

22 ENVIRONMENT AND WOMEN: THE GENDERED SYNERGY

Ms. Sunithakumari

Assistant Professor of Sociology, Governemnt First Grade College, Harohalli,
Karnataka – 562117. Email: smilesb4mv@gmail.com

Abstract:

The idea that there is a positive synergy between women's interests and environmental conservation is examined in this paper. women have a special and close relationship with nature, and that women are particularly altruistic and caring in their environmental management. Gender analysis provides an apt framework for understanding women's and men's environmental relations and a potentially contrary view of the synergy between gender interests and environmental conservation.

Keywords: *Women, Environemnt relations, conservation, ecofeminism*

Introduction:

The dominant discourses on women and environ- ment — i.e. ecofeminist and Women, Development and Environment' (WDE) literatures — emphasize the affinity of women with their environments, yet gender analysis offers a preferable alternative con- ceptual framework as the basis for understanding, and intervening in, the local specificities of men's and women's environmental relations.

Ecofeminism takes different forms, characterized broadly as cultural ecofeminism and social ecofemi- nism (Plumwood, 1992, p. 10)“A basic assumption common to all ecofeminist positions is therejectionoftheassumedinferiority ofwomenand nature and of the superiority of reason, humanity and culture” (Plumwood, 1992, p. 13). Both are ecocen- tric, in that nonhuman life is seen as morally consid- erable (Eckersley, 1992) and both bracket women with nature. Our concentration on cultural ecofemi- nism here is justified by the apparent ascendancy of thiselement,especiallyamongactivistenvironmental groups in the West, as well as by the influence (acknowledged by Rodda, 1991, p. 4) ofcultural ecofeminism upon literatura pertaining to women, development and evnironment, primarily through Vandana Shiva. Critiques of ecofeminism from a development perspective (Agarwal, 1991; Rao 1991, Jackson, 1993) have drawn attention to its biological determinism and essentialism, and the absence of social, material or historical context.

Women and environment – The Linkages

Women as a group do not experience environmental degradation in a uniform manner — these effects are mediated by the *livelihood system*. Some women may have remittances from migrant males, or more diverse livelihoods, or assets that may be liquidated, or kin-based entitlements which ameliorate the effects of environmental degradation. For example, the effects of logging in Malaysia upon rainforest inhabitants is varied. Hunter-gatherer Penan men have resisted assimilation into wage work with the logging companies and the negative effects on their livelihood system are felt equally by men and women since “property” rights and divisions of labor are barely differentiated. Both men and women have been involved in the protests and road blockades against logging. The absence of males makes it difficult to fell new lands, in order to fallow old ones, and women therefore are driven to continue repeatedly cultivating the same plots, with negative effects on soil fertility and crop yields. Neither Iban men or women have become involved in the protests against logging — the addition of wages to livelihood portfolios compensates for the absence of male labor and buffers the potentially negative experience by women of environmental degradation (Heyzer, 1992).

Environmental relations of particular women also depend upon a class-gender system. As Agarwal documents for South Asia (1991, pp. 38—44) the adverse effects of environmental degradation fall particularly upon poor women, and Hobley (1991) shows how gender and class intersect in the use of forest resources in Nepal. The latter instance demonstrates that dependence on forest resources and participation in decision making by women regarding forest use is variable — low caste men and in particular low caste women were dominated in meetings.

In addition to the class-gender effects there are other distinctions between women which are significant. Inequalities among women exist even at the household level where seniority frequently patterns divisions of labor, access to and control of resources and decision-making powers. For example, in Zimbabwe, older women within households can, and do, send junior wives, son’s wives or daughters to collect fuel wood (McGregor, 1991, p. 206). In 65 households randomly sampled in the Chivi Communal Area of Zimbabwe* 42% were households with only one adult woman. Of the whole sample 31% collected water alone and 36% collected wood alone, 27% did not collect water at all themselves and 14% did not collect wood themselves. Thus a considerable number of women are seen to share and delegate these tasks. Since there are power relations between women within the same household, a younger woman in Chivi is frequently dominated by more senior household women, and carries a disproportionate burden of wood and water collection. Thus the division of labor may allocate wood collection to wives but if a wife can delegate the means by which she meets that responsibility then the incentive toward replanting (increased time in collection) may not be felt equally by all women of a household. Life-cycle processes intervene in various ways to pattern the incentives to positive environmental management. But age is not only significant in that women of different seniority have differently structured constraints and opportunities with regard to environmental relations. Societies are not socially reproduced without change and younger women have experienced a different history from older women and their attitudes and expectations differ as a result. The aspirations of young

women in rural Zimbabwe today are different from those of their mothers as young women. To posit a special relationship between women and their environments which ignores such multiple sources of difference is problematic, because women bear socially formed gender, as well as other, identities.

