. Also, as an educator, one of my main goals is to help students implicate themselves in systems of privilege. I get a lot of cognitive dissonance when I teach about the connection between violence, women, and nonhuman animals. It stretches the students--and when former students write back to me, it's mostly on veganism.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

This response is particularly interesting as it resonates with why I have undertaken this research project and the cognitive dissonance I have encountered when speaking on the subject. In my discussion of the findings, I will return to a plausible explanation for such dissonance and why some do not readily ‘see’ the connections between human and nonhuman oppressions.

Learning Outcomes. The survey asked participants to identify the learning outcomes for their courses; participants identified similar expectations to those that were outlined in the course syllabi. In addition, some participants provided further insight into their goals for the course. In addition, some participants shared the following:

A critical understanding of power as it flows through social bodies.

Reflect critically on your relationship to a variety of feminist concepts, as well as on relationships between feminism(s) and other movements working against injustice.

Like me I want students to see the world they live in and how we create conditions that put others at risk. I want them to see power at its worst and know why we allow it. I want them to claim their own voices and do the work of change.

Students will be aware of the complexities of diversity and the relations of power.

[A]ttention to connections among forms of oppression and potential for alliances and working across difference as part of social transformation.

Recognize intersectional oppressions in texts, students' lives, the world, relationships.

I hope that first year students will begin to ask big questions about the ways that the stories we tell, collectively and not always consistently, about gender are made to seem natural and unchanging. Students come to understand gender as produced at the intersections of age, class, race, sexuality, ability, and other sociocultural factors, I want to students to understand their own roles in circulating stories about gender, and we set out to disrupt conventional narratives about gender.

It is clear from these responses that instructors are not mere ‘service providers’. They are invested in how students learn. It is clear from these responses that it is expected that participation in these courses will have lasting influence on students, preparing them for academic, personal, civic and political life.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Survey feedback. The survey invited participants to share any additional comments, in response to the overall survey:

I think this survey is incredibly timely, given that I've just decided that both the feminist theory seminar I teach and my first-year gender studies course need to do more in this area. I am bringing in a feminist animal-rights speaker for my next iteration of the first-year course. In general, I attempt to trouble the animal/human binary from the beginning of the class, but this is primarily in the context of analyzing sex difference in non-human animals rather than from an ethical or broader perspective. I hope you will present your findings on this topic in the near future!

I fully expect that when my colleague teaches the 101 course, this topic is included, as it is part of her scholarly work and commitments. I appreciate being asked about this in your survey because it challenges my own assumptions about what I do include and don't include in the 12-week course.

I wish I had spent more time on this because what I have added doesn't come close to what I hope a conversation would provide. We need more cross platform conversations particularly as we find more students living in a time of controlling conversations through tech (although also blasting through with critiques).

In short, I think that nonhuman issues are very important for feminist studies but more appropriate as topics to be explored at the second- and third-levels.

The particular class as titled doesn't lend itself to dealing with non human animals but I might have included that theme had the course been an open-ended intro to feminist perspectives ...

I have not always included veganism on my syllabus--about half the time. This survey challenges me to do more.

These responses illuminate that instructors are receptive to re-visiting and expanding the scope of their pedagogy to include nonhuman animals. This feedback encourages me as a researcher, and activist, to pursue my goals of advancing a mainstream focus on speciesism and for nonhuman animals to be considered as part of feminist pedagogy, on their own terms. Most importantly, these comments are reassuring for a new future of feminist pedagogy, one that can recognize speciesism as an issue of justice and nonhuman animals as worthy of critical consideration. Overall, responses from the survey provide an excellent insight into how

introductory courses are conceived, designed, and taught and future directions of feminist pedagogy.

3.4 Discussion

The purpose of this thesis was to explore whether a gap between existing feminist scholarship on nonhuman animals and pedagogy is only apparent and if such a gap is a real limitation in how feminist studies is taught in Canadian universities. The findings of the syllabi review and the survey clearly demonstrate that such a gap exists. I will begin this section by reiterating the connection between feminism and nonhuman animals before addressing the findings.

Prevailing ideology and discourse, operating on dualisms of human/animal and nature/culture, have ontologized nonhuman animals as usable, disposable and consumable (Adams, 1993). Feminists have only fared only slightly better in this regard. Addressing the question ‘should all feminists be vegetarian/vegan?’ (one encountered by those of us that identify as feminist *and* vegan) and whether feminist conferences, should serve only vegetarian food, Adams (1993) explains that “autonomy—the insistence that enforcing vegetarianism at a conference restricts an individual’s autonomy” (p. 210)—and ‘pluralism’—feminist conferences must be pluralistic—are often invoked as defenses of what she called the ‘feminist trafficking in animals’.³¹ An important contribution of this discussion is her position that viewing species as a social construction enables offering “an alternative social construction that is morally preferable, one that recognizes animals as a subordinated group, rather than naturally usable” (Adams, 1993, p. 201). A plausible explanation for why nonhuman animals have not received substantial

³¹ Adams (1993) is deliberate in using the phrase ‘feminist trafficking in animals’. In using this phrase, she notes “I wish to politicize the use of animals’ bodies as commodities” (p. 197), to draw attention to “the serving of animal flesh” (p. 197) at feminist conferences and gatherings. She goes on to declare that “trafficking in animals oppresses them ... in other words, trafficking in animals makes us oppressors” (Adams, 1993, p.213).

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

attention, in feminist pedagogy, is that they are not viewed as a 'subordinated group'. Viewing nonhuman animals as such will contribute to remedying the cognitive dissonance that occurs when a claim to recognize their oppression is made.

The exclusion of significant ecofeminist contributions to consideration of nonhuman animals as a 'subordinate group, speciesism as a structural oppression, and species as a category of analysis, is a real limitation of feminist pedagogy as it leads to incomplete analyses of oppression and strategies for change. It is clear from the findings that instructors aim to a) facilitate intersectional, multidisciplinary and critical understandings of topics under consideration b) include diverse perspectives c) facilitate critical analytical skills that students carry forward in academic and personal life d) challenge normative and oppressive ideologies and e) foster a commitment to social justice through discussions on feminist activism and resistance. I would argue that these aims can be more fully realized if holistic analyses of oppression, which include all forms of oppression, are undertaken in feminist studies.

One of the survey responses to why scholarship on nonhuman animals is excluded was that course themes are chosen based on learning outcomes; another response was that consideration of nonhuman animals is not within the mandate, informed by the learning outcomes. My interpretation of the 'mandate' as outlined in the learning outcomes, overall, is that instructors seek to enable to students to challenge and unsettle taken-for-granted ideas about gender, race, sexuality, class, (dis)ability, oppression, power and privilege. This is achieved, as is evident in the findings, by facilitating an intersectional understanding of oppression and privilege. Therefore, speciesism must be included in introductory courses to challenge the notion that oppression is experienced by human animals only.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

The findings of this study also clearly demonstrate that introductory courses are of great import. The various course components discussed in this section are geared toward facilitating an intersectional and multidisciplinary approach to pertinent issues. The assignments are designed to ensure that students can critically apply the knowledge and skills gained in the course; the films and guest lectures allow them to hear diverse voices and lived experiences, further enhancing their understanding of course materials. The inclusion of diverse course components also show that feminist pedagogy has kept pace with developments in feminist discourse. This is evident in the inclusion of course content that clearly reflects traditional and emerging localized and cross-cultural understanding of gender, race, sexuality among other categories for analysis, and intersectional understanding of oppression. For instance, the discussions of patriarchy, informed by the works of intersectional theorists, no longer take women as a homogenous category or hetero-patriarchy as their singular oppression. Discussions of masculinity have evolved into discussion of *masculinities*, expanding our understanding of the same as complex and dynamic. However, this has not been the case with respect to ecofeminist scholarship. Observations from the syllabi review and the survey responses similarly indicate that ecofeminism is not consistently included in introductory courses and that nonhuman animals are discussed, if at all, to a limited extent.

It was suggested in some survey responses that discussions of nonhuman animals are better-suited to courses offered at the upper-year levels. A plausible explanation for could be that in-depth undertakings of various topics are not possible at the introductory level where the effort is to introduce students to a variety of perspectives. Introductory courses, however, provide a strong foundation for students to undertake upper-year courses which is precisely why a consideration of nonhuman animals, as a ‘subordinate group’, and speciesism, as a form of

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

structural oppression, must be introduced at the first-year level. After all, fragmented problems will lead to fragmented solutions. It was also noted, by some participants, that exclusion of ecofeminist considerations is due to time and resources constraints. The challenges instructors face with respect to these constraints are real, as introductory courses strive to cover a substantial amount of information in a limited amount of time. However, an introductory course is designed to provide a strong foundation for further study. Therefore, a strong foundation depends on complete narratives.

