

Sustainable Development

(Chapter 26 in Arthur, J., Davies, I. & Hahn, C. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*, London, Sage Publications, 2008, pp. 342 – 354.)

John Huckle

The ultimate goal of education for sustainable development is to empower people with the perspectives, knowledge, and skills for helping them live in peaceful sustainable societies. UNESCO, 2001, p. 1

There is now a growing consensus that 21C civilisation is on a path that is not sustainable. Dominant forms of political economy are failing to conserve ecological resources and services; guarantee economic stability; reduce social inequality; maintain cultural diversity; and protect people's physical and mental health. We face related crises of ecological, economic, social, cultural and personal sustainability yet the means are available to set civilisation on a more sustainable path. Adopting more sustainable forms of political economy involves the establishment of new forms of global governance guided by new forms of citizenship. Education that features such citizenships should lie at the heart of initiatives linked to the UN's Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD) that runs from 2005 to 2014.

This chapter seeks to clarify the new kinds of governance and citizenship that may be necessary to set civilisation on a more sustainable path and how these might be developed through citizenship education as part of DESD. It begins with considerations of philosophy and ethics.

Philosophical and ethical foundations

Central to the perspectives that ESD should develop is what Hartmann (1998) terms a social-ecological theory of reality and the values that stem from it. Rather than regarding nature and society as separate realms (modern dualism) we should

acknowledge that reality is always the product of both ecological (bio-physical) and social relations and processes. The phenomena of global warming illustrates how the relations between objects in the bio-physical and social worlds enable ecological and social processes, how these processes affect one another constantly, and how our understanding of such phenomena can never be entirely neutral or objective because it is always partly a product of those social or power relations it needs to explain. The politics of sustainability is about the relations that humans are in with other human and non-human agents, how we understand these relations, and what we can do to ensure that they are more sustainable.

Hartmann argues that for a society to be sustainable (capable of evolving indefinitely alongside the rest of nature) three sets of relations have to be maintained:

1. Social relations amongst humans based on mutual respect and tolerance. These require equitable access to basic needs; freedom of thought and expression; and democratic forms of decision making and governance in all spheres of life including that of economic production and distribution.
2. Environmental relations between humans and their bio-physical environment that ensure the survival and well-being of other species (biodiversity) and their continued evolution alongside people.
3. Ecological relations between organisms (including humans) and their environment that ensure similar environmental conditions and opportunities (climate, water availability, soil fertility, radioactivity levels, etc) to those that have prevailed throughout most of human history.

The question then arises, what form of ethics, politics and governance should regulate social and environmental relations and their impact on ecological relations?

As regards ethics, a socio-ecological theory or reality, based in dialectical materialism (Harvey, 1996) or the new physical and life sciences and systems theory (Capra, 2003), recognizes that people are part of ecological relations (members of a biological species, dependent on ecological resources and services to supply their needs), yet partly independent of such relations as part of social relations (they have powers of language and technology that enable them to transform their own nature and that

which surrounds them). In finding sustainable ways to live they have to balance ecology and society centred values or an ecocentric perspective that finds intrinsic values in the non-human world, with an anthropocentric or technocentric perspective that suggests the only value of this world lies in its usefulness to people.

In seeking sustainability we should be guided by a weak anthropocentrism. This maintains that while humans are the only source of value, they are not the only bearers of value. In addition to valuing or caring for present and future generations of people, we should value and care for the rest of nature by recognising its ecological, scientific, aesthetic and spiritual value alongside its economic value, and acknowledging its right to exist. In other words, we should balance our rights to self determination and development, with responsibilities towards the rest of the human and biotic community.

The ethics of weak anthropocentrism are reflected in the Earth Charter (ECI, 2007) that sets out fundamental principles for sustainable development. Part of the unfinished business of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the final version, approved in 2000, is essentially a people's treaty shaped by a global dialogue that involved both experts and representatives of civil society. Its preamble suggests that *we must decide to live with a sense of universal responsibility, identifying ourselves with the whole Earth community as well as with our local communities. We are at once citizens of different nations and of one world in which the local and global are linked. Everyone shares responsibility for the present and future well-being of the human family and the larger living world.* The charter's vision recognizes that environmental protection, human rights, equitable human development and peace are interdependent and indivisible, and its sixteen principles are grouped into four sections (respect and care for the community of life; ecological integrity; social and economic justice; and democracy, non-violence and peace). Principle 13 suggests that the world community should *strengthen democratic institutions at all levels, and provide transparency and accountability in governance, inclusive participation in decision making and access to justice.* Principle 14 advocates ESD as part of formal education and life-long learning.

In 2003 UNESCO affirmed the intention of member states to use the Earth Charter as an educational tool for implementing the DESD.

