

2 EMPLOYING A FEMINIST METHODOLOGY

Between 1997 and 1998, a debate about methodology in international relations took place within the journal *International Studies Quarterly*. In a prominent exchange between Ann Tickner (1997) and Robert Keohane (1998), Tickner noted the frustration that many feminist scholars feel when speaking to an audience unfamiliar with their approach.¹ Rather than engaging with the substance of their argument, the audience often ask questions that seem to challenge whether they are actually doing work that fits within the discipline at all. Brooke Ackerly (2009, 432) characterizes the Tickner-Keohane debate as a “normative feminist theorist asks a positive theorist to reconceive the conceptual building blocks of the IR [international relations] field and a positive theorist asks a normative theorist for a positive research agenda.” For many years I have assigned these two articles to students in my Scope and Methods of Political Science graduate seminar. The response is often something along the lines of “they don’t really seem to be talking to each other!” Students note that both scholars appear to have something very different in mind when they talk about international relations—its characteristics, goals, and expectations. While there are frequent calls for methodological plurality in IR, it remains the case that many scholars within the field remain unfamiliar with the kinds of methodologies associated with feminist scholarship. Since one of the key goals of this book is to reinforce the importance of centering gender in global environmental politics (GEP), it is important to illustrate how this is done with a specific feminist methodology. Additionally, focusing on methodology allows us to see an important area of similarity between some GEP scholars and feminist scholars.

This book sets out to highlight the existence of discourses on women and climate change that are already being utilized by people in climate spaces. I argue that gender is of fundamental importance for understanding environmental politics, including the politics of climate change. Because of this, a feminist methodology has guided my work from the initial stages of pondering my research puzzle to the final stages of editing the manuscript. Feminist approaches to international relations gained prominence in the decades after the end of the Cold War. There is not a single feminist approach or methodology, but rather significant diversity among feminisms (Ackerly, Stern, and True 2006; Ackerly and True 2010). The majority of these fall within the category of critical theories rather than problem-solving ones in the conceptualization of Robert Cox (1981, 129). According to Cox, critical theory “stands apart from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about. Critical theory . . . does not take institutions and social and power relations for granted but calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing.”² Meryl Kenny and Fiona Mackay (2018, 92) observe that “feminist approaches are explicitly political in that they seek not only to recognise and understand gender power relations, but also to change and transform them.” Likewise, Brooke Ackerly (2009, 433) calls on us to think of feminism as a research ethic or “a theoretically informed practice that affects every decision about research, from theoretical predisposition to question to method of data collection to method of analysis to publication.” This necessitates “feminist rigor in research, a rigor directed at reflection on all stages of the methodology.” While many scholars consider gender as a variable within international relations, what makes work explicitly feminist is its commitment to a particular methodology, or system of methods (Wibben 2016). In the case of feminist environmental scholarship, it centers a normative commitment to justice and equity as well as sustainability. None of this is to suggest that we should be content with scholarship that is not rigorous, but rather that the criteria we use to evaluate methods take into account multiple ways of doing good work.

Cynthia Enloe (2016, 258) argues that “a feminist approach to anything . . . is an approach that is rooted in awareness that the researcher is part

of a collective. That consciousness translates any of our efforts into engagement with the work of others, others to whom we are accountable. No matter how alone any feminist might occasionally feel when conducting research or writing, we can never kid ourselves into imagining that we are living on an intellectual island.” In the case of my scholarship, I see myself embedded in multiple academic fields including global environmental politics, feminist international relations, and feminist environmentalism. It is essential to recognize these communities, particularly given my overarching goal of highlighting discourses of gender within climate change. My scholarship has been influenced not only by my own ontological and epistemological position but also these intellectual communities.