The importance of an introductory course in feminist studies also lies in its ability to enable students to challenge cultural, social and political givens such as dualistic notions of identity that position one as superior to the other i.e. man/woman, black/white, reason/emotion, masculine/feminine; traditional ideas about sex, gender and race/ethnicity; and singular approaches to oppression and privilege. hooks (2000) has argued

Western metaphysical dualism (the assumption that the world can always be understood by binary categories, that there is an inferior and a superior, a good and a bad) was the ideological foundation of all forms of group oppression, sexism, racism, etc. ... (p. 106)

Similarly, the human/animal dualism, is the ideological foundation of speciesism: the ‘group oppression’ of nonhuman animals. However, such a consideration is absent from discussions in introductory courses. Given the major themes in introductory courses, as they emerged in the syllabi review and in survey responses, I will explain why a consistent consideration of nonhuman animals is not only warranted but that it is a feminist issue, of foundational importance.

Intersectionality. As noted in Chapter 1, intersectionality, as a theoretical framework, is arguably the most important contribution of women’s studies, along with related fields, (McCall,

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

2005) not only to feminist thought and praxis but also to other fields of inquiry. However, Twine (2010) has argued

much recent feminist work specifically on the concept of intersectionality ... makes no references to ecofeminist theory, or 'nature', or the question of the animal. This is not to say that these works lack sophistication, but that they do seem to both exclude the nonhuman from the political, and operate an understanding of the 'social' as equated with the human. There is hopefully some vigour to the argument that feminist work on intersectionality and feminism generally should broaden out to research and theorize our political relations to the more-than human. (p. 402)

In the present context, it is important to note that Critical Animal Studies (CAS) has exemplified "an explicit commitment to fighting discrimination and oppression, adding species to the intersectional analysis of race, gender and class and emphasizing the role of capitalism in exploitation of all these entities" (Freeman, 2014, p. 37). It is important to bring such an explicit commitment to feminist studies. Vegetarian ecofeminists and feminist environmentalists have effectively shown that speciesism is a structural oppression, one that must be understood intersectionally. According to Potts (2010)

when we confront the denigration or trivialization of nonhuman animals we also find new ways to challenge racism, (hetero)sexism and classism. A feminist politics embracing such intersectionality as a starting point is a fuller and more powerful adversary against social injustice. (p. 299)

In her analysis on the overlap between women's oppression and the oppression of nonhuman animals, Adams (1990) has argued that institutionalized patriarchy renders both 'absent referents'. Spiegel (1996) has demonstrated a similar overlap, in the context of the trans-Atlantic slave trade, arguing that the basis for racist subjugation and moral disqualification of African persons (while not viewed as persons by 'slave-traders') was that they were viewed as 'irrational' 'wild' and 'inferior', as were nonhuman animals. Her analysis situates speciesism as a foundational oppression. Arguing that the master/slave narrative has claimed both human and nonhuman lives, Spiegel (1996) highlights the importance of challenging speciesism in noting,

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

“[by] eliminating the oppression of animals from the fabric of our culture, we begin to undermine some of the psychological structures inherent in a society which seems to create and foster masters” (p. 32).

Discussions of intersectionality that focus solely on oppressions experienced by humans, leaving speciesism unexamined, are incomplete, at best. According to Gaard (2002) “[f]eminism’s commitment to inclusiveness has meant (ideally) that when a disenfranchised group is recognized, responding to and including the concerns of that group subsequently influences the shape of feminist theory” (p. 128); this has been most effectively demonstrated by vegetarian ecofeminism and feminist environmentalism. The feminist commitment to inclusiveness must also reflect in feminist pedagogy, as praxis. Twine (2010) argues “[i]t is one thing to include the nonhuman in one’s understanding of intersectionality, another also to accept the nonhuman into the political and act accordingly” (p. 400). If the goal of feminism is justice for *all* by elimination *all* forms of discrimination, the consideration of nonhuman animals, as a ‘subordinate’ group, is imperative to achieving this goal.

Patriarchy. Ecofeminists have amply demonstrated that the domination of women and nature is rooted in patriarchal ideology (Gaard, 2002). Adams (1990) has argued that “[a]utonomous, antipatriarchal being is clearly vegetarian. To destabilize patriarchal consumption, we must interrupt patriarchal meals of meat” (p. 188).³² Although use of nonhuman animals for their flesh, milk and eggs is the most pervasive form of their exploitation,

³² While Adams (1990) uses the word ‘vegetarian’, it is clear from her account of the various ways in which nonhuman animals are oppressed that the word ‘vegetarian’ can be understood to mean vegan. Similarly, vegetarian ecofeminists when using the term ‘vegetarian’ seem to imply vegan as they challenge the use of animals in all forms. Vegetarian, in popular discourse, generally refers to someone who refrains from eating animal flesh but not all animal-derived products (milk, eggs, honey, leather, silk, wool, ‘sustainable fur’). Vegan, on the other hand, refers to someone that abstains from or rejects the use of *any* nonhuman animal-derived products. Personally, I use the term ‘ethical veganism’ to describe efforts to do least harm in adopting principles of compassion and non-violence, toward *all*, in thought and action. This includes not only refraining from using food/non-food and animal-tested products, but, more importantly, actively working to eliminate oppression of animals for any purpose.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

nonhuman animals suffer tremendously for non-food purposes as well. That we, as humans, think at all that we can appropriate their bodies for any or many purposes is at issue here.

According to Gruen (1993)

[b]y refusing to consume the products of pain (not eating animals, not wearing leather, fur, and feathers, not using makeup and household products that have been tested on animals), feminists, like animal liberationists, can directly deny the legitimacy of a patriarchal system that treats sentient individuals as objects to use and profit from. (p. 83)

In our efforts to destabilize patriarchal domination, it is important to understand the extent of such domination and that it includes the nonhuman world; the failure to do will render our effort to challenge oppression incomplete and ineffective. Given that discussion of patriarchy is a major theme, in introductory courses, it is imperative that such a discussion considers patriarchal domination of nonhuman animals. It is important to recognize how we as consumers are implicated in the patriarchal system of oppression. Aviva Cantor has gone so far as to argue that “[n]owhere is patriarchy’s iron fist as naked as in the oppression of animals, which serves as the model and training ground for all other forms of oppression” (as cited in Jones, 2015, p. 477).

Oppression and privilege. Identifying and challenging oppressions requires that we are cognizant of how we are implicated in the oppression of others. Collins (1993) has argued

[w]hile many of us have little difficulty assessing our own victimization within some major system of oppression, whether it be by race, social class, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age or gender, we typically fail to see how our own thoughts and actions uphold someone else’s subordination”. (p. 1)

To confront our complicity in upholding the subordination of others “we need new visions of what oppression is, new categories of analysis that are inclusive of race, class, and gender as distinctive yet interlocking structures of oppression” (Collins, 1993, p. 2) and “we also need to change our daily behavior” (Collins, 1993, p. 3). New visions of oppression must include species as a category of analysis; speciesism as a structural oppression; and our complicity, direct or

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

indirect, in the subordination of nonhuman animals. As Warren (1987) has argued, “[i]t is only when dive deep and see the interconnections between various systems of oppression that our feminist theories will hold much water. A transformative feminism has the potential to make these connections” (p. 20). A persistently transformative feminism should be our way forward; it is important that we, as feminist scholars, students and social justice activists, are willing to confront our own anthropocentric prejudice and actions that maintain the subordination of nonhuman animals.

