

## **EcoPolitics Podcast - Episode 4.11 - Canadian Ecopolitics in the Anthropocene**

### **Dr. Rosalind Warner (00:01):**

One of the key issues or fulcrums around which a lot of Canadian Ecopolitics has circulated is around the question of economic growth and planetary limits. Canada has been a country of expansion. We've been a country of extraction for the most part. Building a national identity, building a national structure in institutions very often against imposing external forces and following economic patterns that have been less than sustainable over time. And so, the fact that ecopolitics is so relevant now I think is testament to the way in which these issues have played out over our history.

### **Dr. Peter Andrée (00:48):**

Hello and welcome back to the Ecopolitics Podcast. This is episode 11 of season 4. This is a podcast for students and researchers studying environmental politics. I'm Peter Andrée from Carleton University and I'll be your host today. And my co-host for this podcast is Ryan Katz-Rosene from the University of Ottawa, though Ryan won't be joining us in today's episode.

### **(01:12):**

So, this season's theme is the Ecopolitics of the Anthropocene, and today we're honing back in on Canadian environmental politics specifically. This was the dominant theme of the first season of our show produced back in 2020 and 2021. And I'm here today with three co-authors of a new book released in 2025 from the University of Toronto. This book is called Canadian Ecopolitics, and it offers a comprehensive overview and introduction to the intersection between environmental issues and political processes in Canada. The release of this book gives us an opportunity to turn back to some key themes raised in the first season of this podcast. Themes like how Canada's multilevel governance structure, its resource-based economy, and the ongoing dynamics of settler colonialism, all shape environmental politics in this country that my guests and me all call home. So, this book gives us a chance to bring these issues up to date. Offering students and researchers a great overview of the complexity of Canadian ecopolitics in the mid-2020s. I'm excited to have three guests joining me today to unpack this topic of Canadian ecopolitics.

### **(02:25):**

First, we have Dr. Rosalind Warner or Roz. Roz is a college Professor of Political Science at Okanagan College. Her research focuses on global environmental politics, nature rights, and earth systems law. Roz is also Director of the Canadian Environmental Network, (Le Réseau canadien de l'environnement) and a Research Fellow at the Earth Systems Governance Project. Welcome to the Ecopolitics Podcast, Roz.

### **Dr. Rosalind Warner (02:49):**

Thank you. Really glad to be here.

### **Dr. Peter Andrée (02:51):**

It's great to have you here as well. Next, I'll turn to Dr. Will Greaves, an Associate Professor of International Relations at the University of Victoria in British Columbia. Will's primary research examines climate change security and arctic politics. And in 2025, Will was elected as a member of parliament for Victoria. So, welcome to the Ecopolitics Podcast, Will.

**Dr. Will Greaves (03:14):**

Thanks for having us, Peter. It's great to be here.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (03:17):**

Great. And finally, Dr. Peter Stoett is Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities at Ontario Tech University in Oshawa. Peter has worked extensively with international organizations and publishes on environmental policy, human rights, and other global issues. Welcome to the podcast, Peter.

**Dr. Peter Stoett (03:36):**

Thank you, Peter.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (03:38):**

So, I think I will turn to you first, Peter, because you're the last one I introduced. This is a really complex topic to take on Canadian ecopolitics. What do you see as some of the defining features of the Canadian ecopolitical landscape that was important to talk about in this book?

**Dr. Peter Stoett (03:56):**

Yeah, thanks. Well, certainly history's important and we don't neglect that in this book. It's not a history text, but we try to infuse history throughout. I think what really emerges for me is this issue or theme of connection. The connections between imaginaries, between the historical process of extraction, which of course Canada is so famous for regarding the building its economy. And then also the political processes that shape ecopolitics themselves. So, certainly multilevel governance. Yes, that's a fundamental aspect that's unavoidable when talking about Canadian politics. You're talking about federalism, right? But it goes far beyond that. There are also, of course, community level initiatives that are taking place. There are first nations that are active ecopolitical actors. So, we make an effort in the book, I think, to bring all of these actors, themes, and the connections between them into play.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (05:02):**

I wonder, Roz, if maybe you want to speak to this? What are some of the defining features of the Canadian, ecopolitical landscape that you would add to what Peter's just given us?