Like feminist IR, GEP has often utilized methodological approaches that separate it from the mainstream of political science. This is not to say that there is no diversity within the field of GEP. One aspect of this diversity is a split along epistemological positions with some scholars aiming for positivist causal explanations and others rejecting, in whole or in part, the idea that we can provide this kind of “knowledge.” Over the years, GEP scholars have adopted numerous methodological approaches across this divide (Hochstetler and Laituri 2014). Likewise, within the community of GEP scholars there has tended to be an openness to acknowledging that multiple kinds of methods can result in rigorous academic work (Neville and Hoffman 2018). While the majority of GEP scholarship has tended to use qualitative methods over the years, more recently there has been an increase in the use of quantitative methods. However, not everyone finds these shifts in methodology to be necessarily positive. Peter Dauvergne and Jennifer Clapp (2016, 3) claim that “the increasing complexity of theories and intricacy of modeling and statistical methodologies risk disconnecting contemporary scholarship from the earlier goals of problem-focused, policy-oriented, activism-linked research.” This suggests that one’s methodological approach should fit the goals of one’s scholarship rather than being driven by the conventions in one’s field of study.

Some argue that certain methods or approaches should be chosen because of the unique characteristics of environmental politics topics. For instance, Kate O’Neill and coauthors (2013, 441) state that global

environmental governance problems are often “characterized by institutional and issue complexity, linkages, and multiscaleity that pose challenges for many conventional methodological approaches. As a result, given the large methodological toolbox available to applied researchers, we recommend they adopt a reflective, pluralist, and often collaborative approach when choosing methods appropriate to these challenges.”³ This argument suggests that there is something unique about the kinds of challenges or concerns that drive much GEP scholarship and that these should influence our methodology.⁴ They go on to argue that methodological choices should be made based on their utility to explain and understand “the questions that motivate our research—usually to address an environmental problem—rather than choosing methods first and then selecting research questions those methods can address” (O’Neill et al. 2013, 442). While these calls for critically evaluating methodology are sound, adopting a feminist methodology implies that one’s ontological and epistemological positions are inseparable from one’s research choices. In the words of David Marsh, Selen A. Ercan, and Paul Furlong (2018, 177), they are a skin not a sweater. They are something that we live in rather than something that can be shed at will only to be replaced with something else for the next project. Feminist scholars are guided by their view of how they see the international system, and this will influence the questions they choose to ask about it as well as their approach to scholarship. Feminist methodology relates not only to how scholars design their research, but also to their larger goals for scholarship, which are explicitly normative.

Likewise, many if not most GEP scholars ask the questions they ask because they are motivated to do more than simply test theory. They want to know about the world because they seek particular kinds of changes within it—sustainability or justice or equity. Kate Neville and Matthew Hoffman (2018) have argued that GEP scholars should be up front about our normative position both for greater transparency in research and in order to foster trust between academics and the general public. Feminist IR and feminist environmental scholarship illustrate this kind of openness about their normative commitment (MacGregor 2017b). Those who make up this academic community—across disciplinary homes—are motivated by a deep concern about not only gender justice, but also the challenges facing

the planet. This kind of transparency about goals allows us to center justice in approaches to studying climate change.

This book undertakes a critical analysis of climate change discourses that feature a focus on women. It highlights the characteristics associated with women in these discourses, and the roles in which they are cast. In order to better understand the discourses of women and climate change, I chose to speak to women actively working in climate spaces. Qualitative interviews are an appropriate choice because I see knowledge as “something which does not already exist, but which is created and negotiated in the interview, with both interviewee and researcher actively participating and interpreting” (Yeo et al. 2014, 179). This approach to interviewing understands the process as potentially transformative for both parties and sees the researcher as an active participant in the development of data and meaning (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009).

The data collected for this project can shed light on the perspectives of women on the question of whether and how gender influences the causes of, experiences of, and solutions to climate change. These first-hand accounts from women with expertise in a variety of climate change areas represent an important contribution to the way we understand climate change as a gendered phenomenon and the discourses we use when describing women’s place in climate change debates. Discourses refer to the way we make sense of the world. They are powerful forces within both academic and policy debates (Milliken 1999). I am guided by Maarten Hajer’s (1995, 45) definition of discourses as “specific ensembles of ideas, concepts and categorization that are produced, reproduced and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities.” This definition suggests that discourses are constantly evolving entities that are shaped by society over time. At the same time, actors can draw on discourses strategically in order to focus attention on a particular issue or frame an issue in a specific way. The process of discourse analysis involves tracking the storylines that make up a larger discourse. A storyline is a set of concepts, ideas, or themes that are repeated and combine to form a discourse. Each of the discourses outlined in the following chapters focuses on particular elements of women’s characteristics or roles in climate change. They are made up of

