No Sustainability without Justice:
A Feminist Critique of Environmental Citizenship[1]

Dr Sherilyn MacGregor
School of Politics, International Relations and Philosophy
Keele University
Keele, Staffordshire ST5 5BQ
s.macgregor@pol.keele.ac.uk

Abstract

In this paper, I draw on long-standing feminist concerns about masculinist bias in political theory and critical insights of ecological feminism to problematise key themes in the emerging discourse of 'environmental citizenship'. Although it is a relatively new branch of citizenship theory which addresses some of the most pressing concerns of the present period, most scholarship on environmental citizenship retains a traditional model of citizenship that masks specificities of gender inequality while depending upon a division of labour that frees citizens to participate in the public domain. I discuss some of the central problems with environmental citizenship as I see them. These problems include: a paradoxical coupling of labour- and time-intensive green lifestyle changes with increased active participation in the public sphere; silence on questions of rights and social conditions that make citizenship practice possible; and a failure to acknowledge the ways in which injunctions to make green lifestyle changes (as expressions of good green citizenship) dovetail into neoliberal efforts to download public services to the domestic sphere.

Introduction

There is growing interest of late in how to change the behaviour of individual citizens to tackle environmental problems such as climate change. The popular media now seem obsessed with what people can do to minimize their unsustainable ecological impacts and to reduce their personal 'carbon footprints' -- in short, with how to become good green citizens of an environmentally sustainable society. The concept of 'environmental citizenship,'[2] which has been the subject of research within the field of environmental politics for a decade, has suddenly gone mainstream. It is unfortunate, however, that in both popular and academic circles the apparent urgency of the ecological crisis has allowed important questions of social justice to remain unexplored. Although this paper asks questions about the treatment of gender inequality within academic discussions of environmental citizenship, their relevance to emerging popular discourse are obvious.

How might citizenship be framed so that environmental sustainability and gender justice are taken into account in equal measure? Many theorists have looked at citizenship through environmental or feminist lenses, but few have brought sustainability, gender and citizenship together in a way that serves to illuminate the complex and political nature of their interconnections. Feminist theorists of citizenship have had little to say about the environment; ecological feminists are inclined to dismiss citizenship as the inherently exclusionary product of elite male minds; and environmental political theorists seem rarely to think about gender, approaching citizenship as if 'we're all in this together'. I think each of these

---

[1]This paper is adapted from a chapter with the same title in Andrew Dobson and Derek Bell (Eds.) (2005), *Environmental Citizenship* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press). It draws on my book *Beyond Mothering Earth: Ecological Citizenship and the Politics of Care* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006).

[2] Some make a distinction between 'environmental' (e.g., Jelin, 2000) and 'ecological' (e.g., Smith, 1998; Curtin, 1999; Dobson 2003) as prefixes to citizenship. Whilst this distinction is part of an interesting debate, here I use 'environmental' for simplicity's sake.

scholarly camps deserves to be challenged on their respective lacunae if more inclusive approaches are to be found. My aim here is to argue that the discourse of environmental citizenship suffers from its lack of attention to gender relations. For if it is true that 'the way we define citizenship is intimately linked to the kind of society and political community we want' (Mouffe 1992, 225), then it reasonably can be inferred that few proponents of environmental citizenship have lost sleep over the persistent barriers to women's equal participation in public life, much less over how to create an inclusive and gender-friendly polis.

I begin with a brief introduction to the literature on the greening of citizenship, highlighting its origins and basic claims. I then draw on long-standing feminist concerns about the masculinist bias in political theory and critical insights of contemporary ecological feminist thinkers to problematize some of the central themes of environmental citizenship. The most significant problem in my view is the assumption of a generic model of citizenship that masks realities of gender (and other forms of) inequality while depending upon a division of labour that frees citizens to participate in the public domain. From this stem further problems which I discuss in turn: a failure to acknowledge how a focus on 'green duties' and lifestyle changes dovetails into the neoliberal downloading public services to the domestic sphere; a paradoxical coupling of labour-intensive and time-intensive green lifestyle changes with a call for increased active participation in the public sphere; and silence on questions of the social conditions that make citizenship practice possible for women. I conclude with the uniquely (eco)feminist[3] argument that blindness to gender relations undermines the very promise of environmental citizenship, for a society that has not addressed the unjust division of responsibility for sustaining life will not be sustainable socially, politically, or ecologically.

The greening of citizenship: politics as usual?

'Sustainability' and 'environmental citizenship' have been popular concepts in green political thought throughout the 1990s and into the 2000s (cf. Dobson 1990, 1995, 1998, 2003). The growing awareness of environmental degradation and the belief that human societies are fast approaching the biophysical limits of our inhabitation of the planet has prompted environmental scholars and policy-makers to pay attention to what it means to live more sustainably. Concerns about sustainability have informed proposals for a range of dramatic changes to current systems -- economic, regulatory, and political -- that would improve the quality of life of current populations while ensuring similar chances for survival of subsequent ones. However, because sustainability is a contestable concept and because moving towards a sustainable society will require such dramatic and sweeping changes in individual human behaviour and institutional practices, many ecopolitical theorists argue that it is necessary to involve people democratically in the process, to ensure the consent and on-going active participation of all concerned (see, for example, Barry 1999; Dryzek 1999; Torgerson 1999). In addition to positing it as the most appropriate means of articulating this green democratic involvement, some see citizenship as a way to change individual behaviour and to foster values of stewardship and ecological virtue in local places and in global civil society (e.g., Curtin 1999; Dobson 2003). It is a small yet growing area of research and theorising and, interestingly, the majority of the work has been done by British political theorists.

