



Gendering environmental geography

MAUREEN G. REED

Department of Geography, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon SK S7N 5A5 Canada (m.reed@usask.ca)

BRUCE MITCHELL

Department of Geography, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1 Canada (mitchell@uwaterloo.ca)

Despite sharing common interests in being advocates for social change, feminist and environmental geographers have yet to acknowledge interests they share in common. Environmental geographers, particularly those focused on policy and institutional analysis, have not embraced feminist theories or methodologies, while few feminist geographers have engaged issues associated with environmental policy-making. Our purpose is to initiate a dialogue about how linkages might be forged between feminist and environmental geography, particularly among Canadian environmental geographers working on institutional and policy analysis. We begin by illustrating that environmental geographers working on Canadian problems have neglected to introduce gender as an analytical category or feminist conceptual frameworks to guide their research. Second, we identify four feminist research approaches that should also be pursued in environmental geography. Third, we consider examples of how feminist perspectives might be incorporated in three themes of environmental geography: institutional and policy analysis, participatory environmental and management systems and alternative knowledge systems. Fourth, we consider two research frameworks—political ecology and environmental justice—and suggest that these may be useful starting points for integrating feminist analysis into environmental geography. Last, we summarise our suggestions for how future research of feminist and environmental geographers could benefit from a closer association.

Malgré les intérêts qu'ils partagent en tant que défenseurs du changement social, les géographes féministes et les géographes environnementaux doivent encore admettre qu'ils ont des intérêts communs. Les géographes environnementaux, en particulier ceux spécialisés dans l'analyse politique et institutionnelle, n'ont pas intégré les théories ou méthodologies féministes et peu de géographes féministes ont abordé des questions liées à l'élaboration des politiques environnementales. Notre objectif est d'initier un dialogue sur la manière dont des liens pourraient être établis entre la géographie féministe et la géographie environnementale, plus particulièrement parmi les géographes environnementaux canadiens travaillant sur l'analyse des politiques et des institutions. Dans un premier temps, nous illustrons que les géographes environnementaux attachés aux questions canadiennes ont généralement négligé de tenir compte du sexe comme catégorie analytique ou cadre conceptuel féministe pour guider leur recherches. Dans un deuxième temps, nous identifions quatre axes de la recherche féministe qui devraient également avoir une place dans la géographie environnementale. Dans une troisième partie, nous nous intéressons à des exemples démontrant comment intégrer des approches féministes à trois thèmes de la géographie environnementale: l'analyse politique et institutionnelle, les systèmes participatifs de gestion environnementale et les systèmes de connaissances différents. Quatrièmement, nous présentons deux champs de recherche—écologie politique et justice environnementale—et nous suggérons que ces derniers peuvent constituer des points de départ intéressants pour intégrer l'analyse féministe à la géographie environnementale. Enfin, nous faisons un sommaire de nos suggestions pour tirer parti

d'une collaboration plus poussée entre les géographes féministes et les géographes environnementaux dans leurs recherches futures.

Despite women's concern for the environment, they are overrepresented in polluted and/or resource-poor areas and underrepresented in environmental policy decision-making. In the past two decades, the Canadian federal government and intergovernmental organisations have attempted to address gender inequality and the environment but have seen them as separate themes, rather than identifying the important connections between them. (Dwivedi *et al.* 2001, 239–240)

Introduction

Feminist and environmental geographers share interests in research on, and advocating for, social change. As the above quote indicates, environmental quality and gender equality are interrelated concerns. Environmental management, with its applied focus on institutional arrangements for public policy-making, has drawn attention to how institutions—both customary and formal—have often been born out of, created and/or reinforced unsound environmental management practices (Mitchell 1993; Peet and Watts 1993, 1996). Similarly, some strands of feminist scholarship have examined how gender relations as social institutions have favoured some societal groups over others (Birkeland 1991, 1993; Seager 1993; Armstrong and Armstrong 1994; Eichler 1995; Moghadam 1999, 2000). Yet despite the potential for mutual learning and scholarship, feminist and environmental geographers in Canada have undertaken their research in relative isolation from each other. As Margrit Eichler (1995, 19) observes, '[I]t is only relatively recently that environmentalism as a social movement has been somewhat more sensitive to social justice concerns, and it is also relatively recent—with the important exception of ecofeminism—that environmental concerns have been seen as relevant to feminism'. This separation has restricted potential dialogue across interests, thereby resulting in the paradox identified in the opening quote.

With regard to these solitudes, our purpose is to initiate a dialogue about how research and policy prescriptions of applied environmental geograph-

ers might benefit from feminist analysis. By 'applied environmental geographers', we mean those geographers who are interested in analysing and/or participating in the creation, implementation and effects of environmental management practices, policies and programs (e.g., Mitchell 2002), rather than cultural theorists who interpret the cultural basis of human-environment relations (e.g., Braun and Castree 1998). In particular, we argue that feminist analysis can introduce new actors, perspectives and issues for environmental geographers, who, in turn, may reconsider basic assumptions and research questions. Our consideration of feminist analysis is sensitive to the distinction between gender as an analytical category and feminism as an analytical framework, and recognises that these two are not mutually exclusive elements of feminist contributions. Because of the paucity in environmental geography of research that considers gender or uses feminist frameworks, we suggest that both contributions are relevant to a project aimed at gendering environmental geography. Consequently, the introduction of feminist approaches to environmental geography has the potential to influence the conceptual frameworks, methodologies and analytical interpretations currently employed by environmental geographers.

Because of the range of potential research topics that could be used to illustrate our argument, we limit our discussion primarily to those geographers working in a Canadian context. We begin by illustrating the limited reference to gender and/or feminist frameworks by applied environmental geographers in Canada. Next, we examine feminist scholarship in geography and suggest four research approaches that could be productively pursued in applied environmental geography. We are not suggesting that all four approaches be applied in every research project. On the contrary, we consider three research themes in environmental geography—institutional and policy analysis, participatory environmental and management systems and alternative knowledge systems—and selectively illustrate how feminist approaches might enrich them. Our themes are illustrative, rather than exhaustive, but we believe that they

address important research themes for environmental geographers in Canada. Next, we illustrate how two research frameworks—political ecology and environmental justice—have been informed by feminist scholarship. These two have been applied to research in the United States and developing countries, but have not been widely adopted by environmental geographers in Canada. By illustrating how feminist approaches have been introduced in applied research elsewhere, we hope to provide some useful starting points for integrating feminist analysis into applied environmental geography in Canadian settings. Last, we summarise our suggestions for how future research of feminist and environmental geographers could benefit from a closer association.

Environmental Geography without Gender

In Canada, the stakeholders and social groups who form the research focus of many environmental geographers normally are drawn from white, male, middle/upper-class, well-educated elites. With the exception of those who write about Aboriginal First Nations (e.g., Usher 1987, 1993, 2000; Day and Quinn 1992; Barker and Soyez 1994; Kuhn and Duerden 1996; Berkes 1998, 1999; Duerden and Kuhn 1998; Berkes, Colding and Folke 2000; Peters 2003), our literature normally presents ‘managers’, ‘interest groups’, ‘industry’ and ‘analysts’ as faceless, ephemeral actors whose gendered (not to say racialised, classed) position in society is irrelevant to decision processes and outcomes. In his review of environmental geography in *The Canadian Geographer*, for example, Scott Slocombe (2000) does not identify any work by geographers related to the importance of gender in understanding social relations associated with environmental management, except for one piece of research by Reed (1997b). Similarly, while Bruce Mitchell’s second edition of *Resource and Environmental Management* (2002) has a chapter on gender, environment and development, all examples are taken from outside North America. A few exceptions stick out. Cathy Nesmith and Pamela Wright (1995) examined the roles of women in environmental organisations and resource-management agencies, linking their modest influence in policy-making to their lack of representation in conventional postsecondary resource-management professions. Joni Seager’s

book, *Earth Follies* (1993), remains the one and only attempt by a geographer to apply a feminist perspective to a broad sweep of cultural and political ‘Western’ institutions that have contributed to environmental problems in a North American context. Some of this text is applied to Canadian situations. In the main, studies of women’s environmental perspectives and grassroots environmentalism have been undertaken by scholars outside geography (e.g., West and Blumberg 1990; Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992; Mohai 1992; Merchant 1995; Sturgeon 1997) or outside Canada (e.g., Seager 1996; di Chiro 1998, 2000; Domosh and Seager 2001).

Our review leads us to conclude that applied environmental geographers continue to undertake research about environmental management in ways that usually erase any hints of the underlying social relations of gender. But this does not mean that such relations do not exist. On the contrary, feminist scholars have continually argued that gender relations are often the most strongly embedded in the culture when they are the most invisible (Smith 1987; Acker 1991; Brandth and Haugen 2000). For example, Susan Hanson, a former president of the Association of American Geographers, stated that when she was a research student in the 1970s, it was difficult to think about, let alone formally conceptualise, many aspects of gender and the built environment now taken for granted within our discipline (quoted in McDowell 1994). It appears as if applied environmental geographers, whose analyses have remained remarkably ‘gender-neutral’, are in the same situation that urban geographers were in a generation ago. An important task for applied environmental geographers is to see how their work has contributed to gender-blindness and even structural inequality, and to identify ways to engage in research practices that incorporate feminist theoretical and analytical insights, methods and even epistemologies. Four strands of feminist geographic research are presented to begin this engagement.

Four Approaches of Feminist Geography

Feminist geography is not a singular enterprise. Rather, feminist scholarship embraces several different research approaches and perspectives that coexist across and within individual research pro-

jects (WGSIGB 1997). We have divided these approaches into four categories. We recognise that by doing so, we have grossly simplified and even segregated approaches that often work in combination with others. Yet our intention is to present these approaches in a manner that is accessible to those outside the field and to identify areas of study that might have fairly direct links with those of applied environmental geographers.

The first approach is to *count women in*, in the sense of undertaking a taxonomy of gender. This approach characterised early work in feminist geography (WGSIGB 1984), as feminists argued that revealing women would help to overcome their systematic exclusion from public debate. In gender/development studies that focus on 'developing countries', early work about 'women in development' (WID) drew attention to the condition of women (Young 1988) and their lack of empowerment within dominant public institutions and conventional planning mechanisms. This approach, although conceptually simple, remains relevant for environmental geography (Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter and Edmunds 1995; WGSIGB 1997; Archibald and Crnkovich 1999), particularly to combat the assumed gender-neutrality of policy-making and management strategies.