Masculinities. A discussion of speciesism is important to the discussion of masculinity to expand the scope of understanding what it is to ‘be a man’ and how vegetarian/vegan men challenge the status quo. In the U.S. context, according to Sumpter (2015), meat-eating and hunting are activities often associated with production of hegemonic masculinity. Furthermore, consumption of nonhuman animals, as Adams (1990) has argued, is gendered in that ‘meat’ is considered masculine and eating vegetables is repudiated as feminine. In a study conducted in Australia, Nath (2010) found that male informants who abstained from ‘meat’ experienced a “gendered form of censure and scrutiny in food-related social contexts” (p. 266) from non-vegetarian males. These men shared that in addition to having to justify their choice to not eat ‘meat they also experienced “having their masculinity questioned, as a direct consequence of hegemonic masculine norm enforcement” (Nath, 2010, p. 266).³³ The study focuses on the prominence of the barbeque in Australian life, an integral part of male socializing; the barbeque is “a place where groups of men can consume an assortment of grilled meats and, in doing so, enjoy their perceived shared status as ‘real men’” (p. 270). The study also found that “the consumption of meat at the barbecue is bound up with hetero-normative assumptions about

³³ Nath (2010) employs Connell & Messerschmidt’s (2005) conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity to argue that meat-eating, like hegemonic masculinity, is normative and an embodiment of the honourable way to be a man.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

qualities that are considered typical or appropriate to being male. (Nath, 2010, p. 267). However, some vegetarian men in Nath's (2010) study shared that while they ignored or verbally challenged being censured for their dietary choices, they also felt empowered by subverting the social norm of meat-eating.

Connell (1995) has argued that 'masculinity' is "inherently relational ... [and] does not exist except in contrast with 'femininity' (p. 68). In the present context, hegemonic masculinity entails a repudiation of what is perceived as subordinate masculinity, which includes those men that reject meat-eating and hunting. Furthermore, by adopting vegetarianism or veganism they challenge social and cultural expectations associated with 'being a man'.

Activism and Resistance. Where introductory courses emphasize the importance of linking theory with praxis, the absence of a discussion of ethical veganism and animal liberation efforts as acts of resistance is remarkable. While early animal protection efforts, in the 19th century, borrowed their strategies from abolitionist and women's rights movements "using moral suasion to expose the reality of injustices" (Freeman, 2014, p. 35) the efforts of late 20th century "drew from the ideologies of feminist and environmental movements to critique instrumentalism, the institutionally-sanctioned exploitation of others as a means to an end" (Freeman, 2014, p. 36). The modern animal rights/liberation movement that began in the 1970s, in the United States, occurred (and continues to occur) alongside human-rights movements of the time with participation from individuals and groups involved in organizing against human oppressions. This is evinced by the dominant presence of women in advocacy work. In her study on the majority of women in animal advocacy, Gaarder (2011) found that many participants attributed their majority status and, by extension, the absence of men, to social and biological discourses around femininity and masculinity. However, she warns against equating this presence of women

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

in animal advocacy with essentialist ideas about women's pre-disposition to care and notes that in their decision to become animal rights activists they should be considered as "political thinkers making political choices" (hooks as cited in Gaarder, 2011, p. 72). While discussions of historical and contemporary feminist and civil rights movements feature significantly in introductory courses, they are limited to considerations of human-centered activism. Such considerations must include a discussion of ethical veganism as an act of resistance and organizing by feminist activists, highlighting their contributions to various interconnected causes.

3.5 Toward a new (eco)feminist pedagogy

The literature presented in this study effectively situates oppression of nonhuman animals as a feminist issue. Building on ecofeminist insights on nonhuman animals, feminist pedagogy must foster what Bowers (2010) has called 'ecological intelligence'. Ecological intelligence, already developed by many Indigenous cultures that rely on it, "takes account of relationships, contexts, as well as the impacts of ideas and behaviours on other members on the cultural and natural systems" (Bowers, 2010, p. 45). A model of pedagogy that incorporates ecological intelligence is EcoJustice Education. Martusewicz (2013) describes it as a 'commons-based' approach to educational reform that is attentive to 'ancient' knowledge systems that have pioneered sustainable living long before sustainable became a buzzword.

Building on the EcoJustice Education approach Martusewicz and Edmundson (2013) present a discussion on what they have called 'pedagogy of responsibility'. They argue that the proper use of education is "to enable citizens to live lives that are economically, politically, socially, and culturally responsible" (Martusewicz & Edmundson, 2013, p. 178). To foster such

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

an education, as feminist educators, scholars and students, we must urgently revive insights that challenge dualism and centrism in all forms.

3.6 Implications of findings

My objective in conducting this study has been to contribute to the mainstreaming of nonhuman animals and to offer a new direction for foundational feminist pedagogy. If we are to challenge structures of oppression we must be cognizant of their sphere(s) of influence, to the full extent. I acknowledge that introductory courses can be challenging to design and teach and that the duration of these courses may not allow for inclusion of and considerable attention to several important topics. However, given their significance in playing a vital role in introducing students to critical concepts in the field and their lasting impact, as discussed in Chapter 2, I believe speciesism as a structural oppression must be integrated as part of foundational curricula in feminist studies and could contribute to expanding the scope of discussions on intersectionality, patriarchy, power, and privilege, and oppression. Introductory courses, regardless of their duration (single term or full year), provide a foundation to understanding various concepts and ideas; they play an important role in facilitating critical thinking (and doing). Introducing a consideration of nonhuman animals at this level will ensure that students will acknowledge the various ways in which power operates and that oppression and violence claim not only human but also nonhuman lives. A complete understanding of oppression has significant implications for transformative thought and action in challenging the same.

3.7 Limitations and further research

To the best of my knowledge, this study is the first of its kind in Canada. An objective of this study was to explore and understand the landscape of foundational feminist pedagogy. It is my hope that this study can provide a foundation for an extensive examination of core courses, in

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

feminist studies, at all undergraduate course levels, by conducting in-depth interviews with instructors. A limitation of conducting a survey is that it did not allow for a thorough and comprehensive assessment of whether ecofeminist content and nonhuman animals were considered in introductory courses. It is possible that relevant issues may have been discussed in lectures and in-class discussions or as part of other topics (as noted by some survey participants).³⁴ Interviews would provide further insight into how instructors engage in decision-making with respect to course content.

A limitation of this study is that it was conducted only in English, as I speak only one official language of Canada. However, the document review conducted for this study includes course outlines from bilingual post-secondary institutions. Further research on this subject should include an examination of introductory courses, in feminist studies, offered in French. It is likely that the survey response rate was impacted because it was offered only in English. This study focused only on post-secondary institutions that offer degree programs in feminist studies, as a major and/or minor, and does not include colleges. It should be noted that some colleges offer one or more courses and certificates in women's studies. Further research could include a similar examination of other interdisciplinary fields of study, particularly those that employ feminist and social justice frameworks. Importantly, further research should also include an examination of student expectations in foundational courses and their awareness of and engagement, if any, with nonhuman animal issues.

³⁴ See discussion on 'Ecofeminism as a major theme' on p. 58-59.

3.8 Conclusion

Feminist studies, as a critical field, is rooted in resistance; challenging centric and dualist thinking is at the heart of feminist scholarship and praxis. Thus, it must include in its considerations *any* centrism and dualism that result in the oppression of anyone. A feminist pedagogy must reflect the same in addressing the issue of speciesism as a form of oppression, which will lead to devising better strategies for mobilizing against oppression in *all* forms. Audre Lorde has rightly argued, “the true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that piece of oppressor which is planted deep within each of us” (as cited in Collins, 1989, p.1). The absence of considerations of nonhuman animals and their oppression in feminist pedagogy, leaves intact the oppressor within us. Being made aware of one’s own oppressiveness can be unsettling. However, this has not stopped feminists from asking difficult questions or addressing the unsettling, whether it concerns our own oppression or our complicity in someone else’s.

The criticisms against ecofeminism, as outlined in Chapter 1, could be why ecofeminism has not been included, consistently, in foundational feminist studies pedagogy. It is reasonable to conclude that ecofeminism’s troublesome past continues to haunt its present. Understandably, inclusion of ecofeminism may pose a challenge for instructors in navigating through these criticisms. However, it is vital that we do not ignore the ecofeminist scholarship that emerged as a result of addressing those criticisms, offering an intersectional way forward that allows for developing a fuller understanding of oppressive ideologies and practices. Moreover, acknowledging the past debates can help students better understand how contemporary feminist scholarship has come into being.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Importantly, in addition to addressing criticisms, vegetarian ecofeminists and feminist environmentalists have advanced significant analyses that recognize the parallels between human and nonhuman suffering, expanding the scope of relevant discussions which can lead to comprehensive strategies for change. Furthermore, ecofeminist work on nonhuman animals through sophisticated critiques of the dominant rights-based and utilitarian perspectives, through feminist animal care theory (Donovan, 1990; 2006), makes valuable contributions to animal advocacy. Reviving these contributions by including them in foundational feminist pedagogy can facilitate critical discussions on the human-animal dualism, despite the troubled past of some of the larger body of literature where this scholarship is situated.