The writing on environmental citizenship offers valuable challenges to those theorists (feminists included) who make little room for ecological questions in their understandings of citizenship. Hartley Dean sums up these challenges nicely:

> Green thinking has impacted on our understanding of citizenship in at least three different ways. First, environmental concerns have entered our understanding of the rights we enjoy as citizens. Second, the enhanced level of global awareness associated with ecological thinking has helped to broaden our understanding of the potential scope of citizenship. Third, emergent ecological concerns have added fuel to a complex debate about the responsibilities that attach to citizenship (2001, 491).

---

[3] I put 'eco' in parentheses to indicate that I am drawing on selected aspects of both ecofeminism (specifically those ecofeminists who, like me, are critical of maternalism, and spirituality as a basis for politics) and feminist political theory (specifically those who embrace radical democracy and the intrinsic value of politics and citizenship) to fashion a hybridized perspective that is not reducible to either label.

Many ecopolitical thinkers argue for a non-territorial notion of citizenship because ecological problems know no state boundaries and want to include the private sphere as a site for citizenship (Dobson 2003). They define environmental citizenship as citizenship that includes rights to a clean and healthy environment and, crucially, a set of responsibilities: to protect the interests of future generations and non-humans; to understand the interconnected, global causes and costs of environmental degradation; to engage in environmentally-sound practices in daily life; and to actively participate in political debate about sustainability (see, for example, Christoff 1996; Barry 1999; Newby 1996; Light 2002; Dobson 2003). Support for this notion of green citizenship is increasingly shared by politicians, NGOs and business leaders who seek to mobilize public participation in environmental initiatives. For example, the United Nations Environment Programme's (UNEP) concept of global environmental citizenship 'is about asserting the ethical responsibilities needed …to create new forms of solidarity to protect all life on Earth' (http://www.ourplanet.com/imgversn/85/barcena.html).

But what kind of subject would one have to be to fulfill these expectations of the good environmental citizen? This is an important question from the perspective of feminist citizenship theory because of the tendency in traditional political thought to assume a gender-neutral citizen and a gender-neutral model of citizenship practice. The main feminist criticism of citizenship is that it masks the specificities of gender inequality while depending upon a gender division of labour that frees autonomous (gender-neutral) citizens to participate in the public domain. Feminists have pointed out that the very notion of 'the citizen' is based on a universal subject who, until relatively recently, was independent, property owning and male. Historically, it was only this kind of person who was granted the status of citizen and so citizenship, the argument goes, has been imbued with the values and experiences of white affluent men (Lister 1997). Fundamental to this citizenly identity are autonomy, self-determination, rationality, and the maintenance of a clear boundary between public and private life. Women were denied citizenship status because they were not seen as autonomous persons (i.e., they were property), because they allegedly lacked the capacity for rational thought, because their proper role was to tend to matters emotional and domestic, and because political involvement theoretically would interfere with their childbearing duty to the nation (i.e., giving birth to the next generation of workers and soldiers). It is fair to say that the legacy of this sexism lives on: even after women in most countries around the world have successfully fought for legal citizenship status, economic and cultural barriers continue to exclude them from participating as full and equal citizens of their political communities.

My review of the environmental citizenship literature leads me to think that, as ever, some old patriarchal habits die hard. As I illustrate below, most green political theorists work from a definition of citizenship that speaks volumes about their commitment to participatory democracy and saving the planet at the same time as it reveals their lack of interest in the organization of socially and ecologically necessary work. They may recognise the relevance of private actions to ecological goals, but have little to say about who does what. That these theorists are predominantly white, male academics living in advanced capitalist societies are not irrelevant facts in this discussion. Those who fit the citizen mould nicely are probably less well acquainted with the complexities of being and acting as a citizen than those who do not. However it is not only about masculine understandings of citizenship: most ecofeminist writers have observed that environmentalism, as a largely androcentric position historically, displays sexist tendencies and overlooks specificities of gender. Feminism has always had a contentious relationship with left-green politics, often stemming from the failure of male-dominated perspectives and social movements to acknowledge feminist concerns (Segal 1987).[4] A useful analysis of sexism in environmentalism is found in Mary Mellor's *Breaking the Boundaries* (1992), in which she argues that for much of their evolution, greens have lacked a vision that adequately integrates ecological sustainability and social justice. More recent work by ecofeminist Greta Gaard (1998) has uncovered the lingering sexism and ambivalence towards feminism within the US Green Party.

Yet few ecofeminists have had much to say about citizenship, probably because many tend to want to abandon the concept altogether. They tend to side with those feminist theorists who prefer to

---

[4] Just as radical feminism emerged out of the sexism and unequal gender relations within civil rights and student movement groups in the 1960s, one impetus for the birth of ecofeminist perspectives in the early 1970s was sexism within the green movement (cf. d'Eaubonne 1994).

construct an alternative approach to politics that is rooted in private sphere concerns and feminine or maternal virtue (cf. Elshtain 1981; Ruddick 1989). Like the campaigners for female suffrage at the turn of the twentieth century, these feminists argue that politics, how we live on earth, will be improved by an injection of women's values. As I have discussed elsewhere (see MacGregor 2004, 2006), many ecofeminists embrace a vision of the good ecological society modelled not on some abstract Western notion of political identity but on women's experiential knowledges and practices of life-sustaining work (e.g., caring for people, tending to animals and crops) (cf. Mies and Bennholdt-Thomsen 2000).