Social theory, politics and governance

Values reflect and shape ongoing social development and debates surrounding sustainability should be guided by social theory. This now seeks to integrate nature and the environment into its concerns (Barry, 2000, Sutton, 2004) and suggests that the world is undergoing fundamental change that goes to the heart of the individual-society relationship on which the concept of citizenship is founded. Following a crisis of profitability at the end of the 'post-war boom' powerful economic and political elites restructured political economies in ways that intensified globalisation, environmental degradation, and social inequalities. This change is variously interpreted as, for example, a shift from Fordist to Post-Fordist modes of regulation (Lipietz, 1992); from modernity to post-modernity (Crook et al, 1992); or from scarcity to risk society (Beck, 1992). Its significance lies firstly in the ways it has further compromised the competence, form, autonomy and legitimacy of the nation state as the prime container of political community and citizenship. The urgency of global issues, together with the growth of global networks of power and international political institutions and agencies, has prompted renewed attention to global models of democracy and citizenship, while the rise of movements and nationalisms from below, has prompted experiments with forms of direct or deliberative democracy encouraged by governments adopting new consultation procedures to improve their standing with citizens (Held et al, 2000).

Secondly, global change challenges the existential foundations of people's lives and brings new status and class divisions along with new interests and insecurities. In the advanced industrial economies, the old politics of production and class has been largely replaced by the new politics of consumption and identity. Consumer capitalism offers a vast array of cultural products and encourages individuals to use these to create meaning and organize and monitor their own multiple identities and life narratives. Epistemological uncertainty may result in hedonism, or refuge in old and new fundamentalisms, but it can also prompt a new sensitivity to difference and subjectivity; scepticism towards grand narratives and universal truths; and a

constructive post-modernism that seeks to acknowledge and correct the mistakes of modern development. This involves a reassessment of industrialism, liberalism and Marxism; a wider definition of politics; and the design and implementation of new forms of democracy and citizenship that can foster sustainable development.

Constructive postmodernism recognizes that government, in the form of the constitution, law and state policies, can act as protector and trustee of collective reason, but that self-managing citizens must increasingly act themselves in responsible and enlightened ways that express solidarity with others. Sustainability requires the extension of both legal and practical notions of citizenship: a restructuring of the state and international political institutions to facilitate new legal rights and responsibilities (environmental citizenship), and the strengthening and democratisation of civil society to foster moral responsibility and more sustainable ways of living (ecological citizenship). The Real World coalition of UK environment and development NGOs is one advocate of such improved governance (Christie & Warburton, 2001).

Green political theory and the politics of sustainable development

The green movement and green politics reflect the theory and practice of these new kinds of citizenship (Barry, 1998). Greens work 'in and against' the state urging it to meet new demands based in ethics, and 'beyond and around' the state by using international forums, treaties and conventions to establish new environmental rights and responsibilities across borders. International NGOs shadow international governmental agencies, organize social forums offering alternative agendas alongside international summits (Hubbard & Miller, 2005), and use the new communication technologies to sustain virtual communities of active global citizens. As regards practical citizenship, greens seek to rescue society from the instrumental reason that dominates markets and states by fostering civil society and a public sphere in which ecological and social issues can be debated and self-managing sustainable communities can take root. Appropriate technologies, economic localisation, and deliberative democracy, are key elements of green alternatives (Woodin & Lucas, 2004) with localisation or decentralisation encouraging both greater self-sufficiency and more deliberative decision-making (Baber & Bartlett, 2005). Encouraging

dialogue and discussion, as part of community decision making, has moralising and pedagogical effects, and is a key element of social learning for sustainability.

Having suggested that greens are in the vanguard of new forms of governance, citizenship, and community development, it should be acknowledged that both liberals and Marxists now advocate variants of sustainable development. Liberals are reformist, strongly anthropocentric, and believe that such development does not require a radical restructuring of capitalist social relations. Economic growth can be balanced with environmental protection and social justice using existing and new forms of technology and global governance (Turner, 2001). Sometimes termed ecological modernisation or the greening of capitalism, this liberal view is dominant within the international community and is reflected in Agenda 21, the agenda for sustainable development produced by the 1992 Earth Summit.

Marxists reject capitalism with a green face suggesting that market-based environmental policies do little to counter the anti-ecological characteristics of capital. While sceptical of the utopianism in much early green political theory, they now acknowledge the environmental crisis (the second contradiction of capitalism (Merchant, 1994)) but remind greens of the continuing significance of class struggle (Burkett, 2003); imperialism (Harvey, 2003); and state regulation and planning (Dickenson, 2003). Dresner (2006) argues that the language of sustainability returns us to many of the unfashionable ideas about fairness, solidarity, and the conscious regulation of social development, that were associated with socialism in the past. Post-industrial socialists have updated these ideas with new concepts of welfare and citizenship.

