

Aberystwyth University

Gendered, embodied knowledge within a Welsh agricultural context and the importance of listening to farmers in the rewilding debate

Jones, Ffion

Published in:

Area

DOI:

[10.1111/area.12808](https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12808)

Publication date:

2022

Citation for published version (APA):

Jones, F. (2022). Gendered, embodied knowledge within a Welsh agricultural context and the importance of listening to farmers in the rewilding debate. *Area*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12808>

Document License

CC BY

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400

email: is@aber.ac.uk

SPECIAL SECTION

Gendered, embodied knowledge within a Welsh agricultural context and the importance of listening to farmers in the rewilding debate

Ffion Jones 

Department of Theatre, Film and
Television Studies, Aberystwyth
University, Aberystwyth, UK

Correspondence

Ffion Jones, Department of Theatre,
Film and Television Studies,
Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth,
UK.

Email: fhj2@aber.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper uses key ideas developed from practice-led research to explore the division between the land management approaches of rewilding and the embodied and gendered knowledge and practices of upland sheep farmers in an area of Wales known as the Cambrian Mountains. Such knowledge, I argue, is developed through a haptic, temporal, hybrid and complex engagement with the land and environment of the farm and this, in turn, defines the nature of farming identities. In contrast, rewilding, as discussed in the paper's exploration of Rewilding Britain's 10,000-hectare rewilding project in the Cambrian Mountains in 2018, is perceived as a challenge to these practices; a threat not only to farm livelihoods, but also to the hybrid construction of masculine identities. Due to the embedded nature of my relationship with the subject material of my art work and research, Donna Haraway's term "situated knowledge" is used to address how my art practice and research is always situated, partial, incomplete, hybrid and defined by my gendered subjectivity within the patriarchal world of my farming community. This article argues that part of the failure of Rewilding Britain to establish their project within the Cambrian Mountain area relates to an underappreciation of the importance of situated knowledge, and that within the context of the polarising ideas of rewilding, sensitivity, and the need to listen to embodied, situated, agricultural knowledge and practice, should be taken seriously.

KEYWORDS

embodied knowledge, farming, film and theatre, gender, rewilding, Wales

1 | INTRODUCTION

Developed by the Wildlands Project in North America in the 1980s (Foreman et al., 1992) and gaining interest in the UK over the past 10 years, rewilding has captured the imagination of ecologists and the public as a persuasive methodological approach to mitigate anthropogenically driven species loss. It is generally accepted that rewilding's aims are to restore ecosystems through "a process of (re)introducing or restoring wild organisms and/or ecological processes to ecosystems

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The information, practices and views in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG).
© 2022 The Author. *Area* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

where such organisms and processes are either missing or are ‘dysfunctional’” (Prior & Brady, 2017, p. 34). Rewilding’s migration from scientific to vernacular usage has led some to argue that it has become ill defined, multi-dimensional and overly porous (Jørgensen, 2015), whilst others have perceived flexibility as an opportunity for “creative plurality” (Reiners & Lockwood, 2009, as cited in Hobbs et al., 2013, p. 58). Within the public domain, rewilding has been popularised within the writing of rewilding advocate, environmental journalist and author, George Monbiot. Although Monbiot suggests in his book *Feral* (Monbiot, 2014) that rewilding should never be used with the intention to dispossess people, his repeated vilification of farming in his writing has inhibited opportunities for meaningful dialogue between proponents of rewilding and the farming population; re-igniting divisions between farming communities and conservationists.

This paper offers observations taken from my practice-led research using film and site-specific performance and developed temporally, haptically and through my gendered body, of the lifeworld of upland sheep farming; a world that I am both a part of and marginalised from because of my gender. Gendered female “through a series of acts which are renewed, revised and consolidated through time” (Butler, 1988, p. 523), my conformity to female heteronormativity through my performance of traditionally gendered farm roles prohibits me from having the status of “farmer proper” (Riley, 2009; Saugeres, 2002; Whatmore, 1991a). This has resulted in my exclusion from acquiring embodied knowledge that would be “normalised” for farm boys, and from the patrilineal inheritance patterns of land and property afforded men (Laband & Lentz, 1983). Whilst I acknowledge this power dynamic as problematic, there is insufficient space to explore its complexity within this paper (for further discussion on feminism and farming, see Whatmore, 1991b).

