

Local Sustainability: Balancing Quality and Equality?

Julian Agyeman

Tufts University Boston/Medford, USA

Introduction

Irwin (1995 p. 7) has argued that 'any kind of citizenship which neglects the knowledges held by citizen groups will be restricted in its practical possibilities' and that 'there will be no "sustainability" without a greater potential for citizens to take control of their own lives, health and environment'. He calls this 'citizen science', a science which "assists the needs and concerns of citizens".

In a similar vein, one of John Ralston Saul's points in his Keynote to the 1999 Australian Association of Environmental Education (AAEE) Conference was that public language must become political if environmental educators are to get their issues on the policy and action agendas of politicians. Earlier, at the 1999 Royal Geographical Society/Institute of British Geographers conference, the politicisation of public language was brilliantly exemplified by an African-American sociologist who said that he'd stopped reading the thoughts of 'dead white sociologists' and now practiced a more potent form: 'kick ass sociology'.

In the same vein, it is hoped that this paper, and the 1999 AAEE Conference at which it was given, marks the beginning of a brave new approach to the theory and practice of environmental education: welcome 'kick ass environmental education!'

The tension between 'environmental quality' and 'human equality'

Having worked in environmental education for the best part of 20 years, in schools, the voluntary sector, local government, consultancy and in higher education in the UK, and more recently the USA, I have felt rather alone talking about *equity, social justice and equality* to an environmental and environmental education 'movement' who, for the most part didn't really want to listen. Their primary preoccupation was with the identification, study and preservation of environmental quality. Tanner (1998) is explicit in this environmental quality-bias when he notes that 'a venerable premise of the environmental education community is that

A B S T R A C T

This paper attempts to link four themes which are interrelated, but not often discussed together in local sustainability discourses. They are: the tension between achieving both environmental quality and human equality; the possibilities offered by Local Agenda 21 (LA21); what a sustainable community or society might look like and some good practice guidelines for local governments in their pivotal role as key facilitators of local sustainability.

Environmentalists and environmental educators are good on notions of what they perceive as 'environmental quality', but are poor, or very poor on notions of 'human equality'. Human equality has always been an implicit agreement as opposed to an explicit goal, safely tucked away in the notion of 'quality of life'.

One of the guiding principles of LA21 is that people normally excluded from the decision making process (women, indigenous people and young people) need to be integrally involved in decision making within a framework which stresses the importance of public participation. The reason for this inclusive form of participation is that these groups are seen as having had little impact on the production of local environments, although they are sometimes disproportionately affected by them, by virtue of their social role.

Using a set of 13 themes that were developed by community consultations in Britain that would feature in a sustainable community or society, the paper looks at the potential for integrating quality and equality concerns. The paper finishes by looking at some good practice guidelines or ways that local governments, as decision makers nearest local peoples, could be integrating quality and equality concerns into emerging local sustainability strategies.

the education of children and youths should produce adults committed to environmental quality, adults whose behaviours consistently evidence that commitment in their many life roles' (p. 365).

This may not seem an unreasonable bias in a movement that is (still) largely driven by ecologists. However, it is argued that the blind pursuit of environmental quality has been at the expense of the equally necessary pursuit of human equality:

- I can remember a mid 1980s conference, organised by the the British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (BTCV), Britain's biggest voluntary conservation organisation, where a person from BTCV HQ accused me of 'rocking the boat', for asking questions about BTCV's lack of staff and volunteer diversity. I'm glad I rocked his boat.
- I can remember in 1989, researching a TV programme on people of colour in the UK environmental movement, and, when calling Greenpeace UK to ask about the makeup of their workforce, a press person said 'it's not an issue for us, we're here to save the world'.
- Similarly, when researching an article for the UK journal *Town and Country Planning* in 1988, I called the then Department of the Environment in the UK to inquire if any research had been done into environmental quality and Britain's ethnic minority communities. I was told 'it's not the kind of research we do, it doesn't come under our auspices'.
- I once got a range of UK Friends of the Earth's literature on rainforests, and laid it out, in chronological order. The early materials spoke almost exclusively about the rainforests as a resource for us in the North - genetically,

biodiversity-wise and climatically. It wasn't until comparatively recently, that their rainforest literature put First People centre stage, and described the forest as a living habitat for them, rather than purely as a resource for us.