**Dr. Rosalind Warner (05:10):**

I absolutely agree that the connections between environmental issues and political processes and institutions is really key, and we see that playing out over Canada's history for sure. I think that in general, one of the key issues or fulcrums around which a lot of Canadian ecopolitics has circulated is around the question of economic growth and planetary limits. Canada has been a country of expansion. We've been a country of extraction, for the most part. Building a national identity, building a national structure, and institutions very often against imposing external forces and following economic patterns that have been less than sustainable over time. The fact that ecopolitics is so relevant now I think is testament to the way in which these issues have played out over our history.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (06:06):**

That is super interesting. And as someone who also teaches Canadian environmental politics, I do often notice that Canadian position on some issues seems to be a bit at odds with say, our European counterparts. And that the nature of our economy really plays into this. Maybe also the age of our

country. I'm curious, Will, what would you add in here about – because I know there's a whole aspect of this book, which is about the international dimensions of environmental politics and where Canada fits in, given Canada's history and nature of our economy, what does that do to us in the international system?

**Dr. Will Greaves (06:43):**

Yeah, thanks for the question, Peter. Two things come to mind specifically. The first is the way in which, as you noted, a lot of Canada's roles in the world, our political economy, has been tied to the extraction of natural resources from this land. And that has just been a mainstay of the entirety of 400 odd years of Euro-American settlement in Canada. That has coloured our relationships with other countries. It affects a conception of the national interest that Canada has and what it should be pursuing through different kinds of international organizations, different kinds of negotiations. And I would say that there is a tension that has emerged frequently between the way that Canadians, or at least some Canadians, like to see themselves as being green, if you will, as being pro-environmental, as having this positive attitude towards the natural environment and a desire to ensure the preservation of that environment and some of the realities of our economy and some of the interests in this country that seem to win out when it comes to how the Canadian state actually conducts itself and what kinds of agreements or commitments it's prepared to make in the world.

**(08:03):**

But a second dimension to your question that I think is really interesting is we're all aware, of course, that Canada is this geographically very large country, the second largest country by area in the world. And that's something which is I think internalized at a very young age by many Canadians. It's kind of a mainstay of basic public education about this country. And because of Canada's enormous size and its relatively small population, it's led to a situation, or maybe more accurately a state of mind, where for the last number of centuries, there's been a view that Canada's resources were inexhaustible. What impact could we possibly have on the environment? We have so much of it. We have so much nature that who will even notice if we take a few trees or we take a few fish or we open this mine, et cetera, et cetera. And while there is still certainly a lot of nature in Canada, I think we have really started to encounter in this century the limits of that mode of thinking.

**(09:06):**

And because most of Canada's peer countries – and here there are a few exceptions, Australia and the United States are also both very large geographic countries with some similarities, I think, to Canada. But when we compare Canada to a lot of our peer comparator advanced democracies in Western and Northern Europe, for example, but also in Northeastern Asia, what we see is that those countries have no such illusions about inexhaustible natural resources to the extent that they had natural resource bases, they have largely been exhausted. And so, I think that leads to a really different set of conversations, but also a certain amount of public policy differences that are manifesting in the environmental space in terms of sustainability, in terms of climate change politics, because Canada and Canadians still have this conception of limitless nature, which is not really true and is increasingly undermined by our somewhat rapacious appetite for natural resources. But it leads to a pretty different relationship to the natural world between us and many of the other countries that we like to keep company with.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (10:10):**

This has been super interesting so far. And one thing that you just said though, Will, was really – well, there were two aspects of it. One was around the idea of this 400 years of Euro-Canadian settlement, and of course there was a settlement in people's here before that. And there's been, I think an increasing consciousness among Canadians over the last decade. And now I'm talking about non-indigenous Canadians who have slowly been waking up to this through the reconciliation discussions and decolonization discussions that of course there were people over much of this land, most of this land, for many, many thousands of years. And one of the things that I noticed about your text that sets it apart from maybe some earlier text in environmental politics is you're really getting into the conversation about settler colonialism and where indigenous people fit in environmental politics in Canada, how environmental politics impact them, how they're impacting environmental politics.

