

What's the Problem Here?

Joni Seager

1993. *Earth Follies: Coming to Feminist Terms with the Global Environmental Crisis*.
New York: Routledge, pp. 1-13.¹

Let's start with the bad news first. Simply put, ours is a small and much-abused planet. We have so degraded our environment, so disrupted our biosphere, so stressed physical carrying capacities that the lives of millions of people on the planet (certainly our cherished "ways of life") are at risk. The litany of contemporary environmental horrors is now familiar, even to grade-school children: ozone depletion; acid rain; chemical pollution of groundwater; the startling and escalating rate of loss of bird, animal, and plant species; tropical deforestation; increasingly massive and deadly chemical, oil, and toxic spills; and the list could go on for pages. The daily newspapers are filled with a barrage of bad news, all of it larger than life. We hear how many acres of trees have fallen in the Amazon between the time of our morning coffee and our evening meal (over 1,500 acres on an average day); we are told, with uncomfortable precision, how many of us will be likely to develop skin cancer in the coming decades, and how many of us will die from it (more than 6,500 a year in the US alone); we are mesmerized by images of the ozone hole over the Antarctic pulsating in astral colors.

These are the Big Problems. Nature is clearly in trouble, and we with it. If we are going to solve these environmental problems, we need to bring to bear on them all of our analytic and political skills and resources, including feminist analysis.

But what can feminists contribute to our understanding of the environmental problems? Is there a place for feminist voice in the environmental chorus? As a feminist and a geographer, I posed these rhetorical questions to myself a number of years ago – and, surprisingly, my first answer was "no," feminist analysis was not

¹ Modified and reprinted with permission from Joni Seager and Taylor and Francis.

particularly pertinent to things environmental. The environment, after all, seems genderless, and thus not a very fruitful arena for feminist inquiry.

My training as a geographer, in both the physical and social sciences, led me to conceptualize environmental problems in their physical forms – that is, I understood environmental problems as *problems of physical systems under stress*. This interpretation of the state of our environment is reinforced by popular media reporting on environmental issues, which typically emphasizes the visual and physical manifestations of environmental problems. The media conveys very powerful and enduring messages: of oil-slicked otters dying off in Prince Edward Sound; of acres of scorched stumps of tropical rain forest in Brazil; of NASA computer-simulated photos of the pulsing hole in the ozone layer. These images, and the reporting that accompanies them, encourage us to think of environmental problems in their physical forms – the problem, we're told, either directly or subliminally, is too many dead trees, too big a hole in the sky, too many fossil-fuel pollutants, too much soil erosion, too much garbage, not enough water, not enough arable land, not enough fuel wood.

The tendency to conceptualize environmental problems in their physical form has a number of implications. Popular reporting on environmental affairs that focuses primarily on the scope of environmental calamity leaves causality out of the picture. The journalistic predilection for using passive language wherever possible (presumably so as to offend as few people as possible, and to limit legal liability) leaves us all ill-equipped to make sense of the environmental scene. Statements such as “we will ‘lose’ 50,000 animal species annually by the end of the century” or “there are more toxins in the Great Lakes than ever before” or “the ozone hole is growing” may provoke an awareness of environmental problems, but they leave the question of agency unexamined. Questions about agency – that is, the social and economic processes that create a state of scorched trees and dead otters – are placed at a distant second, if they are raised at all. The physical manifestations of environmental problems are often presented as both the beginning and the end of the story.

The conventions of scientific analysis, similarly, blunt curiosities about questions of agency. Neither specialist training nor popular media coverage encourage us to ask questions about the actors, institutions, and processes behind mutilated elephants and oil-slicked beaches. Social analysis and institutional critiques are shut out from both specialist and popular representations of the state of our earth. Feminist analysis is shut out.