The point is that environmentalists and environmental educators are good on notions of what they perceive as 'environmental quality', but are poor, or very poor on notions of 'human equality'. Often off the environmental educators' radar completely, human equality has always been an awkward and implicit agreement as opposed to an explicit goal, safely tucked away in the notion of 'quality of life'. Environmental education has the rhetoric of equality and social justice in its learned journals and internet colloquia, but at the practitioner level, there is still little manifestation of this. However, the development of education for sustainability (see for example Tilbury (1995), Huckle and Sterling (1996) or Fien (1997) promises more commitment at both the theoretical and practical levels.

In amongst a wide array of material on the 1998 Environment Canada/Canadian Journal of Environmental Education Online Colloquium, was a paper by Stephanie Rixecker. She is a US trained political scientist who teaches on an MSc Resource Management at Lincoln University in bicultural Aotearoa New Zealand. She is interested academic border crossings, that is where people trained in one place and culture go to a different place and culture to practice, in her case environmental education. In her article, she uses reflexive narrative and makes a very perceptive comment on the theoretician-practitioner and quality-equality divide in environmental education. She says: 'it is a common occurrence to link environmental education with social justice and equity issues However, the extent to which environmental education practitioners actually consider the sociocultural, geopolitical, spiritual and (post) colonial settings in which they work—and which they influence through their work—is much less considered and debated' (Rixecker 1999 p. 221).

She continues that 'I do not doubt that well meaning and a genuine belief in empowerment and social justice exists amongst environmental education practitioners and theorists..... Unless practitioners constantly and consistently interrogate their own approaches and authority in whatever pedagogical context(s) they reside, the chances are high that the rhetoric of empowerment, social justice, and a healthier, more sustainable environment will not manifest themselves in the material world' (Rixecker 1999 p. 224).

This comment is as relevant to Stephanie's global academic border crossings, as it is in a local practitioner context. I can think of my own experience of those doughty conservation evangelists from the London Wildlife Trust undertaking 'practitioner border crossings' by going into blighted housing estates in inner London where the poverty was palpable, and saying 'OK, where do you want your nature garden? Do you want a field maple hedge here, or there?'

I think there is a critical nexus that has been poorly, if ever debated within environmental education. It is the nexus between (environmental) quality and (human) equality. This is unfortunate because each year I am more convinced that ultimately, there will only be environmental quality, when there is human equality.

'Ultimately, there will only be environmental quality, when there is human equality'

For me, this simple idea is fundamental to resolving the 'environmental problematique': the increasing array of interconnected problems that currently afflict our planet. As environmental educators, we are uniquely placed to effect change. Firstly however, we must broaden our competencies and expand our worldviews such that we understand and appreciate the inextricable links between environmental quality and human equality (look around, the evidence is plain to see). Secondly, and fundamentally, we then need to integrate our (new) understanding(s) and appreciation(s) into practice. Thirdly, we must recognise that this (new) approach changes, or at least (re) focuses the agenda for environmental education. As Fien (1998) puts it 'the recognition that real improvements in the quality of life are dependent on the reconciliation between economic development, environmental conservation and social equity has changed the agenda for environmental education' (p. 20).

Another way of looking at the quality-equality nexus is through two concepts that have interested me for the past 10 years. On the one hand, we have the British Forum for the Future's Jonathan Porritt's concept of '*the privilege of concern*'. This is the notion that it is a privilege to be able to release yourself from the daily grind to get active in environmental activity, conservation etc. On the other, we have the Bishop of Chicago's comment that his people need to '*consume for at least 100 years*', and when they've finished consuming, and have consumed to the point that the US middle classes have done, then perhaps they too can share '*the privilege of concern*'. *Quality and equality in stark contrast*. On reflection, and in subsequent discussions at the conference, we decided that it is perhaps disingenuous to think of the 'privilege of concern', after all, surveys show that most people are 'concerned' about the environment. It is better to think of the '*privilege of choice*', the ability to release oneself from the mundane in order to *choose* to do something for the environment.