**Dr. Will Greaves (11:08):**

Yeah, it was really important to us to engage indigenous peoples, indigeneity, indigenous forms of knowing, being and governing, but then distinct, but related to that settler colonialism as a process, as a series of structures without which you really can't get very far in terms of understanding the history of this country and the people who now inhabit it.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (11:31):**

I wonder, Peter, if I can just turn to you and ask you how you brought in this question of settler colonialism into this text on Canadian ecopolitics.

**Dr. Peter Stoett (11:40):**

So, there's definitely an emphasis on these nation building premised on an extractivist political economy, an approach to nature which does come with colonialism. And that's not unique in any way. It's not unique to Canada, nor is it unique to North America, right? And in fact, we were previously talking about Canada and the international world, and something to bear in mind, and we do give some examples of this I think in the text too, is Canada's actions abroad today in some ways do mirror earlier conceptions of what Will refers to as the infinite space for exploitation that nature presents in countries in Latin America and elsewhere. Canadian mining companies have acquired a certain reputation for their actions in certain countries and so forth.

**(12:36):**

So, to say that colonialism or the settler where epic is a thing of the past, I think is a mistake, and indigenous communities will tell us that too. We talk about the Anthropocene, for example, but for them it's always been, I think Anthropogenic, once colonialism really sunk its teeth into the land. And the impacts of climate change in fact have been experienced by indigenous communities for a long, long time. And so, I think we tried to infuse the book with this notion that as much as we can talk about Canada as having this historic background, much of which is based on exploitation and violence, to be blunt, that's still part of the continuing evolution of the Canadian landscape. Now that sounds pretty negative, but that being said, we are seeing more and more auctions by First Nations, for example, in the realm of litigation. We've seen court cases that are favoring in terms of land claims settlements, but also in terms of the obligations that Canada, and the Canadian government has vis-a-vis the treaty rights of indigenous peoples and including those that live on unsettled claims lands. So, it's evolving every day. It's fascinating really, because it makes Canada the complex polity that has emerged over these years, right? We've got this conflict that occurs between past and present, still playing out today on a large scale.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (14:16):**

Yeah, let's just turn it to you, Will, would you like to add something here?

**Dr. Will Greaves (14:19):**

What I think is important, at least for me in this context is to stress that when we're discussing settler colonialism, I understand that a lot of people, and probably a lot of Canadian students in particular, will have a kind of negative association with that term or will view it as perhaps pejorative in some cases. And in our instance, I think what's really important is that it's an analytical term. It's an important way of describing a period of modern history, and then all of the politics that have flown from this set of processes that were obviously in motion when European peoples first arrived in numbers and began permanently settling on this continent. And so, just to point out that on the one hand there is a lot of baggage associated in a lot of chatter around settler colonialism and indigenous issues in Canada these days. And largely to the good in the sense that I'm of the view that it's better for us to be engaging in these discussions than not. But we use it primarily as an analytical term that actually offers a particular set of insights about the issues and the themes that we're interested in the book.

**(15:23):**

The second piece that I think is really important and interesting though is most people will know that indigenous peoples today are a minority within the demography of Canada, somewhere in the neighborhood of 5% of the population. But what that number obscures is the fact that in the parts of the modern country of Canada where a lot of the resource extraction and a lot of the themes of the book are actually taking place, we see far, far larger proportions of indigenous peoples within those subnational or regional populations. And in the case of the Canadian Arctic, or at least Nunavut, the territory, we have a very large Inuit majority, somewhere in the neighborhood of 85 to 90%. So, to a certain extent, when we're talking about these ecopolitical issues in Canada and we engage the ideas of indigeneity and settler colonialism, I think it also really forces us to reckon with parts of the country where indigenous peoples are actually the numerical majority. And as you noted, where both political processes such as devolution, but also very much the role of the judiciary and the Canadian courts have transferred effective governance, effective control over decision-making in those territories to indigenous peoples. So, there's simply no way of having these conversations in the 21st century without engaging indigenous rights because they have become so central to what can happen in vast, vast swaths of this country.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (16:57):**

Yeah, thank you Will. And certainly for listeners to this podcast, these are familiar themes. We just finished two episodes specifically looking at indigenous-led food system sustainability initiatives, bringing them into dialogue between Canada and Aotearoa [New Zealand]. We'll link into the show credits with some of the episodes that have really focused on this theme.