multiple storylines. According to Fran Tonkiss (2004, 373) “discourse analysis involves a perspective on language that sees this not as reflecting reality in a transparent or straightforward way, but as constructing and organizing terms in which we understand that social reality. Discourse analysts are interested in language and texts as sites in which social meanings are formed and reproduced, social identities are shaped, and social facts are secured.” This is consistent with an anti-foundationalist ontology that is common among multiple approaches to IR, including some versions of feminism, constructivism, and poststructuralism. Within this position “the material world is not necessarily rationally and objectively independent of our conceptualization of it because we mediate reality through our interpretations and emphases. Discourse is the mode of interpretation” (Gentry 2016a, 24).

Thinking through meaning and discourse is essential in climate change work because discourses can guide debate and policymaking in distinct ways. For example, Maria Stern (2006, 181) defines discourse as “the production and re-presentation of meaning, which delimit the realm of understanding, action, and imagination within a certain framework.” There is not one dominant discourse used to frame women’s position in climate change. Rather, there are multiple, overlapping, and sometimes conflicting discourses. This multiplicity is important, because it contradicts the frequent tendency to paint women as uniformly vulnerable across the international community. According to Annick Wibben (2011, 4), “there is always more than one point of view and more than one story to be told. The choice to privilege one perspective over another is never innocent or obvious but always intensely political.” The fact that vulnerability discourses have had an oversized place in climate change debates illustrates that one particular representation of women, and particularly women from the global South, has disproportionately tended to shape our imagination on climate change (Arora-Jonsson 2011; Cuomo 2011; Denton 2002; MacGregor 2009). In line with work by Sherilyn MacGregor (2010) and Mary E. Pettenger (2007), I use a feminist constructivist lens to examine links between power and knowledge that fundamentally shape understanding of gender as well as climate change. This feminist constructivist approach allows for the analysis of discourses that reinforce existing gender norms as well as challenge them. The approach is

particularly helpful for highlighting multiple forms of agency in addition to pointing out marginalization or exclusion. This kind of analysis is essential for determining not only how we as scholars or practitioners might address climate change more effectively, but also for how we might overcome rigid gender roles and intersectional marginalization as we envision alternative futures that become necessary due to environmental change.

This book is built from the analysis of semi-structured interviews with seventy-six individuals who identify as women working in climate change spaces in the global North in different capacities, including as academics, nonprofit workers, activists, and practitioners.⁵ Interviews were conducted between August 2016 and June 2017 and in March 2019. As shown in the appendix, participants were individuals who self-identified as women and who engaged in some kind of climate change-related activity at the time of the interview. The majority of the interviewees held jobs working for environmental nonprofits or were scholars working on some facet of climate change. A few participants were either interns or volunteers for nonprofits. Most of them identified themselves as white and financially stable. Very few identified themselves as women of color. While I tried to increase the number of non-white respondents in the study, this was a difficult task for a few reasons. First, academics as well as the environmental nonprofit sector tend to be majority white spaces (Cimpian and Leslie 2017; Montañez 2018; Taylor 2018). Second, while there is a strong representation of women of color in environmental advocacy—particularly in organizations campaigning for environmental justice—they are often overburdened with service and would be less likely to have the time to speak to me.⁶ I used purposive sampling to identify participants who had experience with climate change debates but might not have specifically thought a great deal about gender and climate change (Ackerly and True 2010). I used a snowball technique (i.e., asking interviewees to recommend other candidates for participation) to expand the pool of candidates.⁷