UNESCO suggests that ESD should develop knowledge and understanding of the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Addressing the social dimension clearly involves citizenship education as it seeks *an understanding of social institutions and their role in change and development, as well as the democratic and participatory systems which give opportunity for the expression of opinion, the selection of governments, the forging of consensus and the resolution of differences* (Pigozzi, 2005, p. 2)

Liberal environmental citizenship

Environmental citizenship (refers to) the way in which the environment-citizenship relationship can be regarded from a liberal point of view. . . . this is a citizenship that deals in the currency of environmental rights, that is conducted exclusively in the public sphere, whose principal virtues are the liberal ones of reasonableness and a willingness to accept the force of better argument and procedural legitimacy, and whose remit is bounded political configurations modelled on the nation-state. For the most rough-and-ready purposes, it can be taken that environmental citizenship here refers to attempts to extend the discourse and practice of rights-claiming into the environmental context. Dobson, 2003, p. 89

While liberal democracy is not the dominant form of government in the world, it is dominant in those advanced industrial states that cause most of the environmental degradation. Sustainable development may be pursued using existing and additional human rights contained in state constitutions and international instruments (Alder & Wilkinson, 1999; Elliott, 2004). These should include substantive rights to life, to those basic needs that support it, and to a liveable and sustainable environment, together with procedural rights, such as the right of access to environmental information. Rights and associated laws that govern environmental management and land use planning are particularly significant, with activists in the environmental justice movement seeking to use and extend these in ways that protect the health, livelihoods and amenities of disadvantaged communities.

In outlining a conception of environmental citizenship that is developed from an immanent critique of contemporary liberalism, Bell (2005) suggests that liberalism should abandon its conception of the environment as property and adopt a conception of the environment as provider of basic human needs and a subject about which there is reasonable disagreement. Within mainstream liberalism, civic citizenship regards the environment as property to be owned; political citizenship ensures that the environment will become a political issue; and social citizenship is theorized with no reference to the bio-physical environment. Since liberals accept that citizens have a social right to the fulfilment of their basic needs and this requires exploitation of the environment, consistency requires that the basic needs concept should take priority

over the property concept, and that liberals concerned about the welfare of current and future generations should be committed to forms of sustainable development grounded in this concept. Such a revision of liberal theory reflects ethical principles of inter and intra-generational justice and imposes a constraint on capitalism rather than requiring its rejection.

Liberals believe that there is a multiplicity of reasonable moral doctrines held by reasonable people in democratic societies (the fact of reasonable pluralism) and that it is unreasonable to defend principles of political justice, that govern the basic institutions of society, by appealing to controversial moral claims (for example the strongly ecocentric views of deep ecologists). The fact of moral pluralism rules out the conception of the environment as property (only one of many reasonable conceptions) but allows that of the environment as a supplier of basic needs since no reasonable doctrine could deny its factual or normative foundations (survival as a precondition for all other goods). The fact of reasonable pluralism allows an additional conception of environment in that all citizens should accept (for the purposes of political justice) that the nature and value of the environment is a subject about which there is reasonable disagreement. This conception suggests that decisions, relating to environmental matters, should reflect democratic procedural principles and that the policies of the liberal state will reflect conceptions that win in politically just debates.

Liberal environmental citizenship requires citizens to have substantive rights to such basic needs as clean air and water. Such rights are likely to be subject to considerable dispute and possible judicial or legislative interpretation. It also requires citizens to have procedural rights to defend and extend substantive rights, by for example seeking redress if rights are denied or campaigning for new rights. A conception of the environment as a subject about which there is reasonable agreement, requires citizens to have procedural rights to participate in environmental decisions and debates (to promote their own conception of the ‘good environment’), and personal rights that allow them to make choices in their everyday life about how they affect the environment. In return environmental citizens have duties to obey and promote just environmental laws that secure these rights and to promote, through political institutions, environmental justice across the world. They do not have a duty to

protect nature, wilderness or ‘green spaces’ (a particular conception of environment), nor do they have a duty to make lifestyle choices that promote global environmental justice (a negation of personal rights).

An apparent rejection of private environmental duties (for example the duty to recycle or reduce car use) puts liberals at odds with other accounts of environmental citizenship. But Bell argues that liberals can endorse such duties for two reasons: that they are an effective way of promoting changes in policy and law; and may be considered as citizens’ duties rather than legal duties.

Post-cosmopolitan ecological citizenship

Ecological citizenship deals in the currency of non-contractual responsibility. It inhabits the private as well as the public sphere, it refers to the source rather than the nature of responsibility to determine what count as citizenship virtues, it works with the language of virtue, and it is explicitly non-territorial. Dobson, 2003, p. 89

Dobson starts his discussion of citizenship and the environment by noting that asymmetrical nature of globalisation. Local acts with global consequences produce communities of obligation that are primarily communities of injustice. Cheap food in European supermarkets, for example, is often the result of exploited labour and land in Africa, and British consumers therefore have non-reciprocal duties to African farmers that should be discharged through redistributive acts.

