

This article was downloaded by: [University of California, Berkeley]
On: 20 June 2013, At: 10:47
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954
Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH,
UK



Environmental Politics

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fenp20>

Living environmentalisms: coalition politics, social reproduction, and environmental justice

Giovanna Di Chiro^a

^a Mount Holyoke College Massachusetts, USA

Published online: 08 Apr 2008.

To cite this article: Giovanna Di Chiro (2008): Living environmentalisms: coalition politics, social reproduction, and environmental justice, *Environmental Politics*, 17:2, 276-298

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09644010801936230>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Living environmentalisms: coalition politics, social reproduction, and environmental justice

Giovanna Di Chiro*

Mount Holyoke College Massachusetts, USA

This paper examines the intersectional, coalition politics forged by activists in US environmental justice and women's rights organisations. This coalitional politics articulates environmental and feminist concerns and rejects the limitations of a narrow-focused politics in favour of a more strategic, relational vision of social and environmental change. Framed by the Marxist-feminist concept of 'social reproduction', the analysis addresses the complex ways that globalised capitalism has transformed state and corporate responsibilities for social reproduction. The neoliberal policies of privatisation and deregulation have eroded the assurance of a liveable wage, affordable healthcare, decent education, breathable air, and clean water. Drawing on several examples from grassroots movements and community-based organisations, the essay discusses how diverse women activists conceptually link environmental justice and reproductive rights issues in their communities' struggles to sustain everyday life (or, to accomplish 'social reproduction'). The innovative coalition politics of organisations such as Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice and the Environmental Justice and Climate Change Coalition are generating dynamic 'living environmentalisms' with enough political vision and community 'groundedness' to build broadly-based social-environmental collaborations that stand a chance at compelling people to take stronger action to curb problems as big as global warming.

There has been some talk of late about the alleged 'death' of environmentalism. Whether viewed as a timely critique of a moribund and out-of-touch environmental movement, or as a gratuitous bit of grandstanding by a couple of *living* dead white men (*pace* Wendy Wasserstein) seemingly oblivious to decades of vibrant environmental activism by people of colour and Third World activists, the publication in 2004 by Michael Shellenberger and Ted Nordhaus proclaiming environmentalism's demise has generated a lot of heat

*Email: gdichiro@mtholyoke.edu

(see Schlosberg and Bomberg, this volume).¹ Like horsemen of the apocalypse, the ‘death’ prognosticators maintain that despite the significant gains made by the US environmental movement, it has failed miserably in its goal to create a successful movement that would inspire widespread popular support or that could muster sufficient political strength to confront effectively the earth’s ecological crises, especially the big ones, like global climate change. A similarly bleak assessment of the world’s environmental report card, and an implicit criticism of the political vitality of the environmental movement, was launched early in 2005 with the release of the United Nation’s Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, a five-year study compiled by an international panel of scientists, which warned that if current levels of resource exploitation and waste production continue unabated, the world’s ecosystems will not support life on earth or sustain future generations of humans or other species.² The overall message from these prominent environmentalist voices is that the battle to protect the environment is being lost.

The language invoking ‘inadequate gains’ and ‘losing ground’ also surfaces in critical assessments of the outcomes of what is generally considered a *separate* social movement – the international women’s movement – in terms of its success in improving the status and wellbeing of women around the world. For example, hundreds of delegates attending ‘Beijing+10’ – the meeting of the United Nation’s Commission on the Status of Women convened in 2005 to assess the advances in women’s rights in the 10 years since the groundbreaking UN Women’s conference was held in Beijing – concluded that the condition of women around the world is worsening as evidenced in virtually all indicators: deteriorating health, escalating violence, declining access to education, decent jobs, and civil rights, and rising poverty levels worldwide. A key issue that rose to the top of the Beijing +10 agenda, and one that the delegates asserted continues to limit women’s equality, status, and advancement around the world, was that of women’s reproductive health and rights to sexual freedom.³ Leading feminist analysts speaking in 2006 at the 20th Annual International Conference on Reproductive Freedom warned that ‘we are not winning, we are losing, and if more people don’t come out for reproductive rights in this country and internationally, the “right to choose”, in its fullest sense, will be an empty promise for thousands of poor and low-income women’.⁴

Activists in both the environmental movement and the women’s movement have struggled with how to represent the urgency of their message to a broader audience and have felt discouraged by what appears to be dwindling interest and participation in these movements. In this paper I argue that we can look to the innovative intersectional politics being shaped by a host of environmental justice and women’s rights organisations to find evidence that ‘environmental’ awareness and action are very much *alive*, and concern for ‘reproductive’ freedom extends far beyond what has been considered its customary political terrain. I discuss some promising developments in the analyses of women activists who link environmental and feminist concerns and reject the limitations of a narrow-focused politics in favour of a more strategic, relational

vision of social and environmental change. I explore the ‘politics of articulation’ (Hall 1986, Haraway 1992) forged by environmental and social justice activists who identify the important intersections between ‘reproductive’ and ‘environmental’ issues, thereby challenging western societies’ categorical distinction between humans and nature and the normative binaries partitioning the separate spheres of production and reproduction. Such political-ecological articulations identify, and address, patterns of *social reproduction*. They also strive to address threats to such relationships associated with the rise of neoliberalism: the re-privatisation, commodification, and increasing deregulation of all things relating to social wellbeing including the assurance of a liveable wage, affordable healthcare, decent education, breathable air, and clean water. Adopting the position held by many ecofeminists that *all environmental issues are reproductive issues* (see Mies and Shiva 1993, Merchant 1996, Silliman and King 1999), I examine examples of the political-conceptual coalitions and articulations formulated by women activists that make clear the social and environmental dangers inherent in hypercapitalism’s relentless subordination of reproduction to production (Colker 1998). The struggle for social reproduction is the common ground that joins up the diverse, genuinely *pro-life* social movements vigorously engaged in life-and-death battles for environmental justice and reproductive freedom.

In(toxic)ating alliances: reframing common ground, moving toward coalition politics

According to the aforementioned ‘eco-morticians’⁵ proclaiming environmentalism’s death, the major failure of the environmental movement has been its commitment to a narrow minded and objectivist practice of ‘boundary work’ (Gieryn 1999, Jasanoff 2005) bent on demarcating the definitional limitations of what counts as ‘the environment’, the entity which the movement has seen itself in the business of protecting and saving. In their essay, Shellenberger and Nordhaus provide a compelling instantiation of the perils of a ‘bounded environmentalism’ (Gottlieb 2001) that separates environmental issues from social ones. They recount the history of the US auto industry’s and the autoworker unions’ ruinous 1980s decision to tie their fortunes to the niche market of the gas-guzzling, landscape-shredding, pollution-spewing SUV, while the environmentalists went after fuel efficiency and global warming – neither group recognising the necessity or potential to hammer out a ‘win-win’ alliance (also see Bradsher 2002). The inability of the environmental groups to break out of their rigid environmental categories (by, for example, refusing to identify national health insurance as an ‘environmental’ issue, a public policy that would unshackle the auto companies from paying rising healthcare costs and allow them instead to invest in manufacturing fuel-efficient cars) resulted in a lost opportunity for environmentalists to unite with labour and to bring corporations into the fold in a mutually beneficial alliance combining the goals of environmental rationality and economic security.