I conducted thirty-four in-person interviews, twenty-five through a program such as Skype, Google hangouts, or Zoom, and seventeen over the phone. I started with the same list of questions for each interview, then asked follow-up questions when necessary to draw out a point, encourage a

participant to elaborate, or clarify a comment for my own understanding. Each interview typically lasted between thirty minutes to an hour. The interviews were all recorded and then transcribed into a text file.⁸ I maintained the anonymity of the participants by assigning them pseudonyms. While there are arguments to be made both for having participants remain anonymous and for using their names, I chose to keep interviewees anonymous because I wanted them to feel comfortable speaking freely about their own actions in climate change as well as their institutions or organizations, and I felt that they would feel more comfortable doing this if I used pseudonyms. Additionally, I sent out a survey containing the interview questions in order to serve as a check on the results that I got through the interviews. I sent out the survey link through two listservs that I am a part of. One of them is on environmental politics and the other one is on feminist theory and gender studies. I had twenty survey responses.⁹

The interview and survey transcriptions were coded for discourses of women's roles and characteristics in climate change. This involved looking for themes, terms, and ideas that indicate a link between women and climate change. These themes, terms, and ideas were developed inductively through coding the data multiple times. I coded the data first by hand, then in NVivo software (Coffey and Atkinson 1996). The analysis revealed four central, overlapping discourses describing connections between women and climate change.¹⁰ Each of these central discourses is made up of multiple storylines. In general, the responses to the survey questions followed patterns that were similar to those of the interviews, with the same central discourses used.

Interviews offer a rich source of information for a project such as this. However, it is essential to be clear about the position that the interviewees were put in by agreeing to take part in the project. They had no prior information about the questions that I would ask. Most of them had no background in thinking systematically about connections between gender and climate change. Their experience and expertise are in climate change, and many of them had not thoroughly thought about gender and climate change before I sent them an email asking them to participate. Essentially, they were put on the spot to offer reflections on extremely complicated and fraught issues. Several participants were noticeably uncomfortable about

being in this position. They mention things like “I struggle to not be offensive, or incorrect in my views,” or “I’m hesitating slightly because what I’m uncomfortable with is a broader stereotype.” This means that many of them were drawing on existing discourses or impressions they had readily at hand. Having participants answer questions without advanced preparation is useful because it gives a better sense of which discourses are dominant among people who have spent a great deal of time thinking about climate change, but not how climate change intersects with gender. Charlotte Epstein (2008, 7) argues that discourses allow individuals to “make sense of themselves, of their interests and their ways of behaving, and of the world around them.” The discourses and storylines that the interviewees used reflect not only their understanding of themselves and their position within climate change, but also their perception of larger human-climate change interactions.

WHY FOCUS ON WOMEN?

A thorough examination of climate change necessitates a nuanced, critical evaluation of how power and perception shape life. Since climate change is a global phenomenon that touches nearly all humans on the planet, some may wonder why a specific emphasis on perceptions of the characteristics and roles of women is necessary. I chose to focus on women in climate change debates for a few reasons. First, because the varied and complex experiences of women around the world have frequently been homogenized into simplistic narratives that diminish women’s agency. The project seeks to illustrate the hazards of painting the world’s women with a broad brush. Assuming homogeneity erases differences in how climate change is experienced, studied, and addressed. To identify effective and just solutions to climate change, it is essential to have a clear picture of the various roles women already play and might play in combating climate change now and in the future.

Second, I focus on women because they remain invisible or underestimated in many aspects of climate change debates. In 1990, pioneering feminist international relations scholar Cynthia Enloe (1990, 1) argued that “if we employ only the conventional, ungendered compass to chart international politics, we are likely to end up mapping a landscape peopled only by men,

mostly elite men. The real landscape of international politics is less exclusively male.” Much the same can be said about the realm of climate change. While there has been an increase in prominent women in climate change spaces, most high-profile figures who do the debating are still men, on the side of those who call for urgent action on climate change and of those who doubt its very existence. Specifically, most climate negotiators as well as most policymakers who create and implement policy about climate change are men, and even most newscasters who discuss climate change are men (Ivanova 2015; MacGregor 2009). The perceptions of men are already fairly visible. As in many other topics, men’s voices are abundant. And while women are active in most areas of climate change scholarship, advocacy, and policymaking (a point that will be made across the following chapters), these contributions are often not recognized or valued in the same way as men’s. This is particularly true for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) women.