A further problem with the “special relationship” between women and environments is that it ignores the context within which environmental relations are nested — women relate to natural resources as part of their livelihood strategies, which reflect multiple objectives, powerful wider political forces and, crucially, gender relations, i.e. social relations which systematically differentiate men and women in processes of production and reproduction. Microstudies of resource use reveal that the relations of women to environments “cannot be understood outside the context of gender relations in resource management and use” (Leach, 1991, p. 14).

WOMEN - The CARERS COMMUNITY

The idea that women “naturally” care for the environment as an extension of their caring roles is expressed by Bernadette Valley of the Women’s Environment Network — “Women’s priorities are usually oriented towards the good of the community thus placing more emphasis on the protection of the environment and the resources within it” (WEN, 1989). This is perhaps as untenable a generalization as that which assumes altruism within the household (Folbre, 1986). The suggestion that “women are involved in *c’omitiinify managing* work undertaken at a local community settlement level in both urban and rural contexts” (Moser, 1959, p. 1801) is not unique to WDE discourse and is generally problematic and inadequately theorized. Collective action with regard to the environment has been “naturalized” for women, but not for men, on the basis of implied altruism and with a failure to scrutinize the private interests of women adequately. In the WDE context, the view of Vandana Shiva that women are responsible for community and forest management is questionable — for most forests in India are managed not by women but by *yan’ha* *nts* which notably lack women members (DN, 1990, p. 795). Here, WDE writers fail to distinguish clearly between working and managing, and employ a crude and simplistic understanding of gender divisions of labor.

Women’s reproductive work does bring them into frequent contact with common property resources but the nature of this contact is generally misunderstood by WDE writers who assume that those who work with the resource manage that resource. “Manage” is a polysemic word — but in development discourses it predominantly implies control over decision making and planning in accordance with objectives. Common property users act in the context of rules and conventions devised by a range of institutions — unlike farm laborers, wood collectors are not working under the farm managers’ direction and supervision but their actions (e.g. to cut live or dead wood), have to be situated within these institutional frameworks. In Kenya, the provision of firewood is a woman’s task, but tree growing is not and women were found to have minimal involvement in tree regenerative activities (Bradley, 1991, p. 149). In this instance tree planting by women is a subversive

activity since adjudication in land disputes is done on the basis of tree ownership (Bradley, 1991).

p. 283)." Without a gendered analysis of common property institutions women as users cannot be directly equated with common property rights managers. Even the gendered planning frameworks devised for project planners the distinction between access to resources and control of resources is routine (Overholt et al., 1985). This distinction reflects not only the difference between use and management but also the differentials in property rights which make the access by women to resources more deeply conditional upon social relations than those of men. More of this is pursued below, but the point being made with regard to community welfare is that the high visibility of women in the use of communally held resources cannot be taken as either indicating a greater commitment to "community" than that of men or as imparting a community management role to women. We return below to the problem of the reductionist understandings of gender divisions of labor which cannot be represented as descriptions of work allocation — they involve differential social relations of production, including power relations and differential resource access, culturally specific understandings of gender identities and capabilities. Gender divisions of labor also necessitate exchange and cooperation between men and women.

In India, as elsewhere in the Third World, many women do indeed cut wood for sale. Refusal to accept that women are agents of environmental degradation and the determined attempt to construct a positive image of women as custodians of, and carers for, the environment is to obscure and prevent a more useful analysis. In addition, the policy implications of accepting the "community management" role of women often means extending unpaid work done by women.