**(17:19):**

One of the things that this is bringing to mind for me is what are the good news stories? There's a lot of challenges in the current ecopolitical moments, but there's also some really interesting signs of positive change. And the court cases that we were just talking about are examples of that. These indigenous led initiatives on multiple fronts are interesting examples of that. And I wonder, Roz, if I can turn to you, what do you see as some interesting positive stories of Canadian ecopolitical landscape that you'd want listeners to be paying attention to?

**Dr. Rosalind Warner (17:53):**

Well, here I would highlight the growth of the environmental movement and the rise of the civil society interest in environmental issues. As I talked about in the book, and as I often talk about with my students back in 1867 with the initial signing of the Constitution Act and the BNA Act [British North America Acts], there wasn't really much consideration of the environment or perhaps even resources other than through how could people best use them and develop them and contribute to the national prosperity. And it's clear to see that over the course of Canadian history, what we've seen is a deepening a growth and an expansion of Canadian's concern for environmental issues in a way that has led them to demand that government do more to solve these problems. I'm thinking of both in an organized sense, so the expansion of environmental groups across the country, some of which are locally organized, operate at the municipal level all the way up to the federal level. We have groups that care about a wide range of issues that really wouldn't have been discussed even 10 or 20, 30 years ago. Climate change is at the forefront of a lot of people's thinking, and there's still really, really wide support for government to take action on climate change and to do more to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

**(19:14):**

I also think Canadians have really, really contributed to the awareness and the advance and progress of international environmental law, international environmental treaties. If we go back to 1992, and the Earth Summit, Canadians have always been at the center of that. We've been at the center of multilateral efforts to improve the actions of all countries working towards our common goals to protect the global commons, to take action on the high seas' treaties, to work on the problem of reducing biodiversity. Canadian government has been, in many ways a leader on a lot of these issues internationally, and I think this is something that Canadians have supported. Canadians have a lot of what we call biophilia, so we have a sense of closeness to the environment, which as Will said, comes from having a lot of it, but also a sense of care for it. And that is something that we have been able to express through our political system and through our international relations.

**Dr. Peter Andr e (20:15):**

Yeah, thank you. Just as you were speaking Roz, I turned to, I think it's page 49, and I think that's a picture of – is that the Rainbow Warrior there? A lot of students, I know, don't know that Greenpeace originated in Canada, right? And it's this intersection between the growth of civil society activism and then having a global impact. This is one of those environmental organizations that really has grown to have that kind of impact. Peter, would you like to add something here?

**Dr. Peter Stoett (20:41):**

Yes. I think it's worth reflecting on the ecopolitical theater to use that term. In the Canadian context, in particular, there's been a constant tension between this sort of pro-environment, biophilic, yes, if we want to use that great term and the perspective that has generated things like Greenpeace and so forth. But also, again, a rather concerted effort, I would argue that has emerged from extractive industries in particular to either play to that consciously and/or obscure it and silence it. So, I'm not trying to paint this in two stark terms, but I would argue that presently I think the ecological consciousness is under a threat like we've rarely seen before. And this, of course, is in the United States, it's just blatant, right? You actually have a government which is actively trying to invisibilize, if you will, the climate issue and silencing those that want to speak about it. And that is very worrying, of course, to see that happening there. We have to be very conscientious that it doesn't start replicating itself here as well.