I acknowledge that drawing parallels between oppressed human groups and nonhuman animals could be difficult to communicate at the foundational level when students are being introduced to various categories of analysis, such as race.

Historically, people of color have been *animalized* to justify their subjugation and deny their humanity. According to Gaard (2002), in addition to associating women with animals in derogatory terms (bitch, pussy, cow, shrew etc.), “[l]inguistic association with animals has also been a method of demeaning Jews and people of color, as Nazi propaganda equated Jews with ‘vermin’, and blacks have been called ‘coons’ or ‘jungle bunnies’” (p. 125). Furthermore, analogies of holocaust and slavery to highlight the oppression of nonhuman animals have invoked strong criticisms from some Jewish and Black community leaders and representative organizations. In her essay on PETA’s exhibits titled “Holocaust on Your Plate” and “Animal Liberation Project: ‘We Are All Animals’”, Kim (2011) explains

Holocaust and slavery analogies have proven controversial no matter which movement evokes them ... An implicit subtext in Jewish and black expressions of outrage toward the Holocaust and slavery analogies is that their group’s struggle in fact goes on—that despite the triumphalist narratives of Jewish and black survival, Jews and blacks continue to fight

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

for full membership in humankind. So when other groups evoke Holocaust and slavery analogies—an act which suggests that the Jewish and black struggles have been successfully completed, that they have the settled meaning of archetypes—this appears to some Jews and blacks to be reinscribing anti-Semitism and racism. (p. 326)

Analogizing human and nonhuman oppression, like Spiegel's *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and Animal Slavery* (1996), is not intended to oversimplify or undermine the struggles of oppressed humans but to expose the centric thinking that is the ideological foundation of *all* oppression. Therefore, introducing students to intersectional ecofeminist perspectives on nonhuman animals by “recognizing conceptual and structural similarities among sexism, speciesism, and racism” (Gaard, 2002, p.125) is vital to fostering a critical understanding of oppression. In his essay on the humanity-animality discourse, Anderson (2002) argues

[I]t is possible that preoccupations about human racial differences have, for the longest time, blocked a sense of our embodied engagement with the rest of the living world, just as constructs of that (falsely essentialized) nonhuman world have shaped ideas of hierarchy about human groups. (p. 29)

It is, therefore, crucial that feminist pedagogy includes nonhuman animals and their oppression to effectively challenge hierarchical thinking.

The findings of this study suggest that foundational feminist studies, in Canada, is human-centered. A revival of valuable ecofeminist contributions is urgently required to ensure a feminist future that is fully inclusive. Where feminist thought offers the tools to articulate, resist, transgress, dismantle, and transform, exclusion of speciesism from discussions on structural oppression and relegating nonhuman animals to sub-topics and footnotes is antithetical to its transformative goals. To this end, I conclude this thesis with my proposal for an introductory course in feminist studies that applies this approach to explore a range of pertinent issues in feminist thought. The course I propose here invites students to pertinent discussions that consider human and nonhuman animals with an objective to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

structural oppressions and strategies for change, informed by intersectional feminist and ecofeminist insights.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

FMST 100: An Introduction to Feminist Studies

The true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us.
- Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider*

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an escapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one affects us all indirectly.
– Martin Luther King Jr., Letter from a Birmingham Jail

Course description

This course will introduce students to contemporary feminist thought. It will trace the key debates in the field and, using an ‘intersectional ecological-feminist’ lens, explore a range of issues related to oppression and justice.

Learning objectives: What am I doing here?

- develop an intersectional understanding of structures of power and oppression and the ways in which these structures oppress human and nonhuman animals
- familiarity with feminist movements and *feminisms*
- familiarity with key terms and concepts in feminist thought
- challenge centric thinking through feminist, ecofeminist and Indigenous insights
- connect theory to praxis and develop an understanding of our responsibility in affecting change

Readings for each are selected such that they facilitate an intersectional understanding of oppression and broaden our understanding of it by considering human and nonhuman animals in. Some topics in this course may cause you to experience strong feelings. Please feel free to take a moment for yourself. A journey of learning must be accompanied by some unlearning. We are in this together; diverse perspectives are encouraged and supported. To allow for vibrant discussions it is important that we are respectful and supportive of one another. It is OK to disagree!

Assignments:

1. What is feminism?
Incorporating 1-3 readings, from Week 2-4, write a critical reflection of what feminism means to you (2-4 pages). You are welcome to include personal anecdotes.
2. 4 in-class responses (1-2 paragraphs)
A quote or a brief paragraph will be presented to you on the day that this assignment is due.
3. Get creative!
Poetry, short story (1-3 pages) or art work on a relevant topic. [Hint: human-nonhuman relationship]

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

4. Research essay (5-7 pages)

Using materials from the course, write an essay, from an intersectional perspective, on a relevant topic of your choice. This assignment will be due at the end of the term. It must include at least 5 readings from the course (Weeks 4-12). You may use outside sources however this is not required. If in doubt, discuss your topic with your T.A. or myself.

5. Tutorial participation

Course Plan

Week 1 *Introductions and expectations*

No readings

Week 2 *What is feminism? Who is it for? Is there only one?*

- “Theory as Liberatory Practice” by bell hooks (1991)
- The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House by Audre Lorde in *Feminist Theory: A Reader* by Wendy. K. Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski (Eds.)
- Introduction: Being Curious about Our Lack of Feminist Curiosity in The “Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire” by Cynthia Enloe (2004)

In-class viewing: Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie on The Danger of a Single Story

https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story

This video is a modern classic, if you will, in feminist studies. Adichie’s talk is an important reminder of the dangers of incomplete narratives, which lead to incomplete strategies for change.

Week 3 *The Struggle is real*

- Changing Times in *Minds of Our Own: Inventing Feminist Scholarship and Women’s Studies in Canada and Quebec, 1966-1976* by Wendy Robbins, Meg Luxton, Margaret Eichler and Francine Descarries (2008)
- “Feminist Challenges to Knowledge” by Margaret Eichler and Meg Luxton (2006)
- “Vegetarian Ecofeminism: A Review Essay” by Greta Gaard (2002)

In-class viewing: Angela Davis on Veganism (2012)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jBqC-E8EDeA>

In this short but poignant video, Davis talks about how we are implicated, as agents of change, in the politics of food through our ignorance of the suffering of nonhuman animals. An in-class discussion on this video will make connections with Adichie’s talk on *The Danger of a Single Story*

Week 4 *Intersectionality*

- “Toward a New Vision: Race, Class and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection” by Patricia Hill Collins (1993)
- *Stolen Bodies, Reclaimed Bodies: Disability and Queerness* by Eli Clare (2001)

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- The Sexual Politics of Meat (Ch-1) in *The Sexual Politics of Meat* by Carol Adams (1990)

Explore: Intersectionality by Vegan Voices of Colour (VVOC) at <https://veganvoicesofcolor.org/2017/01/29/intersectional-veganism/>

Week 5 *Intersectionality (contd.): Oppression*

- “Five Faces of Oppression” in *Justice and the Politics of Difference* by Iris Marion Young (1990, p. 39-65)
- On the oppression of women and animals by Lori Gruen (1996, p. 441-444)
- Foreword to *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and Animal Slavery* by Marjorie Spiegel (1996, p. 13-14); An Historical Understanding (pp. 15-32); Power (pp. 91-104)

Week 6 *Indigenous Knowledges*

- Piracy through patents: The second coming of Christopher Columbus (Introduction, p. 1-5) and Chapter 1 on Knowledge, creativity, and intellectual property rights (p. 7-17) in *Biopiracy: The Plunder of nature and knowledge* by Vandana Shiva (1997)
- “Indigenous place-thought & agency amongst humans and non-humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European world tour!)” by Vanessa Watts (2013)
- Veganism and Mi’kmaq Legends by Margaret Robinson (2013)

Week 7 *Ecofeminism(s)*

- Ecofeminism Through an Anticolonial Framework by Andy Smith in *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature* (1997) by Karen Warren (Ed.)
- “Ecofeminism and First Nations Peoples in Canada: Linking Culture, Gender and Nature” by Kathi Wilson (2005)

Week 8 *Ecofeminism(s)(contd.)*

- The Feminist Trafficking in Animals by Carol Adams in *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature* (1993) by Greta Gaard (Ed.)
- Epilogue: Destabilizing Patriarchal Consumption in *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* by Carol Adams (1990)
- “Pepperoni or Broccoli? On the Cutting Wedge of Feminist Environmentalism” by Joni Seager (2003)

In-class viewing: Man by Steve Cutts

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WfGMYdalCIU&t=5s>

This short but poignant animation looks at our relationship, as humans, with the planet.