The challenge of this approach is that it may assume and emphasise the uniform condition of women. It has also been criticised for promoting minor corrections to existing practices rather than fundamental changes to underlying social structures (e.g., Parpart 1993; Braidotti *et al.* 1995; Chowdhry 1995; Marchand and Parpart 1995). Yet feminist scholars have come to realise that collective actions to address women's material interests are not simply soft alternatives to real structural change; these actions may also challenge the power relationships inherent in the gendered, class and possibly other positions of women and men with respect to policy-making processes (Molyneux 1985; Mayoux 1995; Seitz 1995). Thus, counting women in is not simply a liberal exercise to extend power to women. Inequities in representation and political participation result in gender blindness and bias, so issues that affect women differentially are not adequately represented, conceptualised or addressed in decision-making arenas regarding policy and programs (Kettel 1996).

Conceptually, this approach challenges gender-neutral categories used by environmental geog-

raphers, such as 'workers' or 'stakeholders'. By becoming more gender-specific, we may become more relevant to improving social equity, an element of sustainability that is often expressed as a desirable outcome of environmental management practices. For example, changes in land-use allocations may result in alterations to the number and composition of the workforce that has typically relied on extractive use of environmental resources. Transition programs to support workers when economic restructuring or changes in government policy lead to job losses have frequently ignored the differential access of women and men to burdens and remedies (Leach 2000). Gender analysis of effects of restructuring could lead to policy recommendations that are sensitive to differences in how men and women might acquire necessary education, (re)training or other services to become employed in other sectors of the economy (Reed 1999b).

A second approach taken up by feminist geographers focuses on *gender relations*, reflecting a more dynamic interpretation of women's and men's lives relative to the previous approach. It considers the social relationship between women and men, assuming that women's disadvantage arises because of differences between institutions that are numerically and—more importantly—culturally male-dominated. Emphasis shifts from descriptions of women's lives to explanations of the differences and inequalities, leading to studies of social structures and institutions through which power operates. Feminist analyses of environmental management would consider how and by whom environmental management practices and policies are established, and would consider whether tools and techniques used in management favour some groups over others. It would also appropriately turn attention to the social institutions—sets of rules and codes of social relationships—that establish resource-management practices and lead to differential outcomes for women and men. Thus, analysis would not focus on women and men as individuals; rather, it would pay attention to institutions that condition the relationship(s) between them. This approach would allow for broader questions related to whether differences are equitable and how institutions alleviate or exacerbate differences (Seager 1993).

The challenge here is to combat the tendency to privilege gender over other dimensions of social

life. For example, Sandra Harding (1991) and Patricia Hill Collins (1998, 1999), among others, now challenge other feminists to consider how gender intersects with other dimensions of social marginality to identify reasons for women's inequality in every day life. Feminist geographers have also taken up these issues (e.g., Katz 1992; Nesmith and Radcliffe 1993; Rose 1993; Gibson-Graham 1996; Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter and Wangari 1996). Yet it remains a challenge (and possibly even futile) conceptually *and empirically* to adjudicate the relative importance of gender, race and other axes of difference that work together to (re)produce inequality (Katz 1992). For researchers who are not specialised in feminist geography, questions about where to begin and end analyses that are sensitive to gender, race, class and other dimensions of social inequality may invoke paralysis and/or a simple unwillingness to engage these issues. Yet environmental geographers, with their expertise in institutional analysis, are well positioned to develop frameworks that illustrate the structural basis of inequality and to identify how formal arrangements (e.g., organisations, agencies, laws and regulations) and customary institutions (e.g., local norms and practices) are gendered. They may then follow up by exploring how these institutions and practices result in (intended and unintended) social and spatial differences in outcomes of management policies and plans.

The third approach relates to how *gender identity* is diversely experienced. This approach does away with the assumption that women share a common position within society. Challenges outside and within the academy pointed out that Western, white, urban middle-class women have dominated the ranks of feminist academics, who spoke of gender relations from a position of privilege. Their experiences, however, could not be assumed to be commonly shared. Women are positioned differently by their race or ethnicity, by their social class, their age and family status, by their sexual orientation, by their abilities and so on (e.g., Nesmith and Radcliffe 1993; Rose 1993; Pratt and Hanson 1994; Gibson-Graham 1996; Rocheleau *et al.* 1996). This diversity has a direct relevance to environmental management issues. For example, a recent report to an environmental assessment panel found that Aboriginal women in the Voisey Bay region did not share the same perspectives as

men relating to potential impacts of nickel-mining. Moreover, among Aboriginal women facing common problems, important differences emerged in the remedial or compensation packages they found acceptable and in the political strategies they chose to articulate their concerns (Archibald and Crnkovich 1999).

The challenge of the diversity approach is that while one can recognise differences among women according to race, class, ethnicity and other variables, the inability to make general statements severely restricts the nature and extent of recommendations for those who seek to influence policy-making and policy-makers. Policies are usually crafted to address a single social (or environmental) issue, and it is not always obvious which intersections are the most important to tackle. Furthermore, the emphasis placed by poststructuralists on difference is contentious (Moghadam 1999, 2000). According to J. K. Gibson-Graham (1994, 219), '[T]he binary hierarchy of gender is one of the most powerful and pervasive discourses in social life'.¹ Thus, geographers and other applied researchers suggested that research approaches must make a strategic choice to acknowledge differences among women, while seeking to unite the diverse experiences of women to enter into political coalitions and alliances in order to advance a practical agenda for change (Udayagiri 1995; Kettel 1996; McDowell 1997; Moghadam 1999, 2000). Such approaches require a combination of broad generalisations, carefully constructed, with locally specific analyses, in order to be able to confront some of the political choices that drive changes to policy and practice (WGSIGB 1997; see also Status of Women Canada Policy Research Fund 2002).

The last approach we consider includes *feminist critiques of epistemologies*. Three aspects of feminist questions about how knowledge is produced are relevant to research of applied environmental geographers. The first involves the consideration of how gender influences 'what "counts" as knowledge, how knowledge is legitimised and how knowledge is reproduced and represented to others' (Cope 2002, 44). Meghan Cope (2002, 45)

¹ The feminisation of poverty is but one example (UNDP 1991; Kettel 1996). Valentine Moghadam (1999, 2000) provides others in her examination of how and why women come together in transnational feminist networks.

points out that '[W]omen's active participation in what "counts" as knowledge has historically been seen as less significant than men's through mechanisms of power-based gender relations'. Related to this concern, then, is how the gender of researchers and their subjects might affect data collection and analysis, and how the research results are circulated to various audiences. A second aspect of epistemology 'requires thinking about how socially constructed gender roles, norms and relations influence the production of knowledge' (Cope 2002, 44–45). For example, what kinds of knowledge are considered legitimate, and why (Feldman and Welsh 1995)? If knowledge is actively produced by people who are differently situated in society, then people's various experiences and social locations will influence what they count as knowledge and how they participate in producing and legitimising it (Cope 2002, 45). This requires reflection on the part of the researcher about the roles and relations of all participants in the research process and consideration of their effects on the outcomes produced. A third aspect is the extent to which women share experiences that can result in common actions or approaches of resistance to patriarchal practices and ideologies (Sachs 1996, 20). This approach is consistent with Hill Collins' (1999) call for feminists to take seriously how gender intersects with other forms of marginality to produce and legitimate knowledge production.

Perhaps the most obvious application of feminist critiques of knowledge production is to studies of traditional ecological knowledge and its application to community-based environmental management processes. We discuss these applications in a later section of this paper. However, feminist critiques of epistemologies also challenge all environmental geographers to be reflexive—that is, to reflect on their own location in the production of knowledge. Reflexivity goes beyond a simple assessment of expressing the biases and limitations in one's work. It demands an evaluation of 'our assumptions, our part in the research process and the ethical considerations we make during the research process' (Dyck 1993, 53; see also Mitchell and Draper 1982). Such critical reflection helps to sensitise the researcher to the cultural, social, political and economic contexts of the research and to acknowledge multiple possible interpretations of the findings. This reflection ensures that research-

ers continue to learn from past and present research experiences (England 1994). But perhaps more importantly, reflexivity is an open admission of the subjectivity and partiality of researchers' creation of knowledge. While few environmental geographers would claim that their work represents objective claims to knowledge, open admission of the diversity, complexity and contradictions of scientific representations is a more direct challenge. Part of the challenge lies in mediating the tension between recognising the partial perspective of the researcher(s) and making claims and recommendations that are sufficiently generalised to guide policy change. We offer no resolution to this dilemma, but suggest that this particular issue is one on which feminist and environmental geographers might engage in fruitful dialogue.

These four approaches—counting women in, illustrating gender relationships in society, explaining identity, diversity and difference, and questioning epistemologies of knowledge production—suggest many ways to bring insights from feminist scholarship into studies of environmental management and policy-making. Although we have simplified their content and presented them as separate categories, in practice, linkages among these four approaches often blur the distinctions we have made. In the next section, we illustrate how insights from these approaches might be adopted in applied environmental geography by considering three research themes: institutional and policy analysis, participatory environmental management and alternative knowledge systems. These examples are illustrative, reflecting important topics for Canadian environmental geographers. Our illustrations do not address all four approaches within each theme. Instead, we highlight how one or two applications of feminist scholarship might enhance each theme in environmental geography.

Application to Environmental Geography

Institutional and policy analysis

Public-policy analysis has been the bread and butter of applied environmental research for Canadian geographers. Feminist perspectives can inform such analysis in various ways. Counting women

in policy-making is a start. According to Melody Hessing and Michael Howlett (1997), gender is an issue for resource and environmental policy because women are affected by resource activities and decisions regarding employment, resource communities and environmental quality. Women have also been excluded from and underrepresented in formal decision-making bodies and processes, and their lack of access to public and corporate power has limited their ability to influence policy change (Kettel 1996; MacDonald 1996).