I consider that my practice-led research and artistic practices of film and site-specific performance have emerged due to my exclusion from this masculinist world, and that I have established a way of observing and listening to farmers from the peripheries. Whilst I share embodied knowledge with my male counterparts, for example: ways to catch sheep; hold, catch and bottle-feed lambs; run down mountains in wellingtons without falling; recognise the smells, signs and treatment of particular disease; drive a quad bike; know the intricacies of gathering sheep; hammer staples into a fence, etc.; there is other embodied knowledge that I only know through my observation of men. These include feeling for body composition; using heavy machinery; cutting the farm ear mark; bending rams’ horns; choosing breeding stock; hedge-laying, etc. What this offers me as an artist and researcher is an opportunity to know from both internal and external points of reference, developing what Smith calls a *woman’s standpoint*, that is, “not as a given finalized form of knowledge but as a ground in experience from which discoveries are to be made” (Smith, 2005, p. 8). Such positionality enables me to perceive the upland sheep farming system and culture I grew up in from inside and outside perspectives; leading to my practice-led research having translative potential as well as being positioned as *situated knowledge* (Haraway, 1988), that is, knowledge which is partial, incomplete and defined by my gendered subjectivity in relation to the patriarchal world of my farming community.

Drawing on practice-led research developed from my position within this patriarchal lifeworld, I attempt to reveal the importance of gendered, embodied farming knowledge and practice in relation to the perceived threat of Rewilding Britain’s Summit to Sea/*O’r Môr i’r Mynydd* project; a landscape-scale rewilding project in the local area of the Cambrian Mountains in West Wales where I live and farm. I suggest how Rewilding Britain’s oversight of the relationship between their own, and local inhabitants’ situated knowledge, led to their failure to establish the Summit to Sea rewilding project. Through the various artistic projects and research activities I have undertaken in the Cambrian Mountains, it is clear that within upland sheep farming, gendered embodied knowledge perpetuates patriarchal ideals and produces masculine identities, bodies and ways of being-in-the world that are hybrid and place-specific. Such complexity is repressed within the discussions on rewilding, where farming and farmers are reframed and redeployed as eco-tourism guides and “hands-off” custodians of the landscape; alienating them from their livestock animals which anchor them to their sense of masculine identity as well as the wider community. Rewilding is therefore perceived as an existential threat to masculine farming lives.

2 | UNDERTONES OF IMPOSITION: SUMMIT TO SEA/O’R MÔR I’R MYNYDD AND THE CONTESTED UPLANDS OF WALES

Summit to Sea/*O’r Môr i’r Mynydd* [S2S] was a £3.4 million, 10,000-hectare, rewilding project in the Cambrian Mountains of Wales, taking on the principles of large, connected corridors from upland areas to the sea. The project was funded by the Endangered Landscapes Programme and heralded as Rewilding Britain’s [RB] “flagship” rewilding project in the UK (Wrigley, 2018). RB are an independent charity established in 2015 by journalist George Monbiot, Rebecca Wrigley and others with an ambition to build a portfolio of rewilding projects in the UK (Monbiot, 2015). In October 2019, RB left the

project, citing local unhappiness with their involvement as the cause. Whilst this paper refers to the project prior to the departure of RB, it is important to note that their withdrawal led to a restructuring of the project timeline and funding package, allowing for a period of community co-design led by Welsh-speaking, project development officer, Siân Stacey. Stacey embraced the challenge to ameliorate the damaged community relations caused by RB by offering transparency and encouraging an ethos of community co-production. However, it was announced in April 2022 that the project would not be applying for further funding from the Endangered Landscapes Programme (Summit to Sea, 2022), and would instead focus its energy on the development and delivery of ideas from the co-designing process by securing funding appropriate to the new project ethos.

The S2S project announcement in the local newspaper was not well received by the local farming community. The use of the term *rewilding* caused concern as local farmers associated the word with environmental journalist George Monbiot's ideas about *rewilding* and his disparaging description of the Cambrian Mountains as a “bare waste of sheep-scraped misery” (Monbiot, 2014, p. 69). Shortly after the projects' funding announcement, an article appearing in *Farmers' Union of Wales (FUW) magazine, Y Tir*, explored links between project funding, the wealthy elite of Britain and philanthropy by global agri-business owners. It suggested that the financing of the project had neocolonial undertones, and demonstrated unethical values by large corporate companies and wealthy individuals towards people and land (FUW, 2019). RB also appeared naive to the socio-political importance of Wales's upland environments. Historically, these areas have been narrativised as empty, desolate and economically deprived in order to justify the imposition of the British government's exploitation of its natural resources for national gain, such as enforced land purchases for reservoir building, afforestation and military training (Bohata, 2004; Gruffudd, 1995). Thus, upland environments in Wales are always imbued with “a territorial rooted sense of national identity” (Gruffudd, 1995, p. 219); they are places of rebellion and resistance, where battles over Welsh identity and autonomy have been won and lost.