Finally, it is also important to examine the place of women in climate change debates because numerous actors in the climate change arena have already called on us to take gender seriously. Some have highlighted the fact that women tend to be disproportionately burdened by climate change (Dankelman 2002; 2010). In countries around the world, women fall disproportionately into the category of marginalized due to dominant ideas about the appropriate and acceptable roles that men and women ought to play in society (Enloe 2004; Sjoberg 2010; Tickner 2014; True 2012). While it is dangerous and unhelpful to simplistically paint women as “victims” of climate change, a topic that will be discussed in chapter 3, it remains true that gendered patterns of marginalization (intersecting with race, ethnicity, sexuality, dis/ability, class, caste, and so on) mean that many women will be some of the worst sufferers of the destructive impacts of climate change. On the other hand, women have been put forward as a great hope for combating or adapting to climate change. According to Lakshmi Puri (2015), the Deputy Executive Director of UN Women:

We have to recognize the power of parity and we have to do it now because we can no longer afford to dismiss and waste the potential of women’s agency and their huge role in devising and leading responses to climate impacts. . . . The force multiplier and transformative potential of empowered women and girls

should be harnessed to arrest and reverse climate change and adapt sustainably to its impact.

This passage indicates the view that women and girls have a uniquely essential role in humanity's current climate challenge. Thus, women have been cast in multiple roles in climate change theorizing and policymaking. These include victims, drivers of change, laborers, and saviors (Arora-Jonsson 2011; Awumbila and Momsen 1995).

For these reasons, women cannot be understood as a homogenous category. Feminist scholars writing about gender in general, and women specifically, have to walk a fine line between avoiding essentialization, while identifying regularized patterns of behavior and lived experiences. Likewise, the decision to focus on the perspectives of women for this book does not imply that the crucial ways that masculinity and climate change intersect should be ignored. As argued above, there has been important research on these connections. A specific focus on discourses of women will necessarily include reflections on masculinity and men. Simply put, all of these concepts are fundamentally intertwined in the ways that gender works.

WHY FOCUS ON WOMEN WORKING IN THE GLOBAL NORTH?

The women I spoke with were all based in the United States, Canada, Germany, England, and Scotland. Some of them were originally from countries in the global South (Bangladesh, Brazil, Morocco, Taiwan, and Venezuela) or have lived or conducted research in the global South,¹¹ but the majority were both from the global North and working on climate change issues within the context of the global North. Their position affects how they view climate change, as well as their likely agency in addressing climate change and their vulnerability to its impacts. Unfortunately, no book can cover all the complexity of gender and climate change, or even representations of women in climate change. I chose to focus on the perspectives of these women in the global North because a great deal of scholarly and policy debates about both gender and climate change are dominated by discourses and voices from this part of the world. This makes it an essential space for exploring how gender is understood to work in environmentalism, policymaking, economics, and

other areas. Dominant global discourses about gender have tended to come out of the global North and travel to the global South through processes like globalization and imperialism (Mohanty 2003a, 2003b). It is important to understand how people in elite spaces of the global North conceptualize gender and climate change connections because these perceptions will likely be those that influence international climate negotiations, the strategies of multinational corporations, and the environmental policies of northern states with large greenhouse gas emissions levels.

I also chose to focus on women working in the global North because the majority of existing work on gender and climate change is about women in the global South, in countries such as Bangladesh (Alston 2015; Cannon 2002; Haynes 2017), China (Moriggi 2017), Ethiopia (Team and Hassen 2016), Nepal (Bhattarai, Beilin, and Ford 2015; Oven et al. 2019), Nicaragua (Gonda 2017), and Nigeria (Akinsemolu and Obafemi 2020), and many others. This important work makes an essential contribution to our understanding of these connections. At the same time, there is something to be said for also including a different perspective: that of women who have lived experiences and perceptions about climate change from the perspective of the global North. It makes little sense to strive for inclusive, holistic thinking about climate change and how to address it and not include as wide a swath of perspectives as possible. It would not make any sense to reflect *only* on the positions of women in the global North, but it would also not do to ignore them. To date, there is much less scholarly treatment of this perspective. Existing work that focuses on the global North has tended to examine European countries, although some does examine Australia and other northern states (Alston 2011; Cohen 2017; Dymén and Langlais 2017; Fuchs et al. 2017; Magnúsdóttir and Kronsell 2015, 2021). This book argues that these works on the global North are a complement to the previous research that has already been done, and continues to be done, about the global South.