Resource-based economic activity reflects and reinforces social disparities by mediating employment opportunities, incomes and power relations in terms of class, race, ethnicity and gender. Women are also underrepresented in resource industries, occupying about 15 percent of extraction and processing jobs in fishing and forestry in Canada (Hessing and Howlett 1997). But official numbers are sparse and often obscure biases in data collection and analysis (for discussion, see Brandth and Haugen 1998; Wright 2001; Reed 2003a). Women are spatially and socially segregated in resource industries, with relatively few holding positions in decision-making capacities. For example, Miriam Wright (2001) notes that in the East Coast fishery, women are underrepresented in decision-making positions in unions, government and private companies. Similarly, Elaine Teske and Bronwen Beedle (2001) suggest that the numbers of women in senior management positions in forestry is very low, with no women in Canada who were chief executive officers at the time of their research. Maureen Reed (1999b) notes that women in forestry occupations rarely hold executive positions in the private-sector unions. Nonetheless, unions are often called upon to represent their workers in public, multistakeholder negotiations related to changes in environmental policy and land-use allocation.

Women are also underrepresented in formal, mainstream environmental organisations. 'Women rarely act as leaders of national or international environmental nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), including those based in the northern countries, in spite of the current visibility of some very well-known women environmentalists' (Kettel 1996, 177). In environmental NGOs, the picture for women is improving, but they mostly hold less prestigious positions than men (Seager 1993; Nesmith and Wright 1995; Kettel 1996; Mellor

1997). Furthermore, while women tend to be prominent in grassroots organisations, they are underrepresented in national or international environmental NGOs, which now operate much like large businesses, with masculinist attributes and hierarchical working practices that tend to marginalise women (Seager 1993; Livesey 1994; Müller 1994). Nonetheless, women within environmental NGOs are now challenging these practices. The Clayoquot Sound Peace Camp in 1993 is perhaps the most celebrated example in Canada.² Thus, women's lack of participation in policy-making parallels their marginal economic status in resource communities, their lower participation in resource extraction and their underrepresentation in organised labour movements related to resource production (Hessing and Howlett 1997).

By and large, environmental geographers have not developed these themes.³ Studies are sparse and scattered and offer no coherent picture of women's work in environmental and resource-management institutions and policy-making. Primary data are often collected and analysed without reference to gender categories. Critical analysis of secondary data (e.g., the census) and reflection on their meaning would help geographers to move away from simple counts of women's representation towards analyses of how gender relations in different places and social circumstances of various environments contribute to the more limited influence of women in environmental debates and policy-making.

2 Environmental NGOs operating on British Columbia's west coast are an exception, as a number of women there have risen to popular acclaim in the media. The highlight of the 1993 international protest of logging at Clayoquot Sound was the establishment of a feminist peace camp. The protest was billed as the largest action of civil disobedience in Canada, involving thousands of protesters and ending in the arrest of over 800. Another exception is Elizabeth May, the executive director of the Sierra Club of Canada, who has been characterised as 'one of the country's most high-profile environmentalists' (Jobb 2001, 80). As Jobb (2001, 80) comments, 'May doesn't win every campaign, but her selfless commitment to the green cause has made her an inspiration to her allies and a formidable opponent. If there is one thing this environmental crusader knows, it's how to dig and fight'. Note how the language includes metaphors of opposition that are typically gendered male. It seems that women become legitimate actors when they can be described favourably along dimensions that have been established for political action by men. These insights are ripe for students of environmental politics to consider.

3 But some of these issues have been taken up by rural geographers (e.g., Cloke and Little 1990; Little 2002).

Another omission within institutional analyses of environmental policy-making is any reference to the household. A major contribution of feminist analysis in other parts of the discipline has been to bring the private relations of the household into public analysis. In relation to environmental management, Beate Littig (2001) points out that the 'private' economy of the household depends on various government and market-related services: energy and water are provided by external delivery; foodstuffs are no longer produced and preserved by the households themselves but are purchased in a semifinished form or ready for consumption; fabrics and clothing are bought ready to wear. In Western societies, domestic labour—or household production—has typically been seen, not as a social responsibility, but rather as women's private concern.

Some scholars in Europe have suggested that increased concern for environmental practices at the household level has resulted in the feminisation of environmental responsibility, because activities in ecologically conscious households usually represent extra work for women (for discussion, see Schultz 1993; Littig 2001). Despite an increasing number of women in the paid workforce, the responsibilities in the household reveal that women continue to bear responsibility for most household work (UNDP 1995). Even in Canada, women continue to be primarily responsible for domestic jobs such as child care, food preparation and cleaning, while men are primarily responsible for maintaining and repairing the car, other technical equipment and yard work. These typical roles and relations have resulted in an increase in the unpaid workload for women, as environmental problems are moved to private life, making women more responsible for the '3 Rs' of reducing, reusing and recycling (Sandilands 1993, 1999; MacGregor 2002). This familiar story has caused feminist planner Sherilyn MacGregor to reconsider the often-touted ideal ecological society in North America, wherein typically 'a man will be free to be a self-employed environmental consultant working at home online in the morning, a community organic gardener in the afternoon and a Greenpeace activist in the evening. This leaves me wondering not only who will be minding the kids but also who will be sorting the recyclables and taking out the compost?' (MacGregor 2002, 71)

For many women, these responsibilities have brought conflict into their domestic life. In the words of Norwegian feminist Helga Moss (1994, 239):

I have to buy all the things I need, sometimes ten items a day; and usually I am in a hurry to get home to my children. Each item has a price tag and a label describing the contents...Every commodity I buy involves choices. There are many things to be considered. The price factor often wins, and, if it is food, whether it is produced in Norway [locally]. I avoid the products singled out by campaigns; otherwise, my choices are not very informed. I feel guilty about this. I should do more, know more. I buy so many things! And I am always in a hurry. The task of becoming a conscious, informed consumer seems so fast. And I suspect that there would be reasons to boycott most of the items I buy, were they critically scrutinised for their social and environmental costs.

We appreciate that consumption is not just a 'woman's issue' (Seager 1993).⁴ Neither is it possible to suggest that women form a homogenous group with the same interests, living situations or potential to come together. Rarely do women or men who work the strawberry fields of the Pacific Northwest as migrant workers have the same power and personal autonomy as those who select those fruits for their dinner table in central Ontario or Québec. Yet they are linked through decision-making processes at national *and household* levels. Thus, feminist frameworks reconceptualise 'private' matters such as home life as customary institutions with established norms and practices that are negotiated among household members and are available for analysis. Those interested in environmental policy-making have tended to omit the household as a decision-making institution with policy implications. Yet alternative conceptions of institutions help to count women in and provide opportunities for explaining how gender relationships in different places and at different scales may affect behaviours and practices associated with environmental policy-making. Consideration of the household, in particular, offers ways to link insights of feminist, urban and environ-

4 For example, Seager (1993) points out how important men are in the production, distribution, consumption and even organised protest of products of the fur industry, which are typically considered products of women's vanity and desire.

mental scholarship that are as yet unexplored by environmental geographers in Canada.

Participatory environmental management

Environmental geographers have a long tradition of undertaking research on public participation in environmental management (Sewell and Phillips 1979; Smith 1982, 1983; Sinclair and Diduck 1995, 2000; Diduck 1999). While few environmental geographers still write about a singular and undifferentiated public, fewer still consider ethnicity, class or gender as structural categories of differentiation when evaluating public involvement programs. Yet Canadian society reveals that certain social or cultural groups are notable for their traditional exclusion from or continued underrepresentation in policy processes. Women and First Nations, for example, have vested interests in environmental policy but continue to be underrepresented in existing processes (Reed 1997b; Archibald and Crnkovich 1999). There appear to be no studies that examine the roles of other ethnic groups. For example, in some forestry communities in British Columbia, significant minorities of Indo-Canadians helped shape local conditions. No systematic efforts have been made to find and include them, giving the impression that their presence is both numerically and culturally unimportant.

Instead, our research efforts tend to over-emphasise instrumental problem-solving and underemphasise the power structures that limit democratic participation (Harrill 1999). Embedded within these studies is an assumption of a pluralistic policy process in which people have relatively equal access to political resources. Even if this assumption is abandoned, it is frequently replaced by a belief that, given 'fair' and 'transparent' processes of notification, information exchange and opportunities for debate, all individuals will have an equal opportunity to express views and have them included by government officials. This assumption, however, masks the power relations that exist in a politically and economically stratified society (Roberts and Emel 1992; Harrill 1999; Reed 1999a; MacGregor 2002).

These assumptions are exemplified by contemporary research on locally based planning processes. Locally popular plans do not necessarily avert environmental problems. They may simply

impose a limited social consensus that works against the objective of gender or other dimensions of social equity (Mosse 1994; Davis and Bailey 1996). For example, Anthony Davis and Conner Bailey (1996) reveal that, at local levels, powerful forces preclude the expression of diverse voices—including women's voices—in management decisions, even at the community level. Relatively few studies have explicitly examined how those power relations and other structural barriers reduce the ability of some ethnic or social groups (including women) even to become considered 'stakeholders' in order to participate effectively (cf. Reed 1997b, forthcoming, 2003b; Ellis 2002). They continue to view collaboration within rational planning frameworks, rather than to describe how and under what conditions those with power might be willing to share it (Jamal and Getz 1995; Slocombe 1998; Schindler and Cheek 1999; for critique see Reed 1995, 1997a 1999a). Adopting research practices based on 'nonsexist research methods' (Eichler 1991) would be a starting point from which to address these biases of representation.

The need to address these issues is apparent, as contemporary community-based approaches to resource and environmental management have begun to consider and promote the establishment of a 'civic science'. Civic science involves citizens as researchers and strives to develop a contextual understanding of environmental problems and their resolution (Kruger and Shannon 2000). Efforts are placed on establishing tools for managers to inventory and monitor sociocultural meanings of places so they can incorporate socially relevant meanings into planning processes. Cultural approaches recognise aspects of lived experience, including meanings, symbols, metaphors, myths and traditions, all of which add opportunities for dialogue. Similarly, attention is given to activities/species that not only carry instrumental values, such as food or fibre production, but also have symbolic (noninstrumental) values, such as those pertaining to self-identity, spiritual renewal, a role in local myth and history, ritual significance and a sense of place and community (Martopo and Mitchell 1995; Pulido 1996; Berkes 1999; Jakes and Anderson 2000; Kellert *et al.* 2000). These forms may include accepted patterns of gender relations and family formation, work habits and local celebrations. Understanding these relations helps to understand the positions

individuals or groups hold within society and to explain the links between cultural identity and acceptable practices of resource and environmental management. Reference to feminist research on cultural identity and difference (e.g., Pulido 1996) can provide theoretical and methodological guidance to environmental geographers who may not be familiar with how to tackle these dimensions, either conceptually or within their research practices.