Echoing these experiences, a similar narrative of desolation and decline was used by RB CEO Rebecca Wrigley at the launch of the Endangered Landscapes Programme in 2018, where she describes the project area as follows:

An area that's suffering economic decline, with low incomes, a high dependency on subsidies and insufficient income and employment to keep young people in their communities. So this context and the context of Brexit and the uncertainty that that brings, provides opportunities. (Endangered Landscapes Programme, 2018)

Focusing on the economic instability of the area builds a narrative of people and places that need saving from the uncertainty of Brexit and post-subsidy farming. By speaking for the people of the Cambrian Mountains, communities are deprived of the opportunity to represent themselves; their autonomy is undermined by “experts” who reconstruct and “other” the community in order to fulfil a specific function within particular spaces of discourse. Just like historical narratives of these upland environments, RB construct a narrative showing a lack of sensitivity and understanding of the importance of acknowledging the power relations between different situated knowledge.

3 | FARMING AND NATURE VALUES: THE IMPORTANCE OF EMPATHETIC CONSULTATION

Rewilding's emphasis on the nonhuman animal means that it “often appears indifferent and even antithetical to the myriad ways—timescales, practices, ways of inhabitation—through which humans appropriate the world” (Gammon, 2019, p. 252). This is certainly true when compared to the cultural practices of upland sheep farming, where such anthropocentrism for *rewilders* is often viewed as the cause of environmental degradation. What is central to the *rewilding* debate is often the question of what constitutes “authentic nature” or “too much or too little manipulative control over nature” (Deliège, 2016, p. 423), and whilst farmers perceive “nature-as-repressed-by-agriculture” to be ‘real nature’ (Deliège, 2016, p. 411), *rewilders* do not. *Rewilding's* discourses often misconstrue farming and farmers as having little knowledge or interest in nature. Such generalisation has been used to the detriment of upland farming communities, undermining located knowledge and expertise of the ecosystems of the farm environment and instead, positioning scientists as the “gatekeepers” of environmental knowledge. However, if we listen to upland farmers and their concerns, we may begin to understand the complexity of experience, knowledge and feeling at stake within *rewilding* initiatives.

The following examples, borrowed from my practice-led research, are communicated to the reader through language; however, it is in their convergence within my artistic practices that their potential is fully realised. Ephemeral and site-specific works that utilise participant interviews woven within a framework of experimental imagery, documentary,

autobiographical narrative and performance art, come together within the creative pieces and offer an experiential encounter for an audience. Meskimmon suggests that “Haraway’s re-casting of objectivity as situated is meant to reconnect engagement and responsibility with intellectual and creative insights – it is an epistemology in which ethics, aesthetics and female subjectivity might converge” (Meskimmon, 2003, p. 80). I would argue that my artistic practices and methodological approach embody my female, subjective vision, thus offering ways to think/see/feel with me in an experiential encounter with upland sheep farming culture. I think of my practices as acts of translation or as an active mediator where “Mediators transform, translate, distort, and modify the meaning or the elements they are supposed to carry” (Latour, cited in Sutherland & Acord, 2007, p. 133). As such, my work does not offer “authenticity” or “truth”, it is always an embodied, gendered, situated, partial view, focusing on sensual, visceral and emotional ways of knowing. I argue that it is through this positionality that I am able to offer experiential encounter with a complex sense of feeling and practice; one which demonstrates farming to have an expanded “field of care” (Tuan, 1996, p. 451). That is, practices of care that are not solely concerned with an anthropocentric model of being-in-the-world, but ones which care for and co-create assemblages of more-than-human worlds. These narratives of care and complexity are important in understanding the emotional response and friction between the farming community and the S2S rewilding project.