If environmental problems are framed as problems of physical deterioration, this is barren territory for feminist analysis: there is no feminist analysis of the chemical process of ozone disintegration; there is no feminist analysis of soil erosion, of groundwater pollution, of the acidification process that is killing forests and lakes throughout the industrialized world. (While there *are* feminist critiques of the *construction* of scientific knowledge, the analysis of physical and chemical processes in and of themselves is not particularly suitable territory for feminist forays.)

But there is a subtext to the daily news. Reading between the lines, in the best feminist tradition, reveals the story *behind* the environmental story. The environmental crisis is not just a crisis of physical ecosystems. The *real* story of the environmental crisis is a story of power and profit and political wrangling; it is a story of the institutional arrangements and setting, the bureaucratic arrangements and the cultural conventions that *create* conditions of environmental destruction. Toxic wastes and oil spills and dying forests, which are presented in the daily news as the entire environmental story, are the symptoms – the symptoms of social arrangements, and especially of social *derangements*. The environmental crisis is not just the sum of ozone depletion, global warming, and overconsumption; it is a crisis of the dominant ideology (Simmons, 1992). And it is this that is grist for the feminist mill.

Scientific specialist and environmental populists leave a vacuum of curiosity, into which feminists should step. Feminists are especially acute about asking questions of agency. A feminist analysis of the environment starts with the understanding that environmental problems derive from the exercise of power and the struggle of vested interest groups played out on a physical tableau. A feminist analysis of environmental problems thus needs to be rooted in an analysis of social, cultural, and political institutions that are responsible for environmental distress.

The first task of feminists interested in the environment is to rewrite the litany of horrors in a way that makes agency clear. Take deforestation, for example. We are not “losing” forests. In the Amazon, multinational oil companies, Japanese lumber firms, and local elites, with the complicity of and cooperation of specific Brazilian government officials and international development agencies, are burning, clearing, and clear-cutting vast acreages of tropical forests at a staggering rate for mineral exploitation, timber, and cattle ranches. The rain forest in Indonesia is falling under the ax of Scott Paper Company, among others, which plans to replace 800,000 acres of tropical rain forest with mono-plantations of fast-growing eucalyptus trees for pulp paper. In Hawaii, power-plant developers are clearing the last rain forest in the USA. Deliberate deforestation is a tool of the trade in the dozens of dirty little raging wars in Central America and Asia.

But naming names is not enough, and feminists are not the only ones to point to the structure behind the environmental symptoms. Radical economic analysts have long pointed, for example, to the role of capitalist economic structures as the cause of much environmental damage (an analysis that falls short when environmental degradation is as prevalent in noncapitalist structures as in capitalist [ones]). But the analysis that feminists offer – an analysis rooted in overcoming the workings of gender – is unique, and as of yet, not widely applied to environmental questions.

I started this [essay] by saying that “we” have so degraded our environment, so disrupted our biosphere, so stressed physical carrying capacities that the continued existence of life on the planet is at risk. But “we” – an undifferentiated humanity - have not done so. Rather, our environmental problems are the progeny of very particular clusters of powerful institutions acting in particular ways. A handful of large

institutional structures largely control the state of our environment. Large-scale environmental degradation – not litter on the streets, but the really major environmental problems that may well kill us all – is the product of three or four clusters of large institutions that include, prominently, militaries, multinationals, and governments (which are often in collusion with, or indistinguishable from, militaries and multinationals).

On the other side of the fence, there is the environmental movement. While this “movement” is neither homogeneous or uniform, the environmental agenda is one that is increasingly coordinated by a handful of large, powerful, and very well-funded environmental groups that I call the “eco-establishment.” Grassroots environmental groups, “fringe” groups (such as Deep Ecology), and individuals fill out the rest of the environmental slate, but their presence is overshadowed by the eco-establishment. Governments, militaries, and multinational institutions are primary agents of environmental degradation; eco-establishment institutions are setting the environmental agenda, and framing the ways in which we perceive environmental crisis.