The instance often cited to support both the view of women as both community spirited and of their willingness to mobilize collectively in defense of the environment is the Chipko movement which developed in mid—late 1970s in Garhwal division of Uttar Pradesh out of a Gandhian social development movement. This movement emerged in a context where there was anger over government forest policy which denied local use of trees while giving logging rights to large companies. Floods during the 1970s and land slips were perceived by these social workers as caused by deforestation (Jain, 1984, p. 1788). The initial involvement of women was accidental, but they then became the mainstay of a movement which spread widely and focused on demonstrations, in which trees were hugged, to prevent logging.

Chipko is usually represented as demonstrating women's concern for conservation, and taken as an example of spontaneous environmental and community commitment by women." Recently, questions have been raised as to how we are to understand Chipko:

Locating Chipko culturally and historically provides a long overdue corrective to the popular conception of Chipko, which is that of a romantic reunion of humans, especially women, with nature (Guha, 1989, p. 173).

Guha sees Chipko as essentially conservative and anti-change and locates Chipko within a local history of peasant protest based on charismatic, populist leadership, asceticism and religious imagery, and the charismatic Chipko leader Sunderlal Bahuguna's followers "look to him to restore a pristine state of harmony" [Guha, 1989, p. 171]. Further both Guha and Jain (1984, p. 1789) deny that Chipko is a feminist movement. Women of the region supported the campaign for prohibition, organized by the Gandhian social development organization that spawned Chipko, during the 1960s. Later women became involved in large numbers in tree hugging, but the leadership has been predominantly male. It has been claimed that as the Chipko movement developed it took on more of a feminist quality as women came to oppose, for the first time, not only men from beyond their community but also local men, including their husbands. Guha points out, however, that this is not new, for the anti-alcohol demonstrations were also such. The shortcomings of essentialist interpretations of Chipko which ignore history become apparent, for the image of a woman hugging a tree in front of a bulldozer has a context which contributes to its meaning.

For Guha Chipko is only one in a series of protest movements against commercial forestry dating from the earliest days of state intervention. The peasantry was protesting against the denial of subsistence rights which state policy has wrought. Essentially the movement was a response to a perceived breach of the informal code between the ruler and the ruled known as the "moral economy" of the peasant (1989, p. 174).

In this light the Chipko movement appears more as a conservative affirmation of the moral economy, a contract which sustains power structures, including that of the subordination of women. Women may be more susceptible to mobilization on the basis of breaches in the moral economy since the weight of subsistence work has fallen on them following male outmigration in the region. Hill women are also culturally and historically less subordinated than plains women and the Chipko women should not be taken out of this context and projected as submissive and obedient wives who, through their veneration of nature and instinctive understanding of ecological principles, rose up spontaneously and risked life and limb for their forests. Community action by women

in the Chipko case does not seem to support a view of rural women as profoundly altruistic but rather shows them as responding to wider political and economic change (principally commercialization) within the context of specific gender relations.

The focus of attention on Chipko tends to obscure the fact that in many villages where environmental degradation has occurred this has not led to women's protest movements. A legitimate counterargument may be made that the documentation of women's protest is lacking both because of gender blindness in historical records and because the "everyday forms of resistance," in struggles by women are by nature invisible. It seems inappropriate, at

this stage, to make any generalizations about the likelihood of political action by women in defense of the environment.

Perspectives on conservation:

Women act as agents in both environmentally positive and negative ways but until we begin to approach such agency free of essentialist presuppositions about women's predisposition to conservation and of reductionist understanding of gender divisions of labor, and with improved gender analytical frameworks, we have little prospect of identifying either points where gender equity and environmental conservation can be simultaneously addressed by development interventions or where they cannot.

It is frequently asserted that women are more severely affected by environmental degradation and that they will be the "natural" constituency for conservation activities. The combination of this with the women/nature linkage sustained by ecofeminist influenced discourse leads to the assumption that they can be mobilized in defense of the environment. In examining the question of how far women may be mobilized for environmental conservation we will consider, with African examples, the centrality of gender relations (rather than women) to environmental degradation. It will be argued, against the essentialist ecofeminist position, that women have no inherent closeness to nature, but a socially constructed relationship with natural resources which varies for different groups of women and for individual women during the course of a lifetime. There is a need to recognize that many women are frequently agents of environmental degradation because of gender and class relations and that the alleviation of poverty will not necessarily change this. It is suggested that a gender analysis leads to a very different perspective from that of synergism or the "win-win" policies which the World Bank defines as "actions which promote income growth, poverty alleviation, and environmental improvement" (1992, p. 2). This section examines a range of incentives and disincentives toward environment friendly behavior by women (e.g. the adoption of conservation technologies or the practice of regenerative resource use), illustrates the potential for conflicting gender and environmental interests and draws out some of the development policy conclusions.

