Feminist Economics **11(3)**, November 2005, 107 – 150

EXPLORATIONS FEMINIST ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Guest Editors: Ellie Perkins and Edith Kuiper
Contributors: Rayén Quiroga-Martínez, Terisa E. Turner, Leigh S. Brownhill, Mary Mellor, Zdravka Todorova, Maren A. Jochimsen, and Martha McMahon

ABSTRACT

These Explorations argue that more links between the fields of feminist ecology and feminist economics are both needed and promising, and presents new, boundary-crossing research in this area. It brings together contributions from various regions in the world that link political action and experience in practice and research in an economic theorizing that includes both environmental and feminist concerns.

KEYWORDS
Ecology, women, nature, globalization, feminist economic theory, agriculture

JEL codes: A1, B5, O1

I. INTRODUCTION: EXPLORING FEMINIST ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Ellie Perkins and Edith Kuiper

A close look at the development of feminist ecological economics reveals similarities between its premises and challenges and those of feminist economics. Both disciplines pose similar methodological problems, and both cover topics that do not lend themselves easily to monetary evaluation, including domestic work and reproduction in the case of feminist economics and biodiversity and ecological knowledge in the case of ecological economics.

The central role of women in subsistence production has long been discussed in the economic development literature, beginning with Esther Boserup (1970) and extending through the work of Maria Mies (1986), Vandana Shiva (1989), and Bina Agarwal (1992), along with that of many others. Marilyn Waring (1988), Hilkka Pietilä (1990, 1997), and Mary Mellor (1992) were among the first scholars to attempt to theorize the foundational role of women's unpaid work in industrial societies as well. By

Feminist Economics ISSN 1354-5701 print/ISSN 1466-4372 online © 2005 IAFFE
http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals
DOI: 10.1080/13545700500301494

the time Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson published their *Beyond Economic Man* in 1993, which is generally seen as the take off of feminist economics, the undercounting of women's economic participation and the skewed theoretical models that resulted were receiving more attention, especially in feminist economic circles.

Simultaneously, by the late 1980s, ecological economists identified the need for a fundamental reassessment of environmental and ecological contributions to economic activity (Herman Daly and John Cobb 1989; Robert Costanza 1991). Ecological economics diverges from environmental economics in that it argues for limits to throughput-intensive growth – which depends on ever-increasing consumption of energy and natural resources – in order to respect the material constraints imposed by a finite Earth. It also recognizes that neoclassical market adjustments are almost certainly inadequate to bring about the fundamental economic transformations necessary to accomplish such limits. Although ecological economics has mushroomed as an area of inquiry, it has barely mentioned gender or women, as Mary Mellor points out in her contributions to these Explorations – just as feminist economics has largely ignored ecological concerns.

The connections between neoclassical theory's marginalization of women and the environment began to be explored in the mid-1990s by Agarwal (1992), Mary Mellor (1997a, 1997b, 2002), Pietilä (1997), Martha McMahon (1997), Ellie Perkins (1997, 2000, 2002), Julie A. Nelson (1997), Maren Jochimsen and Ulrike Knobloch (1997), Sabine O'Hara (1995, 1997, 1999), Teresa Brennan (1997), Martha MacDonald (2002), Mary-Beth Raddon (2002), and others. These writers stress the importance of connecting activism with theorizing so theoretical insights are based in specifics of place and hands-on practice, and they also emphasize the theoretical and material links between biophysical reproduction and social reproduction and the importance of each of these processes to the economy. While most current economic models exclude or externalize gender and environmental concerns, the ones described by these authors focus on households, care work, and provisioning as they attempt to theorize about economic activity that is ecologically sustainable, at least and at first, in a local sense.

By linking these two concerns – theoretical and practical *gender* and *ecological* perspectives – a feminist ecological economics provides theoretical justification and impetus for those concerned with economic sustainability or the economic contribution of women to revisit their research priorities. In these Explorations, we bring together contributions of authors who work from both traditions. In our view, these Explorations show the fruitfulness of such a double focus and the importance of linking the discussions in feminist economics and ecological economics.

In putting together these Explorations, we have had the pleasure of working with a notable group of authors and the journal's editorial staff to

present an interesting and coherent compilation of current research and emerging theory in feminist ecological economics. We are especially pleased to have assembled an international collection of contributions – from Latin America, Africa, Canada, and Europe – as well as a diverse representation of theoretical perspectives. These explorations emphasize the linking of theory and practice (political practice, in particular), the changing relations between women and men, and the conceptualization of feminist and ecological concerns.

In her discussion of Chile, and Latin America more generally, Rayén Quiroga-Martínez aims to conceptualize a vision of economic development that is humanist and sustainable. She points out the limits of development theories for this region and shows the overall limitations of traditional development thought by stressing its inherent gender inequality and environmental problems. Quiroga subsequently explores the potential of a more community- and regional-based, diversified, participatory, and equitable form of economic transformation than that entailed by globalization and traditional, trade-oriented "development."

Terisa Turner and Leigh Brownhill provide an account of two gendered class struggles in Africa – one in Kenya and one in Nigeria. These struggles center on environmental devastation and deterioration of living conditions caused by agricultural production for international trade, instead of for the local market, and pollution from oil production. Turner and Brownhill describe how African women are sharing energies and strategies to counter these developments by relying on their specific experience and assets. They give a vivid account of women's use of the "curse of nakedness" to both express and symbolize women's power.

Mary Mellor issues a fundamental challenge to feminist economics: address ecological issues. Mellor argues that both the material physicality of human existence and the inequality and exploitation of political-economic systems must occupy the forefront of what she terms "materialist ecofeminist analysis." She relates her claim to the recent debate in *Feminist Economics* about ontology and critical realism, using it to underscore the importance for human existence of real (and limited) material conditions, even though they are expressed within exploitative social relations. By discussing the links between the exploitation of women's labor and the abuse of planetary resources and systems, she is able to articulate a hypothesis on the rationale of current economic explanations of the global system and its driving forces.

Zdravka Todorova addresses the issue of essentialism, or the notion that biology ties women to nature, making them especially responsible and knowledgeable regarding nature and environmental issues. She also brings in institutionalist theory in an interesting and fruitful attempt to deal satisfactorily with the issues she raises. The reader gains a challenging conceptualization and theorization of the relationship among ecosystems,

gender, and social provisioning, one which incorporates living systems, human agency, habits of thought, and structural transformation.

Stressing the importance of bringing together feminist and ecological concerns, theory development, and social and political activity, Maren Jochimsen relates the history, ideas, and organization of the *Versorgendes Wirtschaften* – a German/Swiss/Austrian network that focuses on the care economy. The network was founded in 1992 by academics and practitioners who address the exploitative character of the economy in relation to women and nature. Jochimsen describes the efforts of the network to integrate feminist and ecological concerns in economics against the background of changing practices, in which the network is actively involved.

Organic agriculture and the experiences of women farmers in this area provide the basis for Martha McMahon's contribution on the relationship between globalization and the transformative potential of subsistence-centered work. She discusses the gendered nature of farming, particularly organic farming. After examining different perspectives on whether organic agriculture is the wave of the future or a specialized niche, she provides a feminist perspective on economic localism. She sees the disruption of generalizations and the questioning of universalities as characteristics of ecological feminist analysis. Together with the redefinition of terms and the recognition of women's contributions as ''vernacular work,'' these are important means to reclaim and transform markets and strengthen local subsistence agriculture.

Along with other feminist ecological economists, the authors represented here emphasize that the formal, money-denominated economy is only one aspect of the overall economic picture, which would collapse without human/social reproduction and ecological reproduction. Instead of providing final answers and political programs, these contributions reveal new perspectives and issues of considerable political and social importance, highly relevant to feminist economic theorizing and research. Bringing together concerns about gender, ecological perspectives, and economic change provides us with new avenues for research and theories that need further exploration and development.

II. GENDER, DEVELOPMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY FROM A LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE

Rayén Quiroga-Martínez (translated from the original Spanish by Phillip Courneyeur)

Thinking about the failure of development from the perspective of Latin America is an ethical imperative. Some 225 million people in the region live in poverty and do not benefit from the products of their arduous labor. They not only suffer from the highly inequitable distribution of income but

must also cope with environmental degradation that threatens to undermine economic growth and their own human development. To understand and to change what is happening to Latin America, we must examine the complex global system that functions with almost all its components in sync, even though it exhibits obvious local particularities. This paper aims to reconsider utopias, the awakened dreams of Latin America.

The failure of Latin American development

In Latin America and across the globe, empirical evidence and analysis bring together a gamut of relevant variables that demonstrate the failure of development (Enrique Leff, 1998; Joan Martinez-Alier 2002; Rayén Quiroga-Martínez 2003b). No matter what indicators we choose, the economic growth associated with the style of development experienced by Latin America does not generate distributive equity or lives of decent quality for men and women. Such growth is even less capable of sustaining itself in the long run.

For example, the Chilean economy is driven by exports (40 percent of GDP is made up of external sales), of which 80 percent consist of raw or slightly processed natural resources, including minerals, agricultural, forest, and marine products. Given that environmental degradation is already extensive, maintaining the current levels of extraction needed to increase GDP is an ecological impossibility that threatens the very basis of the Chilean economy's sustainability (Rayén Quiroga-Martínez 1994, 2003a; Rayén Quiroga-Martínez and Saar van Hawermeiren 1996). Since the Pinochet dictatorship (1973–1980), the percentage of Chileans living in poverty has declined from 48 to 21 percent in the year 2000 (MINDEPLAN 2003), but inequity in income distribution persists. Chile, along with Brazil, has the worst distribution indicators in the region. When we undertake a gender analysis, we find that the differences between the GDP and United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) Human Development Index (HDI) and Gender Potential Index (GPI) rankings are greater in Chile than in any other country in the region (UN-ECLAC 2004). Chilean women earn on average 62 percent of what men make, and the gap grows as educational levels increase. Women executives earn only 45 percent of what their male counterparts earn. Thus, in 1998, women's national per-capita income was only 41 percent of men's. The same pattern prevails in statistics on violence against women and children. There is a greater incidence of domestic violence in Chile than in the rest of the region. The number of cases before the courts concerning intra-family violence rose from 39,000 in 1995 to 74,000 in 1999 (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 2003), and these represent a fraction of actual incidents.

In this paper, I explore in more detail the connections between economic "development," ecological devastation, gender inequality, and

other injustices, before proposing some solutions and citing some examples of how people in Latin America are creating alternative development dynamics.

Historical and analytical antecedents

Latin America has emerged from a colonial history and participates in a defined way in the international economy. It first and foremost has served as a provider of raw materials (1492 to the present). During the so-called ‘‘developmentalist decades’’ (the 1950s to the 1970s and 1980s), planners placed their countries at a considerable distance from the international market in order to promote industrialization ‘‘from within.’’ During this period, a strong output growth rate was achieved, based on the developmentalist industrial orientation to the internal market and less marked growth of exports. Because of neoliberal adjustments that began in the 1970s or 1980s, depending on the country, Latin America once again began exporting low-cost commodities and human and environmental services. This latter stage reflects a world that functions with centers and peripheries, in which Latin America feeds the developed countries with profits, natural resources, and cheap labor.

The asymmetric absorption of the benefits from trade and productive specialization derived from the periphery-center system that was first traced by Raúl Prebisch and his colleagues Anibal Pinto, Osvaldo Sunkel, and Pedro Paz. These authors founded structuralism, the first school of economic thought in Latin America,[1] which stated that structural obstacles, such as the declining terms of trade, the inability to absorb the fruits of technical progress, and the asymmetric absorption of trade gains, restrained the region’s socioeconomic development within the existing periphery-center world system (Raúl Prebisch 1960, 1981a, 1981b; Anibal Pinto 1962; Osvaldo Sunkel and Pedro Paz 1970/1985). They created the first Latin American theory of economic development and derived key policy implications, and advocated that countries move toward economic development through an induced, internally led growth process based on import-substituting industrialization. In order to stimulate this complex process, state regulation and incentives would be necessary. Since most of Latin America implemented these policies, countries attained important economic and social advances during the developmentalist phase in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, but the initiative was weakened and finally ended following the oil shocks of the early 1970s and as a result of other international and national factors. The way was paved for neoliberal adjustments and reforms in most Latin American countries since the 1980s (Quiroga-Martínez 2003b).

In none of the decades following the developmentalist period has Latin America achieved an expansion of GDP and GDP per capita comparable to

that period's growth. The period of neoliberal adjustment was a lost decade in terms of expansion of production and social indicators. Gender dynamics and the results of the international division of labor have reinforced economic weakness and dependence. More recently, absolute poverty has continued to grow. In 2003, Latin America had 227 million poor people (some 44.4 percent of the total population), compared to 200 million in 1990 (UN-ECLAC 2004; using the poverty-line methodology, below which the population is not able to meet their basic needs). The number of people in Latin America living in a situation of extreme poverty (not being able to feed themselves) grew from 62.4 million in 1980 to 97.4 million in 2002 (19.4 percent of the population) (UN-ECLAC 2004). Moreover, Latin America has the least equitable income distribution in the world. In the 1990s, the Gini coefficient, which measures income inequality, reached an average of 53.9 (with coefficients ranging from 40.0 to 60.0, depending on the Latin American country). Comparative coefficient figures were: Africa 42.4, North America 39.2, Asia 36.0, Europe 31.8, and Oceana 37.3 (CIDUTAL 2001).