Advocates of cosmopolitan citizenship (see Chapter 00), such as Held (1995), focus on the human community and suggest that uncoerced dialogue and greater democracy will allow the realisation of universal values, such as those expressed in the Earth Charter. Dobson maintains that they focus on the wrong kind of community (the human community rather than communities of obligation); the wrong mode of operation (impartiality rather than partiality); and the wrong political objective (more dialogue and democracy rather than more justice and democracy). Rather than a thin and non-material account of the ties that bind members of the cosmopolitan community (common humanity and a commitment to dialogue), Dobson offers a thickly material account linked to the production and reproduction of daily life in an

unequal and globalising world. This prompts him to canvass the emergence of post-cosmopolitan citizenship, alongside liberal and civic-republican forms.

Figure 1 Three types of citizenship (Dobson, 2003, p.39)

1 Liberal	2 Civic republican	3 Post-cosmopolitan
Rights/entitlements (contractual)	Duties/responsibilities (contractual)	Duties/responsibilities (non-contractual)
Public sphere	Public sphere	Public and private spheres
Virtue-free	‘Masculine’ virtue	‘Feminine’ virtue
Territorial (discriminatory)	Territorial (discriminatory)	Non-territorial (non-discriminatory)

In comparing citizenship in its liberal, civic republican, and post-cosmopolitan forms, Dobson focuses on four dimensions (rights/responsibilities; public/private; virtue/non-virtue; and territorial/non-territorial), see Figure 1. It is the fact that citizens of globalising nations are ‘always already’ acting on others that requires post-cosmopolitan citizenship to acknowledge non-reciprocal, non-contractual and unilateral duties. Since acts in the private sphere impact upon people and environments at a distance (have public implications), this sphere is properly a site for politics and the exercise of post-cosmopolitan citizenship. Such citizenship focuses on horizontal citizen-citizen relations rather than vertical citizen-state relations, and is committed to such ‘feminine’ virtues as care and compassion. It is non-territorial in that it spans borders and is associated with a global civil society as exemplified by the anti-globalisation movement.

Ecological citizenship is a specifically ecological form of post-cosmopolitan citizenship. It recognizes that as members of global society we are ‘always already’ obligated to others at a distance, a concept best expressed in the notion of ecological footprints. Such a footprint is a measure of the total amount of ecologically productive land and water supporting one’s lifestyle, and for the more affluent members of global society, much of this land and water is located far from their place of residence (Wackernagel & Rees, 1996). As we consume more, our ecological footprints grow,

and we are obligated to more strangers across space and time (to those at a distance and to those not yet born). The community of ecological citizenship is created by our material activities and obligates us to protect a healthy, complex and autonomously functioning ecological system for the benefit of present and future generations. Such obligation is encouraged by adopting a weak anthropocentrism as outlined above.

Ecological citizenship has international and intergenerational dimensions and its responsibilities are asymmetrical, falling on globalising rather than globalised individuals. Ecological citizens will want to ensure that their ecological footprints do not compromise or foreclose options for present and future generations and will be prepared to reduce them without expecting others to follow their example. Obligation ends when ecological space (resources and services) is fairly distributed but such fairness may require the righting of historical wrongs. Virtues normally associated with the private sphere, such as care and compassion, help ecological citizens meet their responsibilities, and this sphere will increasingly become a site of citizenship as they realise that by reducing household consumption they can reduce their ecological footprints. Such politicisation of the private sphere is a challenge for liberals since it questions personal choice and subjects the idea of the ‘good life’ to political scrutiny.

Hayward (2006) offers an alternative understanding of ecological citizenship while Valencia Saiz (2005) suggests that a blind spot in Dobson’s work is his apparent insistence on the efficacy of individual political agency. He fails to address the conditions under which environmental or ecological citizenship can be engendered or the political economy of such citizenships. This is the theme of post-industrial socialism.

Post-industrial socialist citizenship

A theory of post-industrial socialist citizenship (PISC) builds on the ideas of Gorz and Habermas (Goldblatt, 1996). Gorz focuses on the potential of new technologies to free citizens from work so that they can devote the time saved to self and community development. Habermas writes of the colonisation of the lifeworld, or the way in which the instrumental rationality of the economy and state invades everyday life, and argues that if citizens are to extend their autonomy, there needs to be a vibrant civil

society or public sphere governed by communicative rationality or deliberative democracy.

