Introduction

The everyday human environment interface has been pivotal to the discipline of geography. Take, for example, the work of Carl Sauer (1963, 343) and his notion of ‘cultural landscape’, in which ‘culture is the agent [and] the natural area the medium’. Of concern to us in this chapter is how feminist research has approached the taken-for-granted division of the everyday worlds that we encounter and study in two categories: ‘culture’ and ‘nature’. Until the 1980s, this division shaped the understanding of the human environment interface within the discipline of geography, underscored by the problematic separation of ‘physical’ and ‘human geography’. This chapter endeavours to outline some of the ways in which feminist thinking reconfigured and troubled humanist assumptions underpinning the culture–nature antinomy. To do so, the chapter discusses various feminist theoretical and methodological strands that have shaped geographical analysis of the human environment interface.

Our chapter is divided into three sections. In the first, we outline how the ecofeminist politics that sought to make everyday lives more environmentally sustainable were contested. The second examines how post-Marxist feminist approaches to science studies took account of bodies, devices and codes in the knowledge practice of scientists. Post-Marxist feminism addressed the gendered cultural politics of nature to trouble the culture–nature binary that rendered everyday social worlds as solely human achievements. The third and most substantial section discusses feminist work on embodiment that takes a visceral approach and attends to corporeal geographies by drawing on assemblage concepts to think outside the nature–culture divide and take up questions of nonhuman agency. To do this, we draw on a series of different ethnographic research projects that examine mundane practices in a range of everyday and research contexts: eating jam; plating up kangaroo; and washing oneself. These examples illustrate how domestic lives and subjectivities are assembled through relationships that blur the boundaries between the natural and cultural and are bound up in the affective intensities through which bodies’ capacities to act become either diminished or enhanced. In the context of questions that focus on sustainability, liveability and climate change, we outline how a visceral
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approach that is alive to the notion of affective intensities has potential practical and political applications to help to rethink what mobilizes people to change their everyday choices.

Ecofeminisms

Ecofeminists of the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s (see Gaard 1993; Plumwood 1991, 1993; Seagar 1993) posited a close connection between gender/women and nature/environmental conservation/sustainability, specifically addressing the oppression of both nature and women within Cartesian–Kantian understandings of knowledge. Ecofeminism is a contested concept and there is no single agreed form. Two strands of ecofeminist thinking characterize this intellectual and practical movement; cultural or spiritual ecofeminism; and social ecofeminism. Both are entrenched in the binary thinking that assumes that things were assigned to either the categories of ‘culture’ or ‘nature’ and thus rendered the world an exclusively human achievement.

Central to cultural or spiritual ecofeminism is the appropriation of ‘Mother Nature’ as an ideal. This allowed spiritual ecofeminists to advocate for women-as-nature. One of the key tenets of spiritual ecofeminism is that women have a special relationship with nature, because of their reproductive role. Ecofeminists for whom ‘Mother Nature’ held spiritual resonance embraced an essentialist position and advocated that women’s qualities (caring, mothering and nurturing) were intrinsic biological attributes. In addition, spiritual ecofeminists argued that these biological women–nature connections were undermined by patriarchal conditions that inform environmental management policies. Rather than challenging the knowledge that took for granted the association of women and nature, spiritual ecofeminists positioned women as stewards whose interests aligned with nature and thus sought to reverse the social hierarchies of patriarchal societies.

Social ecofeminists rejected the essentialist arguments of spiritual ecofeminism that reduced women to their biology. Instead, this ecofeminist position advocated for rethinking the women–nature connection as socially constructed and, thus, a political rather than a biological category. This strand of ecofeminism centred on the dominant representation of women as carers and nurturers. Socialist feminists critiqued the masculinist view of environmental knowledge born of a Cartesian–Kantian framework that naturalized the dualist thinking that aligns women with nature and men to culture. Such a divided worldview set up nature as ‘out there’ and separate from ‘man’, and therefore could be objectively controlled, studied and manipulated, whereas, following this Western masculinist tradition, women were positioned as closer to nature and as both irrational and emotional.