**(22:06):**

I don't think it matters so much what government is in power. It's a threat that I think that's been throughout Canadian history that certain issues don't get discussed or don't get the airplay that they do in a podcast like this. Others, however, have become just undeniable. So, when we talk about the forest fires, the entire destruction of a town basically in Alberta, at that point, it becomes undeniable that you've got to deal with these issues that they must be discussed. And the short term, of course, and we're including seeing the climate destruction that's occurred in the north in particular, including recent flooding in Alaska and so on. This is really tremendous, the extent of damage that's taking place. So, it will be talked about a bit, but the question is does that get sustained? Does that become part of the national political discourse? And to use a phrase we use in the book, the national imaginary of this polity, and there I might be a little less optimistic than Roz sounded. I don't think we're there, but I certainly think it's under threat, that path to that state.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (23:17):**

I hear what you're saying, and certainly Roz gave us some examples of hope and possibility. And then Peter, you're bringing a bit of the realist perspective and particularly what's been happening in the United States. And I think that word of invisibilizing or trying to really diminish environmental impact and environmental threats at a time when they seem to be the worst is it's really something to pay attention to. And I'd like to bring Will back in here. I'm curious to hear your perspective on what's been shared and maybe if you see some signs of possibility as well.

**Dr. Will Greaves (23:52):**

You know, Peter used the phrase realism and as an international relations scholar, realism has a particular valence for me, but I really like thinking about the term climate realism or being a climate realist because it focuses on the way in which somebody like Donald Trump and any other number of officials, both in the United States but very much in Canada as well, people who like to position themselves as being pragmatic or sensible, or as the ones who are trying to adopt this cloak of being realistic in their assessment of what we can or cannot do about climate change. But in the process are actually diminishing or actively obscuring or in some cases outright denying what climate change means and the consequences that it has on real people and real communities and real economies. I like the language of climate realism because I think it lets us reclaim the language of realism for people who understand that climate change is real and that its effects are so profound that it is deeply not pragmatic to neglect to do anything about them.

**(25:02):**

And so, in that sense, the climate realists unfortunately are still in the midst of that very, very difficult battle of ideas in the public mind. Unfortunately, it does feel like we're on the back foot at this moment, I think. Having made some pretty considerable progress over the last couple of decades, things have turned for a variety of reasons, but not least of which, in my view, the rise of this far right authoritarian movement in the United States and other parts of the world, the overtly regressive attitudes that are making something of a comeback in terms of natural resource extraction, but also to cite a personal favourite of mine, the work of Cara Daggett, the relationships between climate change denialism, authoritarian politics, and this particular form of what she calls petro-masculinity. That it's really potent in my view, because we are seeing those things emerge, and to some extent, I think be adopted by a lot of regular people precisely because they offer a way out of reckoning with the enormity of what climate change actually entails. So, it's seductive because it's so appealing to pretend that actually these things are not happening, or even if they are happening, surely, they're not as severe as some of these climate doomsdayers have been saying for years now. It offers an out over what are otherwise very, very

challenging questions that in fact, demand change of one sort or another, right? The nature of that change might be a little indeterminate, but if you accept that climate change is happening and it's real, you have to embrace the idea that something has to change.

**Dr. Rosalind Warner (26:49):**

I want to take a little bit different tack on this because I think we sometimes get bogged down in optimism versus pessimism, and environmentalists are often put on the pessimist side. I like realism. That makes sense to me. That we need to have discourses that are based in evidence and fact and empiricism. To me, a lot of the discussion when I listen to different sides of the discussion going on right now is more about the timeframe and what does the future entail. One thing we tried to do in the book was to consider how timeframes affect the way in which we think about policy and the role of government.

**(27:31):**

Governments are really short-term thinkers. They're in power for a certain amount of time. They leave power and whatever policy and legislation they bring in might not last for the next decade. Natural changes, environmental changes, climate change, biodiversity loss, these are much longer-term considerations. They're not really well suited to be discussed in a short-term timeframe. And one of the things I kind of want to encourage young people to think about is the larger impact – the way in which we can think more long-term in terms of what is our place in the world, what is our relationship with the natural world? To think more deeply about that, not to reject politics, but to recognize that politics has a very narrow frame and that if we want things to change and ultimately to transform towards a more healthy, more sustainable, more prosperous society, we have to think a little bit more long-term about our actions today. The things we do today are consequential for the future, and I really believe that this is a message that we can bring home and that we can help young people to see that they can really make a difference today more than probably any other time in our history.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (28:45):**

Yeah, thank you, Roz. I really resonate with what you're saying here.