The severity of environmental degradation has been seen to have a greater impact on women because of the overrepresentation of female headed households among the poor (who depend more critically upon common pool resources) and because of the gender divisions of labor within households which allocates work such as firewood and water collection to women — precisely the tasks which have become much more difficult with environmental change such as deforestation and falling water tables. From a gender analysis standpoint, however, the costs of degradation cannot be seen as accruing predominantly to women without an enquiry into how gender divisions of labor are contested and change under environmental stress, without an account of men's environmental relations and without an investigation of the context within which degradation occurs.

Environmental knowledge Base:

It is often held that women know more than men about the environment because of gender divisions of labor which assign women to many of the reproductive tasks which bring them into daily contact with fields, forests and rivers. “[Women] have a profound knowledge of the plants, animals and ecological processes around them” (Dankelman and Davidson, 1989, p. xi). This view leads to the assertion that women’s knowledge equips them for effective conservation and justifies the identification of women as the relevant target group for conservation projects. Women’s knowledges, however, cannot be considered in isolation from men’s for there are variations in who acquires what knowledge. In Chivi Communal Area of Zimbabwe women knew more than men about some crop varieties, men knew more about local soil classification and there was variation in knowledges between research sites. The lived experience of women’s land relations, characterized by relative mobility and insecurity, means that women are more usefully seen as having differently constituted environmental knowledges (possibly greater understanding of spatial and lesser of temporal variation) rather than as knowing more, or less, than men.

More significantly, the problem of accessing women’s knowledge is unrecognized. Knowledges are manufactured and expressed through social processes and therefore reflect gender relations. Particular women (low caste and younger women) were particularly inhibited

The implications of the problem of mutedness (the social and ideological domination which leaves groups, such as women, inhibited in vocabulary and voice) for development practice are wide ranging. In particular, it leads one to question the expectations of “participation” in development — consultation with women may not unproblematically reveal gender interests. For example, how would a participatory development approach respond to women’s widespread support for dowry in Maharashtra (Vlassoff, 1991) or for sex determination tests both of which can be seen as contrary to the gender interests of women? We cannot assume that women have a monopoly upon environmental knowledge, that their knowledges can necessarily be expressed in order to be accessed and validated by development agencies or that views articulated by women are free from the imprint of gender relations. a strong emotional bond exists between individuals and the territory of their ancestors. The desire to live there is equalled only by the desire to be buried there. An important notion in the organising of political and moral existence is the idea of living “at home”.

Intrahousehold dynamics and relations

The crude and universalized conception of a singular gender division of labor leads to an overemphasis of the “closeness” between women and their environments, and obscures the lifecycle differences in the way the genders relate to environments. Household development cycles mediate gendered resource relations in locally specific ways, but they are an important part of understanding the processes of environmental degradation and regeneration. For example, the impact of male outmigration upon rural women can bring about changing domestic development cycles which alters resource use. Domestic development cycles interact with differentiation in complex ways and rural households do not all progress upon a single trajectory of household formation, growth and decline

How far do relations within households influence environmental behavior? Intergenerational relations may be argued to influence women, as mothers, toward concern to conserve environments in order to secure future benefits for children. As Shiva puts it “Women naturally think of the next generation” (Shiva,1989a, p.5). This argument would only apply to sons as daughters would, like their mothers, find that patriliney and patrilocality intervene between them and their environmental relations. But for a number of reasons this may not be a significant factor for mothers — partly because the implicit contract of trusteeship and inheritance excludes them, and partly because of wider economic and political changes.