Week 9: *Masculinities*

- The Social Organization of Masculinity in *Masculinities* (2nd Ed.) by R.W, Connell (1995)
- How Power Makes Men: The Grammar of Gender Identity by John Stoltenberg in *Men and Power* (1999) by Joseph A. Kuypers (Ed.)

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- “Gendered fare? A Qualitative Investigation of Alternative Food and Masculinities” by Jemál Nath (2010)

Recommended reading:

For These Vegans, Masculinity Means Protecting the Planet

<http://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2014/07/21/332329709/for-these-vegans-masculinity-means-protecting-the-planet>

Week 10: *Justice for All* (?)

- “Why ‘Loving’ Animals is Not Enough: A Response to Kathy Rudy, Locavorism, and the Marketing of ‘Humane’ Meat” by Vasile Stănescu (2013)
- “Animal rights is a Social Justice Issue by Robert C. Jones (2015)

In-class viewing: Peaceable Kingdom: The Journey Home (2012)

Preview: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aFqRCc08V6k>

This film “explores the awakening conscience of several people who grew up in traditional farming culture and who have now come to question the basic assumptions of their way of life” (“About”, n.d.).

Week 11: *Activism and Organizing for Change*

- “The Evolution, Structure, and Impact of the Chipko Movement” by Vandana Shiva and Jayanta Bandyopadhyay (1986)
- “Where the Boys Aren’t: The Predominance of Women in Animal Rights Activism” by Emily Gaarder (2011)
- “‘It’s More Than Planting Trees, It’s Planting Ideas’: Ecofeminist Praxis in the Green Belt Movement” by Kathleen P. Hunt (2014)

Week 12: *Toward a Better Future*

- Parting Thoughts

In-class viewing: Before the Flood

https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=D9xFFyUOpXo

This documentary, offers an account of the “dramatic changes now occurring around the world due to climate change, as well as the actions we as individuals and as a society can take to prevent the disruption of life on our planet” (“About”, n.d.).

Recommended viewing:

- Canned Dreams (2012)
Preview: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pFeA1SXARHA>
- Blackfish (2013)
Preview: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w2vG_Ifu4zg
- The Ghosts in Our Machines (2013)
Preview: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DzJvcPmX79w>

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Cowspiracy: The sustainability secret (2014)
Preview: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2SRPk6gB3g0>
- What the Health (2017)
Preview: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jf44vLndiRM>

Appendix A
Observation table

Themes	Number of Courses that included the theme
1. What is feminism?	44/45
2. Women's political movements; Women's Studies	43/45
3. Types of feminism	44/45
4. Social, popular and cultural construction of gender/race/ sexuality/bodies	45/45
5. Intersectionality/diversity	45/45
6. Power	45/45
7. Patriarchy	45/45
8. Masculinities	43/45
9. Oppression and privilege	45/45
10. Indigenous Issues (past and present)	41/45
11. Women's work; unpaid labour	44/45
12. Globalization	44/45
13. Activism/resistance/consciousness-raising/ organizing	45/45
14. Environmental issues: human impact and ecological degradation	12/45
15. Ecofeminism	10/45
16. Speciesism/Consideration of nonhuman animals	6/45*

* based on the findings outlined in Table 1, it is reasonable to conclude that six courses may have included a limited discussion of nonhuman animals. However, none of the forty-five courses included a discussion of speciesism as a form of oppression or as part of their discussion on intersectionality.

Appendix B
Survey online consent form

Title: Toward a New (Eco)Feminist Future: Mainstreaming Nonhuman Animals in Feminist Studies

Date of ethics clearance: To be determined by the REB (as indicated on the clearance form)

Ethics Clearance for the Collection of Data Expires: To be determined by the REB (as indicated on the clearance form)

You are invited to participate in a study on feminist studies pedagogy. This study explores how introductory courses in feminist studies are designed and taught in Canada. My name is priya kumar and I am the researcher for this study. I am a graduate student in the Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies at Carleton University. I am working under the supervision of Prof. Irena Knezevic and Prof. Amrita Hari in the School of Journalism and Communication and the Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies, respectively, at Carleton University.

This study involves one online survey which should take approximately 20 minutes.

While this survey is anonymous and I do not foresee any risks to you, you have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions. You also have the right to end your participation in the survey at any time, for any reason, up until you hit the "submit" button. You can withdraw by exiting the survey at any time before completing it. If you withdraw from the study, all information you provided will be immediately destroyed. (As the survey responses are anonymous, it is not possible to withdraw after the survey is submitted.)

The company running the online survey is Qualtrics, based in the U.S. All Qualtrics accounts are protected by password access, and Qualtrics employees will not access the protected accounts without express permission by the account owner. Qualtrics servers for Carleton are located in the United States, hence subject to the US Patriot Act. All responses will be anonymous. The researchers will disable the option in Qualtrics to collect IP addresses. Data will be downloaded off Qualtrics when the project is completed. This anonymous data will be retained, by the researcher, on a password-protected computer and encrypted USB key indefinitely for use in future research.

If you would like a copy of the finished research project, you are invited to contact the researcher to request an electronic copy which will be provided to you as long as the safety of all participants will not be comprised by doing so.

The ethics protocol for this project was reviewed by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board, which provided clearance to carry out the research. Should you have questions or concerns related to your involvement in this research, please contact:

REB contact information:
Professor Andy Adler, Chair
Research Ethics Board
Carleton University
511 Tory
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
Tel: 613-520-2517
ethics@carleton.ca

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

Researcher contact information:

priya kumar
Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies
Carleton University
priyakumar@cmail.carleton.ca

Supervisor contact information:

Prof. Irena Knezevic
Assistant Professor in the School of Journalism and Communication
Carleton University
irena.knezevic@carleton.ca
(613) 520-2600 ex. 4121

Prof. Amrita Hari
Assistant Professor in the Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies
Carleton University
amrita.hari@carleton.ca
(613) 520-2600 ex. 2904

By clicking “continue”, you consent to participate in the research study as described above.

Appendix C
Survey questions

- 1) Which province or territory do you currently teach in?
 - Alberta (AB)
 - British Columbia (BC)
 - Manitoba (MB)
 - New Brunswick (NB)
 - Newfoundland and Labrador (NL)
 - Northwest Territories (NT)
 - Nova Scotia (NS)
 - Nunavut (NU)
 - Ontario (ON)
 - Prince Edward Island (PE)
 - Quebec (QC)
 - Saskatchewan (SK)
 - Yukon (YT)
- 2) Please confirm that you have taught an introductory course in women's and gender/feminist studies in the last five years.
 - Yes
 - No
- 3) What is/was the duration of your introductory course?
 - Single term
 - Full year
- 4) Typically, how many students have you had in the introductory course?
 - 0-50
 - 50-100
 - 100-150
 - 150-200
 - 200-250
 - 250+
- 5) What are some of the major themes / key topics you include in the course syllabus?
- 6) How do you select these major themes / key topics for your course?
- 7) What do you consider to be canons in teaching women's and gender/feminist studies? Do you think this has changed (i.e. do you think any themes/topics have become irrelevant?)? If so, has this impacted your teaching?
- 8) Is ecofeminism included as a major theme in your course? [contingency question]
 - Yes
 - No
 - 8a. If you answered No to Question 8:
 - a. Please confirm if you have included ecofeminism in the past.
 - b. If you no longer offer it, what made you change your mind?
 - 8b. If you answered Yes to Question 8, please provide:
 - a. A brief explanation of your understanding of ecofeminism.
 - b. The texts (or scholars) you draw from for teaching this topic.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- c. A brief description of some topics of discussion and texts you have included in the course syllabus.
- 9) Is scholarship on non-human animal issues included as part of the course syllabus?
- Yes
 - No
- 10) Please provide a brief rationale for the inclusion or exclusion of non-human animal issues in your course syllabus.
- 11) Is a discussion on speciesism included in the course syllabus?
[Originally coined by British psychologist Richard D. Ryder to protest animal experimentation, speciesism includes behaviours, practices and attitudes based on a belief in human superiority over nonhuman species.]
- Yes
 - No
- 12) What are the expected learning outcomes in introductory courses in women's and gender/feminist studies (i.e. your expectation(s) from students in the course)?
- 13) Do you have any additional comments to contribute to this survey?