The quality-equality nexus can also be characterised as being an expression of the two dominant cultural trends that coexist and overlap in the western world: *modernity* and *postmodernity*. Here is not the place to go into defining these trends, indeed the complexity of classifying such fluid and changing movements is extremely difficult and the following is not intended to be a systematic nor thorough classification.

It is merely intended to illustrate the nexus in a few instances.

<i>Focus of Modernity</i>	<i>Focus of Postmodernity</i>
quality-	quality <i>and</i> equality
biodiversity-	bio <i>and</i> sociocultural diversity
wildlife habitat-	habitat
natural resources-	holistic cosmologies/ traditional ecological knowledge

In each case, the modern approach tends to feature the concerns of what I'd call 'unreconstructed environmentalists': ones whose concerns are largely with environmental quality. They are positivistic, 'objective' and 'scientific'. By contrast, the postmodern approach is seen to be the one which is more integrative, holistic and socially inclusive in linking environmental concerns with those of social justice and equity. This is because, as Sauve (1999 p. 13) argues "postmodern reconstructive epistemology values dialogue among different forms of knowledge (scientific, experiential, traditional and so on)". Yet even with the cultural trappings of postmodernism all around us, in today's more advanced sustainability discourses, let alone 1980s environmental discourses, the dominant 'storylines' (Hajer 1996) still relate primarily to environmental quality issues, not human equality issues.

When equality issues are discussed, it is usually through Malthusian and racist interpretations of actual population growth (rather than what societies actually consume per capita), not through redistributive strategies for the achievement of fair shares for all. However, the 'environmental space' work of McLaren et al (1998) which aims at an "equitable distribution of environmental resources, now and into the future" (p. xiv), and Wackemagel and Rees's (1996) work on the 'ecological footprint' are welcome exceptions.

One conspicuous departure from this dominant, environmental quality-biased storyline, has been the phenomenal growth of the environmental justice movement in the US. This is the grassroots activism of African-American, Latino, Asian, Pacific Islander and Native American communities who are organising themselves around issues of waste facility siting, lead contamination, pesticides, water and air pollution, workplace safety, and transport. Drawing insight from both the US civil rights movement, and the mainstream environmental movement, they are synthesising the civil right to equality, with the environmental movement's strengths in notions of environmental quality.

Clearly, the pivotal act was the problematisation of the word 'environment'. The grassroots (re) definition of environmental issues, not (only) as wildlife, recreational or resource issues, but as *justice* and *rights* issues gave birth to the environmental justice movement. In so doing, 'environment' became discursively different: it became an issue not just for the Sierra

Club, the National Wildlife Federation and the National Audubon Society, but for the Civil Rights Movement.

Bullard (1993), a leading exponent of environmental justice (and Professor of 'kick ass sociology') notes that 'the quest for environmental justice... extends the quest for basic civil rights' (p. 30) and that 'the crux of the problem is that the mainstream environmental movement has not sufficiently addressed the fact that social inequality and imbalances of social power are at the heart of environmental degradation, resource depletion, pollution, and even overpopulation. The environmental crisis can simply not be solved effectively without social justice' (p. 23).

Using Bullard's (1993) critique, it is clear that in the developing discourse surrounding local sustainability, the issue of balancing the quest for environmental quality with the pursuit of human equality is an environmental justice issue which environmental educators, and those involved in education for sustainability must act upon

The possibilities offered by Local Agenda 21

For the reasons outlined above, amongst others, I welcomed the concept of sustainable development and sustainability in the late 1980s with open arms. I'm aware of it's contradictions, and its problem as a goal for education especially in terms of those conceptual, ethical and cultural issues described clearly by Sauve (1999), but on balance it has a workability, a framework and a millennial feel whose potential is greater than its problems. It has given me and others the opportunity, at least theoretically, to introduce such concepts as *equity*, *social justice and equality* into what were discourses dominated by the 'venerable premise' (Tanner 1998, p. 365) of environmental quality.