Gender inequality in Latin America emerges from sociocultural and historical constructions that transform sexual differences into discrimination (UN-ECLAC 2004; Thelma Galvez 1999). Women aged 20 to 59 were more likely than men to be poor in 17 of 18 Latin American countries (UN-ECLAC 2004). Meanwhile in urban zones, the percentage of women older than 15 without their own income (43 percent) greatly exceeds that of men (22 percent). As is true in other countries, unremunerated domestic and reproductive work is almost totally in women's hands. Time-utilization analyses also show persistent gender inequalities in the region. Women devote more time to unremunerated activities than men and work longer hours each day to the detriment of their health, nutrition, and recreation (UN-ECLAC 2004).

The region's main environmental problems are associated with the economic model through which Latin America is inserted in the world scene. In the terrain of natural resources one observes accelerated deforestation and loss of biodiversity, increased soil erosion and degradation, and water shortages in some zones (UNEP 2003). Contamination of surface water and coastal zones is growing because industrial and urban activities play out in a framework of weak protection standards and environmental management. Some 72.7 percent of dry agricultural lands in South America suffer from moderate to extreme levels of degradation, and 47 percent of pasture lands have lost part of their fertility. Deforestation of Latin America and the Caribbean reached 47 million hectares in the period from 1990 to 2000, equivalent to 4.6 percent of its total forest cover. Some 26 percent of coastal areas are highly contaminated, with another 24 percent considered to be at high risk because of an explosion of tourist activity, discharge of urban wastes, and maritime oil spills. Lowland areas are

under increasing threat from rising sea levels provoked by global warming. Finally, the great urban centers (80 percent of Latin Americans live in cities), suffer from extreme levels of air pollution (particularly Santiago, São Paulo, and Mexico City) and contamination from industrial waste (UNEP 2003). The UNEP 2003 Global Environment Outlook (GEO) for the region states concluded that environmental deterioration has deepened in the last thirty years, particularly in the critical areas of forest and biodiversity loss, degradation of soil and water, and urban pollution, all of which affects human health in Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP 2003).

In the midst of the neoliberal crisis of the 1980s, a third group of Latin American thinkers published ''El desarrollo a escala humana,'' ''Human-Scale Development,'' (Manfred Max-Neef, Antonio Elizalde, and Martín Hopenhayn 1986). They refocused development on individuals and proposed a new theory of human necessities. Their approach stressed realizing the potential of invisible local resources, starting from the idea that development resides in the quality of what is created and utilized to satisfy human needs in harmony with local culture and resources. They based their analysis on evident signs of economic alternatives and social movements that were emerging everywhere in Latin America. In my view, this way of thinking represents an advance over traditional economic thought. I believe we must include other dimensions of development, such as gender and sustainability dynamics, in order to create an even more wholesome and holistic proposal.

Integrate women or redefine development and world visions?

Women contribute to a large part of economic production, but have never fully participated in discussions about what kind of development is needed. During the integrative period of the 1970s and 1980s, which was later conceptualized as ''women in development,'' politicians and development practitioners in developing countries tried to integrate women into remunerated markets and into projects for generating income. Those experiences did not substantially ameliorate poverty and even overloaded the workday and responsibilities borne by women.

With the advent of feminism, research in the academy strove to uncover how differences in the economic roles of men and women were perceived in the realm of public policy and in the notions and constructs of various disciplines (Boserup 1970). Feminist economists like Lourdes Benería (1984, 1999, 2003) have analyzed the complex weave of dynamics comprised by work, value, power relations, and gender invisibility and subordination, especially in Latin American economies. Feminist economic research shows that work encompasses much more than labor expended in the market. Devaluing of domestic, family, and community work

reproduces women's subordination in distinct areas including the symbolic dimension – as seen, for example, in the false, but still common, notion of women's economic inactivity.

As the Chilean feminist Margarita Pisano (2001) states, ''whoever argues that the patriarchy has been humanizing itself does not see . . . the thousands of third world people terrorized by and trying to escape famine, drought, and war without being able to jump over the invisible wall the First World has mounted to maintain its privileges.''

Pisano advocates one of the most radical concepts of feminism, developing a profound critique of mainstream feminism that in her view has failed to bring about changes in women's lives and the culture in which they live. The symbolic dimension, gender roles, and women's place in production and reproduction are set forth in a strictly functional arrangement that benefits the patriarchal system. It is not possible to emancipate oneself or attain a relationship between equals under the reign of patriarchal relations. ''Femininity is not an autonomous space of possibilities for equality, self management or independence; it is a symbolic and value-laden construction designed by masculinity and contained within it as an integral part'' (Pisano 2001). This critical vision, which I call ''neofeminism from the outside,'' reveals the limits of women's struggles and holds that mainstream feminism has compromised the transformational force of women's movements in return for seats in the power structure put in place precisely to co-opt and neutralize any counter-hegemonic proposal.

The system and its cracks

We live in a system that deploys a culture of appropriating and delegitimizing the other and the diverse. It rests on a globalized economy whose deepest motivation resides in individual profit, resulting in an appropriation of human labor and an assault on nature. In my judgment, the following elements are critical to sustaining the current styles of development in Latin America, and a transformation in each of these areas would be part of the birth of a sustainable and equitable human development process:

- Relations among humans: most are not sufficiently socialized to consider the other as equally legitimate, and hence they can turn away in the face of exploitation, extermination, persistent inequality, and poverty.
- The humanity-ecosystem relationship: today most see nature only as an infinite source of resources to be used to satisfy a longing for more and more things and privileges.
- The authority of incentives and motivations juridically encrusted on society: the system protects and legitimizes itself through the rule of

law, constructing juridical benchmarks in the constitutions of individual nations and ordinary laws that sanctify private property. These rules are social constructs, however.
- The quality of life: in Latin America, the expansion of economies has come with heavy social, workplace, family, and environmental costs.

Although recent decades have produced unprecedented extractive effort, inequity and cultural homogenization still persist. Hard work within an exploitative system is not the answer, and people are thirsty for a better quality of life. The current globalizing, homogenizing economic system that ravishes nature is not the only entity responsible for this situation. We, human beings are also responsible for our vision of the world and of well-being, as well as for the form in which we relate to each other and to nature (Luis Weinstein 2003).

Some alternatives for building the future

Throughout Latin America, despite the desperate economic situation and despair of critical proportions noted above, silent and unarticulated transformations are brewing and inspiring new visions and new practices.

Diversification

Economies must diversify and become locally sustainable. They need to orient themselves to satisfy human necessities and abandon the search for individual gain, displaying a humanist and environmentalist rationality and new neomatristic stirrings.[2] Economies must change their sources of energy, their technologies, and their scale. Already, people throughout the region use diverse energy sources such as biomass, water, wind, and solar power. These sources depend on local potential and are renewable, utilizing a decentralized generation system. Throughout Chile's northern desert area, the inhabitants, especially the women, have abundant experience with solar stoves that use light concentrated with parabolic mirrors (Casey Woods 2001). These dark ovens can cook a family's lunch in two hours with no expenditure of fuel. Use of solar ovens originated with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) twenty years ago, and the devices are now widely distributed by community organizations via constructed markets.

Local currencies in the South

To avoid the transfer of surplus to the North, Southern economies must hold onto the wealth they produce and use local money and local banks. Creating barter systems and local money among diverse productive communities will establish a framework of equality for the value of an

hour of work to abolish the exploitation of labor. An extended, recent form of this practice – barter fairs – emerged in Argentina during its worst economic crisis.

Networks

To trade surpluses in a way that achieves solidarity and reciprocity, people can set up networks, thereby minimizing social and environmental costs and generating desirable and stable jobs. Creating such networks will involve a display of human creativity in small spaces that will possess personal significance for individuals and a nutritive potential for the social fabric of the community.

"Communal pots," community organizations, and social movements

Cooperative production and marketing initiatives have a long history in Latin America. One example, "communal pots" or community kitchens, flourished during the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile; similar community kitchens also exist in Lima, Peru, and elsewhere in Latin America. The kitchens, mainly organized by women, involve cooperative gathering, purchase of ingredients, and preparation and distribution of meals for many families within local urban communities. Such alternative strategies help families meet their basic nutritional needs despite extreme poverty and the double or triple workday faced by many women.

Today, a great proportion of Latin American households are headed by women, and in the poorest of homes, one can find women microentrepreneurs, who organize very small-scale production of goods and services to be commercialized, obtaining financing and supporting their families. The darker side of the story, made evident by empirical research, is the increasing number of women workers performing their work at home, as part of the shift to unprotected and precarious labor that has raised productivity and competitiveness of small and medium-sized industries, such as the garment sector. The reforms I propose would seek to eradicate such exploitation.

Community healthcare

Community medicine and preventive healthcare measures relying on ancestral wisdom have traditionally been carried out by women who, through their practices and native homeopathic knowledge, have managed to maintain the health and lives of millions of Latin Americans with no access to modern Western medicine. Recently, the first Mapuche (South Chilean native) pharmacy in Santiago opened its doors. There, members of the aboriginal ethnic group legally prescribe treatments based on natural prescriptions to the great many urban Mapuches residing in the capital.

As noted, changes are coming about slowly and silently, but let us not be naïve or overoptimistic. The failure of development in Latin America can also provoke trends toward less democratic and hyper-populist[3] governments, with firm ideological roots in chauvinism and xenophobia. Unfortunately, such governments already exist. They gain power because participation and democracy in all Latin American nations is very difficult as long as inequity and structural poverty endure, and profits and opportunities are concentrated in the hands of a few national elites or siphoned off to the North.

The development of this region is extremely difficult within the current system, with its division of labor and wealth and the resulting ecological costs and abuse of natural patrimony. Therefore, the economies and underlying visions of Latin America need restructuring and transition. Step by small step, almost inadvertently, we are already designing new ways of life, new systems of work relations where all people – women, men, children, and elders – fit in their environment. So, let us dream of building humanist, sustainable societies; let us redesign the development of Latin America so it makes sense and has significance for its communities and cultures. Let us go about building our shared dreams.

III. AFRICAN PEASANTS AND GLOBAL GENDERED CLASS STRUGGLE FOR THE COMMONS

Terisa E. Turner and Leigh S. Brownhill

In this contribution, we consider two gendered and globally connected class struggles – land take-overs in Kenya and the women's oil war in Nigeria – to show how particular peasant women have used their bodies and the ''curse of nakedness'' to defend collective commoning (Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Maria Mies 1999) and challenge global relations of ecological exploitation. The resurgent resourcefulness of women's personal and political creativity, even in extreme circumstances of poverty and repression, has global resonance and is situated in growing challenges to trade liberalization as manifested in the policies of many governments, corporations, and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The Kenyan land take-over movement

In Kenya, and in other regions, arrangements between local elites and foreign corporations have been argued to transfer value from nature and labor, paid and unpaid, to capital (Leigh S. Brownhill, Wahu M. Kaara and Terisa E. Turner 1997). Beginning in 1985, peasant women in Kenya with small land holdings interrupted the cosy relationship between local elites and foreign corporations by uprooting their coffee trees and planting food

instead (Brownhill, Kaara and Turner 1997). They had been pressured by government policy and their husbands to cultivate coffee at the expense of food. Even more powerful protests occurred in the 1990s, when hundreds of thousands of landless women who had squatted on public land faced dispossession (*Daily Nation* 2003). Many landless women defended themselves with the ''curse of nakedness,'' the meaning of which is explained by Ruth Wangari wa Thung'u, who on March 3, 1992, confronted police repression of a hunger strike to release political prisoners by exposing her vagina:

> I was able to confront the guns with my nakedness. Because the moment I removed my clothes is when that war stopped and even the policemen could not shoot anymore, and everybody ran away. . . . So, my nakedness is very symbolic. And it is not only my nakedness but a woman's nakedness [that] is symbolic. And it is a symbol of her strength. Because we give birth to children naked, which is life, and people are born naked. So it is with that symbolism that I understand the nakedness of a woman. (*First Woman* 1996)

Building on these earlier actions, by 2002 women and allied men had created a land occupation movement in Kenya (Leigh S. Brownhill and Terisa E. Turner 2004). It enforced democratic national elections, which ended forty years of dictatorship and made redistribution of land and the re-institution of free primary education possible.