During a performance I made with research participants called *The only places we ever knew* (Jones, 2010),¹ I attempt to deconstruct the romanticised landscape picture of the farm where I was raised by integrating the hidden, situated and embodied knowledges of my father and research participant, Glynne Jones. During the guided walk, Glynne points to a plant on the *Esgair*, explaining its importance to the audience by reciting his grandfather’s proverb “*Pan wel di’r Filfriw, dy wartheg di a fydd fyw*” [when you see Field Woodrush, your cattle will prosper] (Jones, 2010). Whilst shifting the audience’s perception from the landscape picture to the ground underfoot, this linguistic utterance foregrounds nature-culture, connected, and hybridised through the activities of upland sheep farming (Jones, 2014, p. 64). Such knowledge is specific and situated and draws on past/present/futures, in a temporal folding of natural and human history. In an interview I undertook for the film *Dear Mick Jagger* (Jones, 2013),² Glynne suggests that when it comes to grazing practices in the uplands, a farmer should understand the healthiest stocking capacity for the land. He asserts that “if you put too many sheep on the mountain the sheep suffer too” (Jones, 2013). This attunement to upland environments, demonstrates a praxis that relies on embodiment and hybridity; one that draws nature and the environment into a relationship of “dialogue rather than violence” (Bonsdorff, 2005, p. 3).

Over the course of three years of fieldwork for my research project, Glynne’s relationship to the wildlife on the farm extended its presence through some of the following examples: discussing, naming and finding out about rare plant life in sites of special scientific interest; reporting seeing ringed ouzels and crossbills; requesting that I keep the location of peregrine nests secret in case of poachers; attempts to rescue an injured otter; looking up rare unidentified birds; knowing the Latin and common names of trees and plants; watching a fox catching and playing with a mouse in the field near the house; moving a leveret out of danger whilst tractor driving and praising gorse for its shelter of sheep and wild birds. As noted by Bonsdorff (2005), a “farmer’s perception of the landscape may not be bound by his practical interests: he might suspend them and attend to values that do not directly serve him while performing his job” (p. 2). Similarly, Glynne’s appreciation of nature was not for profit, nor for the benefit of others, but was instead valued as part of his field of care.

Comparable values were also evident during interviews undertaken as part of my commissioned film for the Hydrocitizenship³ research project (Jones, 2017). During a filmed interview, retired, local farmer, Gwilym, takes me down to the river Ceulan in Talybont. We stand on a small bridge looking into the river below. In this moment, I witness a deep sadness, as he laments the disappearance of the once prolific brown trout from the river. Gwilym’s field of care includes the fish in the river, which he says he was “*Wrth ei fodd yn ei gweld nhw*” [Overjoyed to see them] (Jones, 2017). Here, the joy of “wild nature” is recounted, not as a separate, leisure time encounter, but as a part of his everyday experiences of farm life.

Rewilding, in many cases, appears to disregard these farming experiences of nature and instead re-invests in a dualism where “what is characteristically and authentically human is defined against or in opposition to what is taken to be natural, nature” (Plumwood, 1991, p. 10). To rectify this divide, Ward (2019) suggests that rejecting such binaries and rethinking rewilding as a “collaboration and co-production of a multiplicity of human and more-than-human intersubjectivities” is key (pp. 50–51). This holistic reconfiguration of rewilding requires a temporal shift that makes space and time available for rewilders to forge new visions of a wild future and to take account of the human practices and perceptions of nature already at work within these spaces. To fulfil this holistic approach, durational and meaningful consultation with the local population should be a key starting point when working with the ideas of rewilding.

In a recently released funding document for S2S, written in 2017,⁴ RB offer repetition of the importance of consultation, transparency and local involvement in the project design, saying: “Community involvement from the very

beginning with peer-to-peer design from the bottom up” (Rewilding Britain, 2017, p. 26); “Take a gradual and personal ‘tea and cake’ approach to building trust. Accept that this takes time and requires an active local presence” (Rewilding Britain, 2017, p. 33). However well-meaning the ambition for transparency and a bottom-up approach, the scale of consultation prior to receiving funding for the project was inadequate. Although RB state they had spoken to 160 individuals at a larger workshop event, follow-up visits to 25 interested farmers/landowners is insufficient (Rewilding Britain, 2017, p. 54). An admission by one member of a partner organisation that “consultations had been limited” (Messenger, 2018) corroborates concerns that their right to speak for the community at public events was dubious if not unethical.