In 1992, the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development agreed to Agenda 21, a program for global sustainable development. Signatories committed themselves to depositing a national plan for sustainable development by 1994. Whilst Agenda 21 is the global agenda, the UNCED organisers were persuaded that, according to the principle of subsidiarity, as the level of governance closest to people, local authorities have a vital role to play in educating, mobilizing and responding to the public to promote sustainable development. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) duly wrote Chapter 28 of Agenda 21, which recognises and relates to this pivotal role. LA21 was born.

One of the guiding principles of LA21 is that people normally excluded from the decision making process (women, indigenous people and young people) need to be integrally involved in decision making within a framework which stresses the importance of public participation. In the spirit of Agenda 21, peoples of colour, First peoples, ethnic minorities etc are included under 'indigenous peoples'. The reason for this inclusive form of participation is that these groups are seen as having had little impact on the production of local

environments, although they are sometimes disproportionately affected by them, by virtue of their social role, such as women and/or their vulnerability, such as indigenous and young peoples.

Part of local authorities' tasks towards LA21 is to ensure that they enable and encourage the fullest participation of all sections of the local community in developing a new approach to local issues.

In addition to the written encouragement, in both Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration, to involve people normally excluded, is the moral imperative to ensure that local sustainable development is based, not only on respecting environmental limits, but on respecting equality between and within generations, genders, cultures and different communities. Whilst many authorities worldwide are working well on the 'environmental' implications of local sustainable development, fewer are getting to grips with 'equalities' implications. Ignoring or underplaying these social and equal opportunities issues will result in an Environmental Action Plan, not a Sustainable Development, or LA21 Action Plan.

Clearly, LA21 is potentially a significant focus for action towards local sustainability. Talking about LA21 and other citizen initiatives, Korten (1996) notes that 'there are signs throughout the world of a political and spiritual awakening of civil society to the reality that national and global institutions are pursuing agendas at odds with the needs of people and living things. Countless citizen initiatives prompted by this awakening are coalescing into a global political movement for transformational change' (p. 46).

What might a sustainable community or society look like?

So, what might a community transformed towards sustainability actually look like? We're not there yet. Not by a long way. Perhaps we don't even know where 'there' is? However, the following is a set of themes, characteristics or issues that would feature in a sustainable community or society. They represent a beginning in our visioning of sustainable futures and were developed by community consultations in Britain carried out by the UK Local Government Management Board, but I've added some more detailed thoughts and examples. They are similar to others I've seen such as those of the Institute for Sustainable Communities used by the President's Council on Sustainable Development in the USA:

• Consumption and Waste:

Resources would be used efficiently and waste minimised by closing resource cycles.

This is the 'low hanging fruit' of sustainable communities. It is an area where there are many innovative municipal source reduction schemes worldwide such as 'Precycle' in Berkeley, California

where people consider waste before they buy. In business, there is a growing use of 'industrial ecology' concepts such as 'zero waste' in eco-industrial parks such as Chatanooga in the USA and Kalundborg, Denmark.

• Pollution (Air, Noise, Water etc):

Pollution would be limited to levels with which natural systems can cope without damage.

There are many examples of communities participating in multistakeholder strategies to address noise, air and water pollution. ICLEI's 'Cities for Climate Protection Plan' which includes cities around the world such as Vancouver, Atlanta, Frankfurt and Newcastle, NSW and the Baynes Sound stormwater monitoring program and stewardship initiative on Vancouver Island are examples

• Wildlife and Nature:

The diversity of nature would be valued and protected.

Local biodiversity action plans give local government the opportunity, to work in partnership to contribute to national targets for species and habitats. Such plans can be prepared at regional/state, county or district levels. In the UK, the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plans are an important move in conserving Suffolk's wildlife. For the first time, nationally important and declining species and habitats have been considered in the context of Suffolk, and a series of actions have been arranged to conserve them at a local level.