The Kenyan power shift expressed itself at the international level when the new government's trade minister, Mukhisa Kituyi, led the walkout of the Group of 21 developing countries (G-21) from the WTO negotiations in Cancun on September 14, 2003. Kituyi, a human rights lawyer, had earlier been involved with the ''commoning'' movement discussed above. In leading the WTO collapse at Cancun over the issue of American and European Union agricultural subsidies, he rejected the neoliberal WTO agenda and affirmed a life-centered alternative to private corporate rule within a resurgent non-aligned movement. In this way, the power of rural Kenyan women reverberated through global circuits to merge with the manifold powers of parallel insurgencies.

Nigerian women's war against big oil

In the oil-rich Niger Delta, women do most of the farming and fishing. Land alienation and severe pollution from petroleum activities directly undermine their economic power. On July 8, 2002, some 600 women occupied ChevronTexaco's 450,000 barrel-a-day Escravos export terminal for eleven days. Twelve other Niger Delta petroleum flow stations were occupied by peasant women and allied men in the days that followed. These actions broke the repressive grip of men linked to big oil companies

(chiefs, contractors, security forces, and politicians) and shut down the oil companies for much of the last half of 2002 (Turner and Brownhill 2004).

In an ultimatum published worldwide in November 2002, some 4,000 women who were attacked by Shell police in Escravos in the Niger Delta on August 8, 2002, threatened to use the ''curse of nakedness'' if the Anglo-Dutch firm failed to pay their hospital bills (Sola Adebayo 2002; Irene Wamala 2002). According to one Nigerian source: ''In a lot of the rural communities here, the practice of throwing off the wrapper is a common [form of censure, given the] belief among the women folks here that it goes with some magical powers to inflict curses ranging from death to madness on its foes'' (IOWG 2003). The injured women's threat resulted in token payments from Shell and ChevronTexaco, as the Nigerian oil conflict escalated.

Conclusion

Women's nakedness in the context of protests against dictatorship in Kenya and against big oil companies in Nigeria invokes ideas of birth and regeneration, the womanly sources of life and subsistence. In exposing their vaginas, these women publicize their power to revoke life by withdrawing their domestic labour. The demands put forth by Kenyan and Nigerian women center on the support of life itself: collective land rights; reparations and ecological restoration; an end to petroleum, mining, and cash crop exploitation; and direct deals between producers and consumers and direct democracy. These accounts of two particular gendered class struggles show the potential power of women's activism. Peasant and squatter women, with their male allies, blocked corporations' access to the ''free goods'' of nature, unpaid labor, social services, and built space. The impact was at once national and international.

The double power of the unwaged and especially of rural women resides in their simultaneous participation in social relations of collective commoning for the sustenance of life and in social relations of global corporate structure, which organize, discipline, and unite us all. These incidents suggest that alliances with the unwaged around their life-centered demands may influence shifts in power from capital to popular movements, examples of which we have witnessed over the past seven years.

IV. ECOFEMINIST POLITICAL ECONOMY: INTEGRATING FEMINIST ECONOMICS AND ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Mary Mellor

Introduction

Feminist and ecological economics argue that mainstream economic thinking has historically ignored issues of gender (feminist economics) and

the environment (ecological economics). A review of the contents of the *Feminist Economics and Ecological Economics* journals shows that articles in the former rarely address the environment and the same is true for gender in the latter. I have no doubt that most, if not all, feminist economists would be committed to the preservation of the environment and that most ecological economists would not espouse overtly sexist perspectives. Given their respective critiques, it is surprising how little attention feminist economists and ecological economists pay to each other.

Ecological and feminist economics share a critique of the way in which the commodified market system forms a boundary between those things that are inside (and therefore generally valued) and those that are not (and therefore generally not valued). Feminist and ecological economists would present more cogent challenges to deficiencies in both economic theories and systems were they to work more collaboratively in developing new theories.

Ecological economics[4]

Throughout its twenty-year development, ecological economics has engaged little with feminist economics. The special issue of Ecological Economics on ''Women, Ecology, and Economics,'' edited by Ellie Perkins in 1997, did not produce a flood or even a trickle of responses. A recent ecological economics text issued by a radical publisher shows little connection with either feminist or ecofeminist economics (Peter Söderbaum 2000). Söderbaum (2000: 127) sees economics as both a science and an ideology and deplores the way in which ''Westernized'' universities have been ''narrowed down to neo-classical economics.'' He instead advocates work that considers democracy and alternative paradigms. In an epilogue that explores possible alternatives, he briefly refers to ''feministic economics'' and the work of Perkins. Although Söderbaum (2000: 130) notes the need to ''go beyond Economic Man and make things that matter for women (like 'unpaid work') visible in economic analyses,'' he does not further explore the implications of a gender analysis.

One of the earliest arguments regarding a link between ecology and economics was made in the early twentieth century by the Scottish scientist Frederick Soddy (1922, 1926; Linda Merricks 1996). He argued that all life and human activities depended upon energy and called for efforts to develop a sustainable economy in energy terms. In the early 1970s, Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (1971) and Herman Daly (1973) again raised the issue of energy in economic systems and challenged the growth model at the heart of economic theorizing. Their work and that of others (see, e.g., Donella Meadows, Jorgen Randers, and W. W. Behrens 1972) sparked heated debates among both ecologists and economists.

Although Daly criticizes conventional economic thought, he looks not toward radical political economy to achieve social change but toward religious transformation. Women's issues, in particular, are not central. In *For the Common Good*, written with philosopher and theologian John B. Cobb, women are referred to only briefly, once in relation to unpaid labor and again in support of sex education to reduce population growth (Daly and Cobb 1990: 414–5, 249) – though they neglect to acknowledge how the inequalities in gender relations make it difficult for women to gain control over their fertility in many countries and cultural contexts.

Ecological economics' critique of economic systems would be greatly enhanced if it were to recognize the links between the marginalization and exploitation of the natural world and women's labor. Ecological economics risks importing gendered assumptions into its theories and proposals if it ignores gender. A feminist economics approach is particularly important in proposals for green economies that stress the local and the communal. Without gender awareness, local and communal could continue to be parochial and patriarchal, with women doing the most menial and lowest-status work.

Feminist economics

In general, feminist economics has sought to open up economic debate, challenge neoclassical economic thought, and explore economic issues as they relate to women, including inequality of treatment, women's work, and women's marginalization and exclusion (see, e.g., Waring 1988; Ferber and Nelson 1993; Edith Kuiper and Jolande Sap 1995; Susan Feiner 1999; Nancy Folbre 2001).

Although, as noted, *Feminist Economics* has published little writing directly focused on ecological issues, some papers address the associated topics of population policies (Ines Smith 1996; Austreberta Nazar Beutelspacher, Emma Zapata Martelo and Verónica Vázquez García 2003) and land rights (Michael Kevane and Leslie C. Gray 1999; Elissa Braunstein and Nancy Folbre 2001). Lourdes Benería, Maria Floro, Caren Grown, and Martha MacDonald (2000) do not refer to women and environmental issues in the introduction to the *Feminist Economics* Special Issue on Globalization, despite the well-established literature on women, the environment, and development (Rosa Braidotti et al. 1994; Wendy Harcourt 1994). While arguing that ''globalization . . . tends to devalue non-market goods and services, including reproductive work,'' Benería et al. (2000: xiii) do not question the ecological impact of economic growth, referring only to ''how gender inequality may constrain or facilitate economic growth and the impact of market reforms on vulnerable sections of the population'' (Benería et al. 2000: xvi).

There is substantial feminist economics literature on quality-of-life issues (see, e.g., the Explorations on Quality of Life Indicators, guest-edited by Iulie M. Aslaksen, Anne Flaatten, and Charlotte Koren 1999; Carmen Sirianni and Cynthia Negrey 2000; A. Geske Dijkstra and Lucia C. Hanmer 2000; Siobhan Austin, Therese Jefferson, and Vicki Thein 2003; the Special Issue on Amartya Sen's work and ideas, guest-edited by Bina Agarwal, Jane Humphries, and Ingrid Robeyns 2003; Naila Kabeer 2004). Quality-of-life literature reflects a wide range of issues including inequality, discrimination, and poverty, all of which have been dealt with extensively in *Feminist Economics.*

Other feminist economists explicitly address ecological issues. Sabine O'Hara is particularly relevant to ecological economics. She writes: ''What may emerge as the core components of well-being may be exactly those functions rendered invisible by current value systems – the sustaining services provided in households, communities and nature that sustain the very social and environmental context within which we all live'' (O'Hara 1999: 87).

In addition, *Feminist Economics* published a review of the *Ecological Economics* special issue on ''Women, Ecology and Economics,'' in 2000. Linda Lucas summarizes the content of the issue in four main themes: how women's work and nature's work are invisible to economic practice because they lie outside the intellectual tradition and vision of the economics discipline; how, this invisible work provides a free subsidy to the production sector; how, because of this inside/outside problem, neoclassical economics presents only a partial analysis of the economic world; and how time as a gendered concept is connected to the creation of economic space and the subsidized economy. She concludes that ''many of the ideas in this volume are the foundation of tomorrow's feminist economics theory'' (Lucas 2000: 119).

Ecofeminist political economy: A material perspective

Ecofeminist political economy sees a connection between the exploitation of women's labor and the abuse of planetary resources. Women and the environment are both marginalized in their positions within the formal economy. As economists have long recognized in theory, but often not in practice, the economic system often views the environment as a ''free,'' exploitable resource while it ignores or undervalues much of women's lives and work. Thus, the material starting point of ecofeminist analysis is the materiality of much of what the world defines as ''women's work'' (although it is not necessarily all done by women or by all women), a theme that is also found in much of the work of feminist economists.

In my previous work (Mellor 1997a, 1997b), I argue for theories that explore the needs and limits of human existence (embodiment) within the

daily cycle, the life cycle, and the ecosystem (embeddedness). Body work must be done where the body is located (no virtual reality here) and within the framework of its temporality, the daily cycle (rest and replenishment), the life cycle (childhood, maturity, old age), and the time-scale of disease or ill health. Body work cannot fit into the schedules of paid work as it must conform to the needs of ''biological time,'' the time it takes to grow old, grow up, or get well.

Ecofeminist political economy and the realist debate

Because of their concern with the materiality of human existence, its bodily reality and embeddedness within the natural world, the debate in *Feminist Economics* about ontology initiated by Tony Lawson's paper ''Feminism, Realism, and Universalism'' (1999) is relevant to ecofeminists. Lawson bases his case for critical ontological realism largely on an analysis of economic systems as social structures, which sees ''all of us as complexly structured, socially and culturally situated, purposeful and needy individuals'' who ''knowledgeably and capably negotiate complex, shifting, only partially grasped, and contested structures of power, rules, relations, and other, possible relatively enduring but nevertheless transient and action-dependent, social resources at our disposal'' (1999: 50).

Lawson ontologically separates the social from the natural, arguing that natural realities have an independent tangible existence, whereas social realities do not. He sees humans as having a biological unity based on ''common or shared real needs...common human nature, a recognition grounded in our biological unity as a species'' (1999: 47). He goes on to argue that ''this common nature is always historically and socially mediated, human needs will be manifest in potentially many ways'' (1999: 47).

Lawson's paper drew responses from Sandra Harding (1999) and in 2003 from a group of respondents (Fabienne Peter 2003; Drucilla Barker 2003; Julie A. Nelson 2003b; Tony Lawson 2003; and Sandra Harding 2003). However, only Nelson's response specifically embraces issues raised by ecofeminism. Nelson (2003: 112) supports the need to develop a feminist ontology although she cautions against the danger of excessive philosophising in face of the real-world disadvantages suffered by women. She stresses the importance of ontological beliefs about how the world works, particularly the importance of emotion and caring: ''My hope is that digging around in the ontological roots can contribute to more fruitful caring about dependents, the disempowered, and the environment'' (Nelson 2003: 110). She criticizes the split between ''a material world that is assumed to be spiritless and a (possible) realm of meaning that is assumed to be bodiless'' (Nelson 2003: 110–1) and points to the importance of the ''living, novel, relational aspects of nature'' (Nelson 2003: 111). This discussion builds upon Nelson's earlier work, in which she rejected both

radical objectivism and radical subjectivism, arguing that ''gendered embodiment be taken very seriously'' (Nelson 1996: 139) and that ''economics should concern itself more with concrete issues of provisioning related to the actual social and natural environment'' (Nelson 1996: 131).

Fabienne Peter (2003: 98), in contrast, adopts the post-positivist position that no ''facts'' exist independently from theory and criticizes critical realism for making ''the validity of claims to knowledge depend on something that lies outside of the process of knowledge production itself'' (Peter 2003: 94). She argues against Lawson's notion of a genetically constituted common human nature. For Peter (2003: 94), human needs are contested rather than shared, which calls for a ''critical rethinking of science and its role in society.'' She proposes a democratic notion of scientific inquiry within which to rethink science and agrees with Harding (1999) that the natural sciences should be seen as particular kinds of social science.