The move towards the creation and evaluation of a civic science begs the questions, 'Whose civics? Whose science?' Feminist scholars, including geographers, have made long-standing contributions to conceptualisations of citizenship, inclusion/exclusion and cultural identity (e.g., Young 1990; Pulido 1996; McDowell and Sharpe 1999; Blomley and Pratt 2001; Peake and Ray 2001). Reference to these contributions would not only provide environmental geographers with a basis for stronger theorisation of community processes; it would also require them to address power relations that have been buried by previous analyses (Birkeland 1991; Moore-Milroy 1996; MacGregor 2002).⁵ Furthermore, the long-standing methodological concerns of feminist scholars about whether research is or should be undertaken with/by/for community members (McDowell 1993, 1997) are important elements to consider in research about community-based approaches to environmental management. For example, in an applied study of indicators of social sustainability of communities in northern Saskatchewan, sociologists John Parkins and colleagues (Parkins, Stedman and Varghese 2001; Parkins, Varghese and Stedman 2001) examined how different methods of obtaining local social indicators to measure sustainability—from the literature, from local surveys, from workshops—altered the evaluation of social sustainability. They found differences across three rural communities, all of which were located in a small area of the boreal forest of northern Saskatchewan. Given these findings, they reflected on how the choice of research instruments affected the selection of indicators in each site and thereby produced

different knowledge and research outcomes related to sustainability. Although not specifically a feminist study, this is a practical example that illustrates how different research practices may produce different kinds of knowledge. The researchers in this case openly addressed the issue of knowledge creation and illustrated how reflexivity, as advocated by feminist scholars, can strengthen research practices in environmental management.

Furthermore, researchers of many persuasions now recognise that long-standing power imbalances in cultural and governance systems have characterised environmental resource-management efforts in the past, resulting in the marginalisation and exclusion of disempowered groups in planning processes as well as that of their interests and systems of knowledge in planning decisions (Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter and Edmunds 1995; Reed 1997b, forthcoming b; Moote *et al.* 2001). Research efforts to address these imbalances will require more than simply counting people in as individual participants in environmental management. Instead, a need exists to achieve the consistency of broad representation by ensuring that the traditions, cultural concepts and self-determination of different peoples are respected and included (McAvoy *et al.* 2000; Gray, Enzer and Kusel 2001; Moote *et al.* 2001). It also requires making links to structural barriers against broad representation and finding ways to overcome them (MacGregor 2002). These efforts require a more fundamental reframing to meet others on their own terms, to respect others' knowledge and to establish a mix of methods that can incorporate on equal terms the diverse cultural and social groups within a community (McAvoy *et al.* 2000; Raish 2000). Debates within traditional ecological knowledge and co-management illustrate possibilities and limitations.

Alternative knowledge systems

Traditional knowledge is acquired experientially from living and working in an area.⁶ Fikret Berkes has been a leading scholar in Canada in this regard, and his work has influenced geographers working with Aboriginal peoples on environmental management topics. According to Berkes (1999, 8), traditional knowledge is 'a cumulative body of

5 Feminist environmental planners have made strong contributions to understanding how differential power relations and workloads affect the ability of women to take part in participatory planning endeavours (e.g., Birkeland 1991, 1993; MacGregor 1995, 2002; Moore-Milroy 1996; Zillman 1996; Sandilands 1999).

6 Berkes (1999) discusses distinctions across terms of traditional knowledge, local knowledge and traditional ecological knowledge.

knowledge, practice and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission'. It is differentiated from knowledge based on science or formal study. Ways of bringing this knowledge into formal planning are seen as means to take advantage of local experience, but also to promote equitable consideration and incorporation of local peoples. While much focus has been placed on traditional knowledge systems of Aboriginal or indigenous groups, customary knowledge can also be considered in terms of other groups (McNabb 1998; Diduck 1999; Neis, Haedrich and Schneider 1999; Neis *et al.* 1999; Mitchell 2002).

If, as feminist geographers claim, women and men experience their environments differently, one might theorise that they bring different types of knowledge to bear on environmental management problems. Yet empirical studies in Canada that examine how gendered social relations might affect the entry of women's knowledge and men's knowledge into the management system are virtually nonexistent. For example, a recent study of traditional knowledge used in co-management exercises in the James Bay region involved interviews with Aboriginal representatives on co-management boards (Peters 2003). As representation on these boards is taken from hunting and trapping committees, none of the Aboriginal interviewees was a woman (Evelyn Peters, personal communication). Furthermore, research by other geographers working with Aboriginal peoples in Canada has not identified the gender of research participants or used feminist analytical frameworks (Usher 1987, 1993, 2000; Kuhn and Duerden 1996; Duerden and Kuhn 1998).⁷

In a book that documents years of experience working with Aboriginal people, Berkes (1999) devotes one-half page to gendered aspects of traditional knowledge; his long and distinguished career reveals only one study in which this aspect

formed an explicit focus (Ohmagari and Berkes 1997). The justification for this omission was that most of the hunting in the contemporary Cree economy is by men, so studies focused on hunting tend not to investigate women's participation (Berkes *et al.* 1994). Yet further investigation revealed that men and women are both involved in transmitting traditional knowledge and bush skills to future generations, although the specific knowledge and skills vary with the gendered division of labour within their communities (Ohmagari and Berkes 1997). From this one study, Berkes (1999, 45) makes a more general conclusion: '[E]ven where there is no clear gender specialisation in ethnoscientific knowledge, the researcher would do well to remember that differences in work and interests will likely translate into gender differences in depth of knowledge and path of transmission'. Yet to date, by and large, geographers have not taken up this observation to frame their own work (cf. Youngs 1991).

Examples of Integration: Political Ecology and Environmental Justice

We suggest that the interests and foci of two research frameworks—*political ecology* and *environmental justice*—illustrate opportunities to build connections between feminism and environmental geography. We highlight these frameworks for two reasons. First, they are both known to environmental geographers, although relatively few geographers working in Canada use them in their own work (e.g., Mackenzie 1998; Baxter, Eyles and Elliott 1999; Draper and Mitchell 2001; Mitchell 2002). Second, they are broad frameworks that offer theoretical guidance for empirical studies previously described. Both frameworks have been shaped by feminist geographers who have used research methods congenial to feminist politics. They also explicitly consider differential power relations across race, ethnicity and other variables when seeking explanations for the outcomes of environmental decisions.

Political ecology

Political ecologists seek to understand how environmental and political forces interact to effect social and environmental changes through the actions of various actors at different scales (Bryant

⁷ There is a parallel here with studies of multistakeholder processes in which local and/or interest-group participants are selected from local governments and private-sector unions. 'Local' participants in co-management boards are often selected on the basis of their involvement in hunting and trapping committees. In all cases, men tend to dominate numerically at the source (e.g., in private-sector unions); therefore, they have an increased chance of being selected for advisory or decision-making boards. This issue has recently been taken up by some management boards (see also Riding Mountain Biosphere Reserve 2002).

1992; Sullivan and Stott 2000). According to Susan Stonich (1998, 29), '[P]olitical ecologists seek integrated explanations of human-environmental interactions linked through different scales from the international/global to the local; centre on the relative power of various social actors (stakeholders) involving access to, and management of, natural resources; and link these actors within and among levels through relations of power'. Political ecology draws attention to political sources (ideologies), context-specific struggles over access and the political consequences of environmental change, with particular attention to local socioeconomic impacts and political process issues (Bryant 1992, 1997; Peet and Watts 1996). Policies are seen to emerge among competing interest groups striving to influence their formulation and substance.

During the 1990s, feminist perspectives began to infuse political ecology, contributing theoretical, methodological and epistemological insights and challenges. For example, research drew attention to how institutions are gendered and affect other social relations, with effects for environmental management (Rocheleau 1991; Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter and Wangari 1996; Engel-Di Mauro 2000). Feminist perspectives and methodologies helped to identify how gender relations influence the magnitude and extent of the human impacts of environmental management practices, to refine theories about causes and effects of environmental degradation, to identify the conditions under which gender relations become significant in explaining environmental problems and to draw attention to how knowledge had previously been framed and created.

Efforts were made by feminist geographers to introduce mixed-method, multiscaled analyses, with emphasis placed on participatory research methods (Rocheleau 1996; Vainio-Mattila 2000). For example, Dianne Rocheleau, Barbara Thomas-Slayter and Esther Wangari (1996) introduced a multimethod approach to understanding agroforestry practices in the Dominican Republic. Their study of the relations of power embedded in this rural reforestation project moved from a broad regional and national context to a case-study analysis based on fieldwork. Data collection was undertaken using attendance at formal meetings, group interviews, focus groups, household histories, labour calendars, participatory mapping, personal life histories and a formal random sur-

vey. According to Rocheleau and colleagues (1996, 232), '[O]ur research methodology mixed recent innovations in feminist ethnography (Katz 1993; Katz and Monk 1993; Behar 1993; Moore 1988) and participatory sketch mapping with the strength of quantitative and formal surveys'. Innovations in method were deliberately adopted to reflect a heightened sensitivity to reflexivity. In the authors' words, '[T]hese methods reflect a turn toward imagery and narrative in feminist field research and theory... to project the multiple perspectives of situated subjects and to engage in an explicitly social project of scientific research on 'nature' (Rocheleau *et al.* 1996, 248, footnote 10). Like other work in feminist political ecology, this research challenged the location of scientific knowledge by highlighting knowledge held by women (e.g., Shiva 1989; Rocheleau 1991; Rocheleau *et al.* 1995; Mosse 1993; Feldman and Welsh 1995), and by using participatory methods to make this knowledge visible.