Militaries, multinationals, governments, the eco-establishment. When I write down this list of institutions on a piece of paper, the first thing that I notice, as a feminist, is that these are all institutions of men. These institutions and groups are controlled by men (and a mere smattering of women). The culture of institutions is shaped by power relations between men and women, and between groups of men in cooperation or in conflict. Institutional behavior is informed by presumptions of appropriate and necessary behavior for man and for women. Their actions, their interactions, and the often catastrophic results of their policies cannot be separated from the social context that frames them. And, on twentieth century Earth, the large social frame is one of gender difference. Everywhere in the world, men and women lead different lives; everywhere in the world, men have more institutionalized power than their female counterparts; even when the “pie” of social power is small, women’s share is smaller still.

The institutional culture that is responsible for most of the environmental calamities of the last centuries is the masculinist culture. The “expert structure” – of scientists, environmentalists and bureaucrats – that interprets and assesses the state of the earth is, for the most part, one of men. *As a feminist then, the first environmental question is to ask whether or not it “matters” that the institutions that for the most part control our collective environmental fate are constructs of male culture.*

[...]

As a feminist who is extremely wary of essentialism (“men are essentially destructive ... women are essentially nurturers”), I try to examine environmental agency without reinforcing essentialist fallacies. The fact that we all know individual women who thrive in the institutions I name, and that we all know individual men who suffer the predations of this institutional culture does not undercut the saliency of the

argument that these institutions are structured around masculinist presumptions and prerogatives. The feminist environmental question that I pose is not so much about men *qua* men, nor even about women as individual agents, but rather whether it matters that the institutions that control virtually all decisions and actions that shape our environment are institutions shaped by male culture. The common-sense answer to this question is a resounding “yes” – common sense suggests that a skew of power and representation in favor of men within these institutions has to “matter”, feminist theory and women’s history tell us it matters. But in what ways does it “matter”?

The feminist challenge is to identify the ways in which gender and gender relations enter into the environmental arena through the workings of institutions, and through the role of individuals working within particular institutional contexts. Men and women have different relationships to militaries, multinationals, governments, and large environmental organizations. Similarly, the implications and experience of environmental decay are different for men and women, rich and poor, elites and disenfranchised. The task for feminists is to unravel the ways in which gender operates as a structured condition within the institutions that hold the balance of power on environmental issues.

I firmly reject the “biology is destiny” argument in whatever guise they take. But I do, just as firmly, believe that we cannot answer hard questions about environmental agency without looking closely at the nature of power, the workings of power, *and the gender of power* in the institutional arrangements and groups on both sides of the environmental coin – those that are primarily responsible for destroying the environment, and those that have set themselves to saving the environment. It is folly to ignore the fact that virtually all of the institutions, bureaucracies, and groups fanned out across the environmental spectrum are run by men in pursuit of male-defined objectives.

Women are fed up. Women carry much of the burden in this world of sustaining daily life, and they are angry – not only because they see their burden becoming heavier as the state of the earth deteriorates, but because they see that as environmentalism is becoming a “big” game in the men’s world of politics, science, and economics, women are once again excluded from the ranks of the powerful players. In 1991 thousands of women gathered in Miami for what was billed as the first Global Assembly of Women for a Healthy Planet. Listen to the voices of some of the women from that conference:

We are here to say that this mad race towards self-destruction must stop ... and that the overwhelming exclusion of women from national and international decision-making, their exclusion from economic and political power, must end (Bella Abzug, USA).

Women are constantly being told that their analysis is political hysteria (Vandana Shiva, India).

The current state of the world is a result of a system that attributes little to no value to peace. It pays no heed to the preservation of natural resources, or to the labor of the majority of its inhabitants, or to their unpaid work, not to mention their maintenance and care. This system cannot respond to values it refuses to recognize (Marilyn Waring, New Zealand).

Only those who have fought for the right to protect their own bodies from abuse can truly understand the rape and plunder of our forests, rivers, and soils (Margarita Arias, Costa Rica).