This realization allowed for the recognition of how masculinist thinking operates as a system of opposition and exclusion. How masculinist thinking shaped human–environment relationships is demonstrated in taken-for-granted assumptions that nature is ‘out there’, still waiting to be protected, remade or reclaimed by men. By contrast, women are thought to become more concerned about the environment through naturalized traditional gendered divisions of labour that position women through their labour as nurturers and carers (Plumwood 1993). For example, Emel (1995) showed how a version of Western frontier masculinity arose in the late nineteenth century in the American west through wolf-eradication programmes. The portrayal of men—who-hunted wolves as chivalrous, virile, moral and civilizing relied upon understandings of wolves as savage, cowardly and with a pack mentality. Emel’s (1995) study shows not only how the wolves were destroyed but also how social hierarchies were generated around a White colonial frontier masculinity. Here, nature–culture is conceived as necessarily entangled and spatial.
In summary, social ecofeminism is primarily a social constructivist approach that critiqued the systems of power and cultural politics that have privileged dominant models of Western masculinist thought. The social ecofeminist paradigm posited that all oppressions (deriving not only from gender, but also from race, class, sexuality, and so on) are set up by hierarchical dualisms from which the subjugation and exploitation of both women and nature stem (Gaard 1993). By this token, it is therefore impossible to truly emancipate any oppressed group if equal efforts to do the same for nature itself are ignored. Social ecofeminism destabilized the positivist, rationalist, essentialist and deeply entrenched Western habitus of environmental history that enabled the oppression of both women and nature by holding the concepts of nature and culture apart. The arguments of social ecofeminism are imperative to destabilizing taken-for-granted gendered categories, identities and discourses.

**Post-Marxist feminisms**

Post-Marxist feminisms advocate for notions of nature–culture conjoining or coupling. Hence, culture should be conceptualized as being ‘in’ or ‘folded’ through the natural. There are at least two strands of post-Marxist feminist explanations of the gendered dimensions of the human–environment relationship: feminist science studies; and feminist political ecology. These feminist approaches emphasize how the social and ideological, alongside technologies, shape gendered knowledge, modes and relationships of production and political activism.

**Feminist science studies**

Feminist critiques of science provide an important avenue to rethink the nature–culture divide. Here, we focus on two contributions: first, the knowledge practice of science as situated; and, second, human–machine interdependencies with respect to the notion of ‘cyborg’. The feminist approach to the question of knowledge practice in science articulated by Haraway (1988) and Rose (1997) positions scientific knowledge as embedded within, rather than divorced from, gendered and classed social worlds. Feminist science studies therefore identified as important the interrogation of the social and ideological construction of science, which is predicated on the idea that nature, as feminized Other, is a site for scientific experimentation and discovery (Merchant 1980). Hence, feminist writers like Haraway advocated for situated knowledges; that is, an epistemology grounded in a reflexive process that reveals the researcher’s subject position in relation to the uneven social power relationships that underpin their knowledge claims. In doing so, feminist science studies critiqued how environmental knowledge is not immune to the ‘subjective’ forces of culture by arguing that scientific communities are embedded in whole series of interconnections that are personal, economic, political and technical (including Haraway 1988; Merchant 1980; Plumwood 1993). Feminist science scholars argued that stronger forms of objectivity stemmed from the positioned rather than idealized humanist subject. These scholars illustrated the strong tendency of scientists to render nonhuman nature as knowable and predictable, rather than chaotic, unpredictable and coupled or conjoining natural–human system. The notion of situated knowledge transcends the gendered dimensions of Eurocentric knowledge by acknowledging that objectivity and disinterest in the subject is the ‘god trick of seeing everything from nowhere’ (Haraway 1988, 581).

Consequently, feminist postcolonial science studies acknowledge Indigenous knowledges that are generally marginalized through colonialism, inequality and power relations. For example, Carey et al. (2016) advocate for a feminist postcolonial glaciology that analyses not only situated knowledge and gender dynamics but also folk glaciology, which is usually silenced through
the operations of patriarchy, colonialism and Western science. While glaciologists may try to understand glacial ice through measurement, a folk glaciology, as offered by Cruikshank (2005), challenges scientific understandings of glaciers by engaging all the senses and the narratives of how the lives of women and glaciers are intimately connected.