I have argued for an ''immanent realism,'' an ecofeminist realism that takes a different approach from Peter's (Mellor 1997b: 111). I take the position that while human knowledge is powerful and human activities have tempered natural forces, natural systems have their own dynamics that can trigger the unexpected. All human activities have to take account of natural conditions, limits, and uncertainties because humans are immanent rather than transcendent in relation to the natural world. Whatever the extent of human capacities or abilities, the body and the physical environment frame human activities. Immanent realism shares much of the approach of critical realism; however, it takes the critical realist perspective beyond the social to embrace the dilemma of humanity's immanence within a limiting, but indeterminate, natural framework. Ecofeminist political economy points to the gendered structures at the intersection of ecology and economy, where every day women and men deal with the consequences of human embodiedness and embeddedness. The danger with a critical realism overemphasizing social aspects or subjectivism that deny the reality and agency of the natural world is that the material reality of women's subordination and exploitation in the dynamics of human existence will be ignored.

Conclusion: (Critical) immanent realism

Humanity is part of a dynamic, interactive ecological process that it cannot manipulate at will or without consequences. Ecofeminist political economy provides an understanding of the role that gender, class, and racism play in the articulation of ecologically unsustainable and socially unjust patterns of domination within human societies (Mary Mellor 2005). From this perspective, promises of ''equal opportunities'' are vacuous if they rely on the further exploitation of the natural world or subordinate groups within

the distorted frameworks of unsustainable economic systems. Ecofeminist analysis argues that the marginalization of women's work is not merely an injustice, but enables dominant groups to live as if they were not embodied and embedded within a limited nature.

V. HABITS OF THOUGHT, AGENCY, AND TRANSFORMATION: AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO FEMINIST ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Zdravka Todorova

Introduction

In her article ''Development, Gender and the Environment,'' Eiman Zein-Elabdin (1996) argues that the relationship between women and the environment can be understood only within the institutional contexts in which the two interact and in which development takes place. She critiques both the ''women in development'' (WID) approach taken by international financial institutions, which perceives women as readily responding to economic incentives,[5] and the ecofeminist perspective, which tends to view women as having a special understanding of the environment.[6] Zein-Elabdin (1996: 929) argues that both approaches fail to account for gender specification as an institution. Zein-Elabdin (1996: 930) defines gender specification as the ''social designation of individuals to a particular gender and the historically and culturally circumscribed economic and social roles contingent upon that designation,'' and she believes the concept is useful for capturing the relative positions of women and men in the economy and in relation to the environment.

One way of understanding the relative positions and vulnerabilities of people in the socio-economic structure is as a consequence of an evolutionary process Thorstein Veblen (1919/1969: 241) describes as a ''cumulative sequence of habitation.'' The process of cumulative change with respect to socio-economic structure is ''the sequence of change in the methods of doing things, the methods of dealing with the material means of life'' (Thorstein Veblen 1898: 391). These methods or ''habits of thought'' are part of cumulative institutional change. As Zein-Elabdin (1996: 942) explains, her concept of gender specification ''is based on Veblen's concept of institutions as 'habits of thought.'''

Ecological economics recognizes that ''humans and their economies are parts of natural ecosystems and coevolve with those natural systems'' (Stephen Ferber and Dennis Bradley 1995: 1). Changes in the composition or functioning of ecosystems are a part of life processes. Human-induced or human-accelerated ecosystem disturbances can be mapped, together with changes in material provisioning processes and hence are subject to human agency. The organization of material provisioning is a process of cumulative

change in habits of thought. Human-induced or human-accelerated ecosystem disturbances have the propensity to affect, for example, public health, as Eric Chivian (2003) writes, through the ''threat, prevalence or incidence of infectious diseases directly or indirectly through their impact on the biodiversity of infectious agents, reservoirs, and vectors.''[7] The methods that a given society develops to cope with the effects of ecosystem disturbances result from its evolving habits of thought, including gender specification.

Habits of thought or, as Veblen (1898: 393) calls them, ''habitual methods of procedure,'' require human intelligence and involve variation. Such habits are not the same as routines, which consist of repetitive acts and imply automata. Geoffrey Hodgson (2002) brings attention to human agency and critiques social theory approaches that treat individuals as automata. The present contribution creates a framework for a gendered approach to ecosystems and social provisioning that is grounded neither in methodological individualism nor in methodological collectivism. This framework seeks to incorporate living systems, human agency, and habits of thought and structural transformation. The concepts of ''structure'' and ''agency'' are invoked here as a way to relate some contemporary methodological debates formulated in these terms to habits of thought and living systems.

Concerns about universal theorizing

According to Zein-Elabdin (1996: 942), both the WID and the ecofeminist approaches imply that women possess some universal, essentialist character;[8] she argues that this assumption leads to ''muting the varied social settings of environmental problems and women's responses to them.'' Her conceptual framework for ''redrawing this discourse, particularly with regard to the treatment of gender'' (Zein-Elabdin 1996: 929) is based on the proposition that gender discussion must be ''firmly grounded in an institutionalist understanding of economic and social processes.'' She further argues: ''Because of the historical and cultural specificity of institutions and processes, there is no basis for a theoretical discourse on development, gender, and the environment, but only a contextual analysis of the multiple points where development, women, and the environment meet and interact'' (Zein-Elabdin 1996: 930). Thus, addressing the WID and the ecofeminist approaches, Zein-Elabdin (1996: 942) concludes: ''[T]he areas of development, gender, and the environment can be juxtaposed only to the extent that they interact within specific historical and cultural institutional contexts rather than in an abstract theoretical domain.''

I will note, however, that an emphasis on institutional specifics can be compatible with a certain level of generalization. This compatibility

between the specific and the general exists, for example, when feminists theorize about more or less stable macroeconomic and global structural conditions. Macroeconomic global trends are related to local livelihoods and occur via particular habits of thought regarding international relations, budgeting, and public policy. Thus, when economists conduct specific contextual analysis, they must also pay attention to general theories about global macroeconomic and political relations. Furthermore, there are no obstacles to preserving the importance of historical and cultural specifics while recognizing a general interdependence between biological organisms and ecosystems and between interdependent changes of habits of thought and ecosystems. As discussed below, these generalizations are crucial for conceptualizing human agency.

Finally, as both Tony Lawson (1999; 2003)[9] and Geoffrey Hodgson (1999; 2002) argue, concerns that universal theorizing may be misleading should not eliminate discussions about method – namely about the perception of reality,[10] epistemology, and social theory in feminist ecological economics. Like Zein-Elabdin, Hodgson (2002) challenges universal approaches to economic theorizing and favors contextual analysis, but in his attention to historical, cultural, and geographical specifics, he emphasizes the importance of abstract discussions on structure and agency.

Living systems, bodies, and agency

The debate over agency and structure comes from the critiques of ‘‘methodological individualism’’ and ‘‘methodological collectivism.’’[11] The first approach, as Hodgson (2002: 160) points out, claims to explain social phenomena exclusively in terms of individuals, and the second purports to explain social phenomena solely in terms of structures or wholes. Hodgson (2002: 166) criticizes both methods and argues that neither individuals nor institutions can be the final explanatory determinant. He emphasizes the common points between structurationists, critical realists, and institutionalists, and appends to the contemporary debate on structure and agency the argument that:

> ‘‘It is not simply the individual behavior that has been changed: there are also changes in habitual dispositions. In turn, these are associated with changed individual understandings, purposes and preferences. [T]here are no mysterious ‘‘social forces’’ controlling individuals, other than those affecting the actions and communications of human actors. People do not develop new preference, wants or purposes simply because ‘‘values’’ or ‘‘social forces’’ control them. What does happen is that the framing, shifting and constraining capacities of social institutions give rise to new perceptions and dispositions within

individuals. Upon new habits of thought and behaviour, new preferences and intentions emerge.

Human novelty and unpredictability lie at the center of Hodgson's (1999: 145) emphasis on the distinction between automata and human beings. For Hodgson, bringing emotional and institutional factors into preference functions is problematic when accounting for agency. As Julie A. Nelson (2003a: 62) notes, in such an approach, ''if values exist, they must exist as universals, as theoretical invariants, lying out there somewhere waiting to be discovered.'' The individual preference function becomes immutable (Hodgson 2002: 176). ''The preference function is already 'there'; ready to deal with unpredictable and unknowable circumstances'' (Hodgson 2002: 176). When ecological problems are reduced to subjective utilities, human beings are reduced to automata; the role of agency is obscured, since people's minds and their ability to learn are nullified.

We usually find such dualisms as mind-body and reason-emotion underlying a reliance on substitutes for agency. Furthermore, these dualisms lead to a division between humans and nature, which prevents us from perceiving people as organic elements of ecosystems. As argued by John Dewey (1922/1988: 60) in his *Human Nature and Conduct*, the conceptual isolation of people from nature is ''duly manifested in the split between mind and body – since body is clearly a connected part of nature.'' Dewey opposes this particular split.[12] Body-mind dualism, which provides the basis for both biological determinism and social determinism, presupposes that the mental action of the individual takes place separately from the body. In biological determinism, the mind is ignored, while social determinism leaves little room for nature.

In contemporary cultural studies ''the body'' has become a focus of interest for gender researchers who have analyzed it as a social construction, as a text, and as having meaning (Sheila Greene 2003: 75). While accepting that there is much to be gained from a discourse on the meaning and representation of the body, Greene (2003: 73) usefully notes that such theorizing does not actually address the reality of the biological body. The meaning of ''body'' is seen as culturally specific and it becomes almost imaginary. On the other hand, biological determinism with its implicit ''recognition'' of the body has not been informative about specific personal vulnerability but, as Greene notes (2003: 74), has served as ''dubious scientific'' justification for social gender designations.

Inquiries in feminist ecological economics benefit from the conceptualization of living bodies.[13] For her purposes, an analyst might complement the social aspects of gender specification with the biological aspects of gender without guilt of essentialism. Biological gender characteristics (e.g., as they pertain to the effects of toxic waste or other pollution on fertility,

pregnancy, breastfeeding, and child bearing) help create understanding about the relative positions of people in their ecology and their vulnerabilities to ecosystem disturbances. A preference-based approach is unable to emphasize biological gender specifications that could be relevant for studying ecological vulnerability. Such an approach ''lacks criteria for distinguishing individuals from one another'' (John Davis 2004: 6). A framework that does not allow for variation in persons does not support feminist economists' concern about universal theorizing. As William D. Williams (2004: 11) notes:

> The preference system approach is biologically uninformed and incompatible with the life process. To account for a living system, one needs a hierarchical structure. Conceptualizing habits of thought brings to analysis a conception of agency that is consistent with living systems.[14]

Habits of thought are dynamic: ''[T]he point of departure, at any step of the process, is the entire organic complex of habits of thought that have been shaped by the past process'' (Veblen 1898: 393). ''[E]ach new situation is a variation of what has gone before it and embodies as causal factors all that has been effected by what went on before'' (Veblen 1919/1969: 242). Variation and agency are intertwined. Hodgson (1999: 145) warns: ''If human beings are more than automata they are not merely programmed responders to external stimuli; their actions cannot always be predicted.'' The idea of institutions merely as incentives is, however, the predominant policy approach to development, gender, and the environment, and it has led to the notion that institutional reform is sufficient to facilitate individual choices.

A number of theorists have argued against this reductionist approach to human agency, including Hodgson (1999: 37), who notes: ''By reducing all transactions to the mutual enhancement of 'utility' . . . one . . . cannot understand the phenomenon of the commodification of human relations, let alone explore its consequences.'' Hodgson (2002: 176) also draws attention to money as an institution, which ''imbues people with pecuniary habits of calculation and comparison,'' citing Wesley Mitchell's (1937: 371) work. It is Mitchell (1937: 371) who contends that the institution of money ''affects our very ideals of what is good, beautiful and true,'' and calls the ''money economy . . . one of the most potent institutions in our whole culture.''

Monetary production, ecosystems, and gender specification

Analysis of money as an institution could facilitate an understanding of the conflict between production and livelihood in the context of monetary production within ecosystems. In a monetary production economy, in

which the creation of livelihoods is incidental to the process of making money (see Thorstein Veblen 1923; Dudley Dillard 1980), human survival (which presupposes ecosystem survival) is incidental to making money. Human-induced ecosystem disturbances that have negative social, biological, and psychological effects on humans are interrelated with the monetary organization of provisioning.

For example, as Williy Douma, Heleen van den Homberg, and Ange Wieberdink (1994: 84) documented in the mid-1990's, coffee growing was introduced in the Andes Mountains in Colombia as a response to the country's external debts and neoliberal policies that were aimed at opening up markets and increasing exports. The policies resulted in clearing forests and halting the growing of subsistence crops, causing a reduction in the region's biodiversity. The consequences of this ecological disturbance included an impoverished diet and alterations in the division of labor between men and women resulting in heavier work burden for women.