Environmental justice

Environmental-justice research also addresses distributive questions. An explicit focus has been on the effect of power imbalances on decisions about the location of environmental hazards and noxious facilities, or the spatial distribution of environmental quality. The literature has emphasised how racialised and ethnic identities and the institutions of racism help to explain spatial differences (Bryant and Mohai 1992; Bullard 1994a, b; Bowen *et al.* 1995; Pulido 2000). As a springboard to political activism, policy-making and scholarship, environmental justice has received far longer and greater attention in the United States than in Canada (e.g., Bullard 1994a, b; Pulido 1996, 2000; Environmental Protection Agency 1997). In Canada, most related research has been designed to conceptually define and empirically measure 'equity' in relation to allocation of noxious facilities and processes for decision-making (Baxter, Eyles and Elliott 1999).

Contributions by feminist geographers challenge both feminist and environmental preconceptions. In the first case, writers and activists challenge the primacy of gender as a social category. They point out that the gender identity of those affected by injustices may not be as important as their racialised or class positioning in

shaping their everyday experiences (di Chiro 1995; Pulido 1996). In the second case, justice scholars and activists challenge the separation of nature and culture, particularly the bias against anthropocentrism in much of the environmental literature focused on wilderness/species protection (di Chiro 1995). They argue that people should be able to gain and maintain access to environmental resources. The drive to protect environments through sequestration of lands illustrates the privilege and economic security of those who attempt to do so.

Beyond demanding a reconceptualisation of environmental problems to be sensitive to the differential social locations from which demands for protection are made, environmental-justice advocates also challenge how knowledge about environmental problems is created and legitimated. For example, environmental-justice writers and activists argue that because of their biological roles in childbearing and their socialised roles as mothers, women often have experiential knowledge of the effects of toxins in their bodies and their immediate environments (Seager 1993, 1996; di Chiro 1998). Yet their efforts to speak out about these effects have been relegated to the diminished position of 'hysterical housewives' (Seager 1996; di Chiro 2000). Giovanna di Chiro (2000) illustrates how women have attempted to reclaim this label in an effort to gain political recognition for their situation. Activists in the United States have also organised alternative forms of protest. For example, an alternative form of tourism, 'the toxic tour', has been created along the lines of ecotourism. Like ecotourism, toxic tours emphasise the links between the environment and local cultures. But the emphasis on taking visitors to not-so-healthy sites and landscapes is intended to raise explicit questions about the compatibility of economic practices and the health of some groups of humans and their immediate environments. The events raise issues of race, poverty and equality with politicians, government workers and regular tourists. Run primarily by women activists, toxic tours blend scientific data with personal experience and political perspective and explicitly challenge tourists to consider personal experience and situation as legitimate ways of knowing about environmental contamination (di Chiro 2000).

In Canada, very little research has focused on racialised or gendered dimensions of justice, with

the exception of work on Aboriginal peoples (e.g., Usher 1987, 1991; Day and Quinn 1992; Barker and Soye 1994; Wolfe-Keddie 1995; Berkes 1998, 1999; Berkes, Colding and Folke 2000; see Peters 2001).⁸ These examples illustrate work on Aboriginal peoples but might not all be considered applications of environmental justice frameworks. Even the passing empirical observations about Canadian society that poor people tend to live in poorer-quality environments and that women dominate the ranks of the poor (Hessing and Howlett 1997; Dwivedi *et al.* 2001) have been made by scholars outside of geography.⁹ Attention has been given to the equity or appropriateness of senior governments downloading responsibilities for environmental protection to lower levels of government without ensuring that necessary institutional and human capacity is in place. Indeed, the finding that such capacity frequently does not exist is a central factor contributing to incidents such as contamination of water supplies in Walkerton, Ontario during 2000 and North Battleford, Saskatchewan in 2001 (Kreutzwiser 1998; de Loë *et al.* 2001; Draper and Mitchell 2001; Mitchell 2001; Perkel 2002). As those writing in political ecology and environmental justice point out, women are often at the front lines of contamination. Yet how gender and community intersect in addressing such crises has not been systematically explored in a Canadian context.

In sum, the research frameworks of political ecology and environmental justice offer much scope for incorporating feminist geography into the analytical frameworks, methodologies, analyses and policy recommendations of environmental geographers. These frameworks draw attention to how power relations intersect to affect real change in the lives of women and men. They address pertinent questions about 'whose income, health status or well-being is being talked about—in class, gender, regional and racial terms, to note just a few of the most relevant distinctions... [They consider] both the aggregate distribution of

8 We include Berkes in this list because of his enormous influence in the field of research, although he is not, by training at least, a geographer.

9 For example, Hessing and Howlett (1997) note that in Canada, one-third of women under the age of 65, almost one-half of senior women and 60 percent of female single parents live in conditions of poverty, in which their living and working environments are substandard and inadequate.

gains and losses and the particular incidence of those gains and losses' (Schrecker 1997, 113; emphasis in original). Feminist geographers can assist in answering these questions because they frequently engage in multiscale analyses that establish links among macroscale processes associated with economic practices and public policy-making affecting environment and development, mesoscale processes in the workplace and household and microscale processes in which individuals' actions, behaviours and meanings are revealed and their implications are assessed (McDowell 1993). Finally, feminist analyses insist on questioning the situation of the researcher and the researched to determine what counts as knowledge and on whose behalf (England 1994; Warrington 1997).

Summary and Conclusions

Through this review, we have suggested multiple ways in which feminist geography can infuse and improve contemporary research on and practices of environmental management. We acknowledge that we have selected from several forms of feminist scholarship, thereby omitting much work that is being done by feminists in other contexts. We recognise that feminist environmental geographers with an applied orientation have also focused on issues of global population and antimilitarism (e.g., Seager 1993, 1999), political ecology (e.g., Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter and Wangari 1996), animal rights, practices and protection policies (Elder, Wolch and Semel 1998; Wolch, Brownlow and Lassiter 2000) and environmental justice (di Chiro 1995, 1998, 2000). We have omitted these research strands because they have not had strong traditions in applied environmental geography in Canada. However, we believe these topics are of significance and that these efforts suggest new opportunities for research agendas here in Canada.

So far, environmental geography in Canada lacks attention to women and other social groups as actors and to the ways that gender is built into political, economic, social and cultural processes and practices. These processes and practices affect the ways in which environmental resources are interpreted, 'managed', protected, allocated, developed, used, rehabilitated, remediated, restored, monitored and evaluated. The four research approaches of feminist geographers

described here—counting women in, illustrating gender relations, explaining gender identity, diversity and difference and questioning epistemologies—can all contribute to introducing feminist analysis to environmental policy-making. It is important to document and thereby make visible women's lives, to illustrate how both women and men are embedded within broader social institutions and sets of relations and to establish a strategic 'balance' between core characteristics of gender, with more nuanced understandings of the differences within and across groups of women and men.

By focusing on institutions, both customary and formal, environmental geographers (and others) can consider the impacts of environmental management on women's lives, illuminating differential issues and remedies accorded to different groups of women and men. We can also draw attention to how and with whose participation decisions about environmental management are made, focusing on which interests have the power to be heard and addressed during planning and implementation processes. Furthermore, we can scrutinise values and assumptions with respect to the forms of knowledge admitted into planning and implementation of environmental management, and reflect on our own roles as researchers in co-creating scientific knowledge. Our consideration of feminist perspectives refers both to the application of gender as an analytical category and to feminist conceptual frameworks. We do not suggest that all approaches to feminist geography be incorporated into every project in environmental management. Rather, our approach has been to select research themes in environmental geography and to illustrate, in a selective way, how they might be informed by one or more feminist approaches. The adoption of feminist approaches includes the consideration of gender as an analytical category, as well as the adoption of feminist conceptual frameworks to guide the selection of research questions and methods and to question dominant epistemologies.

In doing so, we have emphasised the need and opportunity for applied environmental geographers to incorporate feminist perspectives into their research agendas. This emphasis is borne out of our own experiences as environmental geographers who have benefited from feminist perspectives. However, there is likely an equally fruitful

exchange for feminist geographers, who might consider beginning conversations with environmental geographers. As noted at the beginning, few feminist geographers have turned their theoretical insights and analytical skills to environmental management policies and practices (Seager 1993, 1996; Nesmith and Wright 1995; Reed 1997b, 1999b, 2000, 2001, forthcoming). In part, this is due to a focus instead on conditions and policy applications associated with the built environment and more broadly with social programs such as immigration, housing and welfare provision. A frequently cited summary of feminist geography in 1984 (WGSGIBG 1984) makes no mention of environment or nature. In its updated version in 1997 (WGSGIBG 1997), nature and environment were considered under rubrics more closely associated with cultural theory. There was nothing about environmental management, reflecting, in part, a turn by 'critical' geographers more broadly towards cultural theory and a lesser interest on the part of feminist geographers more specifically in concerns of environment and public policy (Martin 2001).¹⁰ For some, the cultural theoretical work is more philosophically sophisticated. Yet one of the concerns of contemporary feminist theorising is that it is increasingly difficult for women who are not full-time theorists to integrate it into their lives and political projects.¹¹ Thus, if theory is the sole contribution of feminist geographers, then the potential for geographers to contribute to changing social relations among groups is limited.

In our view, policy-related research in environmental management must acknowledge differences among women while seeking to unite their

diverse experiences in order to advance a practical agenda for change (Udayagiri 1995; Moghadam 2000). We find support for this position in the activism of women themselves. Moghadam's (2000, 60, 82) review of women's transnational feminist networks suggests that '[F]eminist networks are based on a sense of *collective* identity, *shared* meanings and *common* goals on the part of members... These networks acknowledge the diversity of women's experiences and the salience of class, ethnic and other differences, but do not appear to give "*difference*" the theoretical status or absolute character that postmodernists do' (emphasis added). Indeed, both political-ecology and environmental-justice frameworks offer theoretical purchase and highlight common challenges across axes of difference to forward an agenda for social justice. They also suggest new methods and research approaches for environmental geographers. These are not simple additions to current practices. They require fundamental changes to the ways in which applied environmental geographers consider, study and understand their research problems and subjects. Ultimately, changes need to be developed over time, in individual and collective research projects as well as in long-term research programs of individuals and granting agencies.