Intrahousehold relations between genders are critical to the decision-making processes which pattern resource management. Adoption of a conservation technology will depend on intrahousehold negotiations yet the WDE literature shows no awareness of the debates over the nature of the household, the characterizations of altruism and self-interest of household members or of attempts to model intrahousehold relations and decision making. While the flaws of models of households as unitary bodies with joint utility are well known, the problems with methodological individualism, on the other hand, seem to have been forgotten. It is problematic to assume male household heads to be altruistic as in New Household Economics, but it is also unsatisfactory to assume individual women are altruistic within the community or household.^o At least a focus upon the household allows scrutiny of intrahousehold relations, which an individualized treatment of women obscures. The gross generalizations in WDE literature are innocent of the strictures in this earlier gender scholarship against ethnocentrism and the problem of generalizing domestic group functions across widely differing societies.

There is a need to unpack the idea that women’s “responsibilities” make them environment friendly the responsibility to provide firewood for cooking a meal may lead a woman, when faced with a firewood shortage, to plant a tree but it may also lead her to pull up a wooden fence and burn it, to argue for the purchase of a fuel efficient stove, to insist on the purchase of charcoal, to delegate fuelwood collection to a younger woman in the household or any number of alternative responses. As well as the issues of time preferences and livelihood strategies, these responses depend on the bargaining position, within the household, of individual women. Sen (1987) models intrahousehold relations in terms of cooperative conflict, i.e. both “the coexistence of extensive conflicts and pervasive cooperation in household arrangements” (Sen, 1987, p. 5). He suggests that individuals within households have variable perceptions of self-interest and variable perceptions of the value of the contributions to household welfare by themselves and others and that the bargaining strength of individuals within a household depends not so much on the objective quantity of labor or incomes contributed but on the value that is attributed to those contributions to household welfare. Outcomes of intrahousehold negotiations over resource management, where men and women have differing preferences, will be affected by the bargaining strength of parties which in turn reflects their breakdown positions (i.e. their situations in the event of the breakdown of cooperation — such as divorce). Where divorce for women is difficult and remarriage rare, as in northern India, then a woman may be less able to bargain strongly and outcomes are more likely to reflect male preferences. Where an individual has

a low sense of their self-worth (perceived inter-est response), and where they perceive the claims of others as having greater legitimacy (perceived contribution response) they are also likely to concede to the priorities of other parties. With such a model decision making is understood with a primary focus upon power within households which refract wider societal gender relations. The quality of “altruism” attributed to women, which is “revalued” by WDE discourse, can be seen as symptomatic of powerlessness, the inability to exercise self-interest (despite objective evidence for discrimination against women) and ideological domination. We could also question whether environmental altruism is not therefore profoundly at odds with the project of gender-equality.

Divisions of rights and responsibilities within households are therefore not static but mutable, contested and responsive to changes in societal level gender relations. They also change under stress. While in Chivi it is broadly seen as women’s responsibility to provide household staples in normal years, there are stages in food-shortage coping strategies

References:

- Agarwal, B., “Engendering the environment debate: Lessons from the Indian subcontinent,” CAS ID Distinguished Speaker Series. No. 8, Center for Advanced Study of International Development (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, 1991).
- Aloo, T., “Forestry and the untrained Kenyan woman” in D. Munyakho (Ed.), *Women and the Environmental Crisis: A Report of the Proceedings of the Workshops on Women, Environment and Development*, July 10-20, Nairobi Kenya NGO Forum (Nairobi: Environment Liaison Centre, 1985).
- Ardener, E., “Belief and the problem of women,” in S. Ardener (Ed.), *Perceiving Women* (London: Malaby, 1975), pp. 1—18.
- Biehl, J., “Ecofeminism and deep ecology: Unresolvable conflict?” *Our Generation*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (1988), pp. 19—32.
- Beinart, W., “Soil erosion, conservationism and ideas about development: A southern African exploration 1960,” *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1984).
- Billig, M., “The marriage squeeze on high-caste Rajasthani women,” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (1991), pp. 341—360.
- Bradley, P. N., *Woodfuel, Women and Woodlots*, Vol. 1, The Foundations of a Woodfuel Strategy for East Africa (London: MacMillan, 1991).
- Brown, P., and L. Jordanova, “Oppressive dichotomies,” in Open University, *The Changing Experience of Women* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982), pp. 189—399.
- Bruce, J., “Homes divided,” *World Development*, Vol. 17, No. 7 (1989), pp. 979—1136.
- Carney, J., “Struggles over crop rights and labor within contract farming households in a Gambian irrigated rice project,” *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1988), pp. 334—349.