The institution of money and finance at the macro-level represents particular habits of thought in the global context. For example, Peter Dorman (2004) displays the relationship between external debt and deforestation,[15] confirming that natural, less commodifiable forest values are ignored in favor of ''unnatural'' financial constraints. ''Why should the financial process bias the direction of development away from the preservation of ecological values?'' Dorman asks (2004: 214).[16]

In order to address this question and similar ones and relate them to power relations, one needs not only local understanding of gender specifications, but also some theoretical explanation of global macroeconomic trends and the habits of thought behind them. For example, as a result of patent laws and the legal protection of intellectual property rights, farmers in developing nations have to pay for new varieties of crops in money units of account, and further, they must obtain the credit or the money tokens in order to be able to pay.[17] Money as an institution represents power relations,[18] which also have gender content.

Zein-Elabdin's (1996: 942) concept of gender specifications is intended to legitimate ''the role of gender in determining the relative economic and social positions of women and men in society,'' thus facilitating discussion of power relations. She argues that power relations can be revealed only in concrete institutional analysis (Zein-Elabdin 1996: 941).[19] Furthermore, she emphasizes that overlooking gender specifications can obscure power relations (Zein-Elabdin 1996: 931). The concept of gender reveals the difference between women and men with respect to their usual tasks and vulnerability to ecological change and the effects of monetary production.

Nelson (2003a: 60) identifies as a habit of thought the assumption that ''children and people in other stages of vulnerability will be 'naturally' cared for, at low cost, by unpaid relatives,'' usually women. Greene (2003: 76) argues that ''women's destiny as mother, homemaker and nurturer''

has been seen as "forever tied to the fulfillment of her body's design and its needs." Public budgets will be inadequate for the needs of citizens, if "care" is "naturally" perceived not as a public concern, but as the private responsibility of families and women.[20]

It can be argued that budgeting and macroeconomic policies are often ceremonially locked in to such habitual reasoning. When faced with ecological disturbances and their effects on public health, for example, the institutional adjustment of changes in habits of thought cannot take place instantaneously. Consequently, the conditions of possibility for transforming the institutionalized response to ecological disturbances are related to the likelihood of understanding, elaborating, and transforming habits of thought that are at the basis of global and domestic public policy.

Conclusion

The discussion about habits of thought and gender specifications leads to the following propositions addressing the relationships between ecosystems, gender, and provisioning. First, analyses of the living systems comprised by interdependent organisms are necessary when theorists discuss social provisioning within ecosystems. A perception of living, interdependent organisms is necessary for analyzing gender conflicts within ecological and social systems of production and provisioning. This perception includes abandoning traditional, dualistic conceptualizations of humans and nature, which do not allow people to be conceptualized as organic elements of ecosystems. Second, body-mind dualism presupposes that the mental action of individuals takes place separately from their bodies. This assumption prevents theorists from simultaneously addressing biological gender specification and social gender specification as identifying vulnerabilities to ecosystem disturbances. Furthermore, this dualism facilitates an artificial theoretical and practical breach between financial (as intelligent) and ecological (as natural) concerns. These propositions do not interfere with feminist and institutionalist concerns about universalizing, and they allow for historically and culturally informed theories. More importantly, they do not exclude human agency and the possibility of structural transformation – concepts that have been at the center of contemporary social scientific inquiry.

VI. THE *NETWORK VORSORGENDES WIRTSCHAFTEN*

Maren A. Jochimsen

The *Network Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften* is an association of women, both academics and practitioners, from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. The impetus for the group arose from a session on "Sustainable Development

from a Female Perspective'' at the Fifth Oikos Conference at the University of St Gallen, Switzerland, in 1992. In 1993, the Network began as a workshop that meets annually and continues to grow.

The roots of the *Network Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften* reach back to ecological economists' discussions of sustainable economic development in the 1980s and early 1990s. These discussions focused almost exclusively on the importance of resources and ecological processes; they neglected the importance of social processes and those responsible for their functioning in the study of sustainable economic development. The standpoint of women with respect to sustainable economic development was missing, and a whole set of important questions had yet to be addressed. To what extent do women perceive ecological problems in a distinctive way, resulting from their specific gender experiences in everyday life? To what extent do women develop different ideas and strategies based on these gendered perceptions and develop their own strategies? What are the differences between these ideas and other concepts of sustainable development? The origins of the *Network* demonstrate the overwhelming interest of its members in exploring a more holistic approach toward economic issues and economic development; one that acknowledges their ties to the social and the natural world.

This critical questioning of conventional economic theory and practice, in the quest for an ecologically and socially sustainable economy, marked the starting point of their approach to socio-economic and ecological questions. The term ''*Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften*,'' or ''Caring Economy,'' was created to indicate this shift from the focus and content of other approaches in ecological economics. *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften* signaled an effort to broaden discussions of sustainable development to include socio-economic dimension and gender perspectives (Maren Jochimsen, Ulrike Knobloch, and Irmi Seidl 1994). The all-encompassing question of how we wish to live with others on this planet guides the ongoing development of the *Network*. *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften* acknowledges the fundamental importance of the maintenance economy and its relationship with and interdependency on the market economy in the shaping of any economic system (Maren Jochimsen and Ulrike Knobloch 1993). It treats the caring realm, as well as the life experiences of women with respect to their role as mediators between the maintenance and the market economy, as starting points for analysis. In doing so, the *Network* orients its guiding principles toward principles of action for the development of an economically and socially sustainable economy.

The methodological approach of the *Network* consists of reviewing a combination of personal experiences, case studies, and theoretical work. In our search, *care*, *cooperation*, and *taking the essentials of a good life as a guideline* have emerged as central building blocks of a theory-in-progress (Adelheid Biesecker et al. 2000). *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften* not only concerns itself with

theorizing practical experiences, but also with implementing these concepts and ideas. Working at and with the interchange of theory and practice, *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften* is an ongoing process of thought and action, not a ready-made, globally applicable concept. The aim, rather, is that the specific approach and the principles of a caring economy enter the process of changing society and its economic activities.

The project as well as the *Network* are interdisciplinary and transcend defined realms. Today, the *Network* counts women of many different backgrounds among approximately 50 members. They are academics (professors, project workers, doctoral students) from disciplines including economics, sociology, political sciences, natural sciences, and household sciences; and they are practitioners who are active in different spheres of society, ranging from the household, social banking, and agriculture to the arts and architecture. *Network* members keep in touch via an e-mail list. The *Network* meets annually, but members also undertake research projects, organize conferences, prepare publications, and carry out other various activities in smaller groups. The *Network* held a conference in 1998 (Babette Scurrell 1998) and has produced two publications: an outline of its theoretical and practical approach (Christiane Busch-Lüty et al. 1994) and a critical appreciation of its theoretical and practical findings (Biesecker et al. 2000). It also supports a website (http://www.vorsorgendeswirtschaften.de) and has recently made its way into a research program of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research.

VII. ENGENDERING ORGANIC FARMING

Martha McMahon

Feminist ecological economics combines social justice and ecological perspectives. The field of inquiry emphasizes the ecological and social value of women's work (Waring 1988; Vandana Shiva 1989, 2002; Perkins 1997; Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1999; Hilkka Pietilä 2002), and traces the connection between the gendered nature of global economic restructuring and ecological destruction (MacDonald 2002; Shiva 1989, 2002). Often, economic restructuring most perniciously affects precisely those spheres of life for which feminists have sought to develop innovative, nonsexist, ecological economic analysis – women's unpaid work in households, communities, and subsistence production. As globalization accelerates, it becomes more pressing for feminists to green and engender macroeconomic analysis and examine whether subsistence-centered spheres of life still hold transformative potential in an economically globalizing world.

Organic agriculture and women farmers offer opportunities for investigating these issues. My research has focused on women who practice organic farming in British Columbia (BC), Canada and suggests

that neither critiques of conventional agriculture nor the development of organic agriculture has taken gender seriously. This neglect leaves organic agriculture vulnerable to reproducing many of the problems it was intended to solve. If present trends continue, organic farming will be dominated by the same concentrated economic forces and exploitative ecological and social relationships the movement promised to resist.

For a variety of reasons, the women organic farmers I studied work within the kinds of ethical, ideological, social, and material relationships that would help the organic movement retain its radical promise, if gender and feminist analysis were taken seriously. My analysis does not rest on a romanticized version of pioneer women or traditional farmers but, in the case of the women I studied, a variety of hybridized new political and ecological subjects who are resisting the commodification of food by redefining its meaning. They advocate local production, non-market subsistence, and reclaiming localized markets as ways of re-embedding food and farming in place, space, and moral relationships. The ''vernacular'' values associated with this perspective are deeply radical, diverse, and anti-hierarchical.

Feminism and women farmers

As a movement to make food and agriculture more socially just and ecologically sustainable, the organic movement would seem to present an ideal intellectual and political site for the development of feminist ecological economic analysis. A small but growing body of research literature exposes significant analytic connections between gender and the social justice and ecological goals of the organic movement (Shelly Feldman and Rick Welsh 1995; Alison C. Meares 1997; Laura DeLind and Anne E. Ferguson 1999; Cynthia Abbott Cone and Andrea Myhre 2000; Alan Hall and Veronica Mogyorody 2002). These emerging feminist analyses suggest that the organic movement needs to pay greater attention to the gendered nature of power.

First, some statistics. In Canada, 26 percent of farmers are women. The proportion of farms operated exclusively by women is small (5 percent), but it is growing (Statistics Canada 2001). Among certified Canadian organic farmers, 31 percent are female, with the largest proportion producing organic fruit and vegetables closely followed by organic animals and animal products. Women's farms are small enterprises; nearly 80 percent of farms run exclusively by women have annual receipts of less than CAN$50,000. British Columbia has the highest percentage of women farmers in Canada (36 percent) (Statistics Canada 2001). The number of farmers in Canada is declining, but the drop in BC is smaller than in most provinces. BC has the highest proportion of farmers working fewer than

20 hours per week on the farm (38.4 percent). This suggests that one of the reasons for the greater retention of farmers in BC is the survival strategy once characteristic generally of peasant households: having multiple occupations and sources of livelihood. Farms run exclusively by women account for about ten percent of the farms in BC. Some 65 percent of farmers in BC have under CAN$25,000 in farm receipts, which is almost twice the national average.

Among organic farmers in the province, 69 percent of those licensed with the Certified Organic Association of British Columbia (COABC) have gross annual incomes under CAN$20,000 (Patrick Mallet 2003: 2), and the majority sell their products directly to consumers. Less than 25 percent were involved in interprovincial or international trade in 2000 (Mallet, 2003: 2). Anne Macey (2004) reports that 40 percent of organic farmers in BC are women. In affluent areas near cities, there are also many noncertified organic or largely organic women farmers who sell directly to local consumers at their farm gates.

In the gendered agriculture of the United States and Canada, where male identity is highly conflated with the role of farmer (Marta B. Chiappe and Cornelia Butler Flora 1998: 372), it is hard for women to claim the identity of farmer:

> I never know how to answer the question, ''Are you a farmer?'' My usual answer begins with ''No, but . . .'' My farm is not a business. But I do grow most of my own food, including vegetables, fruit, meat, dairy and eggs . . . . We don't have an adequate term for people who grow food for themselves because, in my opinion, society has little respect for this activity. (Janet Wallace 2004: 4)

The small-scale, local-market orientation of many women organic farmers I studied and their willingness to supplement farm income with other work highlight a key issue in ecologically sustainable agriculture: the political struggles over the meaning of organic farming and food (Hall and Mogyorody 2002: 14). What is farming? Who is a farmer? What is organic? This is a contested and gendered terrain.

Theorizing the conventionalization of organic farming and engendering analysis

The women organic farmers in British Columbia I studied typically grow food for themselves, for their families, and to sell in their local communities. Some derive the majority of their income from selling their produce. They have set up local farmers' markets, encouraged other women to become farmers, helped low-income women access rental or exchange agreements for farm land, shared knowledge, developed apprenticeship programs, educated their communities on health and

ecological issues, protected local farm land from urban development, worked with food banks, and carried out a wide range of other actions that fuse agriculture, social justice, ecology, health, and community building. Some groups have fostered international networks with farmers in developing countries. These networks provide support and a larger voice for women farmers.