Haraway’s (1996) motif of the cyborg helps feminists to think beyond the separation of culture and nature with the objective of being alive to how technology is blurring the boundaries of bodies and conventional notions of a discrete and autonomous human subject. The possibilities of a cyborg folding of flesh and technology acknowledge human–machine–animal interdependencies, including the activities of using hearing aids, wearing glasses, driving a car, talking on a mobile phone and working on a computer. Haraway acknowledges that our minded bodies are engaged in scientific innovations and political decisions. Such ideas seek a more inclusive ecological politics that envisages power as located neither in the environment or in humans but as produced through interrelationships between both together. For example, a car, a driver and driving infrastructure (roads, petrol, parking) become a new entity that has power, space and everyday life-making potentials. The scientific interventions of battery technologies and the driverless electric car, for example, create a whole new set of challenges, from how we organize our everyday lives to how we think of ourselves in the car. The cyborg motif has provided inspiration for feminist geographical research to explore the different ways in which science is reshaping the human–nature relationship, including through modifying foodstuffs, receiving blood and mapping DNA (Nash 2005).

Feminist political ecology

Post-Marxist feminist concepts of nature found in political ecology build upon post-colonial science studies’ and ecofeminism’s interrogations of the dominant Western, masculinist paradigm to offer the concept of ‘socio–natures’ to address the culture–nature binary. A feminist approach to political ecology addresses how patriarchal systems of power are founded upon the capitalist production of goods (Littig 2001). Feminist political ecology, for the most part, adopted a macro-sociological approach that looks to the structural, ideological and discursive to better understand the relationships between gender and the environment. It argues that men and women experience environmental issues differently and have different environmental attitudes and politics, because of the social construction of gendered roles and difference. There are arguably parallels between the capitalist subjugation of the natural world and women’s oppression (Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1997, cited in Littig 2001; Mies et al. 1988; Mies and Shiva 1993). As Seagar (1993) points out, the capitalist wealth upon which state power is predicated is built not only on the exploitation of resources available domestically but also on the claiming of the resources of Others. Control over natural resources is therefore key to performances of power. This is made possible by systems of ownership and privatization that stem from the Western, masculinist view of nature as something that is Other to humanity and thus an object to be dominated (Seagar 1993). Therefore, some feminist political ecology scholars argue that ‘a liberation from the constraints of capitalist material consumption and the preservation and restoration of subsistent economic activity is the only successful feminist counter strategy’ (Littig 2001, 43) to oppressions of nature and of socially marginalized groups.

Feminist political ecology researchers call for studies to move beyond gender to include analysis of power and justice. Hence, political ecology scholars challenge concepts like capitalism and class as taken for granted. As researchers in feminist political ecology argue, that the capitalist enterprise goes largely unquestioned and unchallenged is the product of various discursive ideologies (shaped by essentialist, phallocentric and binary thinking) permeating
Western discourse (Gibson-Graham 1996). Gibson-Graham (1996) sought to rethink capitalism as a ‘driverless juggernaut’ to instead envisage it as comprised of diverse economies and economic difference. Thus, feminist engagements with economy and uneven social power relations challenge dominant, capitalist relations with nature as a resource, and call for alternative economic narratives that acknowledge marginalized, hidden, non-dominant knowledges and practices (Gibson-Graham 2008). The work of Gibson-Graham (1996, 2008), for example, offers alternative conceptual lenses to understand the capitalist regime and its consumption of nature and its resources. If, as suggested above, the critique and dismantling of hegemonic capitalist ideology is the only method by which to liberate nature and women, Gibson-Graham’s (1996, 2005, 2008) insights into Other spaces and performances of economy offer possible sites of resistance and change.

**A visceral approach to environmental politics in the everyday**

Aligned with broader discussions and conceptualization in feminist scholarship on corporeality (see Alaimo 2010; Neimanis 2017), the recent turn of feminist geographies to the most intimately lived geography of the body to address power, justice and knowledge production offers opportunities for scholars to engage with environmental issues through people’s everyday lived encounters, visceral experiences, emotions, affects and embodied realities. A visceral approach offers much to feminist studies of the human environment interface by de-essentializing the corporeal body and acknowledging it as a complex nexus of practices, materialities, discourses and social relations that disrupts the masculinist binaries through which the body is traditionally viewed (Longhurst and Johnston 2014; Valentine 1999). A visceral approach allows for insights into culturally diverse environmental knowledges that are not necessarily based on Western, rationalist epistemologies (Waitt and Welland 2019). The philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari (1988) is a significant resource for feminist geographers’ rethinking of the human environment interface, through their insistence on analysis that begins in the middle of things and, in our understanding of the world, on attention to forces that are both material (bodies, things, technology, plants, water) and expressive (affects, emotions, feelings, sensations, ideas).