PISC (Little, 1998) involves reduced working hours for those in paid employment to provide a more equitable distribution of work. At the same time all have an obligation to make some contribution to the wealth and well-being of society in return for a guaranteed social wage (a new economic right). This new right would increase the prospects of realising equal citizenship, but PISC also requires the redefinition of civil rights to promote autonomy, and of political rights to ensure participation. Rights to self-determination would emphasise positive freedoms, rather than the negative freedoms of liberal democracy; encourage a civil rather than national definition of citizenship; and counter alienation from politics. Political rights would provide citizens with an equal chance to influence the decisions affecting their lives and shift the balance from representative to more deliberative or direct forms of democracy. A universal requirement to contribute to social wealth would value much of the current unpaid work (such as that of carers) that is involved in the maintenance and reproduction of everyday life.

The relevance of PISC for sustainable development lies in its potential to free citizens from the treadmill of capitalist production and consumption and foster diverse green political economies. People would have the time and encouragement to act as environmental and ecological citizens by developing local economic trading schemes (LETSystems, 2007); participating in deliberative environmental management and planning; and building social capital (Smith, 2005). In these and other ways they would learn their way to sustainability.

Citizenship education for Sustainable Development

The DESD website suggests that education is the primary agent of transformation towards sustainable development since it can foster the required values, behaviour and lifestyles. It recognizes however that there can be no universal model of ESD. Each country has to define its own priorities and actions, with goals, emphases and processes that are locally defined to meet local conditions. As quality education ESD supports a rights-based approach; develops the learner's competence as a community

member and global citizen (as well as an individual and family member); upholds and conveys the principles of a sustainable world as outlined in the Earth Charter; is locally relevant and culturally appropriate; and conserves indigenous and traditional knowledge.

UNESCO publishes a booklet on the international implementation of the Decade (UNESCO, 2006) and reports on progress to date (for example UNESCO, 2007), while the DESD website provides access to developments around the world. SDELG (2005) provides a survey of ESD in eleven countries that suggests that there is a great deal of good practice but also a need to appreciate and signpost the embryonic and fragile nature of much ESD. It is most securely established within the curricula of formal education in those countries where it has government support and regional strategies, such as that of UNECE (2005), are significant in prompting action by member states.

ESD has emerged since the 1992 Rio Earth Summit as a synthesis of environmental and development education. UNESCO has acknowledges the central roles of citizenship education and political literacy in ESD and the consequences that follow from this.

... a curriculum reoriented towards sustainability would place the notion of citizenship among its primary objectives. This would require a revision of many existing curricula and the development of objectives and content themes, and teaching, learning and assessment processes that emphasize moral virtues, ethical motivation and ability to work with others to help build a sustainable future. Viewing education for sustainability as a contribution to a politically literate society is central to the reformulation of education and calls for a "new generation" of theorizing and practice in education and a rethinking of many familiar approaches, including within environmental education. (Unesco, 1997, paras. 67 & 68)

Something of what this new theorizing and practice may mean for citizenship education will now be outlined by reference to some of the key features of ESD as quality education listed on the DESD site.

ESD is interdisciplinary and holistic (learning for sustainable development should be embedded in the whole curriculum, not taught as a separate subject)

Mention has already been made of a socio-ecological theory of reality and the need to see the world as a complex of inter-related ecological, environmental and social relations and processes. Modern academic divisions of labour separate the natural and social sciences and humanities; divorce academic knowledge from people's everyday knowledge; and so prevent learners from developing a comprehensive understanding of their place in the world (Dickens, 1996). The primacy of ecology and nature study in much environmental education should be challenged and more attention given to the economic, political and cultural structures and processes that cause social injustice and foster unsustainable practices. The curriculum *What We Consume* that I developed for WWF-UK in the mid to late 1980s (Huckle, 1988) was an early attempt to redesign environmental education as ESD using the Programme for Political Education's framework for political literacy (Crick & Porter, 1978), and a concept of citizenship education that embraces governance within the ecological, economic, political, social and cultural domains, at all scales from the local to the global (Lynch, 1992). Experiential classroom activities focussed on the political economy of goods students consumed, set out sustainable alternatives, and allowed critical consideration of environmental, ecological and post-industrial socialist citizenship.

Clearly environmental citizenship education should develop propositional and procedural knowledge of environmental rights and the roles played by laws, regulations, tax and fiscal policies, and other instruments in shaping sustainable development. Students might for example study local planning issues; ecological tax reform via national budgets; and the introduction of a carbon trading scheme within the European Union. They might focus on the performance of corporations and NGOs as environmental citizens, examining for example the corporate social responsibility claims of a supermarket chain, and an NGO campaign to protect local farmers from land seizures linked to increased demand for bio-fuels. Such lessons require teachers to integrate citizenship education with other subjects (geography, science, technology, media studies etc) and by revealing the ecological footprints of the rich, lead to considerations of ecological citizenship. Encouraged to think and act, both globally

and locally, students may revise their identities as they adopt more sustainable ways of living.