There is, however, considerable evidence that organic food and farming is becoming a globalized industry. European research suggests that as organic farming becomes more institutionalized, it also becomes more conventional and may lose its potential for positive ecological and social transformations (Tracey Clunies-Ross and Graham Cox 1994; Hilary Tovey 1997). In California, the smaller, organic family farm has been marginalized or taken over by large-scale or corporate organic producers who operate in ways that closely resemble those of conventional agribusiness (Daniel Buck, Christina Getz, and Julia Guthman 1997). Indeed, five very large farms now control half of California's US$400 million organic product market. The commercialization of organic farming and adoption of a productivist, industrial paradigm (Tovey 1997) has been the focus of political debate within the organic movement. Some see it as a loss of the movement's founding values; others see it as a marketing success. Others, such as ecosocialist Michael Lowy (2002), caution that the market in advanced capitalism is a self-regulating system beyond social, moral, and political control. My local BC organic farming magazine, the BC Organic Grower, reflects the contradiction:

> Some worry that the vision of [a] . . . smaller and locally based alternatives to the dominant food system is being lost. . . . That original vision saw success not only as commercial expansion but as the expansion of a civic dialogue focused on bring sustainability and social justice to the food system. It is a vision characterized by caring and just relationships to local places, and to human beings. [If that is lost] then its commercial success will ring hollow. (Vijay Cudderford 2003: 10)

The costs of conventionalization to the ecological and social justice potential of the organic movement are high. These include a dilution of organic standards (so far resisted) and downward pressure on prices paid to farmers. More of the price consumers pay goes to the costs of packaging, retailing, and energy-consuming transportation. Continued institutionalization of the movement will further centralize and concentrate control of the organic food processing, distribution, and retailing sectors within the big corporations that currently control the globalized food system (Tim Lang 2003). These (mal)developments will also mean the loss of economically viable options for women and other small-scale farmers and their marginalization within the movement, but even critics seldom make the connections between gender and conventionalization:

> The lack of adequate attention to gender issues within the movement is in itself some reason for concern . . . the gender potential of organic farming may not be realized unless there is a more concerted effort . . . to preserve organic farming, not only as an alternative agricultural movement, but also as a social justice movement dedicated explicitly to gender equality. (Hall and Mogyorody 2002: 12–3)

The organic movement does not recognize that the conventionalization of organic agriculture, like earlier developments in non-organic agriculture, is itself a gendered process. Historically, the adoption of high levels of mechanization, specialization, wage-labor dependency, and capitalization (now increasing features of organic food and farming) played a critical role in distancing women from farm production and decision making (Bill Reimer 1984; Feldman and Welsh 1995; Laura DeLind 2000). The process of capitalization and mechanization did not simply increase men's control of agricultural resources but changed humanity's very thinking about its relationship with the land, animals, and farm products (Feldman and Welsh 1995).

Protect the local, globally

Critics of the global food system and of the conventionalization of organic farming increasingly point to local food economies as an alternative (Vicki Hird 1998; Colin Hines 2000; Sustain/Elm Farm Research Centre 2001; Helena Norberg-Hodge, Todd Merrifield, and Steven Gorelick 2002). Although little acknowledged or referenced, the literature on localization of food appears to be deeply influenced by ecological feminism, not least in its focus on the connection between community building and the ecological value of local food, re-embedding food in social relationships, small-scale farming, low capitalization, enhancing social relationships, and social and ecological diversity. Research on community-supported agriculture (CSA) suggests that women constitute a majority of the active membership in such projects, and although men may be committed to the idea of the local, the practical work of being committed to local food and "doing community" is actually primarily done by women (DeLind and Ferguson 1999) and relies heavily on their unpaid labor. The turn to the local need not be understood (or enacted) as a new kind of inward-looking parochialism but, for feminists like Leigh S. Brownhill and Terisa E. Turner (2003: 3), it can be seen as a kind of "globalization from below," involving an international strategy to control transnational corporations' (TNCs) power and activities. For Brownhill and Turner, this is a process by which the capacities of local civil commons are strengthened and linked to their counterparts elsewhere in the world.

Beyond globalizing nothing

Ecological feminist analysis disrupts homogenizing uses of the terms "organic," "food," and "farmer" both in the debates within the organic movement and in wider public discourse. It argues that homogenization facilitates the workings of power and that erasure of differences blinds us to power struggles over the meaning of food and farming. In contrast, Gunnar Rundgren (2003), then President of the International Federation of Organic Farming Movements (IFOAM) World Board, sees the tensions in the movement as being between trade liberalization and anti-globalization forces and thus concretely about marketing strategies. He advocates an internationally harmonized definition of "organic" to promote trade. Although he sees social justice, fair trade, and localization initiatives as welcome and to be encouraged, he does not consider them realistic solutions to global problems:

> This is not a criticism of local marketing or fair trade. Both are good, but they are also not *The Solution* to the hardship of a billion farming families. Given this, opportunities to expand the organic business should not be missed due to political correctness... the establishment of mutual recognition between organic guarantee systems globally as a means to facilitate the expansion of organic produce in global trade should also be promoted. (Rundgren 2003: 29–31, emphasis in original)

From their research with women farmers, Patricia Allen and Carolyn Sachs (1994) argue for the need to contextualize definitions of sustainability in ecological agriculture, paying particular attention to the different locators of class, race/ethnicity, and gender. Anna Isla (2000) expresses concern that women in developing countries will be exploited labor in the production of high-value organic produce for affluent markets in the West. Ivan Illich's (1980) concept of the vernacular inverts the connection Rundgren sees between making organic products a universal commodity and poverty alleviation, and argues instead that the poor are not those who survive by their vernacular (subsistence) activities because they have inadequate or no access to the market. Rather, the modernized poor are those whose vernacular domain is most restricted. In this sense a universalizing commodification of local produce causes, not cures, poverty, and being organic would offer no protection.

Within community-supported agriculture (CSA) projects in Canada and the United States, small-scale organic farmers and CSA members try to re-invest food and farming with local, contextual, and specific meaning as a way of re-embedding their families and their food in nature and in community (Cone and Myhre 2000). For many reasons, women do the majority of this re-embedding and reconnecting work (Cone and Myhre 2000; DeLind and Ferguson 1999), which can be understood as a means of resisting the

disembeddedness of modernity and the dislocations of the modern self in time and space (Anthony Giddens 1991). This conception stands in contrast to the idea of organic food as a universally tradable commodity.

Community-supported organic farming can be understood as an effort to resist the commodification of food and the destruction of agriculture as a cultural activity of tending and cultivating the land (Cone and Mayhre 2000: 188). In this, it comes close to what Illich (1980) calls ''vernacular'' and feminists call ''subsistence-life economies,'' but the term ''subsistence'' carries too many popular connotations of hardship, dourness, frugality, poverty, tradition, and even drudgery and too few of the theoretical meanings of independence, connectedness, freedom, abundance, and reclaiming the commons. The women organic farmers I have talked to emphasize the richness, pleasure, aesthetics, joy, independence, and economic integrity of their lives.

George Ritzer (2004) reminds us that macro processes like globalization and rationalization also produce countermovements and open new, hybridized political spaces at the intersections of the global and the local – processes Ritzer calls ''glocalization.'' For him, a project of returning to the traditional or preserving the intact local is politically and economically doomed. Thus, organic farming does not require a romanticized version of pioneer women or traditional farmers, but, as Ritzer might put it, a variety of hybridized, new political and ecological subjects who, like the women I studied, are economic actors, willing to resist the commodification of food by redefining its meaning. These women are reclaiming the market at the local level and trying to transform it rather than remaining outside it. In their efforts, the cultural, political, and economic are fused. In a globalizing world, the processes of reclaiming the market, and de-commodifying products through the reintegration of the cultural, political, ethical and economic, constitute resistance. So, too, does imagining political-ecological communities rather than asserting shared identities.

Ellie Perkins, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University,
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3, Canada
e-mail: esperk@yorku.ca

Edith Kuiper, Faculty of Economics and Econometrics, Universiteit van Amsterdam,
Roetersstraat 11, 1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail: e.Kuiper@uva.nl

Rayén Quiroga-Martínez, Consultant, Statistics Division,
UN Economic Commission For Latin America and the Caribbean, Santiage, Chile
e-mail: rayenquiroga@gmail.com

Terisa E. Turner, Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
University of Guelph, 609 MacKinnon, Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1, Canada
e-mail: terisatu@uoguelph.ca

Leigh Brownhill,
University of Toronto,
252 Bloor St. West, 7th Floor, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6, Canada
e-mail: lbrownhi@uoguelph.ca

Mary Mellor, Department of Sociology and Criminology, Northumbria University,
Northumberland Road, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 8ST, UK
e-mail: m.mellor@unn.ac.uk

Zdravka Todorova, University of Missouri – Kansas City, Economics Department,
Haag Hall 211, 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, MO 64110, USA
e-mail:todorovazd@umkc.edu

Maren A. Jochimsen,
Bismarckallee 14, D-53173 Bonn, Germany
e-mail: maren_jochimsen@hotmail.com

Martha McMahon, Department of Sociology, University of Victoria,
Victoria, BC V8W 3P5, Canada
e-mail: mcmahon@uvic.ca

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Zdravka Todorova would like to express her gratitude to two anonymous referees for their valuable suggestions, Fadhel Kaboub and the late Professor William D. Williams (Economics Department and Social Science Consortium at the University of Missouri – Kansas City) for reading a draft of her paper and making insightful comments. The remaining errors are hers. Martha McMahon extends special thanks to Julie Labelle at the University of Victoria for all her help with this paper.

NOTES

[1] The dependentists comprise another important Latin American school of economic thought. Their analyses developed parallel to those of the structuralist school, through the work of Celso Furtado (1961), André Gunder Frank (1967), Enzo Faletto and Fernando Cardoso (1971/2001), and Teotonio dos Santos (1970). These thinkers see Latin America as a satellite, dependent on the metropolis of the industrialized countries, which benefit from the international division of labor and the resulting international trade. They developed the concept of ‘‘international

superexploitation of labor,'' concluding that only by breaking away from the capitalist world system could Latin America truly develop.

[2] ''Matristic'' is a concept developed to account for ancient European societies whose culture was based in collaboration, solidarity, respect, ecological rationality, equal recognition of all forms of life and of both genders, and where no signs of hierarchies were found (Riane Eisler 1988).

[3] I use the term ''hyper populist'' to signify renewed populist ideologies and approaches to government that transform past progressive doctrines and contents into a functional, pragmatic and instrumental pursuit of power in the name of the needs of the people they claim to represent.

[4] Ecological economics differs from environmental economics, which addresses ecological problems within a framework of conventional economics. Environmental economics puts forward a variety of solutions, from environmental accounting, assessments, and audits to proposals for green taxes or pollution permits.

[5] For a comprehensive historical study on the extent of gender and environment-sensitiveness of World Bank policies, see Priya Kurian (2000).

[6] The particular references of Eiman Zein-Elabdin's critique are to the World Bank literature on forestry in Sub-Saharan Africa, representing the WID approach, and the work of Vandana Shiva representing the ecofeminist approach. Vandana Shiva (1988), an Indian physicist, characterizes development programs as a ''Western, masculine project of modernization that has involved the subjugation of women and nature.'' She has promoted the discourse on women, development, and environment.

[7] For examples of the relationship between biodiversity and human health, see Eric Chivian and Aaron Bernstein (2004).

[8] Noël Sturgeon (2003: 95) cautions about ''fixing a definition of essentialist Ecofeminism.'' She argues: ''Ecofeminism in development discourse is not so much an immutable set of theoretical positions as it is a political intervention that continually shifts its discourse in relation to its negotiation with dominant forces in development politics.''

[9] Tony Lawson (2003: 123) has addressed feminists' concerns about universal theorizing, and has argued about the possibility of ''certain generalized features of widespread experience that are necessary for theorizing sets of conditions, and through which an ontological framework is achieved.''

[10] Lawson (2003: 128) emphasizes his intention to encourage consideration of an ontological turn in feminist theorizing. The importance of an ontological conception is that ''the theorist supposes at the outset that the world is intelligible, that what has happened, the actual, must have been possible, and that there are conditions which rendered the actual possible'' (Lawson 2003: 123). He further argues: ''[B]y denying ontology, theorists cannot adequately put the question of the possibility of human emancipation'' (Lawson 2003: 128); see also Lawson 1999).

[11] Anthony Giddens's (1979, 1991) Structuration approach to agency and structure proposed a way to avoid both methodological individualism and methodological collectivism, and stimulated a debate with Critical Realists. In her *Realist Social Theory*, Margaret Archer (1995) conceptualizes human agency and social structure as two separate layers of social reality and suggests investigating the causal powers of both structure and agency. She critiques Structurationists, like Giddens, for defining structure and agency in terms of one another.

[12] For further exposition of the relation between nature, experience, and the falsity of division between body and mind in the context of environmental philosophy, see Hugh McDonald (2004).

[13] For discussions of humans as social and biological beings, see Paul Hirst and Penny Woolley (1982); Peter Weingart, Sandra Mitchell, Peter Richerson, and Sabine Maasen (1997); also see Geoffrey Hodgson's (2001) discussion on habits and institutions.

[14] For a critical discussion about using biological metaphors in economics, see Tony Lawson (2003: Chapter 5). For a favorable discussion on the potential of modern biology for explanations process, time irreversibility, the importance of history, structural change, and so on, see Hodgson (2001).

[15] Peter Taylor and Frederick Buttel (1992: 411) note ''most environmental organizations have been disinclined to take on the world debt crisis, the net South-North capital drain, and the international monetary order as being fundamental contributors to environmental degradation.''

[16] This question echoes Thorstein Veblen's (1923) distinction between workmanship and salesmanship or instrumental versus pecuniary valuation. In Veblen's work, habits of thought originate from two general human propensities: ''workmanship'' (''group-regarding instinct'') and ''predation'' (''self-regarding instinct'').