Defining what counts as an environmental problem and what doesn't invites certain alliances and inhibits others, and the environmental movement has shot itself in the foot by adopting the definitional frontiers that delegate different issues as either inside or outside the environmental 'frame'. The conceptual-ideological mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, which draw clear distinctions between problems that are defined as 'social' (jobs, housing, transportation, public health, racial and sexual inequality, violence, poverty, reproductive freedom) and those termed 'environmental' (global warming, natural resource conservation, pollution, species extinction, overpopulation) have led to the endless fragmentation of progressive movements and to the dwindling appeal of liberal/democratic politics in the US. Sadly, environmentalism got it all wrong.

The critique of how the environmental movement's 'boundary work' (upholding western cultures' categorical distinction between 'nature' and 'society') has crippled coalition politics boasts a respected history (see Bookchin 1990, Darnovsky 1992, Di Chiro 1992, Schlosberg 1999), yet this history remains largely absent in the 'death' thesis. In a supportive, yet critical, response to the 'death' issue titled, 'The soul of environmentalism', a group of environmental justice scholars and activists historicised the problem of conceptual and political fragmentation, arguing that 'the environmental justice and sustainability movements have been reframing environmental issues for more than 20 years' building 'transformative alliances' that 'get people to recognize the inter-connectedness of social, economic, and environmental issues' (Gelobter *et al.* 2004, p. 22). Claiming that 'environmentalism, like poetry, has a *soul deeper and more eternal* than the one described by its examiners', the 'Soul' critics contend that 'the key to environmentalism's new life' is not through sacrificial and/or metaphorical *death* but by breaking through denial to rediscover the movement's deep-rooted ties to human rights and social justice, a lineage which is embodied in and 'nurtured by the Environmental Justice and Sustainability movements' (p. 6).

In agreement with critics of the 'death' thesis, I look to the counter-histories or 'challenger environmentalisms' (Darnovsky 1992) such as the environmental justice movement (EJM) or the many 'just sustainability' developments occurring around the world, for potent examples of the kinds of cross-cutting alliances that are already reframing and reshaping the contours of environmentalism (see, for example, Ageyman *et al.* 2003, Stein 2004, Bullard 2005, Shiva 2005, Sumner 2005). The reframings I examine are representative of the hard-won outcomes of the conceptual and mundane material work that Bernice Johnson Reagon (1983) describes as *coalition politics*: transcommunal alliances and communities of practice forged in the knowledge that survival depends not on the retreat to the comfort of 'home' (what some refer to as identity politics), but on the worldly and laborious engagements with the fleshly realities of socio-ecological interdependence. While Reagon's analysis of coalition politics may be *soulful* (deeply reminiscent of African American musical and spiritual traditions), it does not make its argument by promising

eternity, either of a ‘soul’ or of a particular coalition or social movement. Rather than prefigured on an organic model having an ‘eternal or natural shape to their configuration’ (Clifford 2001, p. 478), Reagon’s coalitions result from the strategic assemblage of ‘uncomfortable’ but necessary social, economic, environmental, and cultural practices implemented by different communities joining together in mutual recognition that ‘I ain’t gonna let you live unless you let me live. Now there’s danger in that, but there’s also the possibility that we can both live – if you can stand it’ (1983, p. 365). Coalition politics is more about life than death.

Coalition politics is also about *articulation* – the power-laden, non-innocent practices of interconnection, alliance-building, and ‘joined-up thinking’ (Agyeman *et al.* 2003). Articulation is produced by diverse social actors through engaging ‘situated knowledges’ about the world and creating new collective eco-political entities in the hopes of ‘surviving together’ (Haraway 1992, p. 311). A politics of articulation understands boundary work and frontier effects; it is aware of the possibility that hooking up and recombining ‘can make a unity of two different elements under certain conditions’ (Hall 1986, p. 53) but the elements/partners are not *eternal*; they ‘are never set once and for all’ (Haraway 1992, p. 314). Moreover, the emerging collective ensembles, while predicated on a coalitional consciousness, are always contested and themselves made up of oppositional and differential practices, relations, and understandings. Arguing that the politics of ‘articulation is work, and it may fail’, Haraway insists that ‘commitment and engagement, not their invalidation, in an emerging collective are the conditions of joining knowledge-producing and world-building practices’ (p. 315). The hard work essential to political articulation – the linking of diverse movements, common ideas, and situated knowledges in the hopes of surviving together – constitutes coalition politics reaching toward the vision of environmental and reproductive justice.

The mainstream environmental movement and the women’s movement have struggled with the difficulties of developing a politics of articulation, largely, I would argue, due to the problems of frontier effects – the impossibility of finding common ground in the risky terrain that ultimately comes down to ‘our issues versus your issues’. Can coalition politics be sustained by reframing ‘common ground’? The women environmental justice and reproductive justice activists whose work I examine engage in a coalition politics that reframes or rearticulates environmental and reproductive rights issues in terms of the necessities for sustaining everyday life, what Marxists and feminists have termed social reproduction. An analysis of social reproduction as an *environmental* issue allows us to ‘jump scales’ (Smith 1992) to understand the impacts of the current mode of production – corporate globalisation – on the survivability of individual bodies, particular communities, national cultures, and the earth itself. The death of everyday *life*, and all that sustains it, becomes the focus of the intersectional analyses forging dynamic coalition politics which brings together social movements committed to environmental and reproductive rights.

The significance of social reproduction

As many feminist theorists have pointed out, the reproductive economy, the supposed 'private' sphere of reproduction (or more precisely, 'social reproduction'), is often ignored or trivialised in mainstream political, economic, and environmental analyses of the worldwide impacts of globalisation and its neoliberal policies (Katz 2001, Peterson 2003, Marston 2004). Even the most critical approaches to theorising the global political economy and its involvement in environmental crises and transformations have sought to describe these shifts in terms of 'power and production and as primarily involving the interplay between states and markets' (Bakker and Gill 2003, p. 3). For many feminist analysts, this narrow ontology of global society as 'states and markets' misses the ways the current era of restructuring has transformed the social processes and institutions associated with the creation and maintenance of communities, and the social, economic, and ecological conditions supporting human security and sustainability. Such processes, institutions, and conditions that are associated with human health, education, and welfare (and upon which, ultimately, all production, exchange, and accumulation rest) correspond to the feminist concept of 'social reproduction' (Bakker and Gill 2003, p. 18).

Social reproduction is the intersecting complex of political-economic, socio-cultural, and material-environmental processes required to maintain everyday life and to sustain human cultures and communities on a daily basis and intergenerationally. It encompasses and critically analyses both the enabling and *dis*-enabling conditions for 'biological reproduction, the reproduction of labour power, and the social practices connected to caring, socialization, and the fulfilment of human needs' (p. 4), as well as the social relations of power within which these conditions are embedded, regulated, and transformed. The conditions for social reproduction are always in dialectical relation with production and so are consistently restructured as capitalist systems shift to new political economies creating new regimes of production and accumulation (Katz 2001).