**Dr. Will Greaves (28:49):**

Picking up on Roz's comments about youth. As educators, as university professors, we have the privilege of working with young people, and it's one of the great highlights of our jobs, but we have a real selection bias in terms of the young people that most of us, I imagine actually interact with. And so, in many of our courses, and even more broadly, students who go on to post-secondary university education in the first place, there are going to be certain structural biases that lead the students who come into our environmental politics classes or are sitting in our lectures to have a baseline level of interest and likely sympathy towards environmental issues. So, we've all met those really passionate young people who are environmental activists or climate activists and are super aware about these issues and very focused on trying to make things better. And they're some of the best students to work with, but they're not representative of their entire generation or of their entire demographic cohort.

**(29:45):**

And that's I think one of the frontal challenges that we have to reckon with here is as we've seen very recently economic pressures and in the Canadian case, the tariff and trade war with the United States. And as those pressures have come online in the last year or so, and prior to that, the pandemic and lots of other examples we might look to – we see the prioritization of environmental and climate issues

diminishing in the face of increasing concerns about bread-and-butter issues and pocketbook issues. And young people aren't immune to that. And in fact, I think there's a very powerful argument to be made that it's people of my generation – so, I'm a millennial in that sense. I was born in the mid 1980s. That it's actually people of my generation who lived through apex material prosperity in many of our, what we would call western societies. And for young people coming of age now, they will be looking at material conditions that are meaningfully less prosperous, or at least less materially consumerists in that sense than the generation that preceded them. And there's a lot of, I think, resentment and again, this appeal to a certain kind of right-wing politics that will come from that. And I think we're seeing many of those effects playing out as we speak.

**Dr. Peter André (31:06):**

Those are really interesting points. And I know I mentioned off the beginning that you've recently entered politics and you're now a member of parliament, and I imagine that in this new sphere, you're not in the classroom every day with those enthusiastic climate activists. You're dealing with a much broader cross section of Canadian society in Parliament and in your town hall meetings and so on. And I'm wondering what you're learning as you make this transition about how to communicate and engage across worldviews and perspectives on these ecopolitical issues.

**Dr. Will Greaves (31:40):**

I've learned a lot in the last couple of months, and I expect that my learning curve will continue to be steep. There are some things from my academic career and my previous work that have served me in good stead in my new role as a member of parliament. And there are some things that really don't, to be honest with you. The desire to be right, the engagement in critique as this kind of mode of engagement with challenging thorny social problems has a place, but it is really not the best way I have found to engage with either constituents, with voters, or with parliamentary colleagues on a lot of these issues. The country is big, the country is diverse, the country is also divided. And so coming in hot, if you will, coming in with a really strong sense of one's own principles, but also a reluctance to seed ground on those principles, or to find areas of compromise, or to engage in kind of an absolutist, moralizing kind of politics that is very common in activism, is very common in academia, is not particularly helpful or useful within electoral politics I will say.

**Dr. Peter André (32:58):**

Within what I just heard, I think, is the idea that in a position like yours, you have to take listening quite seriously, don't you?

**Dr. Will Greaves (33:05):**

Yeah. It's fundamental. Both in terms of listening to people within your own community and who you have the responsibility to represent, but with whom you may not be in agreement. With whom you may actually have very fundamental disagreements. And as tempting as it might be, I don't think it's appropriate, nor would we view it as acceptable just to not engage with those folks because you disagree. But the nature of the role, and I think to be effective as a representative within our democratic system, you do have to have an understanding of where these different groups of people are coming from and what is motivating them to believe what they believe or to be asking for what they're asking for. And then once you have that information as an elected official, I think you're better able to engage your elected colleagues and try to find a way forward, try to find actual policy solutions or common ground. But even then, I've got colleagues within our national caucus who again, come from all corners

of this country. And there can be real challenges in finding what that common ground looks like for people who represent autoworkers in southern Ontario, fishers in Atlantic Canada, farmers on the prairies, and then downtown urbanites of all stripes from all these cities and communities across the country. So, it's a real challenge. And this experience for me has, I think, deepened my sympathy for politicians I've been very critical of in the past as an academic and made me even more aware of the complexity and the compromise that goes into governing a country like Canada and moving us forward in any meaningful way.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (34:41):**