RB missed an opportunity to not only make this funding application a publicly available document from the very beginning, but also to actively seek collaboration with the local population, rather than impose the project upon them. Haraway’s concept of situated knowledge is useful to think with here, as it encourages a shift away from objective and neutral perspectives of the “god trick” (Haraway, 1988, p. 581) and reframes knowledge as constructed and embodied by a situated individual. Understanding that knowledge is embodied and situated may allow for greater reflexivity, empathy and dialogue between opposing views and experiences of the world and a shift away from what Haraway argues against, that is, “various forms of unlocatable, and so irresponsible, knowledge claims” (Haraway, 1988, p. 583). I would argue that the failure of RB to establish the S2S project is the result of an inability to take seriously the situated knowledge of those whose everyday realities are embedded within these areas. As such, they overlook how their own knowledge is situated, incomplete and constructed at geographical, subjective, cultural, political and discursive distances from those who live there. Acknowledging this complexity may have led to the vital imperative to fulfil the bottom-up approach described within their funding document and understand that such an approach would require reflexivity and time. By doing this, they may have been better equipped to develop ways of negotiating conflicting values and perceptions with empathy, to cultivate reciprocal trust and to develop “the capacity to see from the peripheries and the depths” (Haraway, 1988, p. 583). Such openness and reflexivity may have led to a deeper understanding of local values towards nature and to developing an awareness of the hybrid complexity within these environments, especially concerning the position of sheep within upland farming cultures.

4 | THE OVERLOOKED OVINE: SHEEP AND HYBRID CONSTRUCTIONS OF MASCULINITY

Described in what I consider deeply insulting ways as “the white plague”, “woolly maggots” and the landscapes they live in referred to as “sheepwrecked” (Monbiot, 2014), sheep have become unfortunate scapegoats within discussions around rewilding within Wales and elsewhere in the UK. My own understanding of the co-speciesism (Haraway, 2008) or “livable collaborations” (Tsing, 2015, p. 28) between farmer and flock leads me to assert that the ambition of rewilding to shift farming to a nature-based economy underestimates the emotive power of sheep within these locales. I argue that the shared human/animal life-experiences involved in sheep farming, produce a particular human being; not one separate from nature and the wild, but one intimately tied to, “contaminated” by (Tsing, 2015, p. 27) and constructed alongside the daily experiences of farm life.

Although the S2S funding document acknowledges the importance of sheep to the project area, it is also clear that RB hoped to develop test sites to prove their hypothesis that zero grazing in upland areas would accelerate ecosystem restoration and produce more desirable ecologies (Rewilding Britain, 2017 pp. 18–21). Their ambition, however, is in stark opposition to those of the local farming community who value sheep in complex ways. By considering the multispecies connections at stake within upland environments, we might understand the potential of rewilding to erode such valued human-animal relationships, potentially causing catastrophic emotional damage especially to the men-folk whose subjectivity and identity is co-constructed within the cultural frameworks of upland sheep breeding; without sheep, their very existence as beings-in-the-world may be compromised.

Sheep are hybrid nature-culture beings, an embodiment of Donna Haraway’s cyborgian theory and key contributors to historic British economic prosperity and scientific discovery (Franklin, 2007). Over time, the genetic bloodlines of a flock of sheep gain cultural and capital significance for farmers and the wider farming community. In the paper “Reflections on Dear Mick Jagger ...” (2015), I argue that “A ‘bloodline’ in this situation is as much human as it is animal” (p. 93), suggesting how the flock accumulate significance as being metaphorically, genetically linked to the farming family through generational repetition of practices of care and animal husbandry; a weaving of human and animal lifetimes (Jones, 2015, p. 93).

Working directly with material gathered over the three years of fieldwork on my family farm, the film, *Dear Mick Jagger* (Jones, 2013), along with its performative screening, examined the intricacies of the relationship between my family/research participants and our flock of Welsh Mountain sheep. These sheep have been selectively bred since my grandfather took on the tenancy of the farm in 1964 and, because of this long co-history of flock and farmer, they have come to define the identity of my family as people who know about sheep. Through the daily activities of working with and understanding the flock's behaviour, the bodies of the farmers are made and remade and their genders performed through daily encounters with these animals. This results in embodying vital knowledge, expertise and tacit skill that enables them access, status, social encounter and a sense of belonging to wider farming society focused on the genetics and aesthetics of sheep (Jones, 2015, p. 92). Even more specifically, sheep co-create masculine bodies through repetitive tasks that are embodied by men. At various sheep-related events in the yearly farming calendar, such as marts and agricultural shows, one can spot the particular ways of moving that result from physical work done with sheep. One could argue that such a way of moving is partly inherited through mimetic performances of gendered behaviour, but later, is truthfully embodied and co-produced by many of the physical stances involved in the care of sheep. Eventually, such poses begin to settle into the body so that internal erosion becomes an outward involuntary expression of a hybrid masculine identity; an embodiment of the hybrid “fleshy knottings” and “infoldings of the flesh” that Donna Haraway talks about (Haraway, 2008).