The recent intensification of globalised capitalist production has changed the face of social reproduction, and has made its accomplishment (including the ability to procure decent food, clean water, shelter, clothing and healthcare) difficult if not impossible for many people around the world. Feminist critics have pointed out how neoliberalism's mantra of privatisation, flexibility, and mobile capital has eroded the capitalist state's commitment and responsibility for social reproduction (e.g. Brodie 2003, Katz 2004, Mitchell *et al.* 2004, Piven 2004). The current restructuring of social reproduction has had devastating effects and is now signified by: the withdrawal of government entitlements and protections, by public disinvestments in education, social welfare, housing, healthcare and environmental regulation, and by the backing away of corporate commitment and investments in particular places, workforces, and communities. Global economic restructuring policies such as SAPs (structural

adjustment policies), welfare reform, free-trade agreements, low wage labour migration, environmental deregulation, and the privatisation of public amenities hit hardest in the arena of social reproduction, but they are rarely analysed as such. As Katz (2001, pp. 701, 714) emphasises, 'social reproduction is the missing figure in current globalization debates. This is a serious omission . . . The widespread and serious environmental problems symptomatic of capitalist relations of production have received plenty of public attention, but generally not as problems of social reproduction' (pp. 710, 714).

Globalised capitalist *production* has put at risk the realisation of social *reproduction* for a large portion of the world, while at the same time enabling historically unsurpassed wealth accumulation for the few. I am arguing for the resuscitation and rethinking by both environmentalists and feminists of the dynamic and dialectical relationship between production and social reproduction in the hopes of generating effective political articulations across these diverse social movements. Can revitalised political-ecological analyses of social reproduction aid in producing these potentially productive linkages? The struggle for social reproduction, the 'fleshy, messy, and indeterminate stuff of everyday life' (Katz 2001, p. 711), is the common thread articulating 'selected traces of globalization on particular grounds' (p. 721) across scales and across diverse environmental justice and reproductive rights issues. These cross-scale and cross-issue articulations and coalitions centre on the maintenance and long-term sustainability of everyday life (the achievement of social reproduction). They are emerging as the life force of progressive, coalition politics.

All environmental issues are reproductive issues: political ecologies of social reproduction

The emergence in the 1980s and 1990s of theories and actions forging intersectional analyses between feminist and environmentalist agendas signalled a moment ripe with the possibilities for political articulation between the two social movements (e.g. Plant 1989, Diamond and Orenstein 1990, Mies and Shiva 1993, Merchant 1996, Sturgeon 1997). Writing and organising under the compelling, yet ultimately contentious, label 'ecofeminism', scholars and activists drew critical connections among diverse issues including: social injustices based on race, gender, class, and sexuality; ecological interconnect-edness, peace and anti-militarism, domestic violence and the 'rape' of nature, the control of women's bodies and reproductive freedom, toxic contamination and women's and children's health, the Western, Judeo-Christian, and scientific worldviews founded on the 'control of nature', animal rights and environmental ethics, colonialism and Indigenous peoples' rights, earth-based cultural traditions and spirituality, and community-based, sustainable living. Despite this apparent abundance of potentially overlapping causes, many feminist activists have lamented what they see as disinterest or, more accurately, wilful ignorance, on the part of the dominant environmental paradigm regarding how the two movements could intersect and join forces

(e.g. Seager 1993, 2006, Kraus 1994, Silliman and King 1999). For example, the most enduring connection to issues of reproduction identified by the mainstream environmental movement has been what feminists consider a *negative* one, that is, the focus on 'overpopulation' and on reducing global population growth by curtailing the 'unsustainably high fertility rates' of women from poor countries and poor women of colour in the US (Hartmann 1995, Bandarage 1997, Seager and Hartmann 2005). The use of alarmist population arguments that identify poor women's fertility as the major ecological threat to the planet (conveniently shifting the blame from the consumption and production patterns of the North) has led to the recommendation and in some cases implementation of aggressive and coercive population control mechanisms that restrict women's reproductive rights and endanger their health, and also to the support of regressive anti-immigrant policies that portray Third World women as 'over-breeders' burdening the country's resources and threatening national security (Hartmann and Hendrixson 2005). Such concern about *reproductive* issues has not made for a good marriage between mainstream/Northern environmentalists and proponents of feminist environmentalism.

In a similar vein, the mainstream/Northern women's movement, particularly its reproductive freedom wing, has been slow to recognise and embrace conceptual and political intersections with broader environmental arguments (particularly those put forth by the environmental justice movement) or with the concerns raised by women of colour and poor women about what it means to struggle for and have access to 'reproductive rights'. Over the past three decades the movement for reproductive rights in the US has been shifting from what many feminists have argued has been a single-issue movement (the pro-choice battle for abortion rights) to an international movement that is committed to a much wider set of social justice issues and that defines 'reproductive rights' and 'choice' in much broader terms. This redefining of reproductive rights, largely spearheaded by Third World feminists and US women of colour, recognises the interlocking forms of oppression that different women face. This view critiques the dominant framing of 'choice' as situated within a neoliberal tradition that:

locates individual rights at its core, and treats the individual's control over her body as central to liberty and freedom. This emphasis on individual choice, however, obscures the social context in which individuals make choices, and discounts the ways in which the state regulates populations, disciplines individual bodies, and exercises control over sexuality, gender, and reproduction . . . 'Choice' implies a marketplace of options in which women's right to determine what happens to their bodies is legally protected, ignoring the fact that for women of color, economic and institutional constraints often restrict their 'choices'. (Silliman *et al.* 2004, p. 5)

For women whose communities struggle with high unemployment rates, escalating poverty, unreliable, inaccessible, or dangerous contraceptives, and poor health and low life expectancy rates, the decision to have an abortion is

largely not experienced as an act of reproductive freedom or choice. Moreover, in light of the history of US eugenics laws, coercive pro-natalist and anti-natalist population control policies, immigration restrictions, sterilisation abuses, and state-mandated fertility regulation efforts (a feature of the US's current welfare reform policy), the question of under what conditions one can exercise the right to *not* have children or the right to *have* children becomes central. Reproduction, therefore, is

not just a matter of individual choice. Reproductive health policy ... reflects which people are valued in our society; who is deemed worthy to bear children and capable of making decisions for themselves. Reproductive decisions are made within a social context, including inequalities of wealth and power. Reproductive freedom is a matter of *social justice*. (Roberts 2000, p. 4)

Emphasising this point, long time women's rights activist Loretta Ross argues that for poor women of colour, 'our ability to control what happens to our bodies is constantly challenged by poverty, racism, environmental degradation, sexism, homophobia, and injustice in the United States' (Silliman *et al.* 2004, p. 4). In short, reproductive freedom is about both individual and social reproduction.