If women are to “clean up the mess,” they have a right to challenge the people and institutions which create the problems (Peggy Antrobus, Barbados).²

For people who do not encounter feminist analysis in their daily lives, these voices may sound strident. The response of many environmentalists when women start talking feminism is to draw the ideological wagons into a defensive circle, with environmental reason inside, threatened but valiant, against the crazy assault of women’s “paranoia” and “hysteria” without.³ Men are unaccustomed to hearing women express their anger, and some men feel personally attacked by a feminist analysis that lays bare the gender skew of power and responsibility. This has become especially clear to me over the past two or three years as I have given talks across the country on various aspects of the themes I explore in this book. It is apparent that a feminist analysis of environmental issues makes some people – and especially many men – anxious.

The purpose of noticing that environmentally instrumental institutions are run by men is not simply to ask, “Well, what would be different if women were in charge?” For one thing, the state of the world being as it is, we can’t answer that question yet: we do not have many examples of women-led, non-masculinist institutions (or, even, of male-led, non-masculinist institutions). This question, which is often raised as a challenge whenever feminists talk about gender and power, sidesteps the point that most feminists are making: “the problem” with masculinist institutions is not primarily that men are in charge, but that structures can be so rooted in masculinist presumptions that even were women in charge of *these* structures, they would retain the core characteristics that many feminist and progressive men find troubling.

² Quotes taken from taped transcripts of the Global Assembly of Women for a Healthy Planet Conference, Miami, 1991.

³ This sentence paraphrases a comment by Lorene Cary (1992).

In a new book on gender in international relations, a field particularly relevant to environmental relations, Ann Tickner elaborates this point:

Rather than discussing strategies for bringing more women into the international relations discipline as it is conventionally defined, I shall seek answers to my questions by bringing to light what I believe to be masculinist underpinnings of the field {emphasis added}. I shall examine what the discipline might look like if the central realities of women's day-to-day lives were included in its subject matter Making women's experiences visible allows us to see how gender relations have contributed to the way in which the field of international relations is conventionally constructed and to reexamine the traditional boundaries of the field. It is doubtful whether we can achieve a more peaceful and just world ... while these gender hierarchies remain in place (Tickner, 1992, xi).

Over the past two decades, feminists have brought similar gender-based analysis to illuminate the workings of social institutions as diverse as the law and the family, and to virtually every academic field from the sciences through the arts. My contribution here is to bring this kind of feminist analysis to bear on our understanding of the global environmental crisis.

In point of fact, most men, like most women, lead humble lives; most men probably don't feel that they are in charge of anything, or that they have more power or privilege than their female counterparts. At first glance, this is largely true, and, as I and other analysts point out, most feminists are not necessarily interested in "picking on" men (or women) as individual actors. More to the point, when male power is aggrandized by institutional power, it generates an impression of a more distorted gender dichotomy than may actually exist. This magnifying lens of power creates what one observer calls "hegemonic masculinity," a type of culturally dominant masculinity that, while it does not correspond to the actual personality of the majority of men, sustains patriarchal authority and legitimizes a patriarchal society and political order (Connell, 1987)⁴.

At the same time, it is not coincidental that masculinist structures are run by men; there is synchronicity between "hegemonic masculinity" and ordinary manhood; there is continuity between exercise of institutional power by "extraordinary" men and the privileges, however minor, that most men, even the powerless, share in ... and that most women, even the powerful, do not. Gender hierarchies privilege all men: even if individual men do not feel specifically enriched or empowered by them, gender hierarchies that universally install men at the top universally privilege men's knowledge and men's experiences – experiences that are then assumed to be normal,

⁴ This point is also made especially well in Ann Tickner's book.

or ubiquitous, or, simply, the most important. It is still the case that the world is a mirror, in the words of Virginia Woolf, that reflects men (even “little” men) at twice their natural size.