Following Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008, 462), the visceral is ‘the realm of internally-felt sensations, moods and states of being, which are born from the sensory engagement with the material world’. A visceral approach brings bodies to the fore by attending to affect. In this regard, drawing on the work of Deleuze, and of Probyn’s (2000) translation of his ideas, affect is a visceral way of behaving that involves the senses – touch, sounds, taste, sight and smell. That is, affect is conceived as the push in the world, an outcome of embodied knowledge that is at once non-cognitive and cognitive that may circulate between and through bodies and may be stored in places, things and ideas. Attention turns to emotions and feelings articulated through everyday encounters or convergences that either increase or decrease the body’s capacity to act. In this regard, affects may be conceptualized as a relational force. That is, when bodies and embodied knowledge are brought to the fore, before we signify affective forces as emotions or feelings such as shame, pride or disgust, we acknowledge the force that pushes us towards or away from that which we encounter in the world. Shame or pride are thus registered at a visceral level as blushes or euphoria in a way that is attuned to ‘going with your gut response’. In turn, affective forces are conceived to be intensified by discursive framings that align words with specific performances and places. As Ahmed argues (2004, 119), affective relations ‘involve subjects and objects, but without residing positively within them’, for example football fans who get goose bumps of pride at the winning performances of a sports team and who then may shout or sing with elation. The affective capacity, at some molecular level
in the fans’ bodies, produces an enhanced capacity to act in the presence of a winning team and supporters. It is the relationship between the supporters’ bodies and the football team that presents the affect. Furthermore, affective relations have the capacity momentarily to mobilize people to forge a collective, as demonstrated by the euphoria of a winning team.

In this regard, following the feminist philosopher Elspeth Probyn (2000), a visceral approach is a way to conceptualize the body as actively participating in the unfolding of human behaviour, subjectivities and social difference, alongside other processes more often recognized as sociological, psychological and physiological. This attention to the body therefore invites a shift in theoretical approaches to embodiment and so conceptualizes emotions as circulating as much by affective communication in and through moments of proximity or contact between human and non-human bodies as by more discursive modes of interaction. To illustrate the implications of feminist geographers embracing the concepts of Deleuze and Guattari (1988) to advance a visceral approach, our chapter turns to jam, kangaroos and showers.

**Jam – sticky encounters with a difference**

Picking up and extending Probyn’s work, feminist geographers Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008, 2010), Hayes-Conroy and Martin (2010) and Longhurst et al. (2009) have addressed how the deeply visceral attributes of eating make food a particularly compelling entry point for exploring the relationship between subjectivity and place in our accounts of the politics of eating. This work shows how what we eat is shaped not only by sets of ideas but also through multi-sensory engagements with the materiality of things that become food, on an everyday basis (Hayes-Conroy and Martin 2010). It pays close attention to the physical body’s role in social life and, specifically, to how particular oppressive regimes may become embodied. Furthermore, the visceral approach has equipped scholars with the conceptual tools to envisage how the body’s affective capacities could be forces to open possibilities for future change. For example, these feminist scholars conceptualized taste as within the visceral, rather than as attributable solely to the biological realm. In this task, they paid close attention to the affective intensities of individual eating practices, including the foodways of homemade and commercial jams.

The example of tasting jam provided Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008) with an applied entry point to illustrate how a visceral approach can offer new insights not only into ‘taste’ but also into the politics of eating. They deployed a visceral approach to critique the politics of the ‘slow food’ movement, which advocates for the politics of sustainability based on the biological taste of organic foods and knowing where and how food was produced. Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008) drew on an education programme with primary schoolchildren run by ‘slow-food’ leaders in Australia. The leaders prepared the students for a blind tasting of homemade and commercial strawberry jams. When asked about which jam they thought would taste better, most opted for the homemade jams made by their mothers. Yet, after the blind tasting, an overwhelming majority of participants selected commercial jam as their preferred taste; indeed, most of them had grown up eating commercial jams.