The intersectional politics of reproductive justice, therefore, has articulated the rights to bodily self-determination and the right to safe contraception choices and abortion (the right to *not* have children) with the right to *have* children and to be able to raise them, to educate them, to keep them healthy and safe, and to provide them with the opportunities to live meaningful and productive lives. The reproductive justice movement, therefore, asserts that the exercising of an individual woman's reproductive rights and freedom of choice requires attention to and the realisation of many other social, economic, civic, and environmental goals, including good jobs and economic security, freedom from domestic violence, sexual coercion, and forced sterilisation, affordable healthcare, educational opportunities for women and good schools for children, decent housing and transportation, and a clean and healthy environment. This emergent challenge to the dominant discourse of reproductive-rights-as-abortion-rights identifies these social, economic, and environmental issues also as significant *reproductive* issues, thereby constructing a politics of intersectionality recognising the important interconnections between individual rights and the broader aims of social justice. This feminist reframing of the concept of 'reproductive justice' points to the significance of the struggle to achieve social reproduction for poor women and women of colour and develops a critique of its relative invisibility in the political consciousness of the middle-class, predominantly white, reproductive rights movement.

Neither the focus by some mainstream/Northern environmentalists on reducing the fertility rates of poor and Third World women, nor the focus by the mainstream reproductive rights movement on advancing abortion rights for middle-class women (and responding with lukewarm opposition, verging

on indifference, to the ongoing federal and state erosion of *Roe v. Wade* limiting access to abortion rights for low-income and poor women) has led to meaningful or sustained coalition-building with social and environmental justice movements in the developing world or with people of colour in the US. For many Third world women and feminists of colour, the environmentalist's population control agenda, and the US women's movement's narrow-focused abortion rights agenda appear to be about limiting their rights to have children, to reproduce, or to sustain their communities. These agendas can resonate too closely with the histories of colonialism, anti-immigration policies and genocide. In light of these problematic roadblocks to coalition, can we identify existing alliances or political articulations that represent more *proactive* and *productive* intersections between reproductive rights and environmental politics?

Sustainability and everyday life: environmental justice as social reproduction

Having taught for many years in both environmental studies and women's and gender studies departments, I am ever more persuaded by the rationality underlying the argument that *all* environmental issues are reproductive issues; efforts to protect the health and integrity of natural systems – water, air, soil, biodiversity – are struggles to sustain the ecosystems that make all life possible and enable the production and reproduction processes upon which all communities (human and non-human) depend. In other words, environmental struggles are about fighting for and ensuring *social reproduction*. While ecofeminists forcefully challenged mainstream environmentalism's focus on protecting an external and endangered 'nature', and shifted the frame to an understanding of ecology as the interconnectedness between humans and nature, it is the women (and men) activists fighting for environmental justice who have most convincingly foregrounded the everyday life (and death) stakes at the root of their environmental politics.

The history of the environmental justice movement chronicles the existence of a long-standing, sustained challenge to the limitations of a single-focus environmental movement.⁶ It also substantiates the intersectional commitments at the core of its epistemological standpoints and political philosophies (an historical record about which the two aforementioned authors calling for 'death' revealed their apparent ignorance). Critics using the environmental justice frame have argued that the mainstream environmental movement (such as Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy) has ineffectively made the connections between the survival of humans and the survival of the environment. It has instead focused its attention on an *abstracted* idea of nature/environment that is *separate* from humans; in other words, it has been preoccupied with protecting uninhabited wilderness areas, or on saving endangered species. Or it has fixated on a mono-causal peril of overpopulation, blaming the world's deteriorating environment on the birth rate of poor women from the Third World rather than on the cultures of

overconsumption, pollution, and waste originating in its own backyards. This categorical separation of nature and culture, common in much mainstream environmental discourse, has led to claims that the environmental movement ‘cares more about whales and owls than it does poor people’ (Newman 1994, p. 42). It appears to many environmental justice activists from around the world that for mainstream/Northern environmental elites, the survival (aka social reproduction) of an ‘endangered species’ is more important than that of their families and communities. Moreover, as some critics have argued, the institutionalisation in the 1990s of the concept of ‘sustainability’ or ‘sustainable development’ (largely embraced by Northern governments and international NGOs) on the surface looked as though it should have been the environmentalist’s counterpart to the idea of social reproduction. But instead it looked more like a global campaign to *sustain* social and economic development (aka social reproduction) in the rich countries and limit it in the poor countries (Conca and Dabelco 1998, Ageyman *et al.* 2003, Di Chiro 2003).⁷

The diverse, international network of EJM activists and organisations, while not speaking in one voice on all issues, adopts a much more relational idea of humans and nature and develops what some have referred to as an ‘environmentalism of everyday life’ (Peña 2005, p. 153). Rather than understanding nature as an exotic *elsewhere* that is separate from our daily lives and that we might visit on a summer vacation or study in a biology class, activists in the EJM locate ‘nature’ and the ‘environment’ in the geographies of everyday life: the places in which we ‘live, work, play, learn, and worship’. This perspective of the ‘*everydayness*’ of nature brings environmental issues *home*, so to speak, and activists make connections between the health of human bodies and the health of the neighbourhoods we live in, the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the food we eat. In so doing, EJM activists examine how the combination or *intersection* of specific economic, social, and environmental conditions might dis-enable or make very difficult an individual’s or community’s ability to survive into the future. Over the past several years, historical and ethnographic accounts of environmental injustices have revealed many of the dis-enabling conditions that limit a community’s sustainability and that are suffered disproportionately by poor people and communities of colour. These conditions include, for example, living next to a polluting facility that dumps toxic chemicals into your neighbourhood, working in hazardous workplaces, living in substandard housing, teaching and learning in unhealthy schools, or having your tribe’s ancestral land expropriated as the preferred site to bury the country’s high level nuclear waste.

By hitching together all of these diverse issues, activists in the EJM – much like the activists organising under the banner of reproductive justice – also engage in a politics of intersectionality linking a variety of problems that have not been deemed properly ‘environmental’ by the mainstream movement. Instead of seeing the environment as *separate* from people and communities, EJM activists, who are predominantly low-income women and women of

colour, define the environment as the places in which we live our lives, build our communities, and have a chance for earthly survival. 'Sustainability', therefore, becomes about securing the enabling conditions for the accomplishment of social reproduction, an achievement that, in an era of intensified globalisation, and for many poor and marginalised communities around the world, has in fact become an 'endangered species'.

In the final sections of this essay, I discuss examples of how environmental justice and reproductive justice activists are demonstrating the intersections between the health of their environments and the future health and survival into the future of their communities. These examples suggest the potential for the emergence of a nascent politics of articulation and coalition-building around the *localised* effects of a common set of *global* processes – that is, political analyses of how global capitalist production threatens localised struggles for social reproduction.