Where then, some critics ask, is the room for “good men”? Men have been prominent in the struggles for peace, social justice, and against systems that are environmentally destructive – does a *feminist* environmentalism exclude them? Not at all. Ordinary men, the many “good men” among us, can distance themselves from the hegemonic masculinity that they feel does not represent them. Men need not defend, nor be defensive about, the institutions that are wreaking environmental havoc. Patriarchy is not only oppressive to women. Men, like their feminist sisters, can insist on a more clear-headed analysis of how power works in institutions, and men can also be clear about the extent to which they are or are not complicit in perpetuating that power or those institutions. Paraphrasing the words of another feminist scholar, I believe that because gender hierarchies have contributed to the perpetuation of environmental catastrophe, *all those concerned with the environment – men and women alike* – should be concerned with understanding and overcoming their effects ([see also] Tickner, 1992, xii). The fact that men sometimes find this particularly hard to do underscores the strength of the symbiotic bonds between institutionalized masculinist prerogative and ordinary manhood.

Because patriarchy is not something in which membership is optional, for women or for men, the only way that most women and men can “get by” in this world is by making alliances and compromises with male power structures; indeed, all of our major social institutions are supported by the labor and compliance of women as well as men. [...] I do not expunge the reality that there are men and women on “both sides” of the environmental coin. [We should] all [...] take a hard look at how environmental realities are shaped by institutional realities that are, in turn, shaped by distinctive gender assumptions and dispositions.

Feminism and environmentalism are among the most powerful social movements of the late twentieth century. The vision of promise – the carrot on the stick – of both movements is the possibility that personal interactions and institutional arrangements can be transformed into non-exploitative, non-hierarchical, cooperative relationships. Both are progressive movements, both offer a challenge to mainstream “business as usual” standards, both assert the need for reordering public and private priorities, and the constituencies of both overlap. Intuitively, it would seem that the feminist and environmentalist movements should be closely allied. And yet they are not. If anything, as we go deeper into the 1990s, the gap between feminism and environmentalism appears to be widening.

The environmental agenda in Europe and North America is increasingly orchestrated by a handful of large environmental organizations, “the eco-establishment” – groups such as Worldwide Fund for Nature, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, and even more “radical” groups such as Greenpeace, all of which now control multimillion dollar budgets, all of which support expensive lobbying offices

and hundreds of paid staff members. One reason for the widening gap between feminism and environmentalism is that the institutional culture of this eco-establishment is, by and large, hostile to women. Resistance to feminism seems to be as firmly entrenched in environmental establishment as it is in society at large, perhaps only taking more surprising and more subtle forms. The leaders of the eco-establishment, most of whom are men, appear unwilling to entertain a critique of their institutional culture, and in fact they are increasingly looking to the conventional male worlds of business and science as exemplars of organizational behavior. As environmental organizations take on the coloring of business, and the leaders seek to be “taken seriously” by the movers and shakers in business and government – in the terms defined by business and government leaders – they compromise their credibility as “outsiders.” More to the point, the replication of conventional organizational culture within the environmental movement alienates many women working for environmental change, and at the same time it excludes feminist analysis.

On the other hand, feminist theorists have been slow to address environmental concerns. There is only a nascent feminist analysis of ecological issues, perhaps because feminist scholars are concentrated in fields such as history, literature, and art, while environmental issues are assumed (wrongly, I believe) to belong primarily to the realm of the physical sciences. Over the last three decades of the recent wave of the women’s movement, feminists have developed finely honed analyses of social domination and the workings of power in personal and institutional life. We have yet to apply these analyses to environmental issues.

One of the few environmental issues that feminist *have* addressed is the thorny issue of the presumed bond between women and nature. Feminist historians and particularly feminist historians of science have identified that a central dualism – the men-culture and women-nature dichotomy – is pivotal to the development of Western civilization, and of Western patriarchy with it.⁵ A number of feminist writers posit that the *domination* of women and that of nature by men are linked, and are linked to this dualism, and that a deconstruction of one leads to an illumination of the other.