[17] For comparison of traditional principles of reciprocity and a monetized agricultural production, and their environmental aspects, see Matthew Forstater (2002).

[18] For discussion on money as an institution of debtor-creditor relations and property relations, see Stephanie Bell and John Henry (2001).

[19] Zein-Elabdin (1996: 941) points to the institutionally specific discussion of the role of the state in India that Bina Agarwal (1992) documents. Through land privatization, the state facilitated redefining land ownership in favor of well-off farmers who were predominantly male (also see Bina Agrawal 2000).

[20] For a review of ''gender sensitive budgets,'' see Ronda Sharp (1999).

REFERENCES

Adebayo, Sola. 2002. ''N-Delta Women Give Shell 10-Day Ultimatum on Demands.'' *Vanguard*, November 14.

Agarwal, Bina. 1992. ''The Gender and Environment Debate: Lessons from India.'' *Feminist Studies* 18(1): 119–58.

Agarwal, Bina. 2000. ''Conceptualizing Environmental Collective Action: Why Gender Matters.'' *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 24(3): 283–310.

Agarwal, Bina, Jane Humphries, and Ingrid Robeyns, eds. 2003. ''A Special Issue on Amartya Sen's Work and Ideas: A Gender Perspective.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(2/3).

Allen, Patricia and Carolyn Sachs. 1994. ''The Poverty of Sustainability: An Analysis of Current Positions.'' *Agriculture and Human Values* 9: 29–35.

Archer, Margaret. 1995. *Realist Social Theory: the Morphogenetic Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aslaksen, Iulie, Ane Flaatten, and Charlotte Koren. 1999. ''Explorations on Quality of Life Indicators.'' *Feminist Economics* 5(2): 79–137.

Austin, Siobhan, Therese Jefferson, and Vicki Thein. 2003. ''Gendered Social Indicators and Grounded Theory.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(1): 1–18.

Barker, Drucilla. 2003. ''Emancipatory for Whom? A Comment on Critical Realism.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(1): 103–8.

Bell, Stephanie, and John Henry. 2001. ''Hospitality Versus Exchange: the Limits of Monetary Economies.'' *Review of Social Economy* 54(2): 203–26.

Benería, Lourdes. 1984. *Reproducción, producción y división sexual del trabajo.* Santo Domingo: Centro de Investigación para la Acción Femenina (CIPAF).

——. 1999. *Mercados globales, género y el hombre de Davos.* Santiago: Isis Internacional.

——. 2003. *Gender, Development, and Globalization: Economics as if People Mattered.* New York: Routledge.

——. Maria Floro, Caren Grown, and Martha MacDonald. 2000. ''Special Issue on Globalization.'' *Feminist Economics* 6(3): vii – xviii.

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika and Maria Mies. 1999. *The Subsistence Perspective: Beyond the Globalised Economy.* London: Zed Books.

Beutelspacher, Austreberta Nazar, Emma Zapata Martelo, and Verónica Vázquez García. 2003. ''Does Contraception Benefit Women? Structure, Agency, and Well-Being in Rural Mexico.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(2/3): 213 – 38.

Biesecker, Adelheid, Maite Mathes, Susanne Schön, and Babette Scurell. 2000. *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften: Auf dem Weg zu einer Ökonomie des Guten Lebens.* Bielefeld: Kleine.

Boserup, Esther. 1970. *Women's Role in Economic Development.* New York: St Martin's Press.

Braidotti, Rosa, Ewa Charkiewicz, Sabine Hausler, and Saskia Wieringa. 1994. *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development.* London: Zed Press.

Braunstein, Elissa and Nancy Folbre. 2001. ''To Honor and Obey: Efficiency, Inequality, and Patriarchal Property Rights.'' *Feminist Economics* 7(1): 25 – 44.

Brennan, Teresa. 1997. ''Economy for the Earth: The Labour Theory of Value without the Subject/Object Distinction.'' *Ecological Economics* 20(2): 175 – 85.

Brownhill, Leigh S., Wahu M. Kaara, and Terisa E. Turner. 1997. ''Gender Relations and Sustainable Agriculture: Rural Women's Resistance to Structural Adjustment in Kenya.'' *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme* 17(2): 40 – 4.

—— and Terisa E. Turner. 2003. *Feminism in the Mau Mau Resurgence.* http://www.uoguelph.ca/~terisatu/mau03.htm (accessed February 2004).

——. 2004. ''Feminism in the Mau Mau Resurgence.'' *Journal of Asian and African Studies.* Special Issue on Africa and Globalization 39(1/2): 95 – 117.

Buck, Daniel, Christina Getz, and Julie Guthman. 1997. ''From Farm to Table: The Organic Commodity Chain in Northern California.'' *Sociologia Ruralis* 37(1): 3 – 20.

Busch-Lüty, Christiane, Maren Jochimsen, Ulrike Knobloch, and Irmi Seidl, eds. 1994. *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften. Frauen auf dem Weg zu einer Ökonomie der Nachhaltigkeit, Politische Ökologie, Sonderheft 6.* Munich: ökom.

Chiappe, Marta B. and Cornelia Butler Flora. 1998. ''Gendered Elements of an Alternative Agriculture Paradigm.'' *Rural Sociology* 63(3): 372 – 93.

Chivian, Eric, ed. 2003. *Biodiversity - its Importance for Human Health: Interim Executive Summary.* http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/Biodiversity_v2_screen.pdf (accessed April 2005).

Chivian, Eric and Aaron Bernstein. 2004. ''Embedded in Nature: Human Health and Biodiversity.'' *Environmental Health Perspectives* 112(1): A12 – A13.

CIDUTAL. 2001. *Crecimento económico sin distribución: América Latina: la región más injusta del planeta.* Servicio CIDUTAL Estadisticas 10. http://utal.org/cidutal/estadisticas/10.htm (accessed April 2005).

Clunies-Ross, Tracey and Graham Cox. 1994. ''Challenging the Productivist Paradigm: Organic Farming and the Politics of Agricultural Change,'' in Philip Lowe, Terry Marsden, and Sarah Whatmore, eds. *Regulating Agriculture,* pp. 53 – 74. London: David Fulton.

Cone, Cynthia Abbott and Andrea Myhre. 2000. ''Community-supported Agriculture: A Sustainable Alternative to Industrial Agriculture?'' *Human Organization* 59(2): 187 – 97.

Costanza, Robert, ed. 1991. *Ecological Economics: The Science and Management of Sustainability.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Cudderford, Vijay. 2003. ''When Organics Go Mainstream.'' *BC Organic Grower* 6(4): 10 – 2.

Daily Nation. 2003. ''Yes, Probe Land Allocations.'' 2 July.

Daly, Herman, ed. 1973. *Toward a Steady State Economy.* San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.

—— and John Cobb. 1989. *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

——. 1990. *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future.* London: Green Print.

Davis, John. 2004. ''The Individual in Economics,'' presented at the Cambridge Realist Group, November 24.

DeLind, Laura. 2000. ''Transforming Organic Agriculture into Industrial Organic Products: Reconsidering National Organic Standards.'' *Human Organization* 59(2): 198 – 208.

—— and Anne E. Ferguson. 1999. ''Is this a Women's Movement? The Relationship of Gender to Community-supported Agriculture in Michigan.'' *Human Organization* 59(2): 190 – 200.

Dewey, John. 1922/1988. *Human Nature and Conduct. The Middle Works, 1899 – 1924*, Volume 14. Edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dijkstra, A. Geske and Lucia C. Hanmer. 2000. ''Measuring Socio-economic Gender Inequality: Toward an Alternative to the UNDP Gender-related Development Index.'' *Feminist Economics* 6(2): 41 – 75.

Dillard, Dudley. 1980. ''A Monetary Theory of Production.'' *Journal of Economic Issues* 16(2): 255 – 75.

Dorman, Peter. 2004. ''Debt and Deforestation,'' in Jonathan Harris and Neva Goodwin, eds. New Thinking in Macroeconomics: Social, Institutional, and Environmental Perspectives, pp. 213 – 29, Cheltenham UK and Northampton MA: Edward Elgar.

Dos Santos, Teotonio. 1970. *Dependencia y cambio social.* Santiago: Cuadernos de Estudios Socio Económicos, Universidad de Chile.

Douma, Williy, Heleen van den Homberg, and Ange Wieberdink. 1994. ''The Politics of Research on Gender, Environment and Development,'' in Wendy Harcourt, ed. *Feminist Perspectives on Sustainable Development*, pp. 176 – 86. New York: Zed Book.

Eisler, Riane. 1990. *El Cáliz y la Espada. Nuestra historia, nuestro futuro.* Translated by Renato Valenzvela. Santiago, Chile: Cuatro Vientos.

Faletto, Enzo and Fernando Cardoso. 1971/2001. *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina.* Mexico City: Siglo.

Feiner, Susan. 1999. ''Portrait of Homo Economicus as a Young Man,'' in Martha Woodmansee and Mark Osteen, eds. *The New Economic Criticism: Studies at the Intersection of Literature and Economics*, pp. 193 – 209. London: Routledge.

Feldman, Shelly and Rick Welsh. 1995. ''Feminist Knowledge Claims, Local Knowledge, and Gendered Divisions of Agricultural Labor: Constructing a Successor Science.'' *Rural Sociology* 60: 23 – 43.

Ferber, Marianne A. and Julie A. Nelson, eds. 1993. *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics.* Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Ferber, Stephen and Bradley, Dennis. 1995. ''Ecological Economics.'' http://www.fs.fed.us/eco/s21draft.htm (retrieved July 15, 2005).

First Woman. 1996. ''Interviews with Ruth Wangari wa Thungu.'' May 29.

Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values.* New York: New Press.

Forstater, Mathew. 2002. ''Bones for Sale: 'Development', Environment and Food Security in East Africa.'' *Review of Political Economy* 14(1): 47 – 67.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Furtado, Celso. 1961. *Desarrollo y subdesarrollo.* Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.

Galvez, Thelma. 1999. ''Aspectos economicos de la equidad de genero,'' presented at the United Nations Economic Commision for Latin America and the Caribbean Conference.

Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas. 1971. *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

——. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Greene, Sheila. 2003. *The Psychological Development of Girls and Women Rethinking Change in Time.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hall, Alan and Veronica Mogyorody. 2002. ''Organic Farming and the Gendered Nature of Decision-making,'' presented at the International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements Organic World Congress, Victoria, BC.

Harcourt, Wendy, ed. 1994. *Feminist Perspectives on Sustainable Development.* London: Zed Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1999. ''The Case for Strategic Realism: A Response to Lawson.'' *Feminist Economics* 5(3): 127–33.

Harding, Sandra. 2003. ''Representing Reality: The Critical Realism Project.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(1): 151–9.

Hines, Colin. 2000. *Localization: A Global Manifesto.* London: Earthscan.

Hird, Vicki. 1998. *Double Yield: Jobs and Sustainable Food Production.* London: Sustainable Agriculture, Food and Environment Alliance.

Hirst, Paul and Woolley, Penny. 1982. *Social Relations and Human Attributes.* London: Tavistock.

Hodgson, Geoffrey. 1999. *Evolution and Institutions: On Evolutionary Economics and the Evolution of Economics.* Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

——. 2001. *How Economics Forgot History: The Problem of Historical Specificity in Social Science.* New York: Routledge.

——. 2002. ''Reconstitutive Downward Causation: Social Structure and the Development of Individual Agency,'' in Edward Fullbrook, ed. *Intersubjectivity in Economics: Agents and Structures,* pp. 159–80. London: Routledge.

Illich, Ivan. 1980. *Vernacular Values.* The Preservation Institute. http://www.preservenet.com/theory/Illich/Vernacular.html (accessed January 18, 2004).

Instituto Nacional de Estadística. 2003. *Anuario de Justicia.* Santiago: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

International Oil Working Group (IOWG). 2003. ''Interview #2 with Nigerian Source.'' August 2.

Isla, Anna. 2000. An Environmental Feminist Analysis of Canada/Costa Rica Debt-for-Nature Investment: A Case Study of Intensifying Commodification. PhD diss., OISE/University of Toronto.

Jochimsen, Maren and Ulrike Knobloch. 1993. ''Making the Hidden Visible: The Importance of Caring Activities and Their Principles for Any Economy.'' *Ecological Economics* 20: 107–12.

——, Ulrike Knobloch, and Irmi Seidl. 1994. ''Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften. Konturenskizze zu Inhalt und Methode einer ökologisch und sozial verträglichen Ökonomie,'' in Christiane Busch-Lüty, Maren Jochimsen, Ulrike Knobloch, and Irmi Seidl, eds. *Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften. Frauen auf dem Weg zu einer Ökonomie der Nachhaltigkeit, Politische Ökologie, Sonderheft 6.* pp. 6–11. Munich: ökom.

