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Introduction

Few social issues have received greater attention in recent years than that of the environment. Most nations are aware of the challenges of environmental planning and sustainability in a context of heightened evidence, suggesting that the world is experiencing rapid rates of climate change, environmental degradation and declining resources. Almost two decades ago, the United Nations Development Programme (1998, p. 2) laid out the case for growing environmental problems facing our planet:

The burning of fossil fuels has increased almost fivefold since 1950, the world's marine catch fourfold, and the consumption of freshwater twofold since 1960. The result is a severe stress on the capacity of the plant to absorb all of the pollution and waste produced, as well as a rapid deterioration of fresh water reserves, soil, forests, fish and biodiversity.

Since this time, the attention to environmental change has been fuelled by large international conventions such as Agenda 21, formed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the Copenhagen Accord resulting from the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Denmark in 2009, and the Paris Agreement in 2016. As countries have ratified and introduced policy reforms to address these conventions, it has become clear that a pool of active citizens is required to address these challenges and plan for sustainable environmental futures. This has, in turn, influenced the understandings and expectations societies hold toward citizens. Dean (2001, p. 491, emphasis added) refers to this as the 'greening of citizenship', outlining three ways of how it has occurred:

First, environmental concerns have entered our understanding of the rights we enjoy as citizens. Second, the enhanced level of global awareness associated with ecological thinking has helped to broaden our understanding of the potential scope of citizenship. Third, emergent ecological concerns have added fuel to a complex debate about the responsibilities that attach to citizenship.
In parallel with these societal changes, the field of environmental citizenship has expanded over the past 25 years. As early as the 1970s, work within environmental education had articulated for a type of ‘green citizen’ (Schild, 2016), whilst not specifically using those words, and indeed the Thalwil Declaration in 1977 argued for the need to create an active and environmentally aware citizenry. One of the earliest essays which specifically attempted to integrate citizenship and environmental planning and studies was by van Steenbergen (1994, p. 142) who set out to bring together the two ‘cultures’ of citizenship problems and environmental concerns. Since this time, the field has diversified and deepened until such a time that it is arguable that it has come of age (for example, Latta, 2007, p. 377), while others, such as Gabrielson (2008, p. 430), believe that the literature and theorising on green citizenship remains “unnecessarily narrow” (see also Dobson, 2003; Dean, 2001).

This chapter maintains that the prevailing frameworks employed in green citizenship still involve limited, static and instrumental conceptions, somewhat failing to consider all pertinent scales, spaces and lived practices of citizenship. In response, drawing on feminist theorisation and citizenship conceptions introduced by Engin Isin (2008, 2012), we turn to more dynamic, transnational and inclusive notions of lived green citizenship. We begin by outlining the contested nature of green citizenship (and its various expressions through terms such as ecological, sustainable and environmental citizenship) to illustrate the multiple interpretations of scholarly debate. Recognising this, the term ‘green citizenship’ is adopted in the chapter, in keeping with Dean (2001), as a broad term which seeks to encompass and explore in its greatest sense the ‘greening’ of citizenship. After describing the shortcomings of traditional liberal and civic republican approaches, we argue for a widening and deepening of understandings, through a greater acknowledgement of space and the multiple scalar and practed dimensions of citizenship. The chapter concludes with an examination of the future of green citizenship and environmental planning by examining the role of environmental education and the younger generation’s uptake of these ideas.

The contested nature of green citizenship

Green citizenship is neither a neutral nor apolitical concept. Even the terms used to describe it are highly contested. While some use environmental, ecological, sustainable and green citizenship interchangeably, others underline and dispute the differences between them. For example, Dobson (2010) distinguishes between environmental citizenship, which he argues is driven by liberal citizenship traditions focusing on individual and personal rights and duties, whereas ecological citizenship captures a more global conception which he defines as ‘the exercise of ecologically related responsibilities, nationally, internationally, and intergenerationally, rooted in justice, in both the public and private spheres’ (Dobson, 2003, p. 206; see also Latta, 2007; Gabrielson, 2008; Sceri and Magret, 2012; Schild, 2016). Such debates about terms also mirror the conflicting and competing conceptions inherent in the idea of green citizenship. Not only is the concept of citizenship both contested, meaning multiple things to different groups of people (Faulk, 2000), but the concept of environmentalism is also contentious (Dean, 2001). We will examine two broad positions which green citizenship can fall into – that based on a liberal tradition and that of a civic republican position. Much of the discourse surrounding green citizenship parallels these two frameworks.

The first of these traditions – the liberal framework – acknowledges the existence of citizens' environmental rights but focuses on the personal duties and obligations of citizens. The emphasis is often on personal lifestyle attitudes, choices, and the management of environmental problems through actions such as recycling and boycotting unethical products (Dobson, 2003).

Melo-Escrichuela, 2008; Latta (2007) argues that as a result of this prevailing approach, much of the focus has fallen on cultivating ‘green’ attitudes and practices of individuals, rather than more broadly on democracy or collective and societal action. As one concrete example, Danick (2015) illustrates the prevalence of this neo-liberal approach in education by examining how one teacher presented the idea of green citizenship to his class through a focus on their individual patterns of consumption. While this approach led his students to examine their own environmental consumer behaviour, Danick cautions that this is a weakened form of green citizenship as it is disconnected from the contexts in which the decisions are made and from broader political activities (Danick, 2015, p. 396) and thus fails to challenge the root causes of global environmental injustice or challenge established social structures reproducing these injustices over time.

The second prevailing framework in green citizenship is that of civic republicanism, emphasising virtues, responsibilities and community concerns. The weight is on the common good; in this way, the approach attempts to restrain excesses of self-interest in the liberal tradition (Gabrielson, 2008). The virtues and character traits of green citizens are highlighted with appeal to a stewardship model to remind us of our interdependence on nature and its dependence on humans (Schild, 2016; Dobson, 2003). Education within this tradition assumes that individual actions alone are not adequate to address environmental concerns and that participatory political involvement in citizens in environmental planning and decision making is key. In terms of critique, Schild (2016) points out that such approaches can fail to explain why citizens would be motivated to take part in deliberative processes in the first place.

As a way to illustrate and advance upon how these competing conceptions map on to moral discourses which underpin or make possible competing conceptions of green citizenship, Dean (2001) suggests a possible heuristic model or taxonomy, shown in Figure 15.1. Dean suggests that the axes in Figure 15.1 represent two normative conceptual continua. The horizontal axis relates to the liberal and civic republican traditions of citizenship, with more contractarian traditions at one end which highlight that to have freedom an individual must enter into a contract with society, and at the other end, more solidaristic traditions in which an individual develops close communal bonds to develop social cohesion. The vertical axis is a continuum between equality and social traditions in which there are more egalitarian notions about the relationships between individuals in society at one end and more hierarchical at the other. When intersected by environmental discourses, Dean suggests that four positions can be outlined:

- **Entrepreneurism**: compatible with economic liberalism and underpinned by economic rationalism for environmental planning and decision making;
- **Survivalism**: compatible with moral authoritarianism, fundamentally egalitarian as does not question unequal distribution of social power and resources;
- **Conformation**: aspires to social integration and belonging but accepts inequalities in social power and resources;
- **Reformism**: solidaristic, embraces the goal of greater equality in distributions of power and resources.

Dean acknowledges that this taxonomy is over simplistic as many positions combine elements of all four. However, his model helps to confirm the existence of multiple political interpretations of green citizenship and how these overlap deeper moral and political positions (see also Dobson, 2003).

While such frameworks are useful for positioning different perspectives and for considering the extent to which people are active or passive citizens, and for critiquing powerful social structures