ESD is values-driven: sharing the values and principles underpinning sustainable development;

The Earth Charter guidebook for teachers (ECIIS, 2005) provides advice on introducing Earth Charter principles across the curriculum and is supported by a book of essays examining the principles (Corcoran et al, 2005). Moral and social responsibility, partly developed through moral and values education, is a key outcome of ESD, but there is political debate on whether or not the state should promote such principles through education.

Political liberalism maintains that the state should not intentionally promote any comprehensive religious, philosophical or ethical doctrines. It deliberately avoids taking a stand on the purposes of human life or what constitutes our well being. Instead it aims to find principles of justice for a society that can be accepted by people with radically different metaphysical and ethical commitments. Bell (2004) draws on Rawl's concept of justice to suggest that sustainability is an anthropocentric concept arrived at through informed democratic deliberation of what is necessary for all (current and future) members of society to have a decent standard of life through social co-operation. Citizenship education should therefore promote political virtues (reasonableness; a sense of fairness, a spirit of compromise and a readiness to meet others halfway) designed to ensure intra-generational justice, and sustainability virtues (essentially the duty of the current generation to maintain the 'circumstances of justice' for future generations) designed to ensure inter-generational justice. The curriculum *should aim to promote a positive attitude toward 'sustainability' and a basic understanding of the environmental and social science frameworks that citizens need to participate in 'sustainability' decisions* (Bell, 2004, p. 47). It should not however promote particular green ideals or forms of sustainable development that are properly matters of personal and collective choice. These might be aspects of the permissible curriculum (as they are in some national curricula) if the demos so decides, but schools that then promote green ideals should pay proper respect to the political liberal's concern for freedom. The school's environmental ethic is not the

only environmental ethic that can be held in society, and education about some competing green ideals (and non-green or anti-green ideas) should also be part of the curriculum.

Dobson (2003) also considers whether a liberal education system can cope with the value-laden nature of sustainability questions, and concludes that liberalism's normative neutrality commits it to providing the 'mental and material wherewithal' for choosing from a wide range of options concerning the good life. Realism requires the teaching of some determinate habits, practices and values and *the appropriate liberal commitment is not to offer some determinate account of it* (sustainability), *but to ensure the conditions within which the widest range of opportunities for thinking and living sustainability are authentically available* (p. 198). Liberal ESD is more likely to fail by omission rather than indoctrination, and liberal education systems can teach citizenship ESD provided that they embrace the full implications of the indeterminate and contested nature of sustainable development, and develop students' reasoning ability through exposure to real examples of partiality and commitment.

Marxists question the neutrality of liberal states and consider their education systems to be principally concerned with the reproduction of unsustainable social and environmental relations. Education as praxis involves ideology critique and seeks, through reflection and action on lived realities, to bring students to a critical awareness of the limited nature of current forms of democracy and citizenship and the potential of radical alternatives such as those offered by post-industrial socialism. Building on the ideas of Freire, Capra and others, Gadotti (1996, 2005) associates ESD with eco-pedagogy, a utopian project to change current social and environmental relations that emerged from the Rio Global Forum in 1992.

ESD involves critical thinking and problem solving: leading to confidence in addressing the dilemmas and challenges of sustainable development;

Habermas' theory of knowledge constitutive interests suggests that ESD can be theorized and practiced as environmental science and management; values and behaviour change; or socially critical education (Huckle, 2006). Radicals acknowledge the conservative and idealist nature of the first two forms and draw on

critical social theory of the environment and education to theorize the third. *What We Consume* is one example of such ESD. Another is UNESCO's multi-media teacher education program *Teaching and Learning for a Sustainable Future* (UNESCO, 2007) which contains a unit on citizenship education.

ESD that uses critical or eco-pedagogy claims to develop critical thinking and problem solving in democratic ways, but Gough and Scott (2006) suggest that it is prescriptive and manipulative. It is too ready to prescribe educational outcomes from a flawed understanding of the relations between the environment, citizenship and learning, and shape learners to behaviours designed to support the policy choices of others. It roots thinking about the future in what we know (or think we know) in the present, whereas a desirable ESD would acknowledge the uncertainty of many knowledge claims regarding sustainable development; the unpredictable ways in which society and nature co-evolve; and the need for learning characterised by open-endedness, negotiation, and the juxtapositioning of competing perspectives. These are characteristics that socially critical ESD already claims to possess.

Multi-method: word, art, drama, debate, etc.

Bonnett (2003) argues that sustainability should be taught as a frame of mind or sensitivity to the multiple meanings of nature and the numerous ways in which it is valuable to human civilisation. Art, literature, music and film can all help teachers to develop sustainability as a frame of mind and prompt debate about the kinds of political economy and citizenship that would allow it to find expression in the real world.