Feminist response to the presumed woman-nature bond has taken a number of tacks. In the first instance, and most noticeably in the 1970s and early 1980s, many feminist seemed to agree that the way to advance the cause of feminism was to deny the potency of difference between women and men. Early feminist agitation – especially in Western industrialized countries – was aimed at equalizing the relations between men and women. This might be characterized as a “rationalist” or anthropological feminist position. In terms of the Nature question, writers such as Simone de Beauvoir and Sherry Ortner argued that the woman-nature connection should be seen as a male cultural artifact, the product of a particular historical period,

⁵ “Patriarchy,” here means the systematic and systemic dominance of men in society, and the structures that support and further this dominance.

with little contemporary relevance or value other than as a tool of the patriarchy in justifying the ongoing oppression of women (and of nature) (de Beauvoir, 1968; Ortner, 1974). Ortner, for instance, argued that women should reject their presumed link with Nature, and should seek to be integrated into the (“men’s”) world of Culture, and that feminists should explore theoretical work that exposes the presumed woman-nature bond as bankrupt male artifice.

In the late 1970s, other feminists, influenced by prominent theorists such as Susan Griffin and Mary Daly, called for a feminist revaluation and reclamation of the woman-nature connection (See, for example, Daly, 1980; Griffin, 1980). They argued that while the women-nature bond had been defiled and denigrated by patriarchal culture, the bond of women with nature in fact represents a significant and empowering bridge for women – a bridge to their past, and a bridge to the natural cycles that can seem to have significance in women’s lives. For these feminists, a celebration and affirmation of women’s distinctive culture offers an avenue out of and away from the dominant male culture. “Ecofeminism,” virtually the only ecological ideology to self-consciously bridge feminism and environmentalism, derives from this second feminist analysis.⁶

Both strands of feminist analysis are problematic. The first feminist position draws on historical research and contemporary explorations of cross-cultural relativism. It posits that the woman-nature bond is an Anglo-European male cultural construction of a particular historical period, the efficacy of which women should resist and deny. From this position, some feminism pose arguments against women’s separatism – arguments that, in some instances, privilege heterosexual and “mainstream” women’s organizing, and which can merge with a conservative agenda, or that at best lead to a liberal, “reformist” feminist stance. The second feminist position, by claiming a distinctive women’s culture, lends support to women’s (and lesbian) separatism, but it relies on ahistorical, universalizing, and essentialist arguments about the inherent bond of women with nature.

A third feminist approach to the woman-nature debate is just emerging, one that draws on historical research charting the contours of gender difference across time, and on psychological work that maps out the nature of gender difference in particular

⁶ The growing literature on women who identify themselves as “ecofeminists,” and who self-consciously identify themselves as shaping the course of ecofeminism, includes the following: Judith Plant (1989), Collard with Contrucci (1988), Diamond and Orenstein (1990). The ecofeminist articles published in journals and newsletters over the past three or four years are too numerous to be cited here [...]. The term “ecofeminism” is not, of course, the exclusive property of the women mentioned above, and there are no doubt women who call themselves “ecofeminists” who would take issue with some of the above-mentioned authors. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the term increasingly *is* identified with a spiritually-based and goddess-centered philosophy, and its meaning is increasingly specific to that philosophy.

cultural context of work and play.⁷ This research suggests that there *are* differences between men and women in moral behavior and character, the reality of which shouldn't be denied or avoided, but that these are culturally constructed and variable across cultures and time. The promise of this research is that the elucidation of these differences may provide the sense of a common bond among women, and, further, it asserts that women *do* have a distinctive culture from that of men, and that theirs may suggest alternative “ways of being” in the world. When applied to the woman-nature debate and in assessing the relevance of feminism to environmentalism, this new feminist insight suggests a middle path:

That while recognizing that the nature-culture dualism is a product of culture, we can nonetheless consciously choose *not* to sever the woman-nature connection by joining male culture. Rather, we can use it as a vantage point for creating a different culture and politics that would integrate intuitive and rational forms of knowledge ... and enable us to transform the nature-culture relationship (King and Plant, 1989, 23).⁸

It is not clear how this “middle path” can be “operationalized” in terms of changing the “realpolitik” of environmentalism, but it does suggest the saliency of critiquing institutional arrangements from a distinctive woman-centered stance.