- Cecelski, E., "The rural energy crisis, women's work and family welfare: Perspectives and approaches to action," World Employment Programme Research Working Paper No. WEP10/WP35 (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1984).
- Cox, C., "Ecofeminism" in G. Kirkup and L. Keller (Eds.), *Inventing Women: Science, technology and Gender* (London: Open University and Polity Press, 1992).
- Dankelman, I., and J. Davidson, "Land: Women at the centre of the food crisis" in S. Sontheimer (Ed.), *Women and The Environment: A Reader* (London: Earthscan Publications, 1991).
- Dankelman, I., and J. Davidson, *Women and Environment in the Third World: Alliance for the Future* (London: Earthscan Publications, 1989).
- D. K. Munyakho (Ed.), *Women and The Environmental Crisis.- A Report of the Proceedings of the Workshop on Women, Environment and Development, 10—12 October 1985* (Nairobi: Environment Liaison Centre, 1985).
- David, R., "The effects of male out-migration on women's management of the natural resource base in the Sahel," Mimeo (London: SoS International, 1992).
- Davidson, J., "Restoring women's link with nature," *Earthwatch*, No. 37 (1989), pp. 2—3.
- DAWN, *Development Crises and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987).
- De Beauvoir, S., *The Second Sex* (London: Picador, 1988).
- DN, "Women and forests," *Economic and Political Weekly* (April 14, 1990), pp. 795—797.
- Dyson, T., and M. Moore, "Kinship structure, female autonomy and demographic behaviour", *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1983), pp.35—60.
- Eastlea, B., *Science and Sexual Oppression.- Patriarchy's Confrontation with Women and Nature* (London: Widenfield and Nicholson, 1981).
- Eckersley, R., *Environmentalism and Political Theory. Toward an Ecocentric Approach* (London: University College London Press, 1992).
- Eele, G., A. Duncan, and A. Lawson, "Environmental change and the response by small-holder farmers: some evidence from Tanzania," Paper given at the Annual Conference of the British Society for Population Studies, Exeter College (Oxford: September 9—11, 1992).
- Folbre, N., "Heans and Spades: Paradigms of household economics," *World Development*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (1986), pp. 245—255.
- Fortmann, L., "Women in subsistence forestry," *Journal Forestry*, Vol. 84, No. 7 (1986), pp. 39-42.
- GFA — Gesellschaft für Agrarprojekte in Übersee, "Study on the economic and social determinants of livestock production in the Communal Areas — Zimbabwe," Report to Dept. of Veterinary Services of Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement, Zimbabwe (Harare: GFA, 1986).

- Gould, B., "Population growth, environmental stability and migration in Western Province, Kenya," Paper given at the Annual Conference of the British Society for Population Studies, Exeter College (Oxford: September 9—11, 1992).
- Gray, E. Dodson, *Green Paradise Lost* (Wellesley, MA: Roundtable, 1981).
- Griffin, S., *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978).
- Guha, R., *The Unquiet Woods.- Ecological Change and Peasant Resistance in the fifteenth century* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Heyzer, N., "Rainforest management and indigenous livelihoods: a Malaysian case study," Paper prepared for the UNRI SD Meeting on The Social Dimensions of Environment and Sustainable Development (Malta: April 1992).
- Hill, P., *Rural Hausa: A Village and A Setting* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).
- Hobley, M., "Gender, class and use of forest resources: Nepal" in A. Rodda (Ed.), *Women and The Environment* (London: Zed Books, 1991).
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (1987) *Women and the World Conservation Strategy, Report on the first Strategy Workshop held at IUCN, Switzerland* (Zurich: IUCN, 1987).
- Jackson, C., "Environmentalisms and gender interests in the Third World," *Development and Change*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (1993).
- Jackson, C., *Kano River Irrigation Project* (West Hartford, CN: Kumarian Press, 1985).
- Jackson, C., "Change and rural Hausa women: A study in Kura and Rano Districts, Northern Nigeria," Ph.D. thesis (London: Wye College, University of London, 1981).
- Jain, S., "Women and people's ecological movement: A case study of women's role in the Chipko movement in Uttar Pradesh," *Economic and Political Weekly* (October 13, 1984), pp. 1789—1794).
- Jeater, J., "The closing gap: African women and European morality in Southern Rhodesia 1915—30," Paper for the African History Dept Seminar, School of Oriental and African Studies (London: University of London, January, 1989).
- Jones, C., "Intrahousehold bargaining in response to the introduction of new crops: A case study from North Cameroon" in I. Mook (Ed.), *Understanding Africa's Rural Households* (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1986).
- Kandiyoti, D., "Bargaining with patriarchy," *Gender and Society*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1988), pp. 277-290.
- Kelkar, G., and D. Nathan, *Gender and Tribe. Women, Land and Forests* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1991). *Khon Kaen University, Proceedings of the 1985*
- International Conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal (Khon Kaen: Khon Kaen University, 1987).
- King, Y., "The ecology of feminism and the feminism of ecology," in J. Plant (Ed.), *Healing the Wounds. The Promise of Ecofeminism* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1989).