Gilbert (1995) suggests that the political economy of culture and the environment should be incorporated into citizenship education. The power of cultural expression is increasingly available to youth, through such media as video and the internet, and plays an important role in their understanding of self and others. Along with the identity and lifestyle politics of environmentalism, it is a means whereby young people experiment with identity and life narratives, develop a sense of agency and come to act out social alternatives. The sales of texts like *No Logo* (Klein, 2000) suggest that students can be motivated towards politics and citizenship education, but

the starting points should be identity and lifestyle, rather than formal notions of the ideal citizen. Kenway & Bullen (2001) and Quart (2003) raise related issues in the context of consumerism.

Locally relevant: addressing local as well as global issues, and using the language(s) which learners most commonly use

Clearly citizenship ESD should be practised in and beyond educational institutions that are seeking to be more sustainable. There are growing international movements of sustainable schools (Henderson & Tilbury, 2004) and universities (Corcoran & Wals, 2004) and as these green the curriculum, campus and community, there are opportunities for pupils and students to participate in decisions; learn through active citizenship or community involvement (Hart, 1996, Adams & Ingham, 1998); and thereby develop action competence (Carlsson & Jensen, 2006)..

Environmental management, participatory planning, corporate social responsibility, urban greening, rural development, and ethical consumerism, are examples of contexts in which individuals can learn their way to sustainability alongside businesses, governments and civil society organisations. There is an emerging literature on social learning for sustainability: *the learning that takes place when divergent interests, norms, values and constructions of reality meet in an environment that is conducive to learning* (Wals, 2007, p. 18). Wals' text outlines principles, perspectives and praxis from across the world while Keen et al (2005) draw on Australian experience.

There is much in these volumes to support this chapter's argument that 'new generation' theorizing and practice in citizenship ESD is well established and that it is possible to teach activist and duty-based forms of citizenship linked to visions of more just, sustainable and democratic futures.

References

Adams, E. & Ingham, S. (1998) *Changing Places: Children's Participation in Environmental Planning*. London: The Children's Society.

Antunes, A. & Gadotti, M. (2005) 'Eco-pedagogy as the Appropriate Pedagogy to the Earth Charter Process' in P. B. Corcoran, M. Vilela & A. Roerink (eds.) op. cit.

Baber, W. F. & Bartlett, R. V. (2005) *Deliberative Environmental Politics: Democracy and Ecological Rationality*. London: MIT Press.

Barry, J. (1998) 'Green Political Thought', in A. Lent (ed.), *New Political Thought: An Introduction*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. pp 184 – 200.

Barry, J. (2000) *Environment and Social Theory*. London: Routledge.

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society*. London: Sage Publications.

Bell, D. (2004) 'Creating Green Citizens? Political Liberalism and Environmental Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 38(1): 37 – 53.

Bell, D. (2005) 'Liberal Environmental Citizenship', *Environmental Politics*, 14(2): 179 – 194.

Bonnett, M. (2004) *Retrieving Nature: education in a post-humanist age*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Burkett, P. (2003) 'Capitalism, Nature and Class Struggle', in A. Saad-Filho (ed.), *Anti-Capitalism: A Marxist Introduction*, London: Pluto.

Capra, F. (2003) *The Hidden Connections: A Science for Sustainable Living*. London: Harper Collins

Carlsson, M. & Jensen, B. (2006) 'Encouraging Environmental Citizenship: The Roles and Challenges for Schools', in A. Dobson & D. Bell (eds.) op. cit.

Christie, I. & Warburton, D. (2001) *From Here to Sustainability: Politics in the Real World*. London: Earthscan.

Corcoran, P. B., Vilela, M. & Roerink, A. (eds.) (2005) *The Earth Charter In Action*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.

Corcoran, P. B. & Wals, A. E. J. (eds.) (2004) *Higher Education and the Challenge of Sustainability*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Crick, B. & Porter, A. (eds.) (1978) *Political Education and Political Literacy*. London: Longman.

Crook, S., Pakulski, J. & Waters, M. (1992) *Postmodernization: Change in Advanced Society*. London: Sage Publications.

Dickens, P. (1996) *Reconstructing Nature, Alienation, Emancipation and the Division of Labour*. London: Routledge.

Dickenson, P. (2003) *Planning Green Growth, a socialist contribution to the debate on environmental sustainability*. London: CWI Publications and Socialist Books.

Dobson, A. (2003) *Citizenship and the Environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobson, A. & Bell, D. (eds.) (2006) *Environmental Citizenship*. London: MIT Press.

Dresner, S. (2006) *The Principles of Sustainability*. London: Earthscan.

Elliott, L. (2004) *The Global Politics of the Environment*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.

ECI (Earth Charter Initiative) (2007) *The Earth Charter*.
http://www.earthcharter.org/innerpg.cfm?id_menu=19

ECIIS (Earth Charter International Initiative Secretariat) (2005) *Bringing Sustainability into the Classroom: An Earth Charter Guidebook for Teachers*.