Mapping social reproduction and environmental justice in Asian Pacific Islander communities

In response to growing threats to reproductive freedom and women's self-determination signalled by the 1989 Supreme Court decision in *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*⁸, Asian and Pacific Islander (API) feminists in the San Francisco Bay area ignited a new wave of reproductive rights activism broadening the pro-choice agenda to include the specific concerns of API communities and their struggles for social reproduction. Co-founder of Asian Pacific Islanders for Choice (APIC), Audrey Shoji, argued that:

For communities who have been forbidden from immigrating to this country, owning land, interracial marriage; who have endured internment based solely on ancestry, and forced or coerced sterilization and birth control, access to reproductive health care is indeed a basic civil right essential to self-determination and survival. (pp. 176–177)

The struggle for 'reproductive rights' enabling social reproduction for API communities, therefore, needed to address more fully these historical, economic, and social complexities. APIC's members saw the need to enlarge the organisation's original mission, which had focused on abortion rights and on procuring reproductive health services for low-income and immigrant API women. While maintaining their resolve to bring an API perspective to the largely white, middle-class, pro-choice/reproductive rights dialogue, Bay Area feminists also recognised the importance of reaching out to broader API constituencies and organisations, most of which have concerns extending beyond abortion alone. These concerns include issues such as access to basic healthcare, the many barriers to access based on race/ethnicity, linguistic isolation, and cultural differences, the availability of decent, affordable housing and transportation, the high rates of unemployment and harsh working conditions, the access to good schools and educational opportunities, and the

prevalence of human trafficking targeting Asian immigrant women. Several years after its establishment, the organisation changed its name to Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice (ACRJ) to reflect this emergent intersectional framework (ACRJ 2005). As the organisation's current executive director, Eveline Shen, explains:

Our goals were to address reproductive freedom within a social justice context, because we realized that you can't disentangle the issues that intersect with reproductive freedom that are most important to the communities we work with, which include immigrant rights, workers rights, queer rights, environmental justice, educational justice, bringing an end to violence against women, and the empowerment of youth. Our definition of reproductive freedom is connected to social justice and to building self-determination of individuals and communities.⁹

Popular education approaches are at the centre of ACRJ's organising strategy, which focuses on action-based research and educational and political campaigns identified as important to the local community. One such campaign was birthed in 1997 when ACRJ launched the Health Opportunities, Problem-Solving and Empowerment Project (HOPE) for teenaged girls. Through this project HOPE leaders connected issues of reproductive freedom to a broad spectrum of social justice concerns including environmental justice, school safety and quality of education, welfare rights, workplace safety and worker's rights, and community health and quality of life.¹⁰ Working in alliance with organisers from the nationally known environmental justice organisation, Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN), the young HOPE activists recognised the integral connections between reproductive rights issues and APEN's environmental justice campaigns supporting API communities in East Oakland.

From 1998 to 2000, the HOPE for Girls activists designed and conducted a 'Reproductive Freedom Tour' of their neighbourhoods in East Oakland, highlighting sites or 'tour stops' in the city that adversely affect or limit their communities' reproductive freedom (HOPE 2001).¹¹ HOPE activists set out to research and ultimately map the full range of structural, economic, and environmental factors affecting the reproductive health and freedom of women and girls to 'make visible all of the complex intersections pertaining to reproductive justice that come together in their lives, and to determine a course of action around which to organize and take steps to bring about change'.¹²

Loaded into several vans, the 'tourists' (local residents, teachers, community leaders, and media and foundation representatives) were treated to a guided tour of East Oakland, which included stops at the Cal-Works welfare office, a garment factory, Oakland High School, a correctional facility, the IES medical waste incinerator, and several Oakland-based organisations serving the needs of the community, such as Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (AIWA) and Californians for Justice. The HOPE for Girls tour guides presented the 'sightseers' with information and survey research results about the site as well as first hand accounts of its impact on their lives. For example,

stopping in front of the garment factory of a popular clothing designer, a 16-year-old tour guide described the working conditions that her mother contended with, including 12-hour shifts with no breaks, overcrowded sewing rooms with little ventilation, toxic fumes from dyes and cleaning chemicals, and abusive treatment from male supervisors.¹³

The physical reality of environmental racism comes into view as the van approached the IES (Integrated Environmental Systems) commercial medical waste incinerator located in the low-income district of Fruitvale in East Oakland. The HOPE activists displayed the clarity of their intersectional analysis and the strength of coalition politics as they detailed the links between environmental contamination and reproductive justice (HOPE 2001).¹⁴ In the late 1990s, the ACRJ joined together with the San Francisco Bay area's 'Coalition for Healthy Communities and Environmental Justice' to help shut down IES, the largest medical waste incinerator in the state of California (Figure 1). Regularly in violation of federal and state air quality regulations, IES emitted carcinogenic compounds such as dioxins and mercury, highly toxic by-products of solid waste incineration (DeFao 2001), exposure to which has been associated with reproductive health risks including ovarian cancer, breast cancer, birth defects, endocrine irregularities, declining sperm counts, endometriosis, and infertility (Manchikanti 2001, Steingraber 2001, 2007).

After years of community protests, large fines, and pending legal action, IES was sold to another waste treatment company, Stericycle, which immediately closed the East Oakland facility (Fischer 2001). ACRJ's Eveline Shen argues that the success of the environmental justice campaign hinged on the alliance-building that emerged from the Coalition, which was strengthened



Figure 1. HOPE for Health and Environmental Justice activists protest IES incinerator. Photo courtesy of Greenaction.

by the feminist and reproductive justice articulations introduced by the ACRJ and the HOPE activists.

The ACRJ's youth programme, now called SAFIRE (Sisters in Action for Issues of Reproductive Empowerment), continues the legacy established by the HOPE members by articulating reproductive and environmental justice issues in their new initiative known as POLISH (Participatory Research, Organising, and Leadership Initiative for Safety and Health). Partnering with Asian Health Services and researchers at UC Berkeley's School of Public Health, the POLISH project focuses on women's and girl's exposure to dangerous chemical additives, such as dibutyl phthalates, in beauty and personal care products both personally as consumers and on the job as beauty/nail salon workers. Committed to a coalition politics that does not pit environmental protection against economic security, the POLISH project deploys a community-based intersectional approach that connects the environmental health, safety, and livelihood concerns of both consumers and workers.¹⁵ Moreover, by articulating reproductive justice and environmental justice issues the ACRJ has created an army of young API women who now identify themselves as environmentalists, and who are becoming social and environmental justice leaders in this urban community in California. ACJR director Shen refers directly to the necessity of forging a coalition politics to counter the current 'escalated assault on women's rights as well as a shrinking of the mainstream reproductive health and rights movement'. To address adequately the full range of assaults on reproductive justice – including environmental contamination – Shen calls for 'an integrated analysis, holistic vision, and comprehensive strategies that push against the structural and societal conditions that control our communities by regulating our bodies, sexuality and reproduction' (2006, p. 14).

Climate justice and everyday environmentalism: local/global struggles for social reproduction

Another embodiment of a 'living environmentalism' lies in the coalition politics of a growing international network committed to 'climate justice': the aim of making visible the disproportionate impact of global warming on poor and marginalised communities throughout the world. The work of Gulf Coast environmental justice activists, in particular, has been at the forefront of the movement for climate justice in the US, creating the diverse alliances necessary to understand and act on an environmental problem of such magnitude. Hailing from Louisiana, scholar-activists such as Beverly Wright, Monique Harden, Margie Eugene-Richard, and Juanita Stewart have clearly shown how the communities who live in 'Cancer Alley' – the 80-mile industrial corridor flanking the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to New Orleans and housing more than 130 oil refineries and petrochemical plants – are situated at the nexus of the complex local and global intersections contributing to global climate change.¹⁶ These environmental justice activists draw attention to the

US fossil fuel-based energy policy that, on the one hand, selectively locates hazardous petrochemical facilities adjacent to low-income communities of colour in the US and poor communities in the Third World, and on the other hand, represents one of the largest contributors to rising atmospheric CO₂ levels and global warming. Planetary warming will gravely affect those same communities already economically vulnerable and burdened with poor health, inadequate housing, transportation, and municipal services, and bad environmental quality (Athanasiou and Baer 2002, Redefining Progress 2004, Joseph 2005, Mann 2006). For environmental justice activists such as Wright, Harden, Richard, and Stewart, these connections could not have been made clearer than in the events that unfolded in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in the Gulf Coast of the United States.