In this article, we have not tried to provide a specific agenda for future research; rather, we have attempted to open the door for dialogue. Our sketch has not captured the full richness of either environmental or feminist geography. Nor do we suppose that there is only one way to bring insights of each subfield together. We differ in our own emphases, and would anticipate that environmental geographers will reflect a broad range of informed opinion, analysis and theory. Indeed, feminist scholarship now, more than ever, admits *and embraces* diversity in terms of *how to do feminist research* (Reinharz 1992; Moss *et al.* 1993; WGSGIBG 1997; Moss 2002). We also recognise that not all environmental geographers will adopt feminist perspectives. The fact that virtually no environmental geographers do so, however, is a serious gap in our collective scholarship. We claim, therefore, that unless geographers are explicit about the gendered dimensions of environmental management, we will miss a key opportunity to contribute to contemporary social debates and to improve prospects for achieving sustainability.

10 Feminist geographers who have worked on environmental issues have been more closely associated with cultural theorists who examine the politics and gendering of 'nature' and 'wilderness' (Fitzsimmons 1989; Rose 1993; Pulido 1996; Katz 1998). Others are development geographers or political ecologists working outside Canada. Those scholars who examine the gendering of nature would not likely consider themselves to be *environmental* geographers (with the possible exception of Joni Seager).

11 This concern has been raised in relation, not just to feminist scholarship, but indeed to geography at large. The turn to cultural theory has resulted in a movement away from policy analysis in the last two decades (Castree 2000; Martin 2001). Indeed, a close read of progress in environmental geography also demonstrates a gulf between those who write cultural critiques of environmental issues and those who write about policy formulation and management practices (Castree 2002).

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the translation assistance of Celine Bonnel, Olivier Garrigou and Pierrot Richard and the efforts of three anonymous reviewers, who helped us sharpen our focus and arguments.

References

- ACKER, J. 1991 'Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations' in *The Social Construction of Gender*, ed J. Lorber and S.A. Farrell (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage) 162–179
- ARCHIBALD, L. and CRNKOVICH, M. 1999 *If Gender Mattered: A Case Study of Inuit Women, Land Claims and the Voisey's Bay Nickel Project*. Report to the Status of Women Canada's Policy Research Fund (Ottawa: Status of Women Canada)
- ARMSTRONG, P. and ARMSTRONG, H. 1994 *The Double Ghetto* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart)
- BARKER, M.L. and SOYEZ, D. 1994 'Think locally, act globally? The transnationalization of Canadian resource-use conflicts' *Environment* 36, 12–10, 32–36
- BAXTER, J., EYLES, J. and ELLIOTT, S.J. 1999 'Conflict between facility siting principles: A case study of the roles of trust, equity and community participation' *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 42, 501–525
- BEHAR, R. 1993 *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story* (Boston: South End Press)
- BERKES, F. 1998 'The nature of traditional ecological knowledge and the Canada-wide experience' *Terra Borealis* 1, 1–3
- . 1999 *Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management* (Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis)
- BERKES, F., COLDING, J. and FOLKE, C. 2000 'Rediscovery of traditional ecological knowledge as adaptive management' *Ecological Applications* 10, 1251–1262
- BERKES, F., GEORGE, P.J., PRESTON, R.J., HUGHES, A., TURNER, J. and CUMMINS, B.D. 1994 'Wildlife harvesting and sustainable regional native economy in the Hudson and James Bay Lowland, Ontario' *Arctic* 47, 350–360
- BIRKELAND, J. 1991 'An ecofeminist critique of mainstream planning' *The Trumpeter, Journal of Ecosophy* 9, 72–84
- . 1993. 'Towards a new system of environmental governance' *The Environmentalist* 13, 19–32
- BLOMLEY, N. and PRATT, G. 2001 'Canada and the political geographies of rights' *The Canadian Geographer* 45, 151–166
- BOWEN W., SALLING, M., HAYNES, K. and CYRAN, E. 1995 'Toward environmental justice: spatial equity in Ohio and Cleveland' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85, 641–663
- BRAIDOTTI, R., CHARKIEWICZ, E., HÄUSLER, S. and WIERGINGA, S. 1995 *Women, the Environment and Sustainable Development: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis* (London: Zed Books)
- BRANDTH, B. and HAUGEN, M. 1998 'Breaking into a masculine discourse: women and farm forestry' *Sociologia Ruralis* 38, 427–442
- . 2000 'From lumberjack to business manager: masculinity in the Norwegian forestry press' *Journal of Rural Studies* 16, 343–355
- BRAUN, B. and CASTREE, N., eds. 1998 *Remaking Nature* (New York: Routledge)
- BRYANT, R.L. 1992 'Political ecology: an emerging research agenda in Third World studies' *Political Geography* 11, 12–36
- . 1997 *The Political Ecology of Forestry in Burma, 1824–1994* (London: C. Hurst & Company)
- BRYANT, B. and MOHAI, P., eds. 1992 *Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards* (Boulder: Westview Press)
- BULLARD, R. 1994a *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class and Environmental Quality* 2d edition (Boulder: Westview Press)
- . 1994b ed. *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books)
- CASTREE, N. 2000 'Professionalism, activism, and the university: whither "critical geography"?' *Environment and Planning A* 32, 955–970
- . 2002 'Environmental issues: from policy to political economy' *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 357–366
- CHOWDHRY, G. 1995 'Engendering development? Women in development (WID) in international development regimes' in *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed M.H. Marchand and J.L. Parpart (New York: Routledge) 26–41
- CLOKE, P. and LITTLE, J. 1990 *The Rural State? Limits to Planning in Rural Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- COLLINS, P.H. 1998 *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)
- . 1999. 'Moving beyond gender: intersectionality and scientific knowledge' in *Revisioning Gender*, ed M.M. Ferree, J. Lorber and B.B. Hess (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage) 261–284
- COPE, M. 2002 'Feminist epistemology in geography' in *Feminist Geography in Practice: Research and Methods*, ed P. Moss (Malden, MA: Blackwell) 43–55
- DAVIS, A. and BAILEY, C. 1996 'Common in custom, uncommon in advantage: Common property, local elites and alternative approaches to fisheries management' *Society and Natural Resources* 9, 251–265
- DAY, J.C. and QUINN, F. 1992 *Water Diversion and Export: Learning from Canadian Experience* Department of Geography Publication Series no. 36 (Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo)
- DE LOË, R., MORARU, L., KREUTZWISER, R., SCHAEFER, K. and MILLS, B. 2001 'Demand-side management of water in Ontario municipalities: status, progress, and opportunities' *Journal of the American Waterworks Association* 37, 57–72
- DICHIRO, G. 1995 'Nature as community: the convergence of environment and social justice' in *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, ed W. Cronon (New York: W.W. Norton & Company) 288–320
- . 1998 'Environmental justice from the grassroots: Reflections on history, gender and expertise' in *The Struggle For Ecological Democracy: Environmental Justice Movements in The United States*, ed D. Faber, (New York: Guilford) 104–136
- . 2000 'Bearing witness or taking action? Toxic tourism and environmental justice' in *Reclaiming the Environmental Debate: The Politics of Health in a Toxic Culture*, ed R. Hofichter (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press) 275–299
- DIDUCK, A. 1999 'Critical education in resource and environmental management: learning and empowerment for a sustainable future' *Journal of Environmental Management* 57, 85–97
- DOMOSH, M. and SEAGER, J. 2001 *Putting Women in Place* (New York: Guilford Press)
- DRAPER, D. and MITCHELL, B. 2001 'Environmental justice considerations in Canada' *The Canadian Geographer* 45, 93–98
- DUERDEN, F. and KUHN, R.G. 1998 'Scale, context, and application of traditional knowledge of the Canadian North' *Polar Record* 34, 31–38
- DWIVEDI, O.P. KYBA, P., STOETT, P.J. and TIESSEN, R. 2001 *Sustainable Development and Canada: National and International Perspectives* (Toronto: Broadview Press)
- DYCK, I. 1993 'Ethnography: a feminist method' *The Canadian Geographer* 37, 52–57