Gadotti, M. (1996) *Pedagogy of Praxis: A Dialectical Philosophy of Education*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Goldblatt, D. (1996) *Social Theory and the Environment*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilbert, R. (1996) 'Identity, culture and environment: education for citizenship in the twenty-first century', in J. Demaine & H. Entwistle (eds.). *Beyond Communitarianism: Citizenship, Politics and Education*. New York: St Martins Press.

Gough, S. & Scott, W. (2006) 'Promoting Environmental Citizenship through Learning: Toward a Theory of Change', in A. Dobson & D. Bell (eds.), op. cit.

Hart, R. (1996) *Children's Participation: The Theory and Practice of Involving Young Citizens in Community Development and Environmental Care*. London: Earthscan.

Hartmann, F. (1998) 'Towards a social ecological politics of sustainability', in R. Keil, D. Bell, P. Pentz & L. Fawcett (eds.), *Political Ecology: Global and Local*, London: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (1996) *Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hayward, T. (2006) 'Ecological Citizenship: Justice, Rights and the Virtue of Resourcefulness', *Environmental Politics*, 15(3): 435 – 446.

Held, D. (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order: from the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (2000) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Henderson, K. & Tilbury, D. (2004) *Whole-School Approaches to Sustainability: An International Review of Sustainable School Programs*. Sydney: ARIES

Hubbard, G. & Miller, D. (eds.) (2005) *Arguments Against G8*. London: Pluto Press.

Huckle, J. (1998) *Teachers Handbook* (for the What We Consume module of the Global Environmental Education Programme). Richmond: WWF & Richmond Publishing Company.

Huckle, J. (2006) *Education for Sustainable Development: A Briefing Paper for the Training and Development Agency for Schools*.

<http://www.ttrb.ac.uk/Browse2.aspx?anchorId=14633&selectedId=14634>

Keen, M., Brown, V. A. & Dyball, R. (eds.) (2005) *Social Learning in Environmental Management: Towards a Sustainable Future*. London: Earthscan.

Kenway, J. & Bullen, E. (2001) *Consuming Children: Education, Entertainment, Advertising*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

LETSsystems (2007) <http://www.gmlets.u-net.com/>

Little, A. (1998) *Post-industrial Socialism: Towards a new politics of welfare*. London: Routledge.

Lipietz, A. (1992) *Towards a New Economic Order: Postfordism, Ecology and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lynch, J. (1992) *Education for Citizenship in a Multi-Cultural Society*, London: Cassell.

Merchant, C. (ed.) (1994) *Key Concepts in Critical Theory: Ecology*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

Pigozzi, J. (2005) 'Sustainable Development through Education', keynote address to UK Launch Conference of DESD, London.

http://www.unesco.org.uk/UserFiles/File/DESD/ConferenceReport_MaryJoyPigozzi3.pdf

Quart, A. (2003) *Branded: The buying and selling of teenagers*. London: Arrow.

SDELG (Sustainable Development Education Liaison Group) (2005) *Sustainable Development Education: an international study*. Glasgow: Learning and Teaching Scotland.

http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/sustainabledevelopment/images/SDELG%20international_tcm4-306104.pdf

Smith, G. (2005) 'Green Citizenship and the Social Economy', *Environmental Politics*, 14(2): 273 – 289.

Sutton, P. W. (2004) *Nature, Environment and Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Turner, A. (2001) *Just Capital: The Liberal Economy*. Basingstoke, Macmillan

UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) (2005) *UNECE Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development*.
<http://www.unece.org/env/esd/Strategy&Framework.htm>

UNESCO (1997) *Educating for a Sustainable Future: A Transdisciplinary Vision for Concerted Action*.
http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/TLSF/theme_a/mod01/uncom01t05s01.htm

UNESCO (2001) *The Luneburg Declaration on Higher Education for Sustainable Development*.
http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/file_download.php/a5bdee5aa9f89937b3e55a0157e195e6LuneburgDeclaration.pdf

UNESCO (2006) *Promotion of a Global Partnership for the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development: The International Implementation Scheme for the Decade in brief*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001473/147361E.pdf>

UNESCO (2007) *Highlights on DESD Progress to Date*.
<http://www.environment.gov.au/education/publications/undesd-progress.html>

UNESCO (2007) *Teaching and learning for a sustainable future*.
<http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/>

Valencia Saiz, A. (2005) ‘Globalisation, Cosmopolitanism and Ecological Citizenship’, *Environmental Politics*, 14(2): 163 – 178.

Wals, A. E. J. (ed.) (2007) *Social Learning: towards a sustainable world*. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers.

Wackernagel, M. & Rees, W. (1996) *Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.

Woodin, M. & Lucas, C. (2004) *Green Alternative to Globalisation: A Manifesto*. London: Pluto Press.