
Back to Nature? Resurrecting Ecofeminism after Poststructuralist and Third-Wave Feminisms

Author(s): Charis Thompson

Source: *Isis*, Vol. 97, No. 3 (September 2006), pp. 505-512

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of The History of Science Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/508080>

Accessed: 24-03-2018 04:14 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The History of Science Society, The University of Chicago Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Isis*

Back to Nature?

Resurrecting Ecofeminism after Poststructuralist and Third-Wave Feminisms

By Charis Thompson*

ABSTRACT

Rereading Carolyn Merchant's *The Death of Nature* a quarter century after its publication and from the perspective of its contribution to feminist theory is a rewarding process. Merchant's book has garnered a sustained readership as a foundational text of ecofeminism. Simultaneously, however, ecofeminism itself has been sidelined within feminist theory because of critiques that it is marred by ethnocentrism and by an essentialist identification of women with nature. Rereading Merchant leads to three conclusions. First, Merchant explicitly repudiates ethnocentrism and essentialism, developing instead an archival methodology that grounds the universalizing claims of modern science in time and place, text and ideology. Second, the central claim of ecofeminism—that the domination of women and of nature have shared roots in the logic of science and capitalism—remains a powerful thesis. Third, ecofeminism brought together antimilitarist feminists and others whose voices are underrepresented in contemporary academic feminism. Combining the critiques of recent third-wave feminisms with a reevaluation of ecofeminism would greatly strengthen the field.

WITHOUT QUESTION, Carolyn Merchant's 1980 *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* is one of the most successful and influential books of feminist scholarship ever written. It has remained in print, continuing to sell well and to speak to lay and expert readers alike. The book's continued ability powerfully to connect sexism and other forms of domination prevalent in modern life with a historical and analytic framework for examining ecological devastation remains deeply compelling. One may disagree with the interpretation of a particular piece of evidence in the text or find the structural explanation to be too sweeping, but the fundamental insight retains its explanatory power. The idea that the rise of modern science, technology, and capitalism

* Departments of Rhetoric and Gender and Women's Studies, 1070, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

This essay was prepared for the History of Science Society Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, 3–6 November 2005, and presented as part of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary Session in Honor of Carolyn Merchant: "Getting Back to *The Death of Nature*: Rereading Carolyn Merchant."

Isis, 2006, 97:505–512

©2006 by The History of Science Society. All rights reserved.

0021-1753/2006/9703-0007\$10.00

produced and relied on the death, domination, and exploitation of a nature gendered female, and that this reinforced and reflected the cultural subordination and exploitation of women, is the kind of large and provocative thesis of which academia has too few.¹

In the rest of this commentary, then, I shall take as given the enduring importance of Merchant's ambitious text. As I am not a historian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I am ill placed to contest any of her particular selections of evidence or interpretations of texts. Instead, I wish to use this forum to examine the partial sidelining of ecofeminism and to argue for the need to resurrect Merchant's argument within certain branches of feminist theory and women's studies recently and currently in vogue in the academy in the United States.

The Death of Nature is commonly considered to be one of the founding texts—perhaps the founding text—for the articulation of ecofeminism in the U.S. academy. It provided a burgeoning movement with historical evidence, academic rigor, and a secular materialist analytic framework that nonetheless appreciated the centrality of relationality and caring in its call for the restoration of an earlier organic and living view of nature. Many ecofeminists celebrated women's putative life-giving and holistic reproductive and spiritual capacities and tied these gendered qualities to an ability to care for and protect the earth from rapacious natural resource extraction, militarism, and ecological disharmony.² Merchant's analysis made sense of the historical processes whereby women's life-giving and life-protecting capabilities had themselves become the objects of scientific inquiry, thereby objectifying both nature and women. Women's ways of being and thinking, the ecofeminist movement maintained, made them natural (in many senses of the word) inhabitants and guardians of Mother Nature's garden in an antipatriarchal and oft-times prelapsarian imaginary. The reclaiming by ecofeminists of the pairing of women and nature expressed a refusal to base society and community on the power hierarchies of a capitalist patriarchy whose "invisible hand" operated as if it owned not just the means of production but those of destruction and reproduction as well.