RB overlook such embodied, hybrid expressions of self within their rewilding design, and in so doing, fail to demonstrate empathy towards people and place. Secondly, denying the influence and power of multispecies assemblages as part of local constructions of self and community, make attempts to shift attitudes or practices challenging, as farmers' interests are not solely concerned with economics, but also with their own subjectivity in relation to their sheep. Finally, it takes time and meaningful listening and observation to appreciate the depth of feeling that upland communities have towards their sheep and land. This is not something uncovered through short, “doorstep” consultation with local people, but something that unfurls itself through an open engagement with the situated knowledge of not only the observer, but of farming participants too.

5 | CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The cumulative effect of rewilding's challenge to the hegemonic practices of upland farming through its removal of traditional grazing practices and cultural artefacts (Drenthen, 2018, p. 407) would eventually erode a storied landscape, rendering it “mute, meaningless, and foreign” (Gammon, 2019, p. 254). Potential erosion of the storied landscape by RB and the S2S project could destabilise local farming communities, practices and cultures. Eventually, this could lead to the dilution of Welsh language speakers and along with it the loss of geological and environmental specificity attached to the naming of place; cultural heritage that once lost is almost impossible to reinstate.

Upland family farms are unlike industrial, high-input/yield agriculture. Instead, they are reliant on extensive land use and low input models of production; practices that are dependent on the temporal rhythms of nature and family labour. We ought to be envisioning ways that these farming systems can be a part of a heterogeneous solution to ecosystem restoration, rather than depicting them as a problem. Rewilding, celebrated for its carbon-offsetting potential by corporations seeking to transplant their guilt elsewhere, tends to ignore the fact that farming practices and processes within a cultural landscape have co-produced distinct ecologies of plants and animals alongside food production, by developing “the potential already present in nature” (Deliège, 2016, p. 421). Rewilding could damage these unique ecologies without guaranteeing their replacement with more diverse, interesting species, making rewilding simultaneously a restorative and destructive approach.

Rewilding, with its promise (and often failure) of autonomy for co-opted animals (Lorimer et al., 2015, p. 44), or its genetic and aesthetic choices of species substitutions (Lorimer & Driessen, 2016; Tanasescu, 2017), requires more robust ethical consideration (Von Essen & Allen, 2015). So too, does removing established grazing animals from upland areas such as the Cambrian Mountains. Changing the grazing practices within the S2S project area risks leading to the extinction of hefted sheep and regional breed variations, selectively bred over hundreds of years and carrying distinct genetic mutations that offer resilience to local weather and pathogens. As I have argued, human experience within the project area is co-produced in fleshy-knottings with these livestock animals; therefore, their removal would be catastrophic for the emotional well-being of farmers and their families within the Cambrian Mountain area. Understanding the profound ways that my fellow farmers and I are connected to our livestock animals, and recognising this interdependency within the Anthropocene (Haraway, 2008; Tsing, 2015), offers empathetic ways of engaging with the place of all human

experience within nature restoration, and acknowledging, as Tsing so succinctly puts it, that “without collaborations [with non-humans] we all die” (Tsing, 2015, p. 28).

If we understand that it is “the embodied and relational encounter with aesthetic materials that creates room for modification of existing understandings, an essential condition for nascent knowing” (Sutherland & Acord, 2007, p. 134), then within the rewilding debate, artistic practices and practice-led research may offer ways for a non-farmer to gain an experiential understanding of the inaccessible world of upland sheep farming. Encounters with such artistic practices may destabilise assumptions made about upland sheep farming and open a space for better engagement and dialogue with the situated knowledge of farming communities. Engaging with such dialogue may have led RB to be more self-reflexive about the power structures at play within their project design, and to be better equipped for collaborative and ethical approaches.