Arguing that the human and environmental devastation left in the wake of Hurricane Katrina was only the most recent in a long history of social and ecological disasters in the deep South, New Orleans activist and sociologist Beverly Wright (2005, p. 1) elaborates:

New Orleans, what we once called home, is now a toxic wasteland. But our communities were polluted even before Hurricane Katrina . . . I have learned how the use of fossil fuels hits us hard at the front end, through pollution from the production process. But we also suffer from a 'boomerang' effect: the increased extreme weather patterns caused by global warming . . . The situation in New Orleans and the Gulf Coast has pushed three critical issues into the national spotlight. First, Hurricane Katrina dramatically demonstrates our vulnerability to environmental disasters. Second, America still suffers from gross economic inequalities, and these inequalities largely coincide with race. Third, these two issues are linked, and the results can be deadly.

In the wake of a revival of public interest in global warming, environmental justice leaders have refocused the debate on this planetary-scale environmental issue: *global* climate change produces devastating *localised* effects, which are borne most severely by poor and marginalised communities both here and abroad. Far from being the exclusive domain of an environmental elite dispassionately churning out ever more abstracted climate models and impenetrable international protocols, global warming is reframed by environmental justice activists as a *grassroots* concern putting at risk people's health, homes, neighbourhoods, and livelihoods, and exacerbating the life-and-death consequences of government and private disinvestments in social reproduction suffered by millions of people worldwide. As members of a growing international coalition of environmental and social justice groups organising around the concept of 'climate justice', these activists demonstrate a politics of articulation that connects global-scale environmental problems with their everyday impacts on people's lives. Research by climate justice scholars warns that the uneven, (un)natural selection process brought on by climate change will affect human health and security in myriad ways, all of which will be felt disproportionately by environmental justice populations around the world (Cordova 2006, Harden 2006, Pastor *et al.* 2006, Seager 2006, Roberts and

Park 2007).¹⁷ For example, activists from the Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN) have been among the first to observe and document in detail how climate change affects the lives and capacities for social reproduction of land-based cultures and island nations, communities whose homelands and livelihoods are already being transformed by global warming.¹⁸

Long before the levees failed in New Orleans, environmental justice activists were constructing an intersectional politics revealing the political, economic, cultural, and ecological aspects of the geography of social reproduction in a global capitalist production system in which the costs of social reproduction are borne far away from where most of the benefits accrue. As one of the founding members and currently co-director of the 'Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative' (EJCC), Louisianan Beverly Wright joined with other activists in the US and internationally to put climate change on the agenda of the environmental justice movement and to put environmental justice on the agenda of the climate change establishment. To amplify the concerns of those populations most likely to be negatively affected by a changing climate, a coalition of US environmental justice and Native American activists organised in 2000 an Intra-National Equity Panel to present its position on climate justice at The Hague during the 6th Conference of the Parties (COP6) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Climate justice emerged as the point of intersection joining together activists from South Africa, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Colombia, India, the Philippines, California, Native Alaskan territories, and Louisiana. They called for the UN member states to embrace sustainable global economic policies that would include clean production, renewable energy, and sustainable development that would not endanger people's lives and futures, and that would rein in the dangerous emissions of greenhouse gasses warming the planet and threatening life on earth.¹⁹ Energised by the international consensus that was emerging around climate justice, the US-based group expanded its base and participated in the drafting of a consensus statement on climate justice at the 2001 UN World Conference Against Racism held in Durban, South Africa and which has since been revised and developed at the UN COP meetings on Climate Change from Marrakech in 2001 to Bali in 2007.

EJCC activists also participate in national and state level debates, including lobbying Congressional representatives to include a 'green jobs for all' proposal in the drafting of the 110th Congress' energy bill and providing substantial research and documentation in support of the state of California's Climate Action Initiative.²⁰ Climate justice coalition partners worked with US Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi and Representative Hilda Solis (D-CA) to draft H.R. 2847 (the Green Jobs Act of 2007), which was approved by both the US House and the Senate and, if authorised, would direct \$125 million annually for 'greening the nation's workforce', earmarking funds for job training programmes and investments in renewable energy technologies. Reflecting on the early success of these policy



Figure 2. Climate Justice Youth Corps. Photo courtesy of the Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative.

initiatives, climate justice leader Van Jones argues that fighting global warming needs to be articulated with a commitment to environmental justice. That ultimately means addressing the ever-diminishing access to social reproduction suffered by marginalised populations (both human and non-human) around the globe:

The green economy has the power to deliver new sources of work, wealth and health to low-income people – while honoring the Earth. If you can do that, you just wiped out a whole bunch of problems. We can make what is good for poor black kids good for the polar bears and good for the country. (quoted in Friedman 2007)

The central political-ecological strategy adopted by the EJCC focuses on education and youth leadership development. The youth programme, comprised of the Climate Justice Corps and the newly launched Climate Justice Institute, trains youth from around the country in workshops focusing on climate science, domestic and international climate policy, environmental justice theory, media literacy, and community organising (see Figure 2). Upon completion of the week-long programme, the youth return to their communities and initiate creative climate justice actions, which include implementing green building and renewable energy programmes, lobbying for affordable public transportation, working with local organisations to adopt pollution prevention plans in local industries, and calling for wetlands and ecological protection policies.²¹

Conclusion

Young Climate Justice Corps members are learning that the trick to building broad-based coalitions to confront the ‘mythological scale of this issue’ is

helping people to grasp the direct connections to their own lives and to future generations (Gearon 2006, p. 15). This political-ecological approach connects global climate change to an environmentalism of everyday life. Like the successful coalitions forged by the HOPE activists in Oakland, it also possesses the visionary power and vitality to push the bounds of a moribund, decontextualised environmentalism and to confront the shortcomings of a single-issue reproductive rights agenda. Innovative environmental justice and reproductive justice coalitions articulate people's concerns about their families' and communities' access to *social reproduction* – the maintenance and sustainability of everyday life and earthly survival made all the more difficult by global economic and environmental crises. These coalitions are generating dynamic, *living* environmentalisms that may well compel people to join together and take stronger action to curb problems as big as global warming.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to colleagues who have read and given feedback on early versions of this paper: Rachel Stein, Eveline Shen, Katie Hogan, Cate Mortimer-Sandilands, and Anne Wibiralnske. The author is also grateful to the editors of this special issue of *Environmental Politics* – David Schlosberg and Elizabeth Bomberg – for their insightful comments and editorial talents.