Two important conferences, one held in 1980 at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and the other in 1987 at the University of Southern California, drew huge audiences and were representative of the strands of feminist thinking that East and West Coast ecofeminism drew upon.³ The East Coast conference, "Women and Life on Earth: Ecofeminism in the 1980s," brought together Ynestra King's ecological feminism and the concerns of antinuclear and peace activists such as Anna Gyorgy and Grace Paley; it featured the best-known figures of early ecofeminism, including Starhawk, Charlene Spretnak, and

¹ Although it forces one to come to terms with the costs of the liberal view, Merchant's thesis is compatible with the view that the Scientific Revolution and the rise of capitalism also produced significant freedoms, including gender freedoms.

² For the Wicca-based spirituality of some early ecofeminism see, e.g., Starhawk, *Spiral Dance: A Rebirth of the Ancient Religion of the Goddess*, 20th anniversary ed. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999). Later collections show the widespread uptake of ecofeminist ideas in feminist religious studies. See, e.g., Rosemary Radford Ruether, ed., *Women Healing Earth: Third World Women on Ecology, Feminism, and Religion* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1996); and Heather Eaton and Lois Ann Lorentzen, eds., *Ecofeminism and Globalization: Exploring Culture, Context, and Religion* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

³ For histories of ecofeminism at various times and from various perspectives see Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein, eds., *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1990); Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism* (London/Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed, 1993); Karen Warren, ed., *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature* (Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 1997); Noël Sturgeon, *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory, and Political Action* (New York: Routledge, 1997); and Mary Mellor, *Feminism and Ecology* (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1997).

Susan Griffin.⁴ The conference forged a common platform among lesbian feminism, environmentalism, and women's antimilitarist movements, all of which felt a pressing political need to disengage from or otherwise oppose patriarchy and its associated condemnation of the warring inhabitants of the earth to mutually assured destruction. The 1987 West Coast conference, "Ecofeminist Perspectives: Culture, Nature, Theory," organized by Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein, was somewhat more spiritual and more academic in tone and less directly connected to the antinuclear movement, illustrating regional variations as well as temporal changes within ecofeminism. Importantly, though, the presence of Angela Davis and others tied the oppression of women to other kinds of stratification in society, such as racism, that are linked to sexism in complex ways. This marked an early refusal, at least by some, to allow ecofeminism to rest on easy assumptions about the oneness and benign nature of shared womanhood.⁵

The excitement around ecofeminism in the 1980s included predictions that it would prove to be the third wave of feminism (at least within the United States), successor to the first wave, which had achieved women's enfranchisement from the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth century, and the second wave, which raised personal and sexual consciousnesses and exposed enforced work and pay inequities and the banality that marked the lives of many U.S. women in the mid-twentieth century. It was not to be, however. By and large, what has come to be called third-wave feminism developed arguments that contained strong critiques of ecofeminism.

Despite the power of ecofeminism to contribute to debate about the rise and consequences of science, capitalism, and warfare, and despite its ability to unite different strands of feminism in the United States, by the early to mid 1990s ecofeminism had largely been relegated to a marginal position in feminist theory in the academy. The reasons for this were several, and in the end this marginalization was perhaps overdetermined. Ecofeminism in the academy was a victim of its own success in crossing the academic/lay boundary; cosmopolitan academics distanced themselves from the "touchy-feely," religious, and reproductive celebratory strands; jokes about placenta-eating covens of ex-hippies became (and remain) common. Third-wave feminisms contained explicit and implicit critiques of mind-sets that put women in a single category, calling instead for intersectional analyses that—far from celebrating the creative and caring unity of all women—showed, for example, how much reproductive and caring labor is outsourced from privileged men and women to women of color, immigrants, and low-income women.⁶ Ecofeminism, 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. Feminist anti-militarism, based symbolically on the nuclear arms race, lost steam at the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, ecofeminism's central structural thesis ran counter to the particular forms in which hugely influential French poststructuralist thought was making its way across the Atlantic. Ecofeminism's marginalization had multiple causes, then, and this led to what was, in my opinion, a classic case of throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

Rereading Merchant's book with twenty-five years of hindsight allows one to begin the task of rearticulating the central tenet of ecofeminism for which she argues, in a way that

⁴ See, e.g., Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King, eds., *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1989), for statements of these strands of feminist thinking.

⁵ See, e.g., Angela Davis, *Women, Race, and Class* (New York: Vintage, 1983).

⁶ See, e.g., Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds., *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1991).

incorporates the critiques of feminists of color and of poststructural, postmodern, and transnational feminisms, and to resurrect some of ecofeminism's neglected strengths. In short, it is time to move beyond an implicit choice between taking seriously feminist accounts of nature and the environment, on the one hand, or anti-essentialism about women, feminist poststructuralist explanation, and transnational feminist examination of gendering and racialization, on the other hand. *The Death of Nature* itself contains the means to begin this work, and Merchant's later writings went on to consider many of these intersections in more detail.⁷ What is perhaps still missing, however, is a widespread recognition among feminist scholars and others of the power of the central analytic of ecofeminism and, indeed, its implicit and powerful critique of postmodern and poststructuralist positions in some of their incarnations. A retrospective look at *The Death of Nature* can begin to draw out these two elements. If ever there was a time to bring back serious opposition to militarism, freed from the "ontology of the enemy" of the Cold War, and to combine it with a critique of the profoundly inequitable gendered transnational division of natural resources and labor, this must surely be that time.⁸

In *The Death of Nature* Merchant argued persuasively for a view that subsequently became one of the two core tenets of ecofeminism: that the domination of women and the domination of nature are structurally linked. (As alluded to above, the second core tenet was a recognition and celebration of the values and activities traditionally associated with women, including childbirth and various kinds of nurturing.) She suggested that it was necessary to "re-examine the formation of a world view and a science that, by reconceptualizing reality as a machine rather than a living organism, sanctioned the domination of both nature and women."⁹

Merchant was motivated by her recognition of an isomorphism in critiques of capitalism in the women's movement and the ecological movement, noting that "both the women's movement and the ecology movement are sharply critical of the costs of competition, aggression, and domination arising from the market economy's *modus operandi* in nature and society." In examining the Scientific Revolution, she made a historical argument that the rise of modern science and its economies was the motor of these twin oppressions. The corollary—that equality for women and care of the environment are two parts of a single remedy to modern exploitation—united feminists and ecologists in an urgent call to action. In her detailed elaboration of the "historical interconnections between women and nature that developed as the modern scientific and economic world took form in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," Merchant provided an empirical and theoretical genealogy for the forms of oppression of women and of the environment so characteristic of capitalism. Most important, she made the case that the oppression of women and of the environment are linked, textually, ideologically, and empirically, in the same large historical development—namely, what she termed "the death of nature." Much as Robert K. Merton had done in his work on the Puritan spur to capitalism and to science, Merchant

⁷ Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (1980; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990) (all quotations are from the 1990 edition, which will hereafter be cited as **Merchant, *Death of Nature***); and, e.g., Merchant, *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

⁸ See Peter Galison, "The Ontology of the Enemy: Norbert Wiener and the Cybernetic Vision," *Critical Inquiry*, 1994, 21:228–265.

⁹ Merchant, *Death of Nature*, p. xxi.

tied science, technology, and the economy to values and beliefs characteristic of modernity.¹⁰

Yet *The Death of Nature* worked against the kind of externalism Merton usually employed as much as against the narrow internalism of the majority of the history of science. As Merchant put it, “I place less emphasis on the development of the internal content of science than on the social and intellectual factors involved in the transformation. Of course, such external factors do not cause intellectuals to invent a science. . . . Rather, an array of ideas exists, available to a given age; some of these . . . seem plausible . . . ; others do not. Some ideas spread; others temporarily die out.” Her innovative methodology enabled—indeed, was imperative for—this project. Scientific epistemology and “cultural norms” and “social ideologies” had to be examined together. Nature could not be reduced to the merely natural—after all, this deadening of nature was exactly what she was examining—and her methodology, along with the social movements and the sciences themselves that motivated her, resurrected nature from its own death. Thus, “through dialectical interaction science and culture develop as an organic whole, fragmenting and reintegrating out of both social and intellectual tensions and tendencies.”¹¹

In the 1980s ecofeminism spread both inside and outside the academy and around the world, but especially in the western United States where Carolyn Merchant was living and working. Much of her preface to the 1990 edition of *The Death of Nature* dealt with this rise. As she notes there, “During the past decade [since the book first appeared], women over the entire globe have emerged as ecological activists. . . . Feminist scholars were producing an explosion of books on ancient goddesses that became the basis for a renewed earth-rooted spirituality. . . . Concerts, street theater, solstice and equinoctial rituals, poetry, bookstores, and lecture series celebrated human resonance with the earth.”¹²

The rise in the 1980s and 1990s of poststructuralist and other varieties of third-wave feminisms contributed to the marginalization of ecofeminism in feminist theory.¹³ It is instructive to separate the critiques into those that primarily attack the tenet that involves the structural linking of the domination of women and of nature (the structural argument) and those that primarily attack the celebration of traditional womanly and nurturing values. It is my contention that critiques of the second kind—those against womanly celebration—have little purchase against Merchant’s argument. Critiques of the first kind do, however, require an answer. I will suggest that, robbed of the second kind, critiques of the structural argument lose much of their force; indeed, it is possible that the time has come to interrogate feminist poststructuralism and postmodernism from the perspective of the analytic and political clarity that is gained from the structural argument.

Ecofeminism is nearly always criticized for its essentialisms in supposedly equating women with nature and conflating one woman with another, without regard for, say, class, race, nation, able-bodiedness, and age. But while some varieties of ecofeminism may have equated women with nature in an essentialist manner, Merchant’s argument does this as an empirical rather than a *a priori* fact; indeed, she argues expressly against the error and dangers of reifying the identification. Similarly, she argues explicitly against the idea that there is a universal female behavior and against depictions that uniformly cast woman as

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xx; and Robert K. Merton, *Science, Technology, and Society in Seventeenth Century England* (1938; New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

¹¹ Merchant, *Death of Nature*, pp. xxii, xxii–xxiii.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. xv.

¹³ See Sherry Ortner, *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture* (Boston: Beacon, 1997).

a nurturer. The affiliation between women and nature does interest her, but for the underlying argument, not for its own essential identification: “Women and nature have an age-old association—an affiliation that has persisted throughout culture, language and history,” Merchant tells us, but “it is not the purpose of this analysis to reinstate nature as the mother of humankind nor to advocate that women reassume the role of nurturer dictated by that historical identity. Both need to be liberated from the anthropomorphic and stereotypic labels that degrade the serious underlying issues.”¹⁴

Of the anti-essentialism arguments, the ones that are most difficult even for Merchant’s argument to avoid are those that question whether an ecological sensibility is (always) a feminist goal. Whose nature is it, anyway? As anti-essentialists rightly insist, not all women are the same, and many women are part of groups that oppress other women in intersectional hierarchies of class and nation that cross-cut the question of ecology. Furthermore, the health risks and other costs of environmental degradation are disproportionately borne by those with control of the fewest resources, as the scholarship on environmental racism has so compellingly illustrated. So, no one set of values can be assumed to benefit all women (equally). In addition, the prerogatives of the preservation of nature are often invoked in deeply sexist, racist, and transnationally unjust ways. Particular visions of nature, especially those of a pristine nature, have been used—implicitly and explicitly—in legislation against immigrants and in targeting the childbearing patterns and the survival and labor exigencies of the world’s poor.¹⁵ A nature (not to mention a work and domestic schedule) that allows the stereotypical environmentalist—something like the well-off, *au nature* or survival-equipped, white male “deep ecologist” type familiar from a whole tradition of U.S. nature writing—to encounter “wilderness” with little or no other human company is paid for not just by the kinship web that takes care of his labor of reproduction offstage, but also by the transnational and domestic division of labor that underwrites his economic freedom and the protection of his wilderness. These arguments, if sometimes overstated, make it clear that not all ecological visions are feminist ones and that feminist ones cannot be assumed to apply to all women equally.

Merchant’s argument does not support any particular version of nature preservation, however, and it certainly does not conjure up the deep ecological vision with which ecofeminism tends to get lumped. Indeed, her insistence on “investigating the roots of our current environmental dilemma and its connections to science, technology, and the economy” is exactly the kind of political economic purchase that many feminists of color, postsocialist feminists, and transnational feminists would wish to see routinely brought to bear on questions about the conservation of nature.¹⁶ The rise of scholarship that connects activism against environmental racism with feminist activism against environmental degradation has articulated what it might mean to take this task as seriously as it warrants.

What about the structural component of ecofeminism that Merchant herself has been so influential in formulating—and its critique? Both postmodern and postructuralist feminism

¹⁴ Merchant, *Death of Nature*, pp. xix, xxi.

¹⁵ On environmental racism see, e.g., Robert Bullard, ed., *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots* (Boston: South End, 1993); and Bullard, *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality* (1990; Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 2000). On the image of a pristine nature as a weapon against the poor see, e.g., Asoka Bandarage, *Women, Population, and Global Crisis: A Political-Economic Analysis* (London: Zed, 1997).

¹⁶ Merchant, *Death of Nature*, p. xxi. For work that conflates ecofeminism and deep ecology see Ramachandra Guha, *The Ramachandra Guha Omnibus: The Unquiet Woods, Environmentalism, Savaging the Civilized* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006).

explicitly eschewed ahistorical or *a priori* appeals to structure; for example, instead of using “nature” as a given, external, guarantor of truth, they argued that nature, just like writing or avalanches or weapons or envy, cannot be known independently of the lay, juridical, industrial, and any number of other practices that name it, make it, tend it, admire it, destroy it, exploit it, measure it, or render it benign or dangerous. This rejection of structure did not involve taking up structure’s modernist twin, agency, because the unified human subject acting with free will had come under the same attack as structure—as the joke ran in feminist circles, no sooner had women begun to get some agency than feminists deconstructed agency. Instead, postmodern and poststructuralist feminists began to develop accounts of subject formation, of gender performativity, and of nature, exercised through continuously and mutually iterating and constructing norms, freedoms, and oppressions. Poststructuralist feminist theory grew out of the 1960s–1970s poststructuralism of French theorists such as Derrida, Lacan, Foucault, and Althusser. Its strengths have been its repudiation of determinisms and its attention to irreducible complexity, multiplicity, and interpretative flexibility. Postmodern feminism, even more than poststructuralism, made its argument through nature, rejecting a stable nature/culture divide; and both rejected the gender theoretical hallmark of second-wave academic feminisms—namely, the sex/gender divide, arguing instead that biological sex (hence nature) was itself constructed. As such, postmodern and poststructuralist feminisms have been extremely influential in feminist thinking about nature. Perhaps because of their deconstruction, nature as such and “the environment”—let alone the association of nature with a pretheoretical womanhood—tended to be sidelined in postmodern and poststructuralist U.S. feminisms.

In general, academic ecological feminists have incorporated poststructuralist and transnational and other third-wave insights, but few poststructuralist feminist theorists have paid much attention to the environment and environmental issues.¹⁷ This is in part because the most prominent feminist theorists tend to come out of the humanities, and, as those of us at the humanities/social sciences/sciences borderlands often note, somehow the high humanities more or less missed out on the environment. But most important, if you take away the structural argument—the role of the rise of modern science, technology, and capital in oppressing some people and nature—and replace it with critique instead of structural analysis, feminist scholars and students trained in the fine points of postmodern and poststructuralist feminism are left with few resources for discussing environmental problems. Despite rendering both women and nature multiple, contingent, and co-constructed, and nature anything but dead, third-wave and poststructuralist feminisms somehow lost sight of the structuralist insight of ecofeminism that yoked together world patterns of environmental degradation and women’s oppression. Our mistake was to see accounts with a structural argument as structuralist in the sense that poststructuralists rejected (i.e., static and hopelessly beguiled by the singularity of truth and reason).

But is Merchant’s argument structuralist in this “bad” sense? Merchant’s argument is one that, far from assuming a fixed structural relation between women, nature, and their joint cause of oppression, tells a historical story in which the structural argument comes

¹⁷ Ecological feminist work that takes postmodern and poststructuralist thought seriously includes Kate Soper, *What Is Nature? Culture, Politics, and the Non-Human* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995); Warren, ed., *Ecofeminism* (cit. n. 3); and Val Plumwood, *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason* (London: Routledge, 2002). On the other hand, e.g., the deservedly iconic book of U.S. poststructuralist feminism—Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1989)—does not much concern itself with the environment, as its target in nature is the sex/gender boundary.

as the result of particular patterns of material, ideological, and epistemological exchanges and events that enabled and were in turn enabled by the European Scientific Revolution and its continuing legacy. The structural component of her argument is historically constructed; matters have been otherwise elsewhere and at other times, as Merchant has shown throughout her *oeuvre*. Another thing worthy of notice is how poststructuralist in spirit core parts of Merchant's innovative methodology are—namely, the interaction between science and culture, “fragmenting and reintegrating out of both social and intellectual tensions and tendencies,” that she set out in the book. Contemporary academic feminist theory, if it is to have anything to say about environmental crises, would do well to resurrect this component of Merchant's pathbreaking analysis. It would greatly benefit academic feminist theory in the United States to pay more attention not just to the more recent writings of ecofeminists such as Carolyn Merchant, but also to the antimilitarist strands of the early days of ecofeminism. Equally important is the rise of Third World women's feminist scholarship and activism and of transnational feminist theory that does make the environment central even while it fundamentally questions patterns of inequity and works from a starting point of the co-constructedness of categories of knowledge and peoplehood. Crucial too will be those scholars who have analyzed environmental racism and ecofeminism together. Finally, rereading the founding poststructuralist French texts, as Verena Conley has convincingly argued, shows what is lost by importing poststructuralism without its ecological politics.¹⁸ Together, these bodies of knowledge and justice herself demand that we resurrect Carolyn Merchant's nature.

¹⁸ Verena Adermatt Conley, *Ecopolitics: The Environment in Poststructuralist Thought* (New York: Routledge, 1996). Cynthia Enloe is one of the few feminists who have insisted on continuing to take militarism seriously; see, e.g., *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 2001). For examples of Third World women's feminist scholarship and transnational feminist theory see Mies and Shiva, *Ecofeminism* (cit. n. 3); and Merchant, *Radical Ecology* (cit. n. 7). On environmental racism and ecofeminism see, e.g., Dorceta Taylor, “Women of Color, Environmental Justice, and Ecofeminism,” in *Ecofeminism*, ed. Warren (cit. n. 3), pp. 38–81.