• Local Focus:

Wherever possible, all needs that could be met locally would be met locally.

Having a local focus does not mean isolation. We live in a global, networked economy. However, sustainable communities will be able to diversify in order to support needs locally; reduce wastage and encourage reuse and engage in import substitution in order to invest economically and spiritually in the locality. Community Supported Agriculture schemes (or Community Farms in Europe or Food Guilds in Japan) and Farmer's Markets (eg Portland Farmers' market, USA) are good examples.

• Equity:

Everyone would have access to good food, water, shelter and fuel at reasonable cost.

Social justice and equity would permeate the core of sustainable communities. Municipalities can assist by

becoming involved in social investment, by providing affordable housing through streamlining the development approval process and by using creative zoning principles. Funding for affordable housing would be through community finance initiatives such as community development banks, corporations and credit unions. Location efficient mortgages would be more widely available. Cooperatives and co-housing options (eg Denmark) would be more widely available.

- **Employment:**

Opportunities would be provided for all to undertake satisfying work in a diverse economy. Recognition would be given to the value of unpaid work.

The 'new economics' of sustainable community economic development where people and communities identify and create their own economic solutions does not mean isolation, but greater diversification. This will result in an overall shift, and explosion in the types of jobs available, from those in industries that are *natural* resource intensive, to those in industries which are *mental* resource intensive. LETS schemes enable people to decide the local unit of 'currency', and trade their skills in this. In 'time money schemes' in the USA, the currency is the hours spent in volunteer activity, so that shopping for local elderly people becomes an alternative form of 'money'.

- **Health:**

Priority would be given to the creation of safe, clean, pleasant environments and health services that would emphasise prevention as well as cure.

The growth in preventative approaches has been spectacular. It is now considered 'complimentary' to, rather than an 'alternative' to 'modern' drug-based medicine. There are numerous 'Healthy City' programmes around the world, and there is the Australian 'Healthy Localities Projects'.

- **Access for All:**

Access to facilities, services, goods and people would be achieved at no environmental cost, nor would it be limited to car owners.

Integrated transport systems that provide real choices would offer low impact mobility where needed, within the wider context of a planning for a reduced need to travel. The focus would be on mixed-use neighbourhoods and on developing a wide variety of eco-neighbourhood options from rural eco-villages such as West Harwood, Lothian, Scotland, to urban eco-cities such as the Halifax EcoCity Project in

Adelaide. The 'New Urbanism' aims to produce LASTING communities: 'Livable, Affordable, Safe, Transit-oriented, Inclusive, Neighbourly, Growing'. Such 'Transit Oriented Development' (TOD) can be found in Portland and San Diego in the USA, and Waitakere, New Zealand.

- **Crime:**

People would live without fear of violence from crime or persecution because of belief, race, gender, disability or sexuality.

Reclaiming the streets as a result of greater pedestrian usage would go a long way to reducing street crime. In Hamilton, Ontario, there are 'Safety Audit Programmes', in Australia, there is the 'Safer Cities Strategy'. However, crime rates are related to a multitude of factors, such as inequity and economic development and opportunity.

- **Information:**

Everyone would have access to the skills, knowledge and information necessary to enable them to play a full part in society.

Models such as urban study centres, the Dutch Science Shops, community law centres and cybercafes would provide the skills needed to access information and online conference projects such as BBC Online's 1999 'Online Communities' conference, would be fully developed.

- **Local Democracy:**

All sections of the community would be empowered to participate in decision-making.

New forms of governance and government are being developed, and new forms of participation, such as Future Search, visioning, consensus conferencing and citizen's juries would feature in the move towards an inclusive participatory democracy whose aim would be to rebuild social capital and the civil society. The voluntary organisations that make up the 'third sector' link the private and public sectors to local communities. This vibrant and growing sector offers initiative, ideas and alternatives.