- Kumar, S., and D. Hotchkiss, "Consequences of deforestation for women's time allocation, agricultural production, and nutrition in hill areas of Nepal," Research Report 69 (Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute, 1958).
- Lan, D., *Guns and Rain. Guerilla and Spirit Mediums in Zimbabwe* (London: Currey, 1985).
- Lanzaduri, H., "The missing link: Decision-making and the Latin American woman" in D. Munyakho (Ed.), *Women and The Environmental Crisis: A Report of the Proceedings of the Workshops on Women, Environment and Development, July 10-20, Nairobi Kenya NGO Forum* (Nairobi: Environment Liason Centre, 1985).
- Leach, M., "Gender and the environment: Traps and opportunities," Paper prepared for the Development Studies Association conference (Swansea: September 11 — 13, 1991).
- Lovett, M., "Gender relations, class formation and the colonial state in Africa," in J. Parpart and K. Staudt (Eds.), *women and the State in Africa* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1989), pp. 47—69.
- Maathai, M., "Calling women to revive dying Africa" in D. Munyakho (Ed.), *Women and The Environmental Crisis: A Report of the Proceedings of the Workshops on Women, Environment and Development, July 10—20, Nairobi Kenya NGO Forum* (Nairobi: Environment Liason Centre, 1985).
- MacCormack, C., "Nature, culture and gender: A critique," in C. MacCormack and M. Strathern (Eds.), *Nature, Culture and Gender* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- Martin-Brown, M., "Healing hands," in D. Munyakho (Ed.), *Women and The Environmental Crisis. A Report of the Proceedings of the Workshop on Women, Environment and Development, July 10—20, Nairobi Kenya NGO Forum* (Nairobi: Environment Liason Centre, 1985).
- McGregor, J., *Woodland Resources. Ecology, Policy and Ideology. An Historical Case Study of Woodland Use in Shurugwi Communal Area, Zimbabwe*, Ph.D. thesis (Loughborough: Loughborough University, 1991).
- Merchant, C., *Radical Ecology.- The Search for a Livable World* (New York: Routledge, 1992).
- Merchant, C., *The Death of Nature. Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (London: Wildwood, 1982).
- Mies, M., *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale. Women in the International Division of Labour* (London: Zed Books, 1986).
- Monimart, M., "Women in the fight against desertification," in Sontheimer (Ed.), *Women and the Environment: A Reader* (London: Earthscan Publications, 1991).
- Monimart, M., "Women in the fight against desertification," *International Institute for Environment and Development, Drylands Programme, Issues paper No. 2* (London: IIED, 1989).
- Mortimore, M., and J. Wilson, "Land and Population in the Kano closed-settled zone," *Department of Geography Occasional Paper No. 1* (Lagos: Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria, 1965).