Appendix D
Authors and texts

1. Sojourner Truth (*Ain't I A Woman?*)
2. bell hooks (*Feminism is for Everybody*; “Gangsta Culture: Sexism and Misogyny”; “Racism and Feminism”; *We Are Cool: Black Men and Masculinity*)
3. Audre Lorde (*Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*; selected poems)
4. Judith Butler (*Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*)
5. Chandra Mohanty (“Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses” and “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles”)
6. Raewyn Connell & James Messerschmidt (*Masculinities*; “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept”)
7. C.J. Pascoe (“‘Dude, You’re a Fag’: Adolescent Masculinity and the Fag Discourse”)
8. Jack Halberstam (*Female Masculinity*; *Gaga Feminism: Sex, Gender, and the End of Normal*)
9. Michael Messner (“Becoming 100 Percent Straight”)
10. Peggy McIntosh (“White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack”)
11. Afua Cooper (*The Hanging of Angélique: The Untold Story of Canadian Slavery and the Burning of Montréal*)
12. Eli Clare (*Exile and Pride: Disability, Queerness, and Liberation*)
13. Stuart Hall (“The Whites of Their Eyes: Racist Ideologies and the Media”)
14. Patricia Hill Collins (“Black Feminism, Knowledge, and Power”; “Toward a New Vision: Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection”)
15. Vandana Shiva and Maria Mies (*Ecofeminism*)
16. Marilyn Waring (*Counting for Nothing*)
17. Jessica Valenti (*Full Frontal Feminism*; *The Purity Myth*; *Yes Means Yes: Visions of Sexual Female Power and a World Without Rape*; “You’re a Hardcore Feminist, I Swear”)
18. Anne Fausto-Sterling (*Sexing the Body*)
19. Cynthia Enloe (“A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminists Look at Masculinity and the Men Who Wage War”; *On the Beach: Sexism and Tourism*)
20. Michael Kimmel (*The Gendered Society*, with Jacqueline Holler; *Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era*)
21. Sherene Razack (*Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*; “The Race to Innocence: Confronting Hierarchical Relations among Women” with Mary Louise Fellows)
22. Uma Narayan (“Undoing the ‘Package Picture’ of Cultures”; “It is So Often Easier Not to Speak”)
23. Lee Maracle (*I am Woman. In I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism*)
24. Roxane Gay (*Bad Feminist*)
25. Joni Seager (“Unpaid Work”)
26. Thomas King (*The Truth About Stories: A Narrative*)
27. Ivan Coyote (*One in Every Crowd*)
28. Sut Jhally (“Image-Based Culture: Advertising and Popular Culture”)
29. Susan Stryker (*Transgender History*)
30. David Suzuki (*The Legacy: An Elder's Vision for Our Sustainable Future*)

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

31. Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (*Ecofeminism*)
32. Rosemarie Tong (*Feminist Thought*; chapter on Ecofeminism)
33. Rosemary Radford Ruether (“Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing”)

Appendix E
Films

1. *Finding Dawn* (2006) by acclaimed Métis filmmaker Christine Welsh focuses on the murders and disappearances of Indigenous women, in Canada. This film is “a journey into the dark heart of Native women's experience in Canada” (“Finding Dawn”, n.d.).
2. *On the Edge: The Femicide in Ciudad Juárez* (2006): this documentary covers “a documentary covering the brutal murders of hundreds of poor young women in the border town of Ciudad Juárez, Mexico, murders that have been repeatedly ignored and unresolved by police and governments since 1993, despite the continued and persistent efforts of family members and activists to obtain justice for the victims” (“On the Edge”, n.d.).
3. *Miss Representation* (2010): “exposes how mainstream media and culture contribute to the under-representation of women in positions of power and influence in America” (“Synopsis”, n.d.).
4. *The Purity Myth: The Virginity Movement's War Against Women* (2011): this film adaptation of feminist blogger Jessica Valenti's bestselling book *The Purity Myth: How America's Obsession with Virginity Is Hurting Young Women* (2009) “makes a powerful case that evangelical Christians, right-wing politicians, and conservative activists have been using irrational fears around young women's sexuality to undermine women's autonomy and roll back women's rights” (“About”, n.d.).
5. “This isn't her mother's feminism” (2011) by Courtney Martin: Martin's TED Talk “examines the perennially loaded word ‘feminism’” (“This isn't her mother's feminism”, n.d.).
6. “Is Anatomy Destiny?” by Alice Dreger (2010): this TED Talk addresses the big question “Why do we let our anatomy determine our fate?” (“Anatomy Destiny”, n.d.).
7. Sheryl WuDunn “Our Century's Greatest Injustice” (2010): this TED Talk, addresses oppression of women, globally. This talk is based on based on *Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide* (2010) co-authored by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn.
8. *The Codes of Gender* (2009) by Sut Jhally: this documentary, based on Erving Goffman's *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* (1959), “[looks] beyond advertising as a medium that simply sells products, and beyond analyses of gender that tend to focus on either biology or objectification, *The Codes of Gender* offers important insights into the social construction of masculinity and femininity, the relationship between gender and power, and the everyday performance of cultural norms” (“The Codes of Gender”, n.d.).
9. *Tough Guise: Men, Violence and the Crisis in Masculinity* (1999) by Jackson Katz: Katz “argues that the epidemic of male violence that plagues American society needs to be understood and addressed as part of a much larger cultural crisis in masculinity” (“Tough Guise Violence, Media & the Crisis in Masculinity”, n.d.).
10. “Violence is a Men's Issue” (2012): in this TED Talk Jackson Katz calls attention to domestic violence and abuse as being “intrinsically men's issues” (Violence is a Men's Issue”, n.d.).
11. Philippe Diaz *An End to Poverty?* (2010): this film focuses on global poverty and financial crises as consequences of military conquest, slavery and colonization.

12. Alan Dater and Lisa Merton *Taking Root: The Vision of Wangari Maathai* (2008): this film “weaves a compelling and dramatic narrative of [Wangari Maathai’s] personal journey in the context of the turbulent political and environmental history of her country” (“The Story”, n.d.).
13. *Hope in Heaven* (2005), by Meredith Ralston, “follows two years in the life of a Filipino bar girl and deals with the issues of sex tourism in the Philippines” (“Hope in Heaven”, n.d.). Ralston is professor in the Departments of Women’s Studies and Political and Canadian Studies at Mount Saint Vincent University, and a filmmaker and author.
14. *Selling Sex* (2016), by Meredith Ralston, is “a thought-provoking film that challenges our negative view of sex work, through the eyes of an online escort named Megan” (“Selling Sex”, n.d.). Ralston is professor in the Departments of Women’s Studies and Political and Canadian Studies at Mount Saint Vincent University, and a filmmaker and author.
15. *Put This on the Map* (2011): this documentary by Megan Kennedy and Sid Jordan Peterson focuses on the narratives of Seattle’s youth on lack of queer visibility. It is “an intimate invitation into stories of social isolation and violence, fearlessness and liberation” (“About”, n.d.).
16. “My Immigration Story” (2011): this TED Talk by Tan Le is about the story of her family fleeing the Vietnam war.
17. *Maquilapolis: City of Factories* (2006): this documentary exposes the realities of Mexico’s multinationally-owned *maquiladoras* and their impact on the workers and environment.
18. *The Sterilization of Leilani Muir* (1996): This documentary “documentary follows Leilani Muir’s search for justice and explores how eugenics (improving hereditary qualities of a race through the control of reproduction) became acceptable in the early 1900s” (“The Sterilization of Leilani Muir”, n.d.).
19. *Free Angela and All Political Prisoners* (2012): This film by Shola Lynch chronicles the life of young college professor Angela Davis, and how her social activism implicates her in a botched kidnapping attempt that ends with a shootout, four dead, and her name on the FBI’s 10 most wanted list” (“Free Angela and All Political Prisoners”, n.d.).
20. *Mickey Mouse Monopoly* (2001): This documentary by Miguel Picker “takes a close and critical look at the world these films create and the stories they tell about race, gender and class and reaches disturbing conclusions about the values propagated under the guise of innocence and fun” (“About”, n.d.).
21. *Mirrors of Privilege: Making Whiteness Visible* (2007): The accounts, of white women and men, in this documentary, by Shakti Butler, “reveal what is often required to move through the stages of denial, defensiveness, guilt, fear, and shame into making a solid commitment to ending racial injustice” (“Mirrors of Privilege: Making Whiteness Visible”, n.d.).
22. *Killing Us Softly 4* (2010): This updated version of award-winning filmmaker Jean Kilbourne’s documentary series of the same name takes a fresh look at American advertising and discovers that the more things have changed, the more they’ve stayed the same” (*Killing Us Softly 4*”, n.d.).
23. *She’s a Boy I Knew* (2007): this documentary by Gwen Haworth is an auto-ethnography and exploration into the filmmaker’s “process of transition from biological male to female, from Steven to Gwen, but also an emotionally charged account of the individual

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

experiences, struggles, and stakes that her two sisters, mother, father, best friend and wife brought to Gwen's transition" (She's A Boy I Knew", n.d.).