Kabeer, Naila. 2004. ''Globalization, Labor Standards, and Women's Rights: Dilemmas of Collective (In)action in an Interdependent World.'' *Feminist Economics* 10(1): 3–35.

Kevane, Michael and Leslie C. Gray. 1999. ''A Woman's Field is made at Night: Gendered Land Rights and Norms in Burkina Faso.'' *Feminist Economics* 5(3): 1–26.

Kuiper, Edith and Jolande Sap, eds. 1995. *Out of the Margin: Feminist Perspectives on Economics.* London/New York: Routledge.

Kurian, Priya. 2000. *Engendering the Environment? Gender in the World Bank's Environmental Policies.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Lang, Tim. 2003. ''A Battle of the Food Chain.'' *The Guardian,* May 17. http://www.guardian.co.uk/food/focus/story/0.13296.956610.00.html (accessed May 22, 2003).

Lawson, Tony. 1999. ''Feminism, Realism, and Universalism.'' *Feminist Economics* 5(2): 25–60.

——. 2003. ''Ontology and Feminist Theorizing.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(1): 119–50.

Leff, Enrique. 1998. *Saber ambiental: Sustentabilidad, racionalidad, complejidad, poder.* Mexico City: Siglo XXI/PNUMA.

Lowy, Michael. 2002. ''From Marx to Ecosocialism.'' *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 13(1): 121–33.

Lucas, Linda. 2000. ''Review of *Women, Ecology and Economics,* edited by Ellie Perkins: Special Issue of Ecological Economics 1997.'' *Feminist Economics* 6(2): 115–19.

MacDonald, Martha. 2002. ''Lessons and Linkages: Building an Analysis of Gender, Globalization and the Fisheries.'' *Women and Environments International* 54/55: 19–22.

McDonald, Hugh. 2004. *John Dewey and Environmental Philosophy.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Macey, Anne. 2004. ''The State of Organic Farming in Canada in 2002.'' *EcoFarm & Garden: The Canadian Organic Grower* 7(1): 44–7.

Mallet, Patrick. 2003. ''Small Grower Certification.'' *BC Organic Grower* 6(4): 2–4.

Martinez-Alier, Joan. 2002. *The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation.* Cheltenham/Northamption, MA: Edward Elgar.

Max-Neef, Manfred, Antonio Elizalde, and Martín Hopenhayn. 1986. *El desarrollo a escala humana.* Uppsala/Santiago: Fundación Dag Hammarskjold/Centro de Alternativas del Desarrollo (CEPAUR).

McMahon, Martha. 1997. ''From the Ground Up: Producing an Ecological Economics.'' *Ecological Economics* 20(2): 163–74.

Meadows, Donella, Jorgen Randers, and W. W. Behrens. 1972. *The Limits to Growth.* New York: Universe Books.

Meares, Alison C. 1997. ''Making the Transition from Conventional to Sustainable Agriculture: Gender, Social Movement Participation, and Quality of Life on the Family Farm.'' *Rural Sociology* 62: 21–47.

Mellor, Mary. 1992. *Breaking the Boundaries: Toward a Feminist Green Socialism.* London: Virago.

——. 1997a. ''Women, Nature and the Social Construction of 'Economic Man.'' *Ecological Economics* 20(2): 129–40.

——. 1997b. *Feminism and Ecology.* Cambridge: Polity Press/New York: New York University Press.

——. 2002. ''Ecofeminist Economics: Women, Work and the Environment.'' *Women and Environments International* 54/55: 7–10.

——. 2005. ''Socialism and the Ecological Challenge,'' in Andrew Dobson and Robyn Eckersley, eds. *Political Theory and the Ecological Challenge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Merricks, Linda. 1996. ''Frederick Soddy: Scientist, Economist and Environmentatlist–An Examination of his Politics.'' *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 7(4): 59–78.

Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour.* London/New York: Zed Books.

Ministry of Planning (MINDEPLAN). 2003. *Survey of Socio-economic Characterization.* Santiago: MINDEPLAN, Social Division.

Mitchell, Wesley. 1937. *The Backward Art of Spending Money and Other Essays.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nelson, Julie A. 1996. *Feminism, Objectivity, and Economics.* London: Routledge.

——. 1997. ''Feminism, Ecology, and the Philosophy of Economics.'' *Ecological Economics* 20(2): 155–62.

Nelson, Julie. 2003a. ''Confronting the Science/Value Split: Notes on Feminist Economics, Institutionalism, Pragmatism and Process Thought.'' *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 27: 49–64.

——. 2003b. ''Once More, with Feeling: Feminist Economics and the Ontological Question.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(1): 109–18.

Norberg-Hodge, Helena, Todd Merrifield and Steven Gorelick. 2002. Bringing the Food Economy Home: Local Alternatives to Global Agribusiness. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.

O'Hara, Sabine. 1995. ''Sustainability: Social and Ecological Dimensions.'' *Review of Social Economy* 53(4): 529–51.

——. 1997. ''Toward a Sustaining Production Theory.'' *Ecological Economics* 20(2): 141–54.

——. 1999. ''Economics, Ecology, and Quality of Life: Who Evaluates?'' *Feminist Economics* 5(2): 83–9.

Perkins, Ellie. 1997. ''Introduction: Women, Ecology, and Economics: New Models and Theories.'' Special Issue on Women, Ecology and Economics. *Ecological Economics,* 20(2): 105–6.

——. 2000. ''Equity, Economic Scale, and the Role of Exchange in a Sustainable Economy,'' in F. Gale, ed. *Nature, Production, Power: Approaches to Ecological Political Economy,* pp. 185–95. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

——. 2002. ''Markets or Discourse? A Green Feminist Alternative Valuation Process.'' *Women and Environments International* 54/55: 15–8.

Peter, Fabienne. 2003. ''Critical Realism, Feminist Epistemology, and the Emancipatory Potential of Science: A Comment on Lawson and Harding.'' *Feminist Economics* 9(1): 93–101.

Pietilä, Hilkka. 1990. ''Daughters of Mother Earth: Women's Culture as an Ethical and Practical Basis for Sustainable Development,'' in L. Simonen, ed. *Finnish Debates on Women's Studies.* New York: Contributions by Finnish Scholars to the Fourth International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women.

——. 1997. ''The Triangle of the Human Economy: Household, Cultivation, Industrial Production.'' *Ecological Economics* 20(2): 113–28.

——. 2002. ''The Aim is Livelihood.'' *Women and Environments International* 54/55: 11–4.

Pinto, Anibal. 1962. *Chile: Un caso de desarrollo frustrado.* Santiago: Editorial Universitaria.

Pisano, Margarita. 2001. *El triunfo de la masculinidad.* Santiago: Surada Ediciones. http://www.mpisano.cl (accessed February 2005).

Prebisch, Raúl. 1960. *CEPAL y los problemas del desarrollo económico en América Latina.* Repr., Discursos, declaraciones y documentos 1952–1963. Santiago: CEPAL.

——. 1981a. *Capitalism periferico: Crisis y transformacion.* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Economica.

——. 1981b. ''The Latin American Periphery in the Global System of Capitalism.'' *CEPAL Review* 13 (April): 143–50.

Quiroga-Martínez, Rayén, ed. 1994. *El tigre sin selva. Consecuencias ambientales de la transformación económica chilena 1974–1992.* Santiago: Programa de Economía Ecológica, Instituto de Ecología Política (IEP).

——. 2003a. *Comercio, inversiones y sustentabilidad: El caso de Chile.* Santiago: Programa Chile Sustentable.

——. 2003b. *Naturaleza, culturas y necesidades humanas: Ensayos de transformación.* México City/Santiago: United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP)/Universidad Bolivariana.

Quiroga-Martínez, Rayén and Saar van Hawermeiren. 1996. *Chile: Globalización e insustentabilidad: Una mirada desde la economía ecológica.* Santiago: Programa de Economía Ecológica, Instituto de Ecología Política (IEP). Repr. *The Tiger without a Jungle: Environmental Consequences of the Chilean Economic Transformation, 1974–1994.* Santiago, Chile: IEP.

Raddon, Mary-Beth. 2002. ''Community Currencies, Value and Feminist Economic Transformation.'' *Women and Environments International* 54/55: 24–6.

Reimer, Bill. 1984. ''Farm Mechanization: The Impact on Labour at the Level of the Farm Household.'' *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 9(4): 429–44.

Ritzer, George. 2004. *The Globalization of Nothing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rundgren, Gunnar. 2003. ''President IFOAM World Board.'' *Ecology and Farming* (September–December). Repr., ''Trade and Marketing...No Simple Solution.'' *Clover: Journal for Professional Organic Production* 21: 26–31.

Scurrell, Babette. 1998. ''Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften–Idee, Konzept, Praxis,'' *GAIA. Ecological Perspectives in Science, Humanities, and Economics* 7(3): 222–6.

Sharp, Ronda. 1999. ''Women's Budgets,'' in Janice Peterson and Margaret Lewis, eds. *The Elgar Companion to Feminist Economics*, pp. 764–9. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Shiva, Vandana. 1988. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development.* New Delhi: Kali for Women.

——. 1989. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development.* New Delhi/London: Kali for Women/Zed Books.

——. 2002. ''Globalisation of Agriculture, Food Security and Sustainability,'' in Vandana Shiva and Beti Gitanjali, eds. *Sustainable Agriculture and Food Security: The Impact of Globalization,* pp. 11–70. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sirianni, Carmen and Cynthia Negrey. 2000. ''Working Time as Gendered Time.'' *Feminist Economics* 6(1): 59–76.

Smith. Ines. 1996. ''Gender Analysis of Family Planning: Beyond the Feminist versus Population Control Debate.'' *Feminist Economics* 2(2): 63–86.

Soddy, Frederick. 1922. *Cartesian Economics.* London: Henderson.

——. 1926. *Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Söderbaum, Peter. 2000. *Ecological Economics.* London: Earthscan.

Statistics Canada. 2001. ''Census of Agriculture: A Profile of Canada's Female Farm Operators.'' http://www.statcan.ca/english/agcensus2001/first/profiles/08female.htm (accessed January 22, 2004).

Sturgeon, Noël. 2003. ''Regional and Transnational Expressions of Ecofeminism and Responses to Globalization,'' in Heather Eaton, and Lois Ann Lorentzen, eds. *Ecofeminism and Globalization Exploring Culture, Context and Religion*, pp. 91 123. Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Sunkel, Osvaldo and Paz, Pedro. 1970/1985. *El subdesarrollo latinoamericano y la teoría del desarrollo.* Repr. Mexico City: Siglo XX.

Sustain/Elm Farm Research Centre. 2001. *Eating Oil: Food in a Changing Climate.* London: Sustain: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming. http://www.sustainweb.org/pdf/eatoil_pr.PDF (accessed July 2002).

Taylor, Peter, and Frederick Buttel. 1992. ''How Do We Know We Have Global Environmental Problems: Science and the Globalization of Environmental Discourse.'' *Geoforum* 23(3): 405–16.

Tovey, Hilary. 1997. ''Food, Environmentalism and Rural Sociology: On the Organic Movement in Ireland.'' *Sociologia Ruralis* 37(1): 21–37.

Turner, Terisa E. and Leigh S. Brownhill. 2004. ''We Want Our Land Back: Gendered Class Analysis, the Second Contradiction of Capitalism, and Social Movement Theory.'' *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 15(4): 21–40.

United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UN-ECLAC). 2004. *Panorama Social de América Latina*, 2002–2003. http://www.eclac.org/publicaciones.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). 2003. *Global Environmental Outlook, 2003: Latin America and the Caribbean.* Mexico City: UNEP.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1898. ''Why is Economics Not an Evolutionary Science?'' *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 12(4): 373–97.

——. 1919/1969. *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays.* New York: Capricorn.

——. 1923. *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times.* New York: B.W. Huebsch.

Wallace, Janet. 2004. ''Editor's Corner.'' *EcoFarm & Garden: The Canadian Organic Grower* 7(1): 4.

Wamala, Irene. 2002. ''Nigerian Women Take on the Oil Companies.'' *Women and Environments* 56/57: 38.

Waring, Marilyn. 1988. *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics.* New York: Harper & Row.

Weingart, Peter, Sandra Mitchell, Peter Richerson, and Maasen, Sabine, eds. 1997. *Human By Nature: Between Biology and the Social Sciences.* Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Weinstein, Luis. 2003. *Personas saludables en un desarrollo saludable: la orientación hacia el desarrollo personal y el proyecto de vida.* Santiago: LOM Ediciones.

Williams, William, D. 2004. ''Veblen Effects,'' presented at Social Science Consortium, University of Missouri Kansas City.

Woods, Casey. 2001. ''Cooking with the Sun: Chilean Village's Experiment with Solar Ovens Offers Alternative to Widespread Deforestation.'' *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 26.

Zein-Elabdin, Eiman. 1996. ''Development, Gender and the Environment: Theoretical or Contextual Link.'' *Journal of Economic Issues* 30(4): 929–46.