Against this position I side with feminist political theorists who have embraced citizenship and want to defend it as a potentially radical ideal that can inform both theoretical analyses and practices of membership in political communities (cf. Mouffe 1992; Pateman 1994). For these theorists, and for me, there is something attractive about the civic republican tradition wherein citizenship is specific kind of universal political identity and politics is realm where freedom, equity, and human excellence may flourish (cf. Dietz 1998). Citizenship is thus regarded as a promising strategy for challenging gender inequality while imagining a form of political solidarity among women that does not forever tie them to an essential capacity or innate sense of responsibility to care for others. Take for example Denise Riley's post-essentialist feminist defence of citizenship in which she claims that, although there are risks in a notion of universal citizenship that masks gender and other local specificities, 'it also possesses the strength of its own idealism'(1992,187). 'Because of its claim to universality,' she continues, 'such an ideal can form the basis for arguments for participation by everyone, as well as for entitlements and responsibilities for all… Citizenship as a theory sets out a claim and an egalitarian promise'(187).

Pro-citizenship feminists make the important point that although this ostensibly gender-neutral concept is actually deeply gendered, it is better to join rather than to eschew conversations about rethinking citizenship that have been gaining momentum in the social sciences in recent decades (Lister 1997; Voet 1998). They therefore analyze the gendered nature of citizenship in the context of societies where capitalist globalization and a neoliberal backlash against the welfare have led to a decrease in social rights and an increase in individual duties. Rather than accepting a neoliberal definition of citizenship an important feminist project is to try to reinvigorate citizenship as a political location from which to destabilize the boundaries between public and private, and to argue for the collective provision of social goods (cf. Lister 1997). Another important yet largely neglected feminist citizenship project should be to participate in debates about the collective achievement of environmental sustainability goals. Working from within these two projects I want to develop the following two feminist criticisms of the discourse of environmental citizenship.

A dangerous dovetail: emphasising responsibilities over rights

The first problem that my feminist interrogation uncovers is a disproportionate emphasis on individual responsibility in environmental citizenship discourse. A significant proportion of the green writing on citizenship tends to emphasise citizens' moral duty to participate in the kinds of activities that will help societies move towards sustainability (cf. Attfield 1999; Smith 1998). As Dobson (2003) explains, the turn toward a Kantian-inspired cosmopolitan view that all citizens qua human beings have moral obligations to the human community has shaped recent conceptions of environmental (and its close relative global) citizenship. While there is some discussion of the need for new environmental rights (e.g., to clean air and water, to participate in environmental decision making), environmental citizenship tends to place greater emphasis on individual duty to care for nature, to engage in behaviour that allows life on the planet to flourish (cf. Attfield 1999). It is the acceptance of this responsibility by individuals that matters, along with the implementation of the kinds of behaviour that this acceptance demands.

What concerns me is that environmental citizenship as 'green duty' dovetails (unintentionally) into a dominant neoliberal agenda that employs 'duties discourse' (Lister 1997; Kershaw 2005) to facilitate the reduction of state provision of social services. Since the 1980s, the equation of citizenship with responsibility has become an escape route for governments as they move to dismantle the welfare state. In neoliberal policy discourse, citizenship is increasingly becoming conditional on performance of duties (especially the duty to do paid work) and becoming synonymous with voluntary involvement in the community. The call for green duties in order to meet sustainability goals seems dangerously similar to the stance of the neoliberal, 'modernising left' that sees the promotion of citizenship-as-responsibility as a

way to meet their economic restructuring goals. (Nicholas Rose [1999] has called this a process of 'responsibilisation' within advanced capitalist societies). For instance, the current emphasis on citizenship in Britain is seen by some analysts as part of a reassertion of the connection between entitlements and obligations in the New Labour platform (cf. Faulks 1999). It is often noted that the Blair government has been influenced by the writings of Amitai Etzioni who argues that the major problem facing western democracies too many social rights have made people passive and dependent on the state to administer their needs. This situation might be corrected if sense of citizen responsibility to make communities work (with minimal help from government) could be restored and strengthened (Etzioni 1995; see also Putnam 2000). Prime Minister Tony Blair is on record as saying, soon after his first electoral victory, that at the heart of Britain's problems is an 'undeveloped citizenship' and that the preferred way to tackle this problem is to nurture a sense of community wherein 'the rights we enjoy reflect the duties we owe' (quoted in Benyon and Edwards 1997, 335). In other words, *'no rights without responsibilities'* (Anthony Giddens, sociologist and former New Labour advisor, quoted in Kershaw 2005, 51).

What is important here is that citizenship has become instrumentalised as a solution to a problem: it is regarded as a way to both enlist public participation in the management of national affairs and to relieve the duty of government to provide goods and services to the population. Relevant to the case at hand, governments and green scholars alike are increasingly appealing to citizens' sense of ecological duty by asking people to reduce, reuse, and recycle, to conserve water and electricity, and to use public transit instead of private automobiles, to vacation at home rather than flying abroad. Helpful tips for greener living and personal carbon calculators can be found on the websites of environmental NGOs and government departments (see, for example: http://www.foe.co.uk/living/tips/ and http://www.everyactioncounts.org.uk/).