- EICHLER, M. 1991 *Nonsexist Research Methods: A Practical Guide* Rev. edition. (Boston: Allen and Unwin)
- . 1995 'Designing an eco-city in North America' in *Change of Plans: Towards a Non-Sexist Sustainable City*, ed M. Eichler (Toronto: Garamond Press) 1–23
- ELDER, G., WOLCH, J. and EMEL, J. 1998. 'Le pratique sauvage: Race, place and the human-animal divide' in *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*, ed J. Wolch and J. Emel (New York: Verso) 72–90
- ELLIOTT, J. 1999 *An Introduction to Sustainable Development* (London: Routledge)
- ELLIS, J.L. 2002 'Empowerment through shared decision-making: a case study of the Okanagan Shuswap land and resource-planning process' Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Waterloo
- ENGEL-DI MAURO, S. 2000 'A gender-sensitive methodology for research on soil management: a case study from Hungary' *Journal of Agriculture and Environment for International Development* 93, 157–162
- ENGLAND, K. 1994. 'Getting personal: reflexivity, positionality and feminist research' *The Professional Geographer* 46, 80–89
- ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 1997 About Environmental Justice <http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/ej/aboutej.htm> (last accessed 18 July 2003)
- FELDMAN, S. and WELSH, R. 1995 'Feminist knowledge claims, local knowledge and gender divisions of agricultural labor: constructing a successor science' *Rural Sociology* 60, 23–43
- FITZSIMMONS, M. 1989 'The matter of nature' *Antipode* 21, 106–120
- FREUDENBERG, N. and STEINSAPIR, C. 1992 'Not in our backyards: the grass-roots environmental movement' in *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970–1990*, ed R. Dunlap and A. Mertig (New York: Taylor & Francis Inc.) 27–37
- GIBSON-GRAHAM, J.-K. 1994 'Stuffed if I know! Reflections on post-modern feminist social research' *Gender, Place and Culture* 1, 205–224
- . 1996 *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- GRAY, G. ENZER, M.J. and KUSEL, J. eds. 2001 *Understanding Community-Based Forest Ecosystem Management* (New York: Food Products Press, The Haworth Press, Inc)
- HARDING, S. 1991 *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)
- HARRILL, R. 1999. 'Political ecology and planning theory' *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19, 67–75
- HESSING, M. and HOWLETT, M. 1997 *Canadian Natural Resource and Environmental Policy: Political Economy and Public Policy* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press)
- JAKES, P. and ANDERSON, D. 2000 'Introduction: diverse perspectives on community' *Society and Natural Resources* 13, 395–397
- JAMAL, T.B. and GETZ, D. 1995 'Collaboration theory and community tourism planning' *Annals of Tourism Research* 22, 186–204
- JOBB, D. 2001 'Earth-shaker' *Elm Street Holiday* 79–89
- KATZ, C. 1992 'All the world is staged: intellectuals and the projects of ethnography' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10, 495–510
- . 1993 'Growing girls/closing circles: limits on the spaces of knowing in rural Sudan and U.S. cities' in *Full Circles: Geographies of Women over the Life Course*, ed C. Katz and J. Monk (London: Routledge) 88–106
- . 1998 'Whose nature, whose culture? Private productions of space and the "preservation" of nature' in *Remaking Nature*, ed B. Braun and N. Castree (London and New York: Routledge) 46–63
- KATZ, C. and MONK, J., eds. 1993 *Full Circles: Geographies of Women Over the Life Course* (London: Routledge)
- KELLERT, S.R., MEHTA, J.N., EBBIN, S.A. and LICHTENFIELD, L.L. 2000 'Community natural resource management: promise, rhetoric and reality' *Society and Natural Resources* 13, 705–715
- KETTEL, B. 1996 'Putting women and the environment first: poverty alleviation and sustainable development' in *Achieving Sustainable Development*, ed A. Dale and J.B. Robinson (Vancouver: UBC Press) 160–181
- KREUTZWISER, R. 1998 'Water resources management: the changing landscape in Ontario' in *Coping with the World Around Us: Changing Approaches to Land Use, Resources and Environment*, Department of Geography Publication Series no. 44, ed R.D. Needham (Waterloo, ON: Department of Geography, University of Waterloo) 135–148
- KRUGER, L.E. and SHANNON, M.A. 2000 'Getting to know ourselves and our places through participation in civic social assessment' *Society and Natural Resources* 13, 461–478
- KUHN, R.G. and DUERDEN, F. 1996. 'A review of traditional environmental knowledge: an interdisciplinary Canadian perspective' *Culture* 16, 71–84
- LEACH, B. 2000 'Transforming rural livelihoods: gender, work and restructuring in three Ontario communities' in *Restructuring Caring Labour: Discourse, State Practice and Everyday Life*, ed S. Neysmith (Toronto: Oxford University Press) 209–255
- LITTEG, B. 2001 *Feminist Perspectives on Environment and Society* (Essex: Pearson)
- LITTLE, J. 2002 *Gender and Rural Geography: Identity, Sexuality and Power in the Countryside* (Essex: Pearson Educational)
- LIVSEY, B. 1994 'The politics of Greenpeace' *Canadian Dimension* 28, 7–12
- MACDONALD, M. 1996 'Promises, promises: Canadian campaign rhetoric, Agenda 21 and the status of women' in *Achieving Sustainable Development*, ed A. Dale and J.B. Robinson (Vancouver: UBC Press) 182–203
- MACGREGOR, S. 1995 'Deconstructing the man-made city: feminist critiques of planning thought and action' in *Change of Plans: Towards a Non-sexist Sustainable City*, ed M. Eichler (Toronto: Garamond Press) 25–50
- . 2002 'Bright new vision or same old story? Looking for gender justice in the eco-city' in *Urban Affairs: Back on the Policy Agenda*, ed C. Andrew, K.A. Graham and S.B. Phillips (Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press) 71–92.
- MACKENZIE, F. 1998 *Land, Ecology and Resistance in Kenya, 1880–1952* International African Library 19 (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press for the International African Institute; Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann)
- MARCHAND, M.H. and PARPART, J.L. 1995 'Part I, exploding the canon: an introduction/conclusion' in *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed M.H. Marchand and J.L. Parpart (New York: Routledge) 1–23
- MARTIN, R. 2001 'Geography and public policy: the case of the missing agenda' *Progress in Human Geography* 25, 189–210
- MARTOPO, S. and MITCHELL, B., eds. 1995 *Bali: Balancing Environment, Economy and Culture* Department of Geography Publication Series no. 44 (Waterloo, ON: Department of Geography, University of Waterloo)
- MAYOUC, L. 1995 Beyond naiveté: women, gender inequality and participatory development' *Development and Change* 26, 235–258
- MCAVOY, L., WINTER, P., LOUTLEY, C.W., MCDONALD, D. and CHAVEZ, D.J. 2000 'Conducting research with communities of color' *Society and Natural Resources*, 13, 479–488

- MCDOWELL, L. 1993 'Space, place and gender relations. Part 2: identity, difference, feminist geometries and geographies' *Progress in Human Geography* 17, 305–318
- . 1994 'Making a difference: geography, feminism and everyday life—an interview with Susan Hanson' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 18, 19–32
- . 1997 'Women/gender/feminisms: doing feminist geography' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 97, 381–400
- MCDOWELL, L. and SHARPE, J.P. 1999 *A Feminist Glossary of Human Geography* (New York: Arnold)
- MCNABB, P. 1998 'There must be a catch: participatory GIS in a Newfoundland fishing community' Paper presented at the NCGIA specialist meeting: 'Empowerment, Marginalization and Public Participation GIS', 15–17 October (last accessed 18 July 2003)
- MELLOR, M. 1997 *Feminism and Ecology* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with Blackwell)
- MERCHANT, C. 1995 *Earthcare: Women and the Environment* (New York: Routledge)
- MITCHELL, B. 1993 'Institutional innovations in resource management' in *Advances In Resource Management: Tributes to W. R. Derrick Sewell*, ed H.D. Foster (London: Belhaven Press) 1–17
- . 2001 'Environmental justice in Canada: issues, responses, approaches and actions' *Zeitschrift für Kanada-Studien* 21, 24–43
- . 2002 *Resource and Environmental Management* 2d edition (Harlow, Essex: Pearson)
- MITCHELL, B. and DRAPER, D. 1982 *Relevance and Ethics in Geography* (London: Longman)
- MOGHADAM, V.M. 1999 'Gender and the global economy' in *Revisioning Gender*, ed M.M. Ferree, J. Lorber and B.B. Hess (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage) 128–160
- . 2000 'Transnational feminist networks: collective action in an era of globalization' *International Sociology* 15, 57–85
- MOHAI, P. 1992 'Men, women and the environment: an examination of the gender gap in environmental concern and activism' *Society and Natural Resources* 5, 1–19
- MOLYNEUX, M. 1985 'Mobilization without emancipation? Women's interests, the state and revolution in Nicaragua' *Feminist Studies* 11, 227–254
- MOORE, H. 1988 *Feminism and Anthropology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)
- MOORE-MILROY, B. 1996. 'Women and work in a Canadian community' in *City Lives and City Forms: Critical Research and Canadian Urbanism*, ed J. Caufield and L. Peake (Toronto: University of Toronto Press) 215–238
- MOOTE, M., BROWN, B., KINGLEY, E., LEE, S., VOTH, D. and WALKER, G. 2001 'Process: redefining relationships' in *Understanding Community-Based Forest Ecosystem Management*, ed G. Gray, M.J. Enzer and J. Kusel (New York: Food Products Press, The Haworth Press, Inc.) 99–116
- MOSS, H. 1994 'Consumption and fertility' in *Feminist Perspectives on Sustainable Development*, ed W. Harcourt (London: Zed Books) 238–246.
- MOSS, P., ed. 2002 *Feminist Geography in Practice: Research and Methods* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- MOSS, P., EYLES, J., DYCK, I. and DAMARIS, R. 1993 'Focus: feminism as method' *The Canadian Geographer* 37, 48–61
- MOSSE, D. 1994 'Authority, gender and knowledge: Theoretical reflections on the practice of participatory rural appraisal' *Development and Change* 25, 497–526
- MOSSE, J.C. 1993 *Half the World, Half a Chance: An Introduction to Gender and Development* (Oxford: Oxfam)
- MÜLLER, S. 1994 'Report on the professional and family situation of women working in the environmental field' in *Conference Proceedings of the 2nd European Feminist Research Conference, Feminist Perspectives on Technology, Work and Ecology*, Graz, Austria, 5–9 July 1994, ed T. Eberhart and C. Wächter (Graz: IFF Interdisciplinary Research Center for Technology, Work and Culture) 288
- NEIS, B., HAEDRICH, R.L. and SCHNEIDER, D.C. 1999 'An interdisciplinary method for collecting and integrating fishers' ecological knowledge into resource management' in *Fishing Places, Fishing People*, ed R. Ommer and D. Newell (Toronto: University of Toronto Press) 217–238
- NEIS, B., SCHNEIDER, D.C., FELT, L., HAEDRICH, R.L., FISCHER, J. and HUTCHINGS, J.A. 1999 'Fisheries assessment: what can be learned from interviewing resource users?' *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 56, 1949–1963
- NESMITH, C. and RADCLIFFE, S. 1993 '(Re)mapping mother earth: a geographical perspective on environmental feminisms' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 11, 379–394
- NESMITH, C. and WRIGHT, P. 1995. 'Gender, resources and environmental management' in *Resource Management and Development: Addressing Conflict and Uncertainty*, ed B. Mitchell, 2d edition (Toronto: Oxford University Press) 80–98
- OHMAGARI, K. and BERKES, F. 1997 'Transmission of indigenous knowledge and bush skills among the Western James Bay Cree women of subarctic Canada' *Human Ecology* 25, 197–222
- PARKINS, J.R., STEDMAN, R.C. and VARGHESE, J. 2001 'Moving towards local-level indicators of sustainability in forest-based communities: a mixed-method approach' *Social Indicators Research* 56, 43–73
- PARKINS, J.R., VARGHESE, J. and STEDMAN R.C. 2001 *Locally Defined Indicators of Community Sustainability in the Prince Albert Model Forest Canadian Forest Service Northern Forestry Centre Information Report NOR-X-379* (Edmonton: Canadian Forest Service)
- PARPART, J.L. 1993 'Who is the "other"? A postmodern feminist critique of women and development theory and practice' *Development and Change* 24, 439–464
- PEAKE, L., and RAY, B. 2001 'Racializing the Canadian landscape: whiteness, uneven geographies and social justice' *The Canadian Geographer* 45, 180–196
- PEET, R., and WATTS, M. 1993 'Introduction: development theory and environment in an age of market triumphalism'. *Economic Geography* 69, 227–253
- . 1996 *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements* (New York: Routledge)
- PERKEL, C.N. 2002 *Well of Lies: The Walkerton Water Tragedy* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart)
- PETERS, E. 2001 'Geographies of Aboriginal peoples in Canada' *The Canadian Geographer* 45, 138–144
- . 2003 'Views of traditional ecological knowledge in co-management bodies in Nunavik, Quebec' *Polar Record* 39, 1–12
- PRATT, G. and HANSON, S. 1994 'Geography and the construction of difference' *Gender, Place and Culture* 1, 5–29
- PULIDO, L. 1996 *Environmentalism and Economic Justice: Two Chicano Struggles in the Southwest* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press)
- . 2000 'Rethinking environmental racism: white privilege and urban development in southern California' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, 12–40
- RAISH, C. 2000 'Environmentalism, the Forest Service, and the Hispanic communities of Northern New Mexico' *Society and Natural Resources* 13, 489–508