- **Culture and Leisure:**

Opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation would be readily available to all.

The phenomenal growth of 'cultural industries' (the people and firms that create and distribute labour-intensive cultural products such as books, magazines,

films, television programs, sound recordings and live theatre productions) will ensure a diverse range of (multi) cultural opportunities and understanding(s), whilst the greater emphasis on preventative health approaches and walking/cycling as viable transport choices will broaden the concept of recreation. Cultural, leisure and recreational activities also contributes to the growth in social capital.

- **Local Distinctiveness:**

Places, spaces, settlements and objects would be designed to value and protect diversity and local distinctiveness.

This was one of the most resonant themes with local communities. People are increasingly aware of the 'placelessness' and 'elsewhereness' of their towns cities and landscapes, caused by the loss of focal high streets, the intrusion of malls and transnational corporate giants, the 'museumisation' of landscapes and the general 'Disneyfication' of culture. In the UK, Common Ground runs a 'Local Distinctiveness' campaign. One of their mantras is: 'Value the commonplace. Our cultural landscapes are our ordinary history and everyday nature intertwined'.

These themes and the examples I've given are far from being solely environmental. They are broadly based, intelligent and I think an excellent blend of social, cultural, economic and environmental issues which we are going to need in the move towards more equitable, sustainable communities. But are the social, cultural and economic aspects being featured in LA21? I think not. Look to your own countries. Trawl the World Wide Web and you'll find that the overwhelming majority of LA21 projects are still broadly 'environmental'- often (strangely enough) the easiest problems to tackle.

Part of the problem of course is that in defining what LA21 is, we are in danger of exclusivity and marginalisation: I've heard people say *'if it isn't an LA21 project, it's not about local sustainability'*. There is the danger that people are going to think that LA21 and local sustainability are the same. They are not. LA21 is merely the preferred form of transport at present, towards the goal of local sustainability. A lot of good work towards sustainability is happening outside the 'LA21 club', especially amongst ethnic minority communities and different cultural groups

For example, ethnic minority communities and different cultural groups all over the world are already involved in a huge range of community, cultural, religious and social groups which are mostly not dealing in single issues, but with a wide range of issues and concerns. It is this holism which sustains and enhances such communities. For this reason, the broad agenda of local sustainable development, of linked environmental, economic, cultural and social issues, is one in which many are already involved, *although they might not name it as such.*

Similarly, research conducted into women's participation in sustainability programs in the United Kingdom (Buckingham-Hatfield 1999) suggests that very little specific effort has been made to encourage women to participate in the formulation of LA21 programs. *LA21 is a process that uniquely occupies territory on the boundary of public and intermediate space.* This is important for issues of women's participation because intermediate space ie community and neighbourhood, is where women are very active, particularly around environmental issues (through their social roles as prime carer, housekeeper, shopper and cook). Conversely, the public space of paid employment, commerce and formal politics is where women are less visible (though present) and wield little influence.

Good practice guidelines for local governments

No discussion on local sustainability in relation to quality and equality would be complete without discussing the role of one of the major actors. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your view of local government, the way toward integrating quality and equality concerns into coherent local sustainability strategies, action plans and programmes could be considerably smoothed by, amongst others, more decisive actions in local governments worldwide. However, these ideas are general good practice and could apply to any organisation working for change.

To realise more fully their pivotal role in local sustainability through LA21, local authorities should:

- **Start where people and the community are.**

If this means dealing with racial and sexual attacks, unemployment and security issues before more traditional environmental ones, so be it. Developing the confidence of people normally excluded can lead to a broader partnership towards local sustainable development;

- **Recognise that there may be credibility barriers.**

Unless there is a proven and demonstrable commitment to anti-racism, anti sexism and equal opportunity in the workplace, and equal partnership in the community, there may be credibility barriers to the participation of people normally excluded;

- **Explore current good practice.**

There is a lot of good work towards sustainability going on outside the 'official' LA21 banner. Find it, learn from it and work with it.