In addition, I choose to interview women living and working in the global North because I wanted to understand their views on women's vulnerability to climate change. It is well known that vulnerability is a spectrum and that some people who are more vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Most of the women in my interview pool were not on the most vulnerable end of

the spectrum. This means that they were not likely to be drawing on personal experiences of direct vulnerability, even as they did use victimhood and vulnerability discourses to describe women's position in climate change. Their doing so presents a unique challenge. How do we avoid talking about women as victims if so many of us engage in it? I was motivated to write on this topic because the discourses describing women in climate change at the global level tended to focus heavily on their victimhood. When I did a quick Google image search for the phrase "women and climate change" the first several pictures that came up were of women presumably from the global South, standing outside, performing some kind of agricultural work or water collection. I had to go down to the tenth image before I saw any variation in this theme; the tenth was of women at a protest for climate justice. I wanted to hear from women who are knowledgeable about climate change and its effects, but who are not necessarily on the front lines of climate change in the way that other communities might be. If they also use victimhood discourses to describe women's position, what does this mean for climate change debates moving forward? What I found was that while participants categorized women beyond the simplistic women-as-climate-change-victims trope, they still tended to stereotype women, particularly women from the global South.

While the perspectives of seventy-six women working in the global North are not generalizable to women as a whole, these perceptions do offer important insight into how climate change is understood in countries that are frequently depicted as leaders in climate change knowledge or action. In 2015 the Pew Research Center observed a gender gap in levels of concern about climate change in several countries in the global North, including the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, South Korea, Germany, and Spain. In each country, women were more likely than men to identify climate change as a serious problem. They were also more concerned that it will harm them personally and that major lifestyle changes are needed to solve the problem (Zainulbhai 2015). This means that even if gendered patterns of marginalization in the global North look different from those in the global South, it is likely that there are still gendered patterns of experiences and perceptions that should be considered in climate change scholarship and policymaking.

What can be learned from the perspectives of northern women without a strong background in gender studies, feminist international relations, or other related fields? These are women who are actively thinking about climate change, and the discourses they use are important for understanding how gender norms are (re)produced or contested in climate change debates. They are also important because they can help us understand where points of contestation lie and what space might be available to transform existing discourses to better achieve goals of sustainability and justice. Interviewees play multiple roles in climate change: some are climate scientists who testify to Congress or work for an environmental nonprofit; others are social scientists who are knowledge brokers or who advise on policy. Critically reflecting on discourses of women and climate change allows us to think not only about gendered patterns of vulnerability, caregiving, knowledge creation, and agency, but beyond these as well. The four discourses outlined in the following chapters often feature storylines associated with dominant gender norms. There is evidence of participants using gender stereotypes in ways that reinforce problematic patterns of “doing” environmental politics, but there are also storylines that complicate or reject rigid gender norms. Thinking through these discourses encourages thinking about how climate change is understood, how narrowly or broadly expertise is conceptualized, and how everyday environmental experiences are gendered as well as raced, classed, and placed.

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/12118.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12118.001.0001)

Women and Climate Change

Examining Discourses from the Global North

By: Nicole Detraz

Citation:

Women and Climate Change: Examining Discourses from the Global North

By: Nicole Detraz

DOI: [10.7551/mitpress/12118.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12118.001.0001)

ISBN (electronic): 9780262372664

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2023

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from MIT Press Direct to Open



The MIT Press

© 2023 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND license. Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Adobe Garamond and Berthold Akzidenz Grotesk by Jen Jackowitz.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Detraz, Nicole, author.

Title: Women and climate change : examining discourses from the global North / Nicole Detraz.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2023] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022022481 (print) | LCCN 2022022482 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262542074 (paperback) | ISBN 9780262362115 (epub) | ISBN 9780262372664 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Women and the environment—Developed countries. | Climatic changes—Social aspects—Developed countries.

Classification: LCC GE195.9 .W478 2023 (print) | LCC GE195.9 (ebook) | DDC 304.2/8082—dc23/eng20221004

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022022481>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022022482>