24. *Cultural Criticism and Transformation* – Pt. 1 (1997): In part 1 of this two-part series, by Sut Jhally, bell hooks discusses the “theoretical foundations and positions that inform her work (such as the motives behind representations, as well as their power in social and cultural life (“About”, n.d.).
25. *Who's Counting? Sex, Lies and Global Economics* (1995): In this documentary, politician turned activist Marilyn Waring “demystifies the language of economics by defining it as a value system in which all goods and activities are related only to their monetary value” and one that devalues women's unpaid work (“Synopsis”, n.d.).
26. “Solutions to the Food and Ecological Crisis Facing Us Today” (2012): This talk by Vandana Shiva focuses on the food crises in India caused by destructive agricultural practices, led by neoliberal policies; the harms of capitalist patriarchal thought on the human condition and the environment; a mechanistic view of the world that ignores the interconnections of all life on the planet; and a ‘monoculture of the mind’ which has led to starvation and farmer suicides in India; and the ecocide perpetrated by such views and actions (TEDxTalks, 2012).

References

- Adams, C.J. (1990). *The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Adams, C.J. (1993). The feminist traffic in animals. In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals and nature*, (pp. 195-218). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Adams, C.J. (2010). Why feminist-vegan now? *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(3), 302–317. doi: 10.1177/0959353510368038
- Agathangelou, A.M., Olwan, D.M., Spira, T.L., & Turcotte, H.M. (2015). Sexual divestments for empire: Women’s studies, institutional feelings, and the “odious” machine. *Feminist Formations*, 27(3), 139-167. doi:10.1353/ff.2016.0003
- Agarwal, B. (1992). The Gender and environment debate: Lessons from India. *Feminist Studies*, 18(1). 119-158.
- Agarwal, B. (2001). A challenge for ecofeminisms: Gender, greening, and community forestry in India. *Women & Environment*, 52/53, 12- 15.
- Anderson, K. (2002). The racialization of difference: Enlarging the story field. *The Professional Geographer*, 54(1), 25-30.
- Animal Equality. (n.d.). *Learn more*. Retrieved from <http://www.animalequality.net>
- Bowers, C.A. (2010). Steps to the recovery of ecological intelligence. *Ometeca*, 43-52.
- Babbie, E. (2013). *The basics of social research*. (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Before the Flood. (n.d.) *About*. Retrieved from <https://www.beforetheflood.com/about/>
- Boxer, M.J. (2002). Women's studies as women's history. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 30(3/4). 42-51.
- Bromley, V., & Ahmad, A. (2006). Wa(i)ving solidarity: Feminist activists confronting backlash. *Canadian Women’s Studies*, 25(3-4), 61-71.
- Bromley, V., & Ahmad, A. (2013). Women’s studies: Are we “broad” enough. *Atlantis*, 36(1), 33-43.
- Bruckner, L.D. (2006). *Surfacing* in the ecofeminist classroom. *Atlantis*, 30(3), 76-85.
- Buege, D.J. (1997). Epistemic responsibility and the Inuit of Canada’s eastern Arctic. In K.J. Warren & N. Erkal (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*, (pp. 99-111). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Buckingham, S. (2004). Ecofeminism in the twenty-first century. *The Geographical Journal*, 170(2), 146–154.
- Canadian Coalition for Farm Animals. (n.d.). *Frequently Asked Questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.humanefood.ca/faqs.php>
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K.W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a Field of Intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs*, 38(4), 785-810.
- Christiansen-Ruffman, L. (2007). Women, knowledge and change: gender is not enough. *Resources for Feminist Research*, 32(1-2), 114-138.
- Collins, P.H. (1993). Toward a new vision: Race, class, and gender as categories of analysis and connection. *Race, Sex & Class*, 1(1), 25-45.
- Collins, P.H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 1-20. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142
- Connell, R.W. (1995). Social organization of masculinity. In *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). (pp. 67-86). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R.W. & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19. 829-859.
- Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(6), 821-836.
- Curtin, D. (1997). Women's knowledge as expert knowledge: Indian women and ecodevelopment. In K.J. Warren & N. Erkal (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*, (pp. 82-98). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Dixon, B.A. (1996). The feminist connection between women and animals. *Environmental Ethics*, 18(2), 181-194. doi: 10.5840/enviroethics199618231
- Donovan, J. (1991). Animal rights and feminist theory. *Signs*, 15(2). 350-375.
- Donovan, J. (2006). Feminism and the treatment of animals: From care to dialogue. *Signs*, 31(2), 305-329.
- Edmundson, J., & Martusewicz, R. (2013). "Putting our lives in order": Wendell Berry, ecojustice, and a pedagogy of responsibility. In A. Kulnieks, D.R. Longboat, & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in environmental and indigenous pedagogies: A curricula of stories and place*, (pp. 171-183). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Eichler, M. (1990a). On doing the splits collectively: Introduction to the Canadian women's studies project. *Atlantis*, 16(1), 3-5.
- Eichler, M. (1990b). What's in a name? Women's studies or feminist studies. *Atlantis*, 16(1), 40-56.
- Eichler, M., & Tite, R. Tite. (1990). Women's studies professors in Canada: A collective self-portrait. *Atlantis*, 16(10), 6-24.
- Eichler, M., & Luxton, M. (2006). Women's studies in focus: Feminist challenges to knowledge. *Atlantis*, 31(1), 79-90.
- Freeman, C.P. (2014). *Framing farming: Communication strategies for animal rights*. H. Pedersen & V. Stănescu (Eds.). New York, NY: Rodopi.
- Free Range Studios (Producer). (2007, December). The story of stuff [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9GorqroigqM>
- Free Range Studios (Producer). (2010, July 21). The story of cosmetics [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pfq000AF1i8>
- Gaard, G. (1993). Living interconnections with Animals and Nature. In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals and nature*, (pp. 1-12). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gaard, G. (1993). Ecofeminism and Native American cultures: Pushing the limits of cultural imperialism? In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals and nature*, (pp. 295-314). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gaard, G. (1997). Toward a queer ecofeminism. *Hypatia*, 12(1), 114-137.
- Gaard, G. (2001). Tools for a cross-cultural feminist ethics: Exploring ethical contexts and contents in the Makah whale hunt. *Hypatia*, 16(1), 1-26.
- Gaard, G.C. (2002). Vegetarian ecofeminism: A review essay. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 23(3), 117-146.
- Gaard, G. (2011a). Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting essentialism and re-placing species in a material feminist environmentalism. *Feminist Formations*, 23(2), 26-53.
- Gaard, G. (2011b). Green, pink, and lavender: Banishing ecophobia through queer ecologies. *Ethics & the Environment*, 16(2), 115-126.
- Gaard, G. (2012). Speaking of animal bodies. *Hypatia*, 27(3), 520-526.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Gaarder, E. (2011). Where the boys aren't: The predominance of women in animal rights activism. *Feminist Formations*, 23(2), 54-75.
- George, K.P. (1994). Should feminists be vegetarians? *Signs*, 19(2), 405-434.
- Gruen, L. (1993). Dismantling oppression: An analysis of the connection between women and animals. In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals and nature*, (pp. 60-90). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gruen, L. (1996). On the oppression of women and animals. *Environmental Ethics*, 18, 441-444.
- Gruen, L. (2009). The faces of animal oppression. In A. Ferguson & M. Nagel (Eds.), *Dancing with Iris: The philosophy of Iris Young*, (pp. 161-172). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Hobbs, M., & Rice, K. (2011). Rethinking women's studies: Curriculum, pedagogy, and the introductory course. *Atlantis*, 35(2), 139-149.
- hooks, b. (1991). Theory as liberatory practice. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 4(1), 1-12.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Hunt, K.P. (2014). "It's more than planting trees, it's planting ideas": Ecofeminist praxis in the green belt movement. *Southern Communication Journal*, 79(3), 235-249.
- Jones, R.C. (2015). Animal rights is a social justice issue. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 18(4), 467-482. doi: 10.1080/10282580.2015.1093689