Notes

1. The essay 'The Death of Environmentalism: Global Warming Politics in a Post-Environmental World,' argues that not only is the mainstream environmental movement dead (in the sense of 'outdated'), but it should accept that its central conceptual frame—a disarticulated 'environment' that needs saving—'must die so that something new can live' (2004, p. 10). Available at: http://www.3nov.com/images/report_doe_final.pdf. The book-length version of the authors' critique expands upon this central thesis of a failed environmental movement. See Nordhaus and Shellenberger (2007).
2. To access the library of reports produced by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment visit: <http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/index.aspx>.
3. For a full review and appraisal of the status of women and conclusions drawn from the Beijing +10 special session of the General Assembly, see the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women, available at: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/Review/>. Also see the report by the Women's Environment and Development Organisation, WEDO (2005).
4. Marlene Gerber Fried, 'What if Roe falls?', 20th Annual International Conference on Reproductive Freedom, Hampshire College, Amherst, Massachusetts, 7–9 April 2006.
5. A term coined by Blain *et al.* (2005).
6. Histories and analyses of the environmental justice movement and its theoretical and political underpinnings can be found in Bullard (1994, 2005); Camacho (1998); Di Chiro (1998); Schlosberg (1999); Cole and Foster (2001); Hofrichter (2002); Gottlieb (2005); Pellow and Brulle (2006).
7. The response to the critiques of early framings of sustainability as being about protecting 'our common future' – now that the world's ecosystems are showing signs of breaking down after hundreds of years of exploitation in the service of progress and modernisation for the West and at the moment that countries of the Global South are demanding their share of the development pie – has resulted in

- the emphasising of the term 'equality' in, for example, United Nations discourse, as one of the necessary ingredients of what should constitute sustainable development (see The Ecologist 1993, Chatterjee and Finger 1994). The language of sustainability has since been appropriated, reclaimed, and modified to reflect different approaches and commitments to balancing economic security, human rights, and ecological integrity (see, for example, Agyeman *et al.* 2003).
8. See Fried (1990) and Solinger (2005) for background on *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, 109 S. Ct. 3040, 3077–3079 (1989).
 9. Author's interview with Eveline Shen, Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice (ACRJ), Oakland, CA, 28 October 2005.
 10. Author's interview with Eveline Shen, ACRJ, 28 October 2005.
 11. Author's interview with Amber Chan, Asian Pacific Islander Environmental Network (APEN), Oakland, California, 31 October 2005.
 12. Author's interview with Aparna Shah, ACRJ, Oakland, CA, 31 October 2005.
 13. Author's interview with Eveline Shen, ACRJ, 28 October 2005.
 14. Author's interview with Eveline Shen, 28 October 2005 and Aparna Shah, ACRJ, 31 October 2005.
 15. Author's interview with Aparna Shah and Dana Ginn Paredes, ACRJ, 31 October 2005.
 16. Beverly Wright, Director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice, and Professor of Sociology at Dillard University (New Orleans), Monique Harden, Co-director of Advocates for Environmental Human Rights (New Orleans), Margie Eugene-Richard, former President, Concerns Citizens of Norco (Norco, LA), Juanita Stewart, President, North Baton Rouge Environmental Association (Alsen, LA).
 17. See World Health Organisation (2005) Climate Change and Human Health, available at: <http://www.who.int/globalchange/climate/en/index.html> and EPA's Global Warming website, <http://yosemite.epa.gov/OAR/globalwarming.nsf/content/index.html>.
 18. See Indigenous Environmental Network, Climate Justice Campaign, available at: http://www.ienearth.org/climate_campaign.html.
 19. Author's interview with Ansje Miller, former Programme Director for the Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (EJCC), Redefining Progress, Oakland, California, 26 July 2006.
 20. For more information on the California's Climate Action Initiative, go to the California Climate Change Portal at: http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/. Also see, Cordova (2006). Information on the 'green for all' initiative launched by members of the US climate justice coalition can be found at: <http://www.greenforall.org/>.
 21. Author's interview with Ansje Miller, EJCC, 26 July 2006.

References

- ACRJ, 2005. *A new vision for advancing our movement* [online]. Oakland, CA: Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice. Available from: http://www.reproductive-justice.org/download/ACRJ_A_New_Vision.pdf
- Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., and Evans, B., eds. 2003. *Just sustainabilities: development in an unequal world*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Athanasiou, T. and Baer, P., 2002. *Dead heat: global justice and global warming*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Bakker, I. and Gill, S., eds. 2003. *Power, production and social reproduction*. London and New York: Macmillan-Palgrave.
- Bandarage, A., 1997. *Women, population and global crisis: a political-economic analysis*. London: Zed Books.

- Blain, L., Dorsey, M., Sethi, S., Weintraub, M., and Wilson, L., 2005. Where's the race? *In these times*. Available from: <http://www.inthesetimes.com/site/main/article/2281/> [Accessed 15 August 2005].
- Bookchin, M., 1990. *Remaking society: pathways to a green future*. Boston: South End Press.
- Bradsher, K., 2002. *High and mighty: SUVs: the world's most dangerous vehicles and how they got that way*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Brodie, J., 2003. Globalization, in/security, and the paradoxes of the social. In: I. Bakker and S. Gill, eds. *Power, production and social reproduction*. London and New York: Macmillan-Palgrave.
- Bullard, R., ed. 1994. *Unequal protection: environmental justice and communities of color*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Bullard, R., ed. 2005. *The quest for environmental justice: human rights and the politics of pollution*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Camacho, D., ed. 1998. *Environmental injustices, political struggles: race, class, and the environment*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. and Finger, M., 1994. *The earth brokers: power, politics, and world development*. London: Routledge.
- Clifford, J., 2001. Indigenous articulations. *The contemporary Pacific*, 13 (2), 468–490.
- Cole, L. and Foster, S., 2001. *From the ground up: environmental racism and the rise of the environmental justice movement*. New York: NYU Press.
- Colker, R., 1998. *American law in the age of hypercapitalism: the worker, the family, and the state*. New York: New York University Press.
- Conca, K. and Dabelko, G., eds. 1998. *Green planet blues: environmental politics from Stockholm to Kyoto*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cordova, R., 2006. *Climate change in California: health, economic, and equity impacts* [online]. Oakland, CA: Redefining Progress. Available from: http://www.rprogress.org/newpubs/2006/CARB_Full_0306.pdf
- Darnovsky, M., 1992. Stories less told: histories of US environmentalism. *Socialist review*, 22 (4), 11–54.
- DeFao, J., 2001. Under an air of suspicion. *San Francisco Chronicle*, 27 March, p. 14.
- Diamond, I. and Orenstein, G.F., eds. 1990. *Reweaving the world: the emergence of ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Di Chiro, G., 1992. Defining environmental justice: women's voices and grassroots politics. *Socialist review*, 22 (4), 93–130.
- Di Chiro, G., 1998. Environmental justice from the grassroots: reflections on history, gender, and expertise. In: D. Faber, ed. *The struggle for ecological democracy*. New York: Guilford.
- Di Chiro, G., 2003. Beyond ecoliberal 'common futures': environmental justice, toxic touring, and a transcommunal politics of place. In: D. Moore, J. Kosek, and A. Pandian, eds. *Race, nature and the politics of difference*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- The Ecologist, 1993. *Whose common future? Reclaiming the commons*. Philadelphia: New Society.
- Fischer, D., 2001. Controversial medical waste incinerator shuts down Monday. *Oakland Tribune*, 8 December, p. 5.
- Fried, M.G., ed. 1990. *From abortion to reproductive freedom: transforming a movement*. Boston: South End Press.
- Friedman, T., 2007. The green-collar solution. *The New York Times*, 17 October.
- Gearon, J., 2006. Youth organize for planetary survival. *Race, poverty and the environment*, Summer, 15–16.
- Gelobter, M., et al., 2004. *The soul of environmentalism: rediscovering transformational politics in the 21st century*. Oakland, CA: Redefining Progress. Available from: <http://www.rprogress.org/soul/soul.pdf>