Whilst the RB design for the S2S project will not be delivered as intended, the empathetic work undertaken by Stacey and others since RB's departure will hopefully inform future approaches to local consultation by non-governmental organisations. Finally, it is worth reflecting that in many ways, the failure of RB to gain local acceptance for S2S teaches us that what is central in emotive cases like this might not simply be approaches to nature, culture or land management change, but rather “a question of how we approach our relations with each other” (Wynne-Jones et al., 2018, p. 398).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dedicated to Professor Mike Pearson – a mentor and a friend. Thank you for believing that I have important things to contribute to the discussion. Your friendship and guidance will be greatly missed. I would like to thank Nadia Bartolini for her patience and support throughout the process and the reviewers for their constructive comments.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing is not applicable to this paper as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

ORCID

Ffion Jones  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4331-2229>

ENDNOTES

- ¹ A performative walk led by my farming participants. It included: dramatic intervention; practical demonstration; spoken narratives and refreshments taken in the agricultural shed.
- ² *Dear Mick Jagger...* a creative documentary film, screened in the main agricultural shed on my research participant's farm and accompanied by task-based performance alongside work done with 100 sheep. The title refers to a narrative within the film attempting to understand my relationship to an orphan lamb named Mick Jagger.
- ³ The Hydrocitizenship research project (2013–2017), a multidisciplinary project focusing on communities and water across four case studies in the UK. I was commissioned to make a film focusing on farmers in the area where I farm in Ceredigion (film available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=peNO7X59MEI>). See Penrhyn Jones (2019), Available: <https://doi.org/10.33008/IJCMR.2019.16> for further discussion of the project.
- ⁴ The funding document was released online after the departure of RB as an offering of transparency by the remaining partner organisations.

REFERENCES

- Bohata, K. (2004) *Postcolonialism revisited: Writing Wales in English*. Cardiff, UK: University of Wales Press.
- Bonsdorff, P. (2005) Agriculture, aesthetic appreciation and the worlds of nature. *Contemporary Aesthetics*, 3, 1–14.
- Butler, J. (1988) Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40, 519–531.
Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3207893>
- Deliège, G. (2016) Contact! Contact! Nature preservation as the preservation of meaning. *Environmental Values*, 25, 409–425. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327116X14661540759151>
- Drenthen, M. (2018) Rewilding in layered landscapes as a challenge to place identity. *Environmental Values*, 27, 405–425. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327118X15251686827732>
- Endangered Landscapes Programme (2018) *Rebecca Wrigley (Summit to Sea [Wales] project)* – Endangered Landscapes Programme launch [video file]. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Na1uXQdWa-4> [Accessed 9th October 2018].
- Foreman, D., Davis, J., Johns, D., Noss, R. & Soulé, M. (1992) The wildlands project mission statement. *Wild Earth*, 1, 3–4.
- Franklin, S. (2007) *Dolly mixtures: The remaking of genealogy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- FUW (2019) *Wilding in the last colony*. *FUW Y Tir*, April, 12–13. Available from: <https://content.yudu.com/libraryHtml/A43o16/WelshFarmeApril2019/reader.html?refUrl=https%253A%252F%252Fexpress.yudu.com%252F>
- Gammon, A.R. (2019) The unsettled places of rewilding. In: Pinto, S., Hannigan, S., Walker-Gibbs, B. & Charlton, E. (Eds.) *Interdisciplinary unsettlings of place and space*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 251–264.
- Gruffudd, P. (1995) Remaking Wales: Nation-building and the geographical imagination, 1925–1950. *Political Geography*, 14, 219–239. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0962-6298\(95\)93185-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0962-6298(95)93185-L)
- Haraway, D. (1988) Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 575–599. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Haraway, D. (2008) *When species meet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hobbs, R., Higgs, E. & Hall, C. (2013) *Novel ecosystems intervening in the new ecological world order*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jones, F. (2010) *The only places we ever knew [Performance] at research participant's farm, Wales, 26 September*.
- Jones, F. (2013) *Dear Mick Jagger [Performance/expanded film] at research participant's farm, Wales, October*. 30 minute edit of film Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o9MVJbB4F_E&t=20s
- Jones, F. (2014) *Woollying the boundaries: Perceptions of, and interventions into, upland sheep farming in Wales*, PhD thesis. Aberystwyth, UK: Aberystwyth University. Available from: https://pure.aber.ac.uk/portal/files/10625276/Jones_Ff.pdf
- Jones, F. (2015) Reflections on Dear Mick Jagger.... *Performance Research*, 20, 89–95. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13528165.2015.1026735>
- Jones, F. (2017) *Edafedd Dŵr* [film commissioned for the Hydrocitizenship research project]. Available from: <https://vimeo.com/251709516>