- Juarez, A.M. (2002). Ecological degradation, global tourism, and inequality: Maya interpretations of the changing environment in Quintana Roo, Mexico. *Human Organization*, 61(2), 113-124.
- Kheel, M. (1985). The liberation of nature: A circular affair. *Environmental Ethics*, 7, 135-149.
- Kheel, M. (1993). From heroic to holistic ethics: The ecofeminist challenge. In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals and nature*, (pp. 243-271). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kheel, M. (2008). *Nature ethics: An ecofeminist perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Kim, C.J. (2011). Moral extensionism or racist exploitation? The use of holocaust and slavery analogies in the animal liberation movement. *New Political Science*, 33(3), 311-333.
- King, M.L. Jr. (1963). Letter from a Birmingham Jail. Retrieved from <https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/king-papers/documents/letter-birmingham-jail>
- Kitch, S. (2002). Claiming success: From adversity to responsibility in women's studies. *NWSA Journal*, 14(1), 160-181.
- Kolodny, A. (2000). "A sense of discovery, mixed with a sense of justice": Creating the first women's studies program in Canada. *NWSA Journal*, 12(1), 143-164.
- Lee, T.M.L. (2001). Feminism, postmodernism, and the politics of representation. *Women & Politics*, 22(2), 35-57.
- Lenton, R.L. (1990). Academic feminists and the women's movement in Canada: Continuity or discontinuity. *Atlantis*, 16(1), 57-68.
- Loss, C. P. (2011). "Women's studies is in a lot of ways – consciousness raising": The educational origins of identity politics. *History of Psychology*, 14(3), 287-310. doi: 10.1037/a0024799
- Luxton, M. (2001). Feminism as a class act: Working-class feminism and the women's movement in Canada. *Labour/Le Travail*, 48, 63-88.
- MacDonald, E. (2013). The royal commission on the status of women in Canada. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 19(4), 383-387. doi: 10.1037/a0034608
- MacIvor, H. (1996). *Women and politics in Canada*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- MacKinnon, C.A. (2004). Of mice and men: A feminist fragment on animal rights. In C.R. Sunstein & M.C. Nussbaum (Eds.). *Animal rights: Current debates and new directions* (pp. 263-276). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Martusewicz, R. (2013). Toward an anti-centric ecological culture: Bringing a critical eco-feminist analysis to ecojustice education. In A. Kulnieks, D.R. Longboat, & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in environmental and indigenous pedagogies: A curricula of stories and place*, (pp. 259-272). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, 30(3), 1771-1800.
- Mies, M., & Shiva, S. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Mohanty, C.T. (1988). Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 30, 61-88.
- Mohanty, C.T. (2003). "Under western eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs*, 28(2), 499-535.
- Nath, J. (2010). Gendered fare? A qualitative investigation of alternative food and masculinities. *Journal of Sociology*, 47(3), 261-278. doi: 10.1177/1440783310386828
- Olwan, D.M., Keating, A., & Orr, C.M. (2016). Make/shift pedagogies: Suggestions, provocations, and challenges for teaching introductory gender and women's studies courses. *Atlantis*, 37(2), 8-21.
- O'Sullivan, M.D., Bryant, K., & Hewett, H. (2016). Unlearning introductions: Problematizing pedagogies of inclusion, diversity, and experience in the gender and women's studies introductory course. *Atlantis*, 37(2), 22-33.
- Potts, A. (2010). Introduction: Combating speciesism in psychology and feminism. *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(3), 291-301.
- Robbins, W., Luxton, M., Eichler, M., & Descarries, F. (2008). Changing times. In Robbins, W., Luxton, M., Eichler, M., & Descarries, F., *Minds of our own: inventing feminist scholarship and women's studies in Canada and Quebec, 1966-76* (pp. 1-39). Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Robinson, M. (2013). Veganism and Mi'kmaq legends. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 33(1), 189-196.
- Robinson, M. (2014). Animal personhood in Mi'kmaq perspective. *Societies*, 4, 672-688.
- Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada. (1970). *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada*. Government of Canada Publications. Ottawa. Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2014/priv/CP32-96-19701-eng.pdf
- Seager, J. (2003a). Pepperoni or broccoli? On the cutting wedge of feminist environmentalism. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(2), 167-174.
- Seager, J. (2003b). Rachel Carson died of breast cancer: The coming of age of feminist environmentalism. *Signs*, 18(3), 945-972.
- Shiva, V., & Bandyopadhyay, J. (1986). The Evolution, structure, and impact of the Chipko movement. *Mountain Research and Development*, 6(2), 133-142.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Singer, P. (2016). Why speciesism is wrong: A response to Kagan. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 33(1), 31-35.
- Smith, A. (1997). Ecofeminism through an anticolonial framework. In K.J. Warren & N. Erkal (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*, (pp. 21-37). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Spiegel, M. (1996). *The dreaded comparison: Human and animal slavery*. New York, NY: Mirror Books.
- Stănescu, V. (2013). Why “loving” animals is not enough: A response to Kathy Rudy, locavorism, and the marketing of “humane” meat. *The Journal of American Culture*, 36(2), 100-110.
- Stoltenberg, J. (1999). How power makes men: The grammar of gender identity. In J. A. Kuypers (Ed.), *Men and Power* (pp. 26-39). Amherst: Prometheus Books.
- Sturgeon, N. (1997). The nature of race: Discourses of Racial Difference in Ecofeminism. In K.J. Warren & N. Erkal (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*, (pp. 260-278). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Steven, F. (Producer). (2016, October 21). Before the flood. [video file] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=D9xFFyUOpXo
- Sumpter, K.C. (2015). Masculinity and meat consumption: An analysis through the theoretical lens of hegemonic masculinity and alternative masculinity theories. *Sociology Compass* 9(2), 104–114. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12241
- Suzuki, D. (2010). *The legacy: An elder’s vision for a sustainable future*. Vancouver, BC: Greystone Books.
- Taylor, D.E. (1997). Women of color, environmental and ecofeminism. In *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*, (pp. 38-91). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Tite, R., & Malone, M. (1990). Our universities’ best-kept secret: Women’s studies in Canada. *Atlantis*, 16(1), 25-39.
- Thompson, C. (2006). Back to nature? Resurrecting ecofeminism after poststructuralist and third-wave feminisms. *Isis*, 97(3), 505-512.
- Thorpe, J., Boon, S., Bednar, L., Bonifacio, G.T., Hobbs, M., Hurst, R., . . . Trotz, A. (2016). *Atlantis*, 37(2), 54-67.

TOWARD A NEW (ECO)FEMINIST FUTURE

- Tribe of Heart (Producer). (2009, September). Peaceable kingdom: The journey home [video file]. Retrieved from http://www.tribeofheart.org/sr/pkjpre_english.htm
- Twine, R. (2010). Intersectional disgust? Animals and (eco)feminism. *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(3), 397–406.
- Universities Canada. (n.d). *Member universities*. Retrieved from <https://www.univcan.ca/universities/member-universities/>
- Warren, K.J. (1987). Feminism and ecology: Making connections. *Environmental Ethics*, 9, 3-20.
- Warren, K.J. (1997). Taking empirical date seriously: An ecofeminist philosophical perspective. In K.J. Warren & N. Erkal (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*, (pp. 3-20). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous place-thought & agency amongst humans and non-humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 2(1), 20-34.
- Williams, T. (1990). Re-forming “women’s” truth: A critique of the report of the royal commission on the status of women in Canada. *Ottawa Law Review*, 22(3), 725-759.
- Wilson, K. (2005). Ecofeminism and First Nations peoples in Canada: Linking culture, gender and nature. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 12(3), 333-335.
- Wood, C.V. (2015). Knowledge ecologies, “supple” objects, and different priorities across women’s and gender studies programs and departments in the United States, 1970-2010. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 51(4), 387–408.
- Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes. (n.d.). *About*. Retrieved from <http://www.wgsrf.com/about-wgsrf.html>
- Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.