- **Develop appropriate communication skills and media.**

The environmentalists' favourite, the leaflet, is not always the best medium for the message! Develop other communication skills eg verbal, visual, written, video, GIS, focus group etc in order to gain greater understanding of and interaction with communities in the area.

- *Ensure that consultation processes seek wide opinions.*

Consult more widely than just the self styled 'leaders' of groups. Different sections of a particular cultural, ethnic or religious group need an opportunity to voice an opinion. This will avoid the often- unrepresentative opinion of self-styled leaders. Make sure you avoid the 'take me to your leader' mode of consultation; it is neo-colonial and offensive.

- *Develop funding packages which are available, accessible and appropriate.*

This means using plain language, avoiding jargon, distributing and publicising funds more widely and targeting funds, so that they can be used by single gender, religious or other special groups;

- *Train council staff, especially those involved with LA21.*

LA21 and other outreach workers will need training in (cross) cultural awareness and cultural competency, anti-racism and equal opportunities issues.

- *Explore and develop twinning initiatives.*

Twinning and international cooperation between local communities, and areas of the world where they have links, is clearly an excellent inroad into comparative local sustainability practice.

- *Take LA21 to community group meetings and festivals.*

Too often LA21 resides in specialist LA21 meetings. Crossing 'borders' will build communities' confidence in a familiar setting. It will also increase awareness of the relevance of LA21 to peoples' lives;

- *Incorporate different perspectives into policy.*

It is one thing to try and make sustainable development more relevant to people normally excluded, but quite another to incorporate their perspectives into developing policy and practice, such that they inform the evolving whole.

Conclusion

One of John Ralston Saul's last points in his 1999 AAEE keynote was that poverty, income disparity and the dismantling of public education are a natural part of the environmental question. If he is right, and I suspect, or rather know that he is, then my conclusion must be that: Ultimately, there will only be environmental quality, when there is human equality.

Roughly translated, this means, go out and kick ass! 🐾

Note

A paper given at the 1999 Australian Association for Environmental Education 'Pointers for Change' Conference UNSW, Sydney 14-18 January 1999.

References:

- Buckingham-Hatfield, S. 1999, 'Gendering Agenda 21: Women's Involvement in Setting the Environmental Agenda', *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, vol. 1, pp. 121-132
- Bullard, R. 1993 'Anatomy of Environmental Racism and the Environmental Justice Movement', in R. Bullard (ed) *Confronting Environmental Racism*, South End Press. Boston MA.
- Fien, J. 1997, *Undermining myths in environmental education*. Keynote paper presented at the 1997 Australian Association for Environmental Education Conference, Hobart, Tasmania.
- Fien, J. 1998, 'Education for Sustainability: Some Questions for Reflection', *RootS*, no. 17, December, pp. 20-24.
- Huckle, J. & Sterling, S. (eds) (1996) *Education for Sustainability*, Earthscan Publications Ltd., London.
- Irwin, A. 1995, *Citizen Science*, Routledge, London.
- Korten, D. 1996, 'Civic Engagement in Creating Future Cities', *Environment and Urbanisation*, vol. 8, no. 1, April, pp. 35-49.
- McLaren, D., Bullock, S. & Yousuf, N. 1998, *Tomorrow's World. Britain's Share in a Sustainable Future*, Earthscan, London.
- Rixecker, S. S. 1998, 'Environmental Education and Academic Border Crossings: Addressing (Educational) Imperialism in Aotearoa New Zealand', *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, vol. 4, pp. 213-230.
- Sauve, L. 1998, 'Environmental Education: Between Modernity and Postmodernity – Searching for an Integrating Educational Framework', *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, vol. 4, pp. 9-35.
- Tanner, T. 1998, 'Introduction', *Environmental Education Research*, Special Issue, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 365-368.
- Tilbury, D. 1996, 'Environmental Education for Sustainability: Defining the New Focus for Environmental Education in the 1990s', *Environmental Education Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 195-212.
- Wackernagel, M. & Rees, W. 1996, *Our Ecological Footprint*, New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island BC.