- Moser, C., "Gender planning in the Third World: Meeting practical and strategic needs," *World Development*, Vol. 17, No. 11 (1989), pp. 1799—1825.
- Munyakho, D. K. (Ed.), *Women and The Environmental Crisis. A Report of the Proceedings of the Workshops on Women, Environment and Development, July 10—20, Nairobi Kenya NGO Forum* (Nairobi: Environment Liaison Centre, 1985).
- Murray, R., "Class, gender and the household: The developmental cycle in Southern Africa," *Development and Change*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (1987), pp. 236—249.
- Omvad, G., "Peasants and the ecological future," *Economic and Political Weekly* (February 10, 1990), pp. 321—323.
- Ortner, S., "Is female to male as nature is to culture" in M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.) *Woman, Culture and Society* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1974).
- Overholt, C., M. Anderson, K. Cloud, and J. Austin, *Gender Roles in Development Projects. A Case Book* (West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1985).
- Overseas Development Administration, "Population, environment and development: An issues paper for the Third UNCED Preparatory Committee," *Memorandum* (London: ODA, 1991).
- Plumwood, V., "Beyond the dualistic assumptions of women, men and nature," *Ecology and Society*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1992), pp. 8—13.
- Plumwood, V., "Woman, humanity and nature," *Radical Philosophy*, Vol. 48 (1988), pp. 16—24.
- Plumwood, V., "Ecofeminism: An overview and discussion of positions," *Australian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 64 (1986), pp. 121—138.
- Rao, B., "Dominant constructions of women and nature in social science literature," *Pamphlet 2, Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* (New York: Guilford Publications, 1991).
- Rodda, A. (Ed.), *Women in the Environment* (London: Zed Books, 1991).
- Rosenzweig, M., "Risk, private information and the family," *American Economic Review* (1988), pp. 245—250.
- Ruether, R., *New Woman, New Earth* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979).
- Salleh, A., "Ecofeminism/ecosocialism," *Capital, Nature, Socialism*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1989), pp. 129—134.
- Sayers, I., *Biological Politics: Feminist and Anti-Feminist Perspectives* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1982).
- Sen, A., "Gender and cooperative conflicts" (Helsinki: WIDER, 1987).
- Shiva, V., *Staying Alive - Women, Ecology and Development* (London: Zed Books, 1989a).
- Shiva, V., "Escaping from masculine time," *Earthwatch* No. 37 (1989b), pp. 4—5.
- Shiva, V., "Where has all the water gone? The case of water and feminism in India," in D. Munyakho (Ed.), *Women and The Environmental Crisis. A Report of the Proceedings of*

- the Workshop on Women, Environment and Development, July 10—20, Nairobi Kenya NGO Forum (Nairobi: Environment Liaison Centre, 1985).
- Sontheimer, S. (Ed.), *Women and the Environment: A Reader* (London: Earthscan Publications, 1991).
- Thomas-Slayter, M., "Politics, class and gender in African resource management: The case of rural Kenya," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (1992), pp. 809—827.
- Thompson, M., and M. Warburton, "Uncertainty on a Himalayan scale," *Montana in Research and Development*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1985).
- Vaughan, M., "Household units in southern Malawi," *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 34 (1985), pp. 35—45.
- Vlassoff, C., "Progress and stagnation: changes in fertility and women's position in an Indian village," *Population Studies*, Vol. 46 (1991), pp. 195—212.
- Warren, K., "The power and promise of ecological feminism," *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 12 (1990), pp. 125—146.
- Warren, K., "Feminism and ecology: Making the connections," *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1987), pp. 3—20.
- Whitehead, A., "Food crisis and African conflict in the African countryside," in H. Bernstein et al. (Eds.), *The Food Question: Profits Versus People* (London: Earthscan, 1990).
- Whitehead, A., "Men and women, kinship and property: Some general issues" in R. Hirschon (Ed.), *Women and Property, Women as Property* (London: Croom Helm, 1984).
- Whitehead, A., "Some preliminary notes on the subordination of women," *Bulletin of the Institute of Development Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (1979), pp. 10—13.
- Wilson, K., "Ecological dynamics and human welfare: A case study of population, health and nutrition in Southern Zimbabwe," Ph.D. thesis (London: Department of Anthropology, University College, 1990).
- Women's Environmental Network, "Women, environment, development seminar report" (London: WEN, 1989).
- World Bank, *World Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Young, M., "Fertility and famine: Women's agricultural history in Mozambique," in R. Palmer and N. Parsons (Eds.), *The Roots of Rural Poverty in Central and Southern Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).
- Zimmerman, M., "Feminism, deep ecology and environmental ethics," *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1987), pp. 21—44.