- Jørgensen, D. (2015) Rethinking rewilding. *Geoforum*, 65, 482–488. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.11.016>
- Laband, D.N. & Lentz, B.F. (1983) Occupational inheritance in agriculture. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 65, 311–314. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1240880>
- Lorimer, J. & Driessen, C. (2016) From “Nazi cows” to cosmopolitan “ecological engineers”: Specifying rewilding through a history of Heck cattle. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 106, 631–652. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2015.1115332>
- Lorimer, J., Sandom, C., Jepson, P., Doughty, C., Barua, M. & Kirby, K.J. (2015) Rewilding: Science, practice, and politics. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 40, 39–62. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102014-021406>
- Meskimmon, M. (2003) *Women making art: History, subjectivity, aesthetics*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Messenger, S. (2018) *Mid Wales wilderness scheme “not targeting farming”*. BBC News, 7 November. Available from: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-46112865>
- Monbiot, G. (2014) *Feral: Searching for enchantment on the frontiers of rewilding*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Monbiot, G. (2015) *Plotting hope: How one rewilding journey began*. Rewilding Britain, 14 July. Available from: <https://www.rewildingbritain.org.uk/blog/plotting-hope-how-one-rewilding-journey-began>
- Penrhyn Jones, S. (2019) A crisis discipline: Broadening understanding of environmental communication through theory and practice. *International Journal of Creative Media Research*, 2. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.33008/IJCMR.2019.16>
- Plumwood, V. (1991) Nature, self, and gender: Feminism, environmental philosophy, and the critique of rationalism. *Hypatia*, 6, 3–27. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.1991.tb00206.x>
- Prior, J. & Brady, E. (2017) Environmental aesthetics and rewilding. *Environmental Values*, 26, 31–51. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327117X14809634978519>
- Reiners, W.A. & Lockwood, J.A. (2009) *Philosophical Foundations for the Practices of Ecology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rewilding Britain (2017) *Summit to Sea – O'r Mynydd i'r Môr Project: Restoring flourishing ecosystems and a resilient economy in mid-Wales*. Available from: <http://www.summit2sea.wales/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Summit-to-Sea-Final-Bid-Document-August-2017-1.pdf>
- Riley, M. (2009) Bringing the “invisible farmer” into sharper focus: Gender relations and agricultural practices in the Peak District (UK). *Gender, Place and Culture*, 16, 665–682. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690903279138>
- Saugeres, L. (2002) “She’s not really a woman, she’s half a man”: Gendered discourses of embodiment in a French farming community. *In Women's Studies International Forum*, 2, 641–650. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395\(02\)00342-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395(02)00342-4)
- Smith, D. (2005) *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Lanham, MD: Altira Press.
- Summit to Sea (2022) *Statement on ELP funding and the Summit to Sea project – April 2022*. Available from: <http://www.summit2sea.wales/funding/>
- Sutherland, I. & Acord, S.K. (2007) Thinking with art: From situated knowledge to experiential knowing. *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, 6(2), 125–140. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1386/jvap.6.2.125_1
- Tanasescu, M. (2017) Field notes on the meaning of rewilding. *Ethics, Policy and Environment*, 20, 333–349. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21550085.2017.1374053>
- Tsing, A. (2015) *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tuan, Y.F. (1996) Space and place: Humanistic perspective. In: Agnew, J., Livingstone, D.N. & Rogers, A. (Eds.) *Human geography: An essential anthology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 444–457.
- Von Essen, E. & Allen, M.P. (2015) Wild-but-not-too-wild animals: Challenging goldilocks standards in rewilding. *Between the Species*, 19, 80–108.

- Ward, K. (2019) For wilderness or wildness? Decolonising rewilding. In: Pettorelli, N., Durant, S. & Du Toit, J. (Eds.) *Rewilding*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 34–54.
- Whatmore, S. (1991a) Life cycle or patriarchy? Gender divisions in family farming. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 7, 71–76. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-0167\(91\)90043-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-0167(91)90043-R)
- Whatmore, S. (1991b) *Farming women: Gender, work, and family enterprise*. London, UK: Macmillan Academic and Professional.
- Wrigley, R. (2018) Welcoming Summit to Sea. Rewilding Britain, 4 October. Available from: <https://www.rewildingbritain.org.uk/blog/welcoming-summit-to-sea>
- Wynne-Jones, S., Strouts, G. & Holmes, G. (2018) Abandoning or reimagining a cultural heartland? Understanding and responding to rewilding conflicts in Wales – the case of the Cambrian Wildwood. *Environmental Values*, 27, 377–403. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327118X15251686827723>

How to cite this article: Jones, F. (2022) Gendered, embodied knowledge within a Welsh agricultural context and the importance of listening to farmers in the rewilding debate. *Area*, 00, 1–9. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12808>