- REED, M.G. 1995 'Co-operative management of environmental resources: an application from Northern Ontario, Canada' *Economic Geography* 71, 132–149
- . 1997a 'The provision of environmental goods and services by local non-governmental organizations: an illustration from the Squamish Forest District, Canada' *Journal of Rural Studies* 13, 177–196
- . 1997b 'Seeing trees: engendering environmental and land-use planning' *The Canadian Geographer* 14, 398–414
- . 1999a 'Collaborative tourism planning as adaptive experiments in emergent tourism settings' *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 7, 331–355
- . 1999b "'Jobs talk": retreating from the social sustainability of forestry communities' *Journal of Forestry* 75, 755–763
- . 2000 'Taking stands: a feminist perspective on "other" women's activism in forestry communities of Northern Vancouver Island' *Gender, Place and Culture* 7, 363–387
- . 2001 'Endangered forests and endangered communities' *Proceedings of The Nature and Culture of Forests: Implications of Diversity for the Sustainability, Trade and Certification* (Vancouver: Institute for European Studies, University of British Columbia) 113–125
- . 2003a 'Marginality and gender at work in forestry communities of British Columbia, Canada' *Journal of Rural Studies* 19 (3), 373–389
- . 2003b *Taking Stands: Gender and the Sustainability of Rural Communities* Vancouver: UBC Press
- . Forthcoming a 'Feminist perspectives in environmental management' in *Resource and Environmental Management in Canada: Addressing Conflict and Uncertainty*, 2d edition ed B. Mitchell (Toronto: Oxford University Press)
- . Forthcoming b *Taking Stands: Gender and the Sustainability of Rural Communities* (Vancouver: UBC Press)
- REINHARZ, S. 1992 *Feminist Methods in Social Research* (New York: Oxford University Press)
- RIDING MOUNTAIN BIOSPHERE RESERVE 2002 *A Cooperation Plan for the Riding Mountain Biosphere Reserve* (Erickson: Riding Mountain Biosphere Reserve)
- ROBERTS, R. and EMEL, J. 1992 'Uneven development and the tragedy of the commons: competing images for nature society analysis' *Economic Geography* 68, 249–271
- ROCHELEAU, D.E. 1991 'Gender, ecology and the science of survival: stories and lessons from Kenya' *Agriculture and Human Values* 8, 156–165
- ROCHELEAU, D.E., THOMAS-SLAYTER, B. and EDMUNDS, D. 1995 'Gendered resource mapping: focusing on women's spaces in the landscape' *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 18, 62–68
- ROCHELEAU, D., THOMAS-SLAYTER, B. and WANGARI, E. 1996 *Feminist Political Ecology: Global Issues and Local Experiences* (New York: Routledge)
- ROSE, G. 1993 *Feminism and Geography* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press)
- . 1997 'Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics' *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 305–320
- SACHS, C. 1996 *Gendered Fields: Rural Women, Agriculture and Environment* (Boulder: Westview Press)
- SANDILANDS, C. 1993. 'On "green consumerism": Environmental privatization and 'family values' *Canadian Women's Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme* 13, 45–47
- . 1999 *The Good-Natured Feminist: Ecofeminism and the Quest for Democracy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)
- SCHINDLER, B. and CHEEK, K.A. 1999 'Integrating citizens in adaptive management: a propositional analysis' *Conservation Ecology* 39 (last accessed 18 July 2003)
- SCHRECKER, T. 1997 'Money matters: a reality check, with help from Virginia Woolf' *Social Indicators Research* 40, 99–123
- SCHULTZ, I. 1993 'Women and waste' *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 4, 51–63
- SEAGER, J. 1993 *Earth Follies: Coming to Terms with the Global Environmental Crisis* (New York: Routledge)
- . 1996 "'Hysterical housewives" and other mad women: grassroots environmental organizing in the United States' in *Feminist Political Ecology: Global Issues and Local Experience*, ed D. Rocheleau, B. Thomas-Slayter and E. Wangari (New York: Routledge) 271–286
- . 1999. 'Patriarchal vandalism: militaries and the environment' in *Dangerous Intersections: Feminist Perspectives on Population, Environment and Development*, ed J. Silliman and Y. King (Cambridge, MA: South End Press) 163–188
- SEITZ, V.R. 1995 *Women, Development and Communities for Empowerment in Appalachia* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press)
- SEWELL, W.R.D. and PHILLIPS, S.D. 1979 'Models for the evaluation of public participation programmes' *Natural Resources Journal* 19, 337–358
- SHIVA, V. 1989 *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development* (London: Zed Press)
- SIEBER, R. 2000 'GIS implementation in grassroots organizations' *Urban and Information Systems Association Journal* 12, 15–29
- SINCLAIR, A.J. and DIDUCK, A. 1995 'Public education: an undervalued component of the environmental assessment public involvement process' *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 15, 219–240
- . 2000 'Public involvement in environmental impact assessment: a case study of hydro development in Kullu District, Himachal Pradesh, India' *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 18, 63–75
- SLOCOMBE, D.S. 1998 'Lessons from experience with ecosystem-based management' *Landscape and Urban Planning* 40, 31–39.
- . 2000 'Resources, people and places: resource and environmental geography in Canada, 1996–2000' *The Canadian Geographer* 44, 56–66
- SMITH, D. 1987 *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology* (Boston: Northeastern University Press)
- SMITH, L.G. 1982 'Mechanisms for public participation at a normative planning level in Canada' *Canadian Public Policy* 8, 561–572
- SMITH, L.G. 1983 'Electric power planning in Ontario: public participation at a normative level' *Canadian Public Administration* 26, 360–377
- STATUS OF WOMEN CANADA POLICY RESEARCH FUND 2002 Request for proposals, August http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/funding/prfcfp-020830_e.html (last accessed 18 July 2003)
- STONICH, S.C. 1998 'Political ecology of tourism' *Annals of Tourism Research* 25, 25–54
- STURGEON, N. 1997 *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory and Political Action* (New York: Routledge)
- SULLIVAN, S. and STOTT, P., eds. 2000 *Political Ecology* (London: Edward Arnold)
- TESKE, E. and BEEDLE, B. 2001 *Journey to the Top—Breaking Through the Canopy: Canadian Experiences* Unpublished report for the Canadian Forest Service and BC Ministry of Forests, Victoria
- UDAYAGIRI, M. 1995. 'Challenging modernization: gender and development, postmodern feminism and activism' in *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed M.H. Marchand and J.L. Parpart (New York: Routledge) 159–178
- UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP) 1991 *Human Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press)

- . 1995 *Human Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press)
- . 1997 *Human Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press)
- USHER, P. 1987 'Indigenous management systems and the conservation of wildlife in the Canadian North' *Alternatives* 14, 3–9
- . 1991 'Some implications of the Sparrow judgement for resource conservation and management' *Alternatives* 18, 23–27
- . 1993 'The Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board: An experience in co-management' in *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*, ed E. Inglis, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Nature) 111–119
- . 2000 'Traditional ecological knowledge in environmental assessment and management' *Arctic* 53, 183–193
- VAINIO-MATTILA, A. 2000 'The seduction and significance of participation for development interventions' *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 21, 431–446
- WALKER, J., MITCHELL, B. and WISMER, S. 2001 'Livelihood approach to community-based planning and assessment: a case study of Molas, Indonesia' *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 19, 297–309
- WARRINGTON, M. 1997 'Reflections on a recently completed PhD' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 21, 401–410
- WEST, G. and BLUMBERG, R.L. 1990 'Introduction' in *Women and Social Protest*, ed G. West and R.L. Blumberg (New York: Oxford University Press) 3–36
- WOLCH, J., BROWNLOW, A. and LASSITER, U. 2000 'Constructing the animal worlds of inner-city Los Angeles' in *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations*, ed C. Philo and C. Wilber (New York: Routledge) 71–97
- WOLFE-KEDDIE, J. 1995 "'First Nations" sovereignty and land claims: implications for resource management' in *Resource and Environmental Management in Canada: Addressing Conflict and Uncertainty*, ed B. Mitchell (Oxford University Press: Toronto) 55–79
- WOMEN AND GEOGRAPHY STUDY GROUP OF THE INSTITUTE OF BRITISH GEOGRAPHERS (WGSIGB) 1984 *Geography and Gender: An Introduction to Feminist Geography* (London: Hutchinson)
- . 1997 *Feminist Geographies: Explorations in Diversity and Difference* (Longman: Essex)
- WRIGHT, M. 2001 'Women in the Newfoundland fishery' in *Framing our Past: Canadian Women's History in the Twentieth Century*, ed S.A. Cook, L.R. McLean and K. O'Rourke (Toronto: Oxford University Press) 343–346
- YOUNG, I.M. 1990 *Justice and Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)
- YOUNG, K. 1988 'Notes on the social relations of gender' in *Gender in Caribbean Development*, ed P. Mohammed and C. Shepherd (Barbados: Women and Development Studies Project, University of the West Indies)
- YOUNGS, C. 1991 'Woods Cree women's labour within the subsistence-based mixed economy of Pelican Narrows, Saskatchewan' M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, University of Saskatoon
- ZILLMAN, K. 1996 'Gender-sensitive and sustainable urban development: a report from the German national round table of women planners and architects for the second United Nations conference on human settlements' *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 7, 147–154