- Gieryn, T., 1999. *Cultural boundaries of science: credibility on the line*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gottlieb, R., 2001. *Environmentalism unbound: exploring new pathways for change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gottlieb, R., 2005. *Forcing the spring: the transformation of the American environmental movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Hall, S., 1986. On postmodernism and articulation: an interview with Stuart Hall. In: L. Grossberg, ed. *Journal of communication inquiry*, 10 (2), 35–73.
- Haraway, D., 1992. The promises of monsters: a regenerative politics for inappropriate/d others. In: L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. Treichler, eds. *Cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Harden, M., 2006. Katrina hits cancer alley. *Dollars & sense*, March–April, 34–51.
- Hartmann, B., 1995. *Reproductive rights and wrongs: the global politics of population control*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hartmann, B. and Hendrixson, A., 2005. Pernicious peasants and angry young men: the strategic demography of threats. In: B. Hartmann, B. Subramaniam, and C. Zerner, eds. *Making threats: biofears and environmental anxieties*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hofrichter, R., ed. 2002. *Toxic struggles: the theory and practice of environmental justice*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- HOPE for Girls/ACRJ, 2001. A reproductive freedom tour of Oakland. Tour guide published by Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice, Oakland, CA.
- Jasanoff, S., 2005. *Designs on nature: science and democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Joseph, P., 2005. Race and poverty are out of the closet: interview with Robert Bullard. *Sierra Magazine*, November/December, p. 5.
- Katz, C., 2001. Vagabond capitalism and the necessity of social reproduction. *Antipode*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Katz, C., 2004. *Growing up global: economic restructuring and children's everyday lives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Krauss, C., 1994. Women of color on the frontline. In: R. Bullard, ed. *Unequal protection: environmental justice and communities of color*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 256–271.
- Manchikanti, A., 2001. Environmentalists work to phase out incinerators, stop release of pollutants. *San Jose Mercury News*, 21 August, pp. 3–4.
- Mann, E., 2006. Climate justice for black New Orleans. *Race, poverty and the environment*, Summer, 18–20.
- Marston, S., 2004. A long way from home: domesticating the social production of scale. In: E. Sheppard and R.B. McMaster, eds. *Scale and geographic inquiry: nature, society, and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Merchant, C., 1996. *Earthcare: women and the environment*. New York: Routledge.
- Mies, M. and Shiva, V., 1993. *Ecofeminism*. New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Mitchell, K., Marston, S., and Katz, C., eds. 2004. *Life's work: the geography of social reproduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Newman, P., 1994. Killing legally with toxic waste: women and the environment in the United States. In: V. Shiva, ed. *Close to home: women reconnect ecology, health and development worldwide*. Philadelphia: New Society.
- Nordhaus, T. and Shellenberger, M., 2007. *Break through: from the death of environmentalism to the politics of possibility*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Pastor, M., et al., 2006. *In the wake of the storm: environment, disaster, and race after Katrina*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Pellow, D. and Brulle, R., eds. 2006. *Power, justice and the environment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Peña, D., 2005. *Mexican Americans and the environment: tierra y vida*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Peterson, V.S., 2003. *A critical rewriting of global political economy: integrating reproductive, productive, and virtual economies*. London: Routledge.
- Piven, F.F., 2004. *The war at home: the domestic cost of Bush's militarism*. New York: The New Press.
- Plant, J., ed. 1989. *Healing the wounds: the promise of ecofeminism*. Philadelphia: New Society Press.
- Reagon, B.J., 1983. Coalition politics: turning the century. In: B. Smith, ed. *Home girls: a black feminist anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table Press, 356–368.
- Redefining Progress, 2004. *African Americans and climate change: an unequal burden* [online]. Oakland, CA: Redefining Progress. Available from: http://redefiningprogress.org/newpubs/2004/CBCF_REPORT_execsum.pdf
- Roberts, D., 2000. Race, reproduction, and the meaning of liberty: building a social justice vision of reproductive freedom. Presentation to the Othmer Institute, 18 April. Available from: <http://www.othmerinstitute.org/reports/report1.html>
- Roberts, J.T. and Parks, B., 2007. *A climate of injustice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schlosberg, D., 1999. *Environmental justice and the new pluralism: the challenge of difference for environmentalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seager, J., 1993. *Earth follies: coming to feminist terms with the global environmental crisis*. New York: Routledge.
- Seager, J., 2006. Noticing gender (or not) in disasters. *Geoforum*, 37 (1), 2–3.
- Seager, J. and Hartmann, B., 2005. *Mainstreaming gender in environmental assessment and early warning*. New York: United Nations Publications.
- Shen, E., 2006. Reproductive justice: toward a comprehensive movement [online]. *Mother Jones*, January/February. Available from: www.motherjones.com/commentary/columns/2006/01/reproductive_justice.html
- Shiva, V., 2005. *Earth democracy*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Silliman, J. and King, Y., eds. 1999. *Dangerous intersections: feminist perspectives on population, environment, and development*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Silliman, J., et al., 2004. *Undivided rights: women of color organize for reproductive justice*. Boston: South End Press.
- Smith, N., 1992. Contours of a spatialized politics: homeless vehicles and the production of geographic scale. *Social text*, 33, 54–81.
- Solinger, R., 2005. *Pregnancy and power: a short history of reproductive politics in America*. New York: NYU Press.
- Stein, R., ed. 2004. *New perspectives on environmental justice: gender, sexuality, and activism*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Steingraber, S., 2001. *Having faith: an ecologist's journey to motherhood*. Cambridge: Perseus Publishing.
- Steingraber, S., 2007. *The falling age of puberty in U.S. girls: what we know, what we need to know*. San Francisco: The Breast Cancer Fund.
- Sturgeon, N., 1997. *Ecofeminist natures: race, gender, feminist theory, and political action*. New York: Routledge.
- Sumner, J., 2005. *Sustainability and the civil commons: rural communities in the age of globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- WEDO, 2005. *Beijing betrayed* [online]. New York: WEDO (Women's Environment and Development). Available from: <http://www.wedo.org/library.aspx?ResourceID=31>
- World Health Organisation, 2005. *Climate change and human health*. Available from: <http://www.who.int/globalchange/climate/en/index.html>
- Wright, B., 2005. Katrina reveals environmental racism's deadly force [online]. *San Francisco Bay View*, 12 October. Available from: <http://sfbayview.com/neworleans/katrinareveals101205.shtml>