Yeah, thank you. And one skillset that maybe we can think about for those of us who teach Canadian ecopolitics is active listening. We often teach students how to debate and make their points but really listening to the other side and figuring out how we can find points of commonality is going to be critical moving forward. Peter, would you like to add something here?

**Dr. Peter Stoett (35:01):**

I think listening to people is extremely important, obviously. The definition of political discourse to me must include listening and not just speaking, but I think listening to nature is just as important. And I have a professor who takes her students out to the woods for a day or two every term. It is a communications class, but they just listened to the woods. It's a wonderful thing, I think. I was happy to support that course. One thing that – and Roz can talk about this with probably greater detail than myself – but we are seeing an increasing movement, I believe, towards people accepting the inherent rights of nature and listening to nature is part of getting there. And you can argue, going back to our discussion of indigenous communities and pre-settlement, this has always been practiced on Turtle Island. But I think the rights of nature movement, which we do discuss in the book, is becoming more and more important in Canada. And if we can move in that direction, I think, in legal terms, it's a very positive development.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (36:09):**

This is a great place to round us out, and I'd love to turn to you, Roz, now, to speak a little bit about this movement because it certainly – I've seen it growing, picking up steam around the world in global discourse, and maybe you can tell us about what's happening with it here in Canada.

**Dr. Rosalind Warner (36:23):**

Well, I think that the rights of nature have gained a lot of interest in Canada in particular because of its focus on water, on connection with nature, and a sense of obligation to nature, and also partly because of the nature of our legal system. Canadians are very familiar with the idea of rights. Our Charter of Rights and Freedoms is relatively recent compared to other countries, right? It's been woven into Canadian society and Canadian cultural fabric for decades now. And I think that Canadians really understand the language of rights. They understand that rights imply obligations to the natural world. And it's not that big of a stretch for people to start to consider how we can better incorporate nature as a subject and not just an object of our use, but as a subject with its own value, its own intrinsic processes, its own sense of worth. And that that's a key balancer against the default position, which is what we've been talking about of resources and extraction and economic growth. So, I'm very excited by the idea, and I know that there's a lot of interest in it and that it's growing in Canada and we hope resonating with people.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (37:49):**

Well, this is a really nice place to end on this positive note and a nice tie back to the last episode of this podcast. We had Māori scholar, Dr. John Reid, talking about legal personhood for rivers, and mountains, and forests, Aotearoa [New Zealand], and indeed, there's growing scholarship on how these concepts are being adopted elsewhere. So, I want to thank you for being here today. Thank you, Peter.

**Dr. Peter Stoett (38:15):**

Yeah, thank you, Peter. I enjoyed it very much.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (38:17):**

Thank you for being with us, Will, I know you have a ferry to catch?

**Dr. Will Greaves (38:20):**

Yeah. Great. Thank you for having me again. Pleasure to be here.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (38:22):**

And Roz, it's been great to have you here with us.

**Dr. Rosalind Warner (38:25):**

Thank you very much.

**Dr. Peter Andrée (38:26):**

The bios for Roz, Will, and Peter are all on the website, [ecopoliticspodcast.ca](http://ecopoliticspodcast.ca). There you'll also find some supplemental resources, including writings by our guests, as well as, of course, a link to their co-authored book from the University of Toronto Press. That book is entitled Canadian Ecopolitics.

**(38:47):**

I also want to say a big thank you to our producer, Kaleigh McIntosh, to our editor Nicole Bedford and our technical and artistic design specialist, Adam Gibbard. And if you haven't yet, please subscribe to the Ecopolitics Podcast on your favorite podcast app and send us your feedback through the website. Thank you all and see you in the next episode.