[...]

The cast of institutional characters that I introduced earlier – the militaries, corporations, bureaucrats, and environmental organizations – hold the balance of power in determining our collective environmental fate. We need to transform our “culture of pollution” by transforming the core institutions that shape that culture. In some cases, institutions can be “reformed.” Reformism should not necessarily be slighted as a liberal band-aid – feminist transformation within institutions, for example, has always necessitated a substantial reworking of both presumptions and the operations of institutional culture, whether implementing affirmative action in hiring, enduring sexual harassment protection procedures in the workplace, or introducing women's sports into the Olympic Games. In other cases, though, feminist transformation has required the wholesale dismantling of “men's club” institutions.

⁷ This emergent strand of feminism relies on the academic work of historians such as Joan Kelly and Carol Smith Rosenberg who identify the separate culture of women in other historical periods, and the groundbreaking work by Carol Gilligan on the construction of women's and men's moral and behavioral development. Ynestra King is a key figure in building bridges between a “transformative feminism” and the environmental issues (see King, 1990).

⁸ King suggests that this is the direction promised by “ecofeminism,” but semantics are confusing here. The direction of what is now called “ecofeminism” is clearly away from this middle ground, and more emphatically towards “essentialist” feminist analysis and a philosophy of goddess-worshipping self-realization.

Global demilitarization, for one, needs to be high on a feminist environmental agenda. But the dismantling of militarism is not going to be achieved only by beating swords into ploughshares. Dismantling militaries necessitates dismantling the bonds of masculinity that prop up and sustain military powers.

I started this [essay] with the bad news about the state of our earth. The good news is that we have the analytic skills to expose the structure of environmental destruction. If we are willing to take seriously the implications of our understanding, we can change course. Feminism, and feminist transformation of environmentally instrumental institutions, is not a magic balm – it will not solve all environmental problems, and it will not save the Earth. But it is perilously evident that “salvation” will not come through masculinist structures that have brought us to the brink of environmental collapse. The African American poet Audre Lorde, speaking of women’s multiple oppressions (of homophobia, sexism, and racism), reminds us that “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house” (Lorde, 1981). It is a warning to which environmentalists, and all concerned global citizens, should pay heed.

References

- Cary, Lorene. 1992. Why it’s not just paranoia. *Newsweek*, 6 April, 119(14), 23.
- Collard, Andre and Judith Contrucci. 1988. *Rape of the Wild*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Daly, Mary. 1980. *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. New York: Harper & Row.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. 1968. *The Second Sex*. New York: Random House.
- Diamond, Irene and Gloria Orenstein. 1990. *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Griffin, Susan. 1980. *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her*. New York: Harper & Row.
- King, Ynestra. 1990. *What is Ecofeminism?* New York: Ecofeminist Resources.
- King, Ynestra, and Judith Plant (eds.) 1989. *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

- Lorde, Audre. 1981. The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In, Cherrie Moraga & Gloria Anzaldua (eds.), *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. NY: Kitchen Table Press, pp. 98-101.
- Ortner, Sherry. 1974. Is female to male as nature is to culture? In, Michelle Zimblast Rosaldo & Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture & Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 67-88.
- Plant, Judith (ed.) 1989. *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- Simmons, Pam. 1992. The challenge of feminism. *The Ecologist* 22(1), 2-3.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 1992. *Gender in International Relations: A Feminist Perspective on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia Press.