Through this example, Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008) alerted us to the possible classed and gendered assumptions of the ‘slow food’ educators. They argued that taste is always more than a biochemical process. When the taste of jam is conceived through the visceral realm, it points to how the affective intensities of taste are not only aligned to particular social groups along class and ethnicity but are also tied to memories and places. The work of Hayes-Conroy and Martin (2010) is also attentive to how the body is implicated in the unfolding politics of the slow-food movement for people to eat more sustainably. Rather than limiting taste to biological and chemical processes, Hayes-Conroy and Martin (2010) recognize that the molecular
and chemical dimensions of taste are connected to the ideas, beliefs and social categories that we inhabit. In doing so, they illustrate how the taste of jam opens up connections between its materiality and particular ideas and identities. Their point is that taste is materially valid yet is complicated by how social difference and affective intensities enter the material realm and shape our everyday food choices. Hence, this work points to wider implications arising from the visceral experience of food for social movements seeking to influence eating habits. Without close attention to the social–spatial circumstances that trigger negative visceral responses, food programmes designed to change eating practices will continue to fail.

**Kangaroo**

Building on the corporeal feminist scholarship of Probyn (2000) and Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008), Waitt and Appleby (2014) conceive the human body as relationally produced and materially affected to better understand the resistance to eating more kangaroo meat in Australia. Environmental scientists (Morrison et al. 2007; Wilson and Edwards 2008) and economists (Garnaut 2008) disseminate information that asserts the benefits of regularly eating kangaroo — including reducing the greenhouse gas emissions associated with what we eat, particularly from the increased consumption of meat and dairy products in Western diets. Here, the logic is that kangaroos produce less methane than cattle due to differences in their digestive tract. Yet, most Australian households seem disinterested in eating kangaroo regularly. This is despite supplies of kangaroo meat being available through leading supermarket chains since 2000. By attending to the affective intensities of produced through seeing, smelling, touching and tasting kangaroo meat, Waitt and Appleby (2014) show how food preparation and eating contribute to the resistance to practise ethnic identities in new ways. Through a discussion of visceral disgust, they illustrate the body’s material agency in arranging social patterns and categories of settler-Australian society. Like the work of Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2008) and Slocum (2008), Waitt and Appleby (2014) illustrate the way that bodily judgements of plating up and eating kangaroo arise from the specific structural circumstances of settler Australian society that position it as holiday ‘bushtucker’ rather than an everyday meal. Overall, the kangaroo tastes (strong, gamey) and textures (tough, stringy) did not connect viscerally with the thoroughly embodied set of culinary practices, labour, skills and social relations that comprise everyday home life and the subjectivities of a ‘good’ grandparent or parent. As Probyn (2000, 9) notes, ‘eating … becomes a visceral reminder of how we variously inhabit the axes of economy, intimate relations, gender, sexuality, history, ethnicity, and class’. In the case of eating kangaroo meat, visceral disgust serves to fix cultural and familial food traditions through the uncomfortable feeling of coming too close to something already rejected as inedible when categorized as wormed or, at best, pet food. However, as Slocum illustrates (2007, 2008), thinking through the visceral and the relational body reveals that affective forces do have the capacity to make way for imagining new attachments and desires, and unsettling cultural and familial food traditions. A visceral approach is committed to the uncertainty of outcomes and the possibility of affective intensities for the world being otherwise.

**Showers**

Our final example draws on Burmese refugees’ and migrants’ experiences of washing themselves in Australia. This project attended to the visceral experiences of the touch of tap water on the skin. Concentrating on the visceral experiences of bathing, insights were offered into participants’ gut feelings about washing themselves. In this instance, the visceral experiences
were about cleanliness, freshness, identity, belonging and longing and place. Insights were offered into how the performances, alongside the touch of water, mobilized bodies to act in particular ways. For those participants who continued to scoop water over themselves from a bucket, this habitual practice reconnected them with their home country, age, faith, freshness and personal ethics to minimize water use. For others, the affective intensity of flowing tap water from the shower was often connected to transitioning between identities and feelings of being ‘clean’ and ‘at home’ in Australia. The affective geographies of showering for these participants were bound up with ideas of water security, and the experiences of the shower became a device to help to constitute professional identities and public selves alongside managing hectic schedules and spatially fragmented lives. These participants illustrate how discourses around cleanliness, convenience and abundance combined with bathing materials (taps, pipes, showerheads, hot-water tanks) in the visceral body. The discourses of the convenience and comfort of showers are not separate from their material design and the sensuous touch of water. Furthermore, this research underscored that bathing is never ‘just washing’. Education programmes designed to reduce water consumption alone may prove ineffective because of how subjectivities and daily lives are entangled with the touch of the shower water. As Waitt and Welland (2019, 39) argue:

the scenario of washing skin from the touch of cool water splashed from a bucket, rather than the flow of warm water for a shower, may raise a series of alarm bells precisely because it challenges habits and routines of deeply embedded racialised, classed, aged, gendered and ethical norms that stabilise white, healthy, classed bodies and western public spaces as deodorised.

To inform household sustainability policy, we also need to understand how the experiences associated with practices – being touched by water, touching water and experiencing the feelings associated with the touch of water – are important components of ethnic, gendered and religious subjectivities and places. Hence, Waitt and Welland (2019) point to the importance of environmental programmes that engage, particularly, through the unpredictability of bodily relationality. Visceral political action could involve, for example, enrolling the felt intensity of a ‘bucket-bathing challenge’ once a year to encourage people to reflect on the social norms of bathing to excess and our connections to river systems. Bound up in the bodily and affective intensities of washing skin are possibilities for embodied social change.

Conclusions: gender, power and the human environment interface

In this chapter, we have outlined how different feminist concepts that engage with the human–environment interface expose how patriarchal structures of domination have worked historically to supress women through a romanticized affinity with nature. The concepts serve to open up corporeal knowledge to rethink what mobilizes everyday choices. Our review highlights how feminist scholarship offers various theoretical portals to understand the human environment interface, each underpinned by a shared commitment to the gendered politics of sustainability/environment. The politics of spiritual ecofeminism was theorized by women as having essential biological qualities and, as such, were used to organize events that sought to celebrate this romanticized connection with nature. In contrast, the politics of social ecofeminism departed from the binary Western hierarchical thinking of man: women, culture: nature, urban: rural, and civilized: wild. The concepts of social ecofeminists enabled a cultural politics that became a technique for challenging the normativity that aligned gendered human environment relationships to their social, spatial and representational dimension.
Post-Marxist feminisms have built upon such a way of thinking that for too long imprisoned women and the environment within analytical divisions of a masculinist knowledge of the world. Post-Marxist feminist thinking – specifically, the concept of ‘situated knowledge’, where knowledge is set in its specific socio-economic context – became a vehicle for an environmental politics that raised questions of how scientific knowledge itself was embedded in gendered and class interests that then legitimated certain ‘truths’ about nature. Furthermore, post-Marxist feminist thinking through the concept of ‘cyborg’ entailed a challenge to the human–nature binary by highlighting the ontological existence of things alongside their powers, capacities and consequences. Feminist political ecology set research agendas embedded in economic relations, institutional sites and state policies that were attuned to how dominant gendered and class agendas were integral to shaping paid and unpaid work, and thus relationships with the environment.

The aim of a visceral approach is to better understand the non-cognitive and cognitive elements that comprise our experiences of everyday life and situate these within political processes, including sustainability, liveability and climate change. For many decision-makers, everyday life is now at the fore of liveable futures. The question of how policymakers and activists can mobilize everyday habits (including bathing, diets and transport) is thus highly germane. The body is the entry point for the visceral approach of corporeal feminism. Corporeal feminists argue that the body should be treated as a relational concept in ways that do not predetermine our analysis of either outcomes or experiences. Thus, a visceral approach requires attention to the interconnections between thinking and being, paying specific attention to the role of affect and emotions in how the dualisms of our social–material world are made, remade or undone. Gender, together with other social categories, is therefore conceived as emerging within the spatially embedded relationships between ideas, actions, things and experiences. According to corporeal feminists, affective intensities that are expressed as emotions, such as disgust, pride and shame, are crucial to our situated subjectivities and our everyday choices and actions. Attention therefore focuses on the multi-sensual dimensions of everyday life encounters with people, things, ideas and places. Corporeal feminists offer important insights to the politics of everyday life and social movements by illustrating the unpredictability of bodily relationality and its implications for being political and changing everyday life.
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