Proponents of environmental citizenship place the onus on individuals, whether as citizens or consumers, to become more educated about environmental issues, to make the necessary changes in their own outlook and behaviours, and to take ecological impacts into account in both their personal and their collective decision making. Education is seen as a key tool for building the kind of society that will be able to transform human-nature relationships, and education reform has been held up as an important part of this project. For example the UK Sustainable Development Action Plan for Education and Skills lists as objective number one that all learners will be given the necessary values and knowledge to become active citizens in creating a sustainable society. In his preface to the report, then Secretary of State for Education and Skills Charles Clark, writes:

> We need to look at [sustainable development] as a whole - how we use resources without wasting them; how we teach and learn about sustainable development; how we generate the skills, knowledge and understanding to allow us to fulfil our duty as global citizens…Our challenge is great: to enable all citizens to exercise informed and responsible choices (http://www.dfes.gov.uk/sd/docs/SDactionplan.pdf).

The underlying premise of this education for sustainability program is problematic. It makes the erroneous assumption that 'citizens fail to act only out of ignorance' (Cruikshank 1999, 16) and suggests that it is uneducated and *irresponsible* individuals -- rather than unsustainable and unjust social and economic structures and relationships -- who are the root cause of the environmental crisis. Although there is promise in efforts to promote cultural change, education for environmental citizenship can also become a way of disciplining the population to internalize a set of rules for behaviour -- to become *self-governing subjects rather than critical, active citizens* -- thereby justifying minimal state intervention (Rose 1999). The control of information by corporations and the state makes it difficult for citizens to develop oppositional consciousness that could lead to meaningful acts of resistance to state power. From a Foucauldian perspective, the fact that citizenship can so easily be co-opted by (or dovetailed into) state agendas makes it an undesirable ideal for guiding social-political and environmental movements.

The kind of (eco)feminist perspective that I want to develop accepts citizenship as a valuable ideal and practice at the same time that is seeks to bring its various blind spots into focus. For instance one can agree that encouraging citizen responsibility for sustainability is important providing that it is not done at the expense of taking steps toward structural and systemic change. I agree with those critics of green

duties discourse who argue that the 'privatisation' of responsibility tends to take the onus off the larger problems (like corporate pollution) created by the costs and by-products of capitalist production. For example Timothy Luke (1997) describes green consumerism and recycling as the 'domestication' of environmentalism, a process that works to tame radical action, to affirm consumption rather than conservation, and to locate the major source of responsibility for unsustainability in the wrong places. The focus is on the end (i.e., citizens/consumers) rather than the mouth (i.e., producers/sellers) of the pipe. For example, household bottle and can recycling is encouraged so that governments can meet EU environmental targets while it is business-as-usual for the beverage industry. Luke (1997) has called this 'the ruse of recycling.' One cannot help but see green citizenship in this case as an effective way to greenwash neoliberal resistance to green regulation.

So what is the gender analysis here? Granted there are some ecofeminists who see hope in women's greater sense of social responsibility and their ability to instil green values in the next generation. Women will make endless trips to the bottle bank because they care, and want their kids to care, about the future of the planet. As I discuss below, however, I am interested in how appeals for citizens to be more ecologically responsible take on a gendered dimension, especially in domestic life. As Claudia Card (1989) notes, women have a tendency to take on a greater burden of moral responsibility than men do, due to their socialization in a patriarchal culture.

There may very well be a gendering of environmental duty taking place that only a few feminist commentators have acknowledged (see Littig 2001). Harriet Rosenberg highlights the ways in which mothers can become targets of corporate and governmental campaigns to download environmental responsibility: 'The individual mother is exhorted to accept personal responsibility for a crisis that she is said to be able to ameliorate through private practices within her household' (1995,197). Insofar as women are primary household consumers, they become the intended audience for morally based prescriptions for greening the household. Advertisers know to whom they ought to target their ostensibly green products (e.g., unbleached cotton diapers, non-toxic and biodegradable cleaning supplies, organic and non-GM produce).[5] Here, the focus on individual choice confuses the meanings of citizen and consumer. Either way, when the future of their children (and of course their children's children) is used as the reason for being ecologically responsible, women are apt to feel guilty; their compulsory feminine altruism is thereby exploited for the public and increasingly corporate good.

What happens when citizenship becomes all about individual responsibility, as if all citizens have an equal ability to accept it? For some, this raises questions of justice and the conditions under which citizenship may be meaningfully practised. Here is important to revisit the issue of how and by whom socially necessary life sustaining work is provided. Since T.H. Marshall's ([1950] 1998) 'Citizenship and Social Class', it has been held by many political theorists that the ability to perform one's duty as a citizen often depends on a set of enabling conditions (cf. Yuval-Davis 1997). Marshall recognized that people need a minimum level of social and economic security (and the *right* 'to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society' [1950] 1998, 94) in order to participate equally in society, so he adds social citizenship to his two other dimensions of citizenship: the civil and the political.

A focus on duty obscures this understanding of citizenship, so important to feminist aims for gender justice, wherein rights in many ways facilitate the performance of duties. Arguably, a feminist conception of citizenship synthesizes the best aspects of the Marshallian liberal social rights tradition and the civic republican tradition of participatory democracy (cf. Mouffe 1992). This 'critical synthesis', as Ruth Lister (1997) calls it, stems from an understanding of citizenship as both a *practice* that involves human agency and a *status* whose attainment, with the political, civil, and social rights it entails, is important for protecting and advancing the interests of marginalized people. Lister writes that 'the case for understanding rights as constituting a mutually supportive web of the formal (civil and political) and

---

[5] The climate change agenda may well be changing the focus of green lifestyle practices, perhaps making them more relevant and interesting to men. Generally speaking, gadgets and DIY projects (e.g., things like mini-wind turbines and eco-friendly roof insulation which require a trip to B&Q) tend to appeal more to men than to women. There is a remarkable overrepresentation of men (especially wealthy white men) in the current media coverage of the climate change issue.

the substantive (social and economic) has been made with reference to their status as a prerequisite for the realisation of human agency'(34).

Besides overlooking or downplaying the question of social citizenship rights, many proponents of environmental citizenship fail to discuss human rights in any significant way, preferring instead to focus on duty and questions of whether rights might be extended to future generations or the non-human world. By contrast, in spite of their criticisms of liberalism and the limitations of masculine rights talk, many feminists have accepted (albeit to varying degrees) an approach to citizenship that entails human rights and political entitlements that are enjoyed equally by every member of society regardless of their social, economic, or cultural status. They have argued (and fought) for the extension of rights to those to whom they have been denied and who have thereby been excluded from citizenship (e.g., children, migrants). They have also argued for new rights to protect disadvantaged groups from unjust treatment (Lister 1997). In particular, reproductive rights are a central concern for feminists and these are especially important in light of prevailing ideas about the ecological impacts of population growth. Civil rights that protect against systemic discrimination and that help to foster social equity are of great value to feminists and other movements for social justice. Rights that protect workers from exploitation and unsafe environmental conditions are increasingly important in a global market that relies on the cheap labour of women (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003; Murphy 2006).

These assertions about rights are central to most contemporary feminist discussions of citizenship. Feminists would be apt to agree that too many rights and not enough responsibilities are indeed causes of the ecological crisis, *providing that* there is acknowledgement this claim applies only to very specific social groups. For most people in the world the opposite is true. Human and social rights are under attack in most neoliberal capitalist places in the globalising world, and communities, families, and the women who care for them have little choice but to shoulder ever greater burdens of responsibility being created. Dobson (2003) makes a similar point about the asymmetrical nature of globalisation and environmental destruction when he argues for a post-cosmopolitan conception of citizenship that does not assume a common human condition. Taking these points seriously, theorists who endorse the ideal of the responsible green citizen ought to acknowledge the importance of maintaining the workable balance between responsibilities and rights that is traditionally constitutive of citizenship -- a balance that makes everyday practices of citizenship sustainable.

A problematic paradox: doing more (duty) with less (time)

Second, there is a problematic paradox in environmental citizenship discourse that stems from the twin emphasis on lifestyle changes in the domestic sphere and greater participation in the public sphere. Ecopolitical theorists call upon good environmental citizens to develop green habits on the home front while making a commitment to get involved in collective decision making in an increasing number of political spaces and institutions (e.g., neighbourhoods, parishes, schools and workplaces).[6] Academic proponents of environmental citizenship appear to assume that people will accept the inevitable increases in time and effort created by green lifestyle practices,[7] and will still have time for citizenly pursuits. This assumption reveals a lack of consideration for the politics of the domestic sphere, for the likelihood that these injunctions will result in an intensification of the activities that are already divided unequally between men and women. Add to this the fact that the abovementioned erosion of the welfare state in most Western countries has made it even more difficult for women to manage their double burden of paid and upaid work, and we have a paradox that promises to be painful indeed.

As mentioned earlier, a central aspect of environmental citizenship is the active participation of citizens in public debate about sustainability. For many green theorists, the goal is to create the kind of society where active citizenship may be valued for its own sake, in accordance with civic republic ideas. For example, Douglas Torgerson (1999, 153) hopes that in the ideal sustainable society there would be 'greater free time and a reduced need for constant employment, [so] there would indeed be greater opportunity for enhanced discussion in a green public sphere'. There are many green political theorists

---

[6] The extent to which governments and corporations share this twin emphasis is an open question.
[7] For a good discussion of the relationship between green practices and increased time spent on domestic work in Germany, see Schultz 1993. See also Littig 2001 for a more general exploration.

who, like Torgerson, appear to model their visions of environmental democracy, face-to-face deliberation, and citizenship after the Greek polis where citizenship was regarded as 'the most important social role an individual can take' (Bookchin 1982, 339). But, as feminists have noted, these Athenian citizens were freed for politics by the labour of foreigners, slaves, and women who were not granted the status of citizen. Citizenship, understood as being about active participation in the public sphere, is by definition a practice that depends on 'free time'; it is thus not designed for people with multiple roles and heavy loads of responsibility for productive and reproductive work. As Carole Pateman (1988) and Anne Phillips (1993) have argued, modern theories of citizenship fail to take into account the sexual division of labour that not only sustains democracy but also makes it extremely difficult for women (and others with time scarcity) to participate as equal members of a political community. In fact, 'the more active the democratic engagement, the more likely it is to be carried by only a few' (Phillips 1993, 112). Relevant to the current discussion, one recent study provides empirical evidence that a disproportionate load of caring responsibilities and environmentally-friendly household practices are significant constraints on women's participation in public environmental activism (Tindall, Davies, and Maubouès 2003). Viewing time as a resource for citizenship is integral to any feminist political theory that seeks to problematise the unfair division of labour that has constrained women from full participation as political citizens (Lister 1997).

Also central to feminist citizenship theory is an acknowledgement that as embodied human beings, all citizens are inevitably dependent on others for care and nurturance. In her extensive critique of liberal democracy, ecofeminist philosopher Val Plumwood (1995) contends that the liberal democratic conception of the self (and, by extension, the citizen) is flawed because in embracing independence and self-determination, they are at odds with the kind of dependency relationships necessary for ecological flourishing -- relationships of kinship, mutuality, empathy, and care. (Note that these qualities are very different from the autonomy, self-determination, and rationality that traditionally have defined citizenship.) What she does not consider, however, is the extent to which green visions differ from liberal ones in their assumptions about the self-reliance of individuals. On my reading, although many green theorists offer progressive revisions of democracy, when it comes to images of the self-reliant citizen they have one foot firmly planted on masculinist ground.

One indication that the interdependency of human beings has been elided in green political theory is that analysis of relations within the domestic sphere is non-existent or seriously skewed. As feminist ecological economists have pointed out, rarely do ecopolitical theorists regard domestic provisioning work as productive and necessary to the functioning and sustainability of the economic system or society as a whole (Nelson 1997). The nature of household or family relationships is not considered relevant to democratic public debate even though changing the practices and behaviour of individual citizens in the private sphere is becoming an important part of many visions of an ecological society. Moreover, when environmental citizenship is said to include a sense of personal responsibility for actions in the private sphere, the private sphere seems to be synonymous with (unsustainable) consumption or it is a place where people procreate (too much). Only in rare cases is it considered to be a space of *productive and reproductive work* as feminists have been arguing since the 1970s. And in all cases, self-discipline and self-reliance are ecological virtues.

Few ecopolitical theorists have addressed the question of how necessary labour -- which is bound to be intensified if people want to be self-reliant -- will be distributed in a sustainable society. It has been well established that women do more unpaid household labour than men. Cross-national empirical research has found that women do significantly more environmentally-oriented work in the household (e.g., recycling, precycling) than men (Hunter, Hatch, and Johnson 2004). My interviews with environmental activists in Toronto yielded the same finding (see MacGregor 2005). Yet few greens call, as feminists have done, for the democratization of the household that would allow for a more equitable distribution of this necessary work. In fact, the question of how green practices in the private sphere are to be initiated, distributed, and sustained is seldom, if ever, asked. John Barry (1999), for example, argues that the practice of ecological citizenship should transcend the public and private divide, yet makes little mention of the implications for women and those who often have no choice but to operate at the interstices of both spheres. Dobson (2003) also declares the private realm to be a site of citizenship because "all green actions in the home have a public impact" but does not consider the public or private

impacts of an unjust distribution of these actions.[8]   Green citizenship theorists may well take for granted that responsibility will be shared, but by failing to address this issue explicitly, they perpetuate the traditional view that it is not an appropriate matter for discussion in theories of politics (see Kymlicka 2002 for a discussion of how this view is common in male-dominated political theory.)

Whilst ordering up increased responsibilities for the citizen, most green theorists are silent about, unless they are critical of, establishing formal collective mechanisms for meeting social needs. Within green political theory there is both nostalgia for the self-reliant and self-managing community and ambivalence about the merits of a rights-granting, welfare-providing nation state. Torgerson is typical of radical democrats when he blames welfare state policies for 'bolster[ing] consumer demand and promot[ing] mass acquiescence'(1999, 8) without mentioning that they also have provided the conditions (i.e., time) for many women and other marginalized people to participate more fully in most aspects of society. This oversight is consistent with a tradition in green theory of preferring mutual aid and individual responsibility for well-being over the administration of welfare by the state or market. I would argue that not only does this not necessarily have to be an either-or choice but also that the green preference for self- and community reliance has not had the benefit of critical gender analysis. For example, when Alain Lipietz (1995) envisions an 'end of work' scenario where people's working time would be reduced to afford more time for leisurely pursuits and community and environmental service, he fails to recognize that work includes more than paid employment. Nor, rather tellingly, is there a discussion of the gendered distribution of leisure time where studies indicate that men use their time off to engage in personal hobbies and pleasures while women tend to use theirs to catch up on the housework. Bittman and Wajcman's study of the quality of leisure time enjoyed by Australian men and women finds that men have more uninterrupted leisure time, whereas the majority of women's leisure time is "contaminated by combination with unpaid work" (2000, 181-2). Feminist research shows that even when policies and programs are implemented that give men and women more time to devote to necessary, unpaid labour, women in general still end up doing more of it than men in general (we all know exceptions). Gender differences in work and leisure time have been of crucial significant to feminist economists (Folbre 1993) as well as feminist sociologists and theorists of citizenship (Schor 1997; Pateman 1994).

Although feminists rightly have criticised the liberal welfare state for sometimes being paternalistic, racist, heterosexist, and alienating, it has also been well established that the ability of some women to participate in the workforce and in public life has been facilitated by state provision of necessary services such as health care and child care (Lister 1997). The models of social democracy in Northwest European (especially Scandinavian) countries are held up by many feminists as more 'woman-friendly' than those systems that assume private responsibility for socially necessary work (cf. Folbre 1993). Despite the weaknesses of welfare state approaches, many feminist theorists of citizenship have recognized the need for some socialization of socially necessary-yet-feminized work in order to offer women a promise of a better quality of life and a capacity to claim their place as equal citizens (cf. Bowden 1997). Arguing for some forms of collectivization of necessary work may also be an alternative to accepting the various private solutions to privileged women's 'time poverty' that sees them purchasing the labour of other women (who tend to be marginalized economically, politically and socially) to supplement their own (cf. Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003). . It is important always to recall the socialist feminist argument that "because it is the labour of ensuring human subsistence, the production time of domestic labour can never be reduced, it can only be shared or redistributed" (Luxton 1987, 172). While I have not seen the case made, I think it is worth investigating the extent to which collectivized approaches to necessary labour are less resource and waste intensive, and therefore more ecologically viable, than privatized approaches (see Littig 2001).

---

[8] The flip side of Dobson's (2003) view that private green practices should be regarded as acts of citizenship seems to be that "toiling to satisfy our material wants" in the private sphere "amounts to the production of ecological footprints which, far from removing us from the realm of citizenship, actually generates the kinds of obligations peculiar to it" (139). I wonder whether this might, by Dobson's logic, mean that those who do the most meeting of basic needs have the most ecological obligations?

I am not arguing against all private provisioning of care or other forms of socially necessary work. Nor am I suggesting that the establishment of organic, vegetarian, communal neighbourhood feeding centres offers a path to social and ecological sustainability. I accept that there may be an irreducibly private dimension to the production and reproduction of human life, such that collectivisation and state-run service delivery can only ever be part of the answer to the provision of a society's needs. What I do want to stress, however, is that whenever the private or domestic sphere is implicated in strategies for social or environmental change, consideration must be given for the unequal and deeply gendered division of labour and responsibility, costs, and benefits. Taking for granted that the necessary work will get done is tantamount to making for "more work for mother." Therefore, I suggest that, at the very least, public debate over *who does what, when, how and under what conditions* ought to be built in to the very definition of environmental citizenship.

Conclusion

The injection of green values into political analyses of 'how ought we to live' has challenged our understandings and practices of democratic citizenship in important ways. The fact that the (eco)feminist critique I have presented here reiterates many of the objections that feminists have been making for decades, however, suggests that environmental citizenship discourse has yet to take the central feminist values of gender equity and justice onboard. Environmentalists and feminists need to do better to bring their different, but not uncomplimentary, agendas together.

By now the differences between feminist and environmental perspectives on citizenship should be clear. Perhaps the overriding difference is that there is little consideration in green political theory of the kind of *citizen relations* that would promote a just and sustainable society, whereas relations among embodied, interdependent people are of central importance to feminists.[9] Some ecofeminists wish to make this point by invoking the language of the care and intimacy, while the feminist theorists of citizenship on whom I draw want to find a way of politicizing these relations and making them subjects of public debate. In contrast, while green political theorists are willing to acknowledge that individual human beings are dependent on nature for survival (thus the prudential responsibility to preserve it) they are less willing to acknowledge the relations of dependence that are central to human well-being. In this way they preserve the position of the powerful vis-à-vis those who do the unpaid work and as such are unacceptable from a feminist perspective (Tronto 1993).

The inclusion of private sphere activities like recycling and energy conservation as examples of ecological citizenship practice is a radical departure from conventional theories of citizenship that consider household activities irrelevant to politics. This is a great improvement on past understandings. Feminists too would want to include such practices in their understanding of citizenship because, like other forms of privatised and feminised work, they have been hitherto ignored. Yet they would want to do so as long as there is sufficient attention to who is performing the work. There is too much evidence to suggest that the gendered division of labour will persist regardless of the adoption of new ecological values by citizens. Consequently, even in spite of some of the dangers of state control, feminists may be more inclined than greens to argue for the preservation of social rights (in addition to introduction of environmental rights) in a democratized welfare state. With years of research and analysis of the gendered division of necessary labour and its obvious imperviousness to change, feminists must be sceptical of visions that neglect to mention the conditions that make citizenship possible for a broad number of people. And they must continue to argue that, where the state does not provide desirable substitutes for necessary labour in the private sphere, this labour must be shared equally by able-bodied men and women as a matter of justice.

References

Attfield, Robin 1999. *The ethics of the global environment.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Barry, John 1999. *Rethinking green politics*. London: Sage Publications.

---

[9] Dobson (2003), who draws on feminist theories of citizenship to develop his notion of post-cosmopolitan environmental citizenship, is a welcome exception to this observation.

Benhabib, Seyla 1992. *Situating the self: Gender, community and postmodernism in contemporary ethics*. New York: Routledge.

Bittman, Michael and Wajcman, Judy, 2000. The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity. *Social Forces* 79(1), 165-89.

Bookchin, Murray 1982. *The ecology of freedom.* Paolo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books.

Bowden, Peta 1997. *Caring: Gender-sensitive ethics*. New York: Routledge.

Card, Claudia 1989. 'Gender and moral luck', in Flanagan, O. and Rorty, A. (eds.), *Identity, character and morality: Essays in moral psychology*, pp. 199-218. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Christoff, Peter 1996. 'Ecological citizens and ecologically guided democracy', Doherty, Brian and de Geus, Marius (eds.), *Democracy and green political thought*, pp. 151-69. New York: Routledge.

Curtin, Deane 1999. *Chinnagounder's challenge: The question of ecological citizenship*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Dean, Hartley, 2001. Green citizenship. *Social policy and administration* 35(5), 490-505.

D'Eaubonne, Françoise, 1994. 'The time for ecofeminism' (translated by Ruth Hottell), in Merchant, Carolyn (ed.), *Ecology: Key concepts in critical theory*, pp. 174-97. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press. (Originally published in 1974.)

Dietz, Mary 1998. 'Context is all: Feminism and theories of citizenship', in Gatens, Moira (ed.), *Feminist ethics*, pp. 301-22. Dartmouth, NH: Ashgate.

Dobson, Andrew 2003. *Citizenship and the environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobson, Andrew, 1998. *Justice and the environment: conceptions pf environmental sustainability and dimensions of social justice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobson, Andew, 1995. *Green political thought.* London: Routledge.

Dryzek, John S., 1999. Global ecological democracy. In N. Low (Ed.), *Global ethics and environment*, pp. 264-82. New York: Routledge.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Hochschild, Arlie Russell (eds.) 2003. *Global woman: Nannies, maids and sex workers in the new economy*. London: Granta.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke 1981. *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Etzioni, Amitai 1995. *The spirit of community: Rights, responsibilities and the communitarian agenda.* London: Fontana Press.

Folbre, Nancy 1993. *Who pays for the kids? Gender and the structures of constraint.* New York: Routledge.

Gaard, Greta, 1998. *Ecological politics: Ecofeminists and the Greens*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jelin, Elizabeth, 2000. 'Towards a Global Environmental Citizenship?' *Citizenship Studies* 4(1), 47-63.

Kershaw, Paul, 2005. *Carefair: Rethinking the responsibilities and rights of citizenship*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Kymlicka, Will, 2002. *Contemporary political philosophy: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Light, Andrew, 2002. Restoring ecological citizenship. In B. A. Minteer and B. Pepperman Taylor (Eds.), *Democracy and the claims of nature: Critical perspectives for a new century*, pp. 153-72. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Lipietz, Alain 1995. *Green hopes: The future of political ecology*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Lister, Ruth 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.

Littig, Beate, 2001. *Feminist perspectives on environment and society*. Harlow UK: Prentice Hall.

Luke, Timothy W. 1997. *Ecocritique: Contesting the politics of nature, economy and culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Luxton, Meg, 1987. Time for myself: Women's work and the fight for shorter hours. In H. Jon Maroney and M. Luxton (Eds.), *Feminism and political economy*, pp. 167-78. Toronto: Methuen.

MacGregor, Sherilyn 2006. *Beyond mothering earth: Ecological citizenship and the politics of care*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

MacGregor, Sherilyn, 2005. 'The Public, the private, the planet and the province: Women's quality of life activism in urban Southern Ontario.' In Melody Hessing, Rebecca Raglan and Catriona Sandilands (eds),

This elusive land: Women and the canadian environment. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

MacGregor, Sherilyn 2004. 'From care to citizenship: Calling ecofeminism back to politics', *Ethics and the environment* 9/1: 56-84.

Marshall, T.H. 1998, 'Citizenship and social class', in Shafir, Gershon (ed.), *The citizenship debates: A reader*, pp. 93-111. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Originally published in 1950.)

Mellor, Mary 1992. *Breaking the Boundaries: Towards a Feminist Green Socialism*. London: Virago Press.

Mies, Maria and Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1999. *The subsistence perspective*: *Beyond the globalized economy*. London: Zed Books.

Mouffe, Chantal 1992. 'Democratic citizenship and the political community', in Mouffe, Chantal (ed.), *Dimensions of radical democracy: Pluralism, citizenship, community,* pp. 225-39. London: Verso.

Murphy, Michele, 2006. *Sick building syndrome and the problem of uncertainty: Environmental politics, technoscience and women workers.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Newby, Howard 1996. 'Citizenship in a green world: Global commons and human stewardship', in Bulmer, M. and Rees, A. (eds.), *Citizenship today: The contemporary relevance of T.H. Marshall*, pp. 209-21. London: UCC Press.

Pateman, Carole 1988. *The sexual contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pateman, Carole 1994. 'Feminism and democracy', in Turner, Bryan and Hamilton, Peter (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical concepts*, pp. 17-31. London: Routledge.

Phillips, Anne 1993. *Democracy and difference*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Plumwood, Val 1995. 'Has democracy failed ecology? An ecofeminist perspective', *Environmental Politics* 4/4:136-69.

Putnam, Robert 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Riley, Denise 1992. 'Citizenship and the welfare state', in J. Allen, J., Braham, P. and Lewis, P. (eds.), *Political and economic forms of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rose, Nicholas, 1999. *The powers of freedom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberg, Harriet 1995. 'From trash to treasure: Housewife activists and the environmental justice movement', in Schneider, J. and Rapp, R. (eds.), *Articulating hidden histories: Exploring the influence of Eric Wolf*, pp. 190-204. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ruddick, Sara 1989. *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace*. New York: Beacon Press.

Schultz, Irmgaard 1993. 'Women and waste', *Capitalism, nature, socialism* 4/2: 51-63.

Segal, Lynne 1988. *Is the future female? Troubled thoughts on contemporary feminism*. London: Virago Press.

Smith, Mark J. 1998. *Ecologism: Towards ecological citizenship*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Tindall, D.B., Scott Davies and Céline Mauboulès (2003). Activism and conservation behaviour in an environmental movement: The contradictory effects of gender. *Society and Natural Resources* 16, 909-32.

Torgerson, Douglas 1999. *The promise of green politics: environmentalism and the public sphere*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

van Gunsteren, Herman 1998. *A theory of citizenship: Organizing plurality in contemporary democracies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Voet, Rian 1998. *Feminism and citizenship*. London: Sage.

Yuval-Davis, Nira 1997. 'Women, citizenship and difference', *Feminist Review* Autumn 57: 4-27.