

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY
Twentieth Annual Meeting
October 22-24, 2016
Salt Lake City, UT

ABSTRACTS

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2016

SUNDAY MORNING 9:00-10:30 a.m.

Session 1: Responsibility in the Anthropocene

Salon 1

Moderator: Steven Vogel, Denison University

**“Climate Change, Human Rights and Individual Responsibility”
Corey Katz, Saint Louis University**

Climate change violates human rights and a GHG mitigation policy is therefore required to protect human rights. But if particular individual or collective agent fail to mitigate, do their GHG emissions harm or violate human rights? The answer is unclear because it is not settled whether we can do without the appeal to individual marginal effects for assigning moral responsibility. I move past the difficulties with this “interactional” model of human rights and explore a “social-structural” one. On the latter, individual and collective agents have an imperfect moral duty to promote the legal and social changes which will lead to the necessary mitigation.

**“Collective Responsibility for the Environmental: Bridging the Motivational Gap”
Jennifer Szende, Trent University**

This paper examines environmental responsibility as a motivational problem, and aims to show that reframing environmental responsibility as a collective action problem can bridge the motivational gap. The feeling of helplessness in the face of environmental problems is impacted by the scale of the problems, and by the belief that individuals acting alone cannot have an impact. A collective responsibility understanding entails that individuals view themselves as contributing to the success or failure of a collective project. This reframing of environmental responsibility effectively captures the motivational gap associated with environmental duties, and suggests routes towards bridging that gap.

Session 2: Environmental Justice: Rights of Nature and the Environment

Salon 2

Moderator: Barbara Muraca, Oregon State University

**“Ontological Problems and Methods in Intergenerational Justice”
Matthias Fritsch, Concordia University**

This paper argues that long-term environmental damages call for a rethinking of time and morality. The first part of the paper reviews the literature on problems that have been argued to affect the idea that presently living generations are responsible for non-overlapping and distant future people. I argue that many of these problems are indeed, as some have suggested, ontological, for they affect the very being and temporality of moral agents and social relations. As such, they call for ontological solutions—

solutions, however, that are avoided by most intergenerational and climate ethicists. I sketch one such solution by making natality and mortality central to moral agency.

**“From Statelessness to Environmentlessness: Arendt and Environmental Injustice”
Joshua Mousie, Oxford College of Emory University**

In this paper, I develop a concept of environmental injustice and political exclusion that I call “environmentlessness,” which I base on Hannah Arendt’s understanding of political belonging. I consider Arendt’s understanding of political exclusion, especially her articulation of what it means to be “stateless” or “worldless.” I use this understanding of political exclusion to develop a theory of political belonging that requires access to and control over one’s environment as a precondition of political belonging.

**“A physio centric foundation of law - with Latin American Buen Vivir on the way
to a Universal Declaration of the Rights of Nature,”
Stefan Knauss, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg**

The most innovative but at the same time the most challenging part of Buen Vivir is the juridical application of nature as a rightsholder. The Ecuadorian constitution from 2009 introduces the indigenous concept of Pachamama and interpretes nature as a rights subject. The intellectual fathers of Buen Vivir are working right now on the universal decalaration of the rights of nature, which could be accepted by United Nations in the future. Would that be the a necessary evolution of the universal declaration of human rights or is it just misleading and metaphorical talk about rights?

Session 3: Invited Book Session: Brian Treanor’s Emplotting Virtue

Salon 3

Moderator: Jonathan Maskit, Denison University

**Allen Thompson, Oregon State University
Martin Drenthen, Radboud University Nijmegen
Response: Brian Treanor, Loyola Marymount University**

SUNDAY MORNING 10:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

Session 1: Invited Book Session: Thom Van Dooren’s Flight Ways

Salon 1

Moderator: Margret Grebowicz, Goucher College

**James Hatley, Salisbury University
Christopher Schaberg, Loyola University New Orleans
Lorraine Code, York University
Respondent: Thom Van Dooren, The University of New South Wales**

Session 2: Animals and Us: the Ethics of Cohabitation

Salon 2

Moderator: Bjørn Kristensen, Oregon State University

**“Close Encounters in Mediated Nature: The Life and Death of Cecil the Lion”
Abigail Levin, Niagra University**

I will argue that some animals kept in certain touristic venues, such as zoos and National Parks, are held out to the viewing public as unique individuals. These are often large and charismatic mammals that have been designated as unique, in part, by the practice of proper naming. This paper will consider whether such a designation gives rise to certain moral obligations toward these animals, owed by these venues and toward the viewing public. I will conclude that there are indeed such obligations, and that coming to understand them as such will offer these animals a degree of indirect protection from acts like poaching and conservation killing.

**“Animal Ethics in the Age of Humans”
Jozef Keulartz, Radboud University, Nijmegen**

The complex problems of wildlife conservation during the current stage of the Anthropocene – the ‘Great Acceleration’ – are forcing us to develop an alternative to the traditional (utilitarian and deontological) approaches within animal ethics. I will put forward Martha Nussbaum’s capability approach as a promising alternative to these traditional approaches, with the proviso that the current version of her list of basic animal capabilities will need to undergo some revision.

**“Bear Down: Resilience in Multispecies Cohabitation”
Brett Buchanan, Laurentian University**

This paper examines the concepts of resilience and multispecies cohabitation in order to help reframe our notion of an ecological commons that may include nonhuman animals, especially those that are considered threatening or a nuisance, and yet with whom we (humans) share lived spaces. Through the writings of Vinciane Despret, Dominique Lestel, Eileen Crist, Donna Haraway, and many more, I explore the fragility and resilience of human-animal behaviors, and the importance of behavioral diversity for our environmental imaginations and senses of place.

Session 3: Critical Theory after Nature

Salon 3

Moderator: Steven Vogel, Denison University

**“Can Environmental Philosophy Do Without the Concept of Nature?”
Michael Scoville, Eastern Michigan University**

In *Thinking Like a Mall*, Steven Vogel claims that “the concept of ‘nature’ might be such an ambiguous and problematic one, so prone to misunderstanding and so riddled with pitfalls, that its usefulness for a coherent environmental philosophy turns out to be small indeed” (Vogel 2015, 25). Given that appeals to “nature” in environmental philosophy are generally thought to be necessary and helpful, Vogel’s claim is provocative. In this paper, I critically assess seven prominent conceptions of “nature” in the literature, concluding that most of these conceptions stand up to philosophical scrutiny, and thus do not need to be abandoned.

**“Eros After Nature”
Chandler Rogers, Loyola Marymount University**

Seeking to conciliate between the positions of Abram and Vogel, I demonstrate firstly that Abram’s linguistic arguments for extending ethical considerability to nonhuman nature succumb to two of Vogel’s critiques, the social constructivist critique and the discourse ethics critique, and secondly that Abram fails to guard against the problem of human-human oppression. On the other hand, however, Vogel’s view fails to protect against the problem of dangerous anthropocentrism. Operating within the boundaries that Vogel establishes I seek to reclaim the virtues of Abram’s view, to address the ideology underlying both types of oppression, and to guard against the problem of dangerous anthropocentrism. Drawing upon the arguments of Trish Glazebrook, I contend that Abram’s appeals to the “speech” of nature can be more effectively conceptualized as erotic appeals, and that the call-and-response erotic

which ensues promotes the development of virtues that counteract this ideology and extend to both human and nonhuman.

**“Critical Theory and Environmental Limits: Apocalypse, Rage, and the Spell”
Michael Reno, University of Mary Washington**

Through an account of the concepts of rage, progress, and the spell in Adorno’s thinking, I consider whether an account of progress which locates its possibility in the non-identical elements of what we might call species-wide regression can accommodate ecological limits. To do so, I return to Adorno’s quasi-evolutionary account of our emergence from animality. And, I argue, using this account, that apocalyptic thinking is a retrenchment of rage in the face of the possibilities of overcoming the spell. As a practical matter I conclude by questioning the framing of contemporary ecological crises, in particular climate change.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON 2:00-3:30 p.m.

Session 1: Post-natural Landscapes

Salon 1

Moderator: Brian Schroeder, Rochester Institute of Technology

**“Hipsters and Heidegger: Unveiling Agrarian Idealization toward an
Ethics of Urban Environmental Care”
Elizabeth Lanphier, Vanderbilt University**

This paper builds on a connection between Heidegger and Tolstoy, pointing to their shared agrarian idealization, which has been taken up by the contemporary back-to-the-land movement. By deploying Heidegger’s own method of disclosure this paper reveals the inauthentic being contained in this rural romantic ideal, unveiling the class inequalities and negative projections of cities it perpetuates. I will ultimately suggest a move toward an ontology of cities as being-with-others in collaborative living, where authentic being is the individuation of responsibility and action in an urban network of shared resources, efficiency and conscious participation in a communal structure.

**“Barriers to Bridges: Rivers As Chiasms in Cultural Imagination”
Teresa Moss, University of North Texas**

In this paper I explore how urban river renewal projects can be viable means of re-imagining water relations. I adopt a phenomenological approach to water and apply Merleau-Ponty’s relational ontology of nature to argue that rivers can be used as bridges to facilitate the development of a new cultural imagination of water. I develop my argument by analyzing a current water supply conflict and two urban river renewal projects underway in the Dallas/Fort Worth metropolitan area. Finally, I discuss how the creation of a regional watershed institute can encourage North Central Texans to rediscover and reconnect with the Trinity River.

**“Environmental Aesthetics: Toward a Place-based Philosophy for the
Post-Industrial Rural Landscape
Elizabeth Walden, Bryant University**

This paper explores a non-anthropocentric environmental philosophy of place, a philosophy that emerges from a specific place tying inquirer to inquiry, creating new ways of knowing and dwelling. It considers traditional American forms of philosophical inquiry (Pragmatism, Native American thought etc.) as thinking that emerged from a lived engagement with North America as much as with existing cultural traditions. And it draws on that work, as well as Speculative Realism and New Materialism, to suggest a place-based philosophy that cannot be generalized, but must be practiced and lived.

Session 2: Invited Session: Land Art

Salon 2

Moderator: Jonathan Maskit, Denison University

Amanda Boetzkes, University of Guelph

David Wood, Vanderbilt University

Gary Shapiro, University of Richmond

Session 3: Invited Special Session: ISEE Roundtable: Three views on environmental philosophy

Salon 3

Moderator: Robert Figueroa, Oregon State University

Allen Thompson, Oregon State University

Benjamin Hale, University of Colorado, Boulder

Katie McShane, Colorado State University

SUNDAY AFTERNOON 3:45 p.m.-5:15 p.m.

Session 1: Who are "we"? What are "they"?

Salon 1

Moderator: Bryan Bannon, Merrimack College

**“Towards an agonal hermeneutic ethics of landscape preservation and rewilding”
Martin Drenthen, Radboud University Nijmegen**

This paper provides a hermeneutic analysis of the current debate between traditional nature preservation and rewilding, arguing that both can be seen as fitting responses to different ways in which nature lays a claim on us. It is the very tension between them that is productive: both perspectives interrogate each other. Care can become a self-serving caricature and an approach of letting things go respectfully is always in danger of slipping into one of outright neglect. The job of a hermeneutic environmental ethics is to lay bare these tensions, and invite ways to endure (or intensify) the agonal nature of our moral experience of nature.

**“Mosquito Malaise: ‘Invasive Species’ Discourse and the Zika Virus”
Rebekah Sinclair, University of Oregon**

The discourse of invasivity is not a neutral observation of “nature’s” organic borders, but is produced when statist logics cross-fertilize with biological/eco logics to generate an other who threatens the ethical centrality of Man. This paper tracks invasive species discourse from its origins in George Perkins Marsh (and his mosquitoes) to contemporary anxieties about invasive mosquitoes and the Zika outbreak. I suggest invasivity plays a significant role in mobilizing and connecting military, state forces of surveillance and intervention with other biopolitical extinction technologies.

**“Onto-epistemology and ethico-onto-epistemology: ‘Who Do We Think We Are?’”
Lorraine Code, York University**

This presentation engages with questions about ecological-epistemology “identity” in order to contest an underlying assumption in present-day Anglo-American philosophy about who the invisible knower is/ knowers are, in knowledge claims that inform analyses of ecological subjectivity and agency. Eschewing the radical individualism and universal entitlement of current white western philosophy and social theory, and endeavouring to think communally, socially, co-operatively and across human and situational differences, is germane to knowing ecological harms well in their specificity and generality. Central is the question “Who do we think we are?”

Session 2: Images, Wonder, and Play in Nature

Salon 2

Moderator: Barbara Muraca, Oregon State University

“Wild Boundaries: Operative Wonder in a Garden of Stones”

Brian Onishi, Eastern Michigan University

This paper argues that the tension between boundaries and wildness in everyday objects and environments can be framed in terms of an ontological wonder that is not confined to human consciousness, but extends to nonhuman objects participating in the generativity and activity of the material world. I will use the Japanese stone garden as an extended example and will appeal to the philosophy-physics of Karen Barad, to Jeffrey Jerome Cohen’s monograph *Stone*, and to the philosophical work of the Kyoto school in Japan. By incorporating Japanese philosophy, I will contribute to the growing development of Asian thought in environmental philosophy.

“The Play of Nature, the Push of Tradition: A Gadamerian Account of Aesthetic Experience of Nature”

M. Joseph Aloï, University of North Texas

Ambient theories of environmental aesthetics emphasize the embodied and multisensory character of aesthetic experiences of nature. I argue that this experience is well-articulated by Gadamer’s phenomenology of play: environmental aesthetic experience is a participation in the play of nature. This participation is made possible by, and contributes to, our background knowledge of nature. This knowledge, in turn, is rooted in social practice and tradition.

“The World Looks at Us”

Eva Maria Raeppe, College of Dupage

The paper argues that considering how to act in this world that continues to be shaped substantially by humans, requires an active imagination, drawing on diverse often-tensional perspectives. The “look of the world,” this opening to the sensible, although frequently detained in thought and words, can provide a unique spur for critical and creative reflection regarding a future still to come. Accordingly, certain photos open perspectives hardly imagined, prompting the viewer to examine those “almost perfect crime scenes” that call for investigation (Baudrillard, *Photographies* 1985-1998. 145, 131.)

Session 3: Roundtable discussion: 20 years of IAEP!

Salon 3

Moderator: Brian Treanor, Loyola Marymount University

Margret Grebowicz, Goucher College

Irene Klaver, University of North Texas

Ingrid Leman Stefanovic, Simon Fraser University

Ted Toadvine, The Pennsylvania State University

David Wood, Vanderbilt University

IAEP BUSINESS MEETING

Sunday 5:30 p.m.

Salon 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2016

MONDAY MORNING 9:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.

Session 1: *Beyond the Human*

Salon 1

Moderator: Barbara Muraca, Oregon State University

**“Speculative Ecology: Correlationalism, the earth as the unthought in Heidegger,
and the necessity of earth-interest in contemporary philosophy”
Vincent Blok, Wageningen Universit**

In this article, we take Meillassoux’ call for realism as a call for a new interest in the earth as un-correlated being in ecological thought. We criticize the onto-centrism of Heidegger’s concept of the earth and call for a question of the earth after Heidegger. To this end, we reflect on the ‘Anthropocene’ and the position of human being on earth. But contrary to philosophers like Timothy Morton who argue for an ‘ecology without matter’, our hypothesis is that ecological thought is impossible without a new conceptualization of the materiality of planet earth.

**“William James, “Pure Experience” and the Posthuman”
Russell Duvernoy, University of Oregon**

In this paper, I argue that William James’s radical empiricism and its correlative posit of a “pure experience” contain latent formal elements for 21st century speculation with regard to the possibility of non-anthropocentric ontologies. In particular, the concept of pure experience can help us to think the possibility of framing an empiricism which doesn’t assume the hierarchy of the human subject as the only possible ‘knower’. In bracketing the subject/object distinction and seeking to undo the constituting a priori categories that are the Kantian inheritance of Western thought, “pure experience” affirms the reality of experience across species borders.

**“Transcorporeal Subjects: Nature as Political Polyglot”
Chaone Mallory, Villanova University**

In the face of the increasing recognition of what Stacy Alaimo calls “trans-corporeality,” (Alaimo 2010) a recognition that human bodies are constantly immersed in, permeated by, and biopolitically interacting with an agential more-than-human world, we must move forward with political projects that seek to address the ways that particular groups, beings, and entities are disproportionately impacted by environmental problems. To do this we must recognize the subject-status of the more-than-human world, taking seriously the suggestion of ecofeminists, ecophenomenologists, and other liberatory theorists to re-think the subject, particularly the subject of political participation and action and refashion our political practices and structures to acknowledge the polyglotic voices of the more-than-human world.

Session 2: *From the Archives of Environmentalism*

Salon 2

Moderator: Keith Peterson, Colby College

**“Darwin’s Speculative Archives”
Parker Smith, University of Oregon**

“Darwin’s Speculative Archives” demonstrates how Darwin reads the bodies of organisms as archives of their ancestry and environmental conditions in order to trace the development of species. Using contemporary theories of the archive as well as speculative philosophy, this paper attempts to demonstrate how this archival methodology of reading organisms allowed Darwin to establish natural

selection as a fact without disregarding the infinite multiplicity of the natural world.

“On the “Ecological” in Ecological Psychology: A Gibsonian Environmentalism for the Anthropocene?”

Guilherme de Oliveira, University of Cincinnati

In this paper I explore three different senses of “ecology” in J. J. Gibson's “Ecological Psychology.” The first sense concerns Gibson's theoretical focus on the reciprocity and complementarity between organism and environment as sufficient to explain perception, cognition and action without reference to mental representations. The second, methodological sense captures Gibson's concern with the “ecological validity” of experiments and the ability to generalize empirical results to real-world situations. In addition to these two well-known “ecological” aspects, I argue that Gibson's thought also foreshadowed contemporary debates about the “anthropocene,” providing an insightful perspective on environmental issues arising from human activity.

“Self-Preservation and Survival in Kant: an Environmental Analysis”

David Craig, University of Oregon

This paper explores the concepts of self-preservation and survival in Kant's philosophy with an eye toward recent work on the ethics of extinction. In the first part of the paper, I show that while Kant recognizes the drive to self-preservation as a universal feature of animality (whether in humans or non-human animals), this drive has no real weight in his system, unlike survival, which is mandated within his moral philosophy. In the second part, I argue that there is nevertheless a current in Kantian thought that recognizes the normative primacy of animal self-preservation, below and before rational survival.

Session 3: Invited Session: Rethinking Conservation

Salon 3

Moderator: Margret Grebowicz, Goucher College

“Bioplurality”

Audra Mitchell, Wilfrid Laurier University

“Spectral Crows: Conservation and the Work of Inheritance”

Thom Van Dooren, University of New South Wales

“The Tyranny of Certainty”

Lorraine Code, York University

MONDAY MORNING 10:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

Session 1: Literature, Technology, and the Environment

Salon 1

Moderator: Bjørn Kristensen, Oregon State University

“Abjection, Violated Bodies and Sexualized Fundamentalism in the Contemporary Arabic Novel: An Ecocritical Study”

Jihan Zakarriya, Beni-Suef University

This research traces the representation of the concepts of fundamentalism, sexism and abjection in a selection of modern and contemporary Arabic novels from an ecocritical view. It specifically examines the relationship between religion and political corruption, fundamentalist movements and ethnic/racial violence, cultural tradition and sexist practices and environmental degradation and human abjection.

This research argues that ecocritical readings give new insights into how and when Arab environment is purposely politicized or enculturated and culture is environmentalized in the selected literary works, exposing the interconnections, settlements, and complicities to relate and take over environment and power concerning fundamentalist and abject practices.

“Daimonic Science and Alienation in the Anthropocene”
Tama Weisman, Dominican University

Whether Geologists will decide to designate the new geological epoch, the Anthropocene, or not is still unknown. Rhetorically, however, the Anthropocene marks a new age of human hubris. Going beyond extraction and re-creation, and even beyond alchemical attempts to transform base metals into gold, humans of the Anthropocene are being described in ways formerly reserved for gods; as ultimate forces of creation and control. In this paper I argue that rather than signifying human triumph, this self-understanding is a hubristic fantasy that marks a moment of radical and extreme alienation from the self, others, and the surrounding environment.

Session 2: *The Earth in Us: The Inheritances and Futures of Time Thought Geologically*

Salon 2

Moderator: Bryan Bannon, Merrimack College

“Time to Stop Dreaming about the End of the World”
Ted Toadvine, The Pennsylvania State University

Apocalyptic fictions dominate contemporary culture and merge with environmental narratives to the point of indistinguishability. These eco-eschatologies are phantasms that construct our identities, our understanding of the world, and our sense of responsibility in the present. I first critique eco-eschatology’s reliance on an interpretation of deep time that treats every temporal moment as interchangeable and projects the future as a chronological extension of the past. I then argue that renewing our responsibility toward the future, beyond apocalypse or apotheosis, demands an intuition of deep time that respects the singular anachronicity of the present while rediscovering time’s liability to geomaterial memory.

**“Timing Nature and Its Effect on Us: The Phenomenological Distinction Between
‘Natural’ and Non-Natural Time and How it Affects Deliberation”**
Matthew Meyer, University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire

Recent psychological studies suggest that the observation of natural objects slows one’s perception of time and reduces impulsivity. The phenomenological tradition attempts to account for the shift from “natural” time—time experienced in nature—to “clock time.” This paper is an attempt to bridge the gap between these two conversations. I begin by briefly reviewing the phenomenological accounts of the derivation of clock time from natural time. I then connect these accounts to give a phenomenological explanation of why the observation of nature may slow our perception of time and reduce impulsivity.

Session 3: *Environmentalism and Realism*

Salon 3

Moderator: Steven Vogel, Denison University

“Do Environmentalists have to be Realists?”
Keith Peterson, Colby College

Environmentalism entails the principle that human communities depend asymmetrically on other-than-human beings for their self-maintenance and well-being. This is the realist principle of dependence.

Some forms of environmental philosophy, however, fail to respect this principle in their epistemological, ontological, and ethical considerations by relying on taken for granted “correlationist” theoretical orientations. The paper examines and criticizes some of them, and argues that environmental philosophers must be realists in order to consistently support the principle of dependence.

**“The Reality and Real of the Ecosystem”
Anthony Smith, La Salle University**

This paper proposes an investigation of the underlying metaphysical assumptions of the scientific concept of the ecosystem. While environmental philosophy has done a fine job of interrogating the ethical implications of environmental thought and ecological science, the metaphysical aspects of environmental thought and scientific ecology have largely remained unanalyzed. I do not propose the necessity of metaphysics or the need for its return, but rather first simply aim to locate those metaphysical ideas operative within ecological science, specifically with regard to the ecosystem concept, and then evaluate the ways such ideas help and hinder ecological thinking.

**“Ecology Without Metaphysics: A Critique of Tim Morton’s Realist Ecology”
Rick Elmore, Appalachian State University**

This paper critiques Tim Morton’s Object Oriented Ontology (OOO) as a realist approach to environmental thinking. The author shows, via the work of Markus Gabriel, that although Morton’s approach attempts to avoid the problems associated with metaphysical holism, Morton ends up repeating the fundamentally idealist error of holism through his reduction of all entities to “objects” or “hyperobjects.” This paper concludes by arguing that Morton’s misstep in relationship to ontology and metaphysical holism is instructive for a realist environmental thinking that wishes to avoid idealist, holistic metaphysics.

MONDAY AFTERNOON 1:45 p.m.-3:15 p.m.

Session 1: Health, Food, and Justice

Salon 1

Moderator: Barbara Muraca, Oregon State University

**“Food Sovereignty and Gender Justice”
Anne Portman, University of Georgia**

A commitment to gender equity has been embedded in the food sovereignty concept from its earliest articulations. Some might wonder why this is the case. In this paper I review and augment the arguments for making gender equity a central component of food sovereignty. The most common argument is: if women constitute the majority of the world’s food producers, then agricultural policy is a women’s issue. I suggest that this is a good reason, but that an ecological feminist perspective can provide additional theoretical reasons for maintaining the centrality of gender justice in food sovereignty discourse.

**“The Constitution of the Self: Rethinking Public Health Ethics Ecologically”
Nicolae Morar, University of Oregon and Jonathan Beever, University of Central Florida**

In this project exploring ecological public health ethics, we examine the interplay among key constitutive factors that make up the self and offer some preliminary thoughts on how those factors integrate conceptually and practically. We propose that understanding complex questions of environmental justice and health demands a deep conceptual shift in ecological ontology to ground an also-important epistemic turn. Analyzing the interactions between social, psychological, and biological factors through examples including microbial ecology and obesity, we emphasize the importance of thinking ecologically both for the continued development of an ecological ontology and for the

application of principles of environmental justice.

**“Sovereigns without a realm: Food sovereignty for uprooted people”
Ian Werkheiser, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley**

Food sovereignty is a growing discourse among scholars, activists, and policy makers working on food. It stresses the importance of communities having control over their food systems, often including the land where that food is produced, and engaging in non-exploitative relationships of solidarity and mutual aid with other communities. While there is a vibrant discourse around food sovereignty, there is concern that the concept does not “Travel well” (Thompson 2015), rather like an heirloom variety of tomato. The worry is that food sovereignty is much less useful outside of its original context of indigenous communities of subsistence farmers. This question of portability is usually discussed in terms of whether food sovereignty can meaningfully be applied to communities of relatively affluent food consumers. In this paper, I instead look at what food sovereignty looks like in contexts of uprooted communities and individuals. I argue that food sovereignty can usefully speak to the lives of refugees and asylees, migrant food laborers, immigrants, and others. In so doing, food sovereignty makes some different claims than are often thought of in discourses around displaced people. These claims are also somewhat different from the ones food sovereignty usually discusses in contexts of landed food producers. Thus, this paper argues that bringing food sovereignty into the contexts of uprooted peoples holds the potential for a fertile hybridization.

Session 2: David Storey’s Naturalizing Heidegger

Salon 2

Moderator: Matthias Fritsch, Concordia University

**Brett Buchanan, Laurentian University
Adam Konopka, Xavier University
Response: David Storey, Boston College**

Session 3: Buddhism, Bicycles, and Blind Spots

Salon 3

Moderator: Janet Fiskio, Oberlin College

**“Robinson Jeffers’ Inhumanism and the Poetics of Place”
Josh Hayes, Alvernia University**

Robinson Jeffers is prophetic in his sensitivity to the inner spirit and life of a region. Considered a neglected genius of American poetry, Jeffers inaugurated an eco-poetics firmly rooted in a reverence for a uniquely Western conception of place influenced by the narratives of both Hellenic culture and Christian humanism. This paper attempts to investigate the complexities of Jeffers’ relationship to these competing narratives with particular attention to the advent of his own inhumanism as an attempt to question the foundations of our Anthropocene age. I conclude by exploring the apparent resonances between inhumanism and Buddhism in Jeffers’ later works.

**“Bicycling Toward Non-Rhizomic Perma-Culture:
Intersectional Environmental Ethics Examined”
Benn Johnson, University of North Texas**

Using anarchism, ecofeminism, Marxist geography, and gardening to build a critically active outlook toward environmental issues as rhizomic rather than radical, the following paper argues that the causes of “environmental crisis” are partial, interconnected, and subterranean. The paper examines critical mass bicycling as an analogy and possible tool for restructuring the world in anti-

capitalistic/patriarchal/anthroparchal/racist (/other?) ways. It rejects approaches that would narrow-mindedly focus on something like capitalism or anthropocentrism as the cause of environmental maltreatment, and attempts to build a framework for resituating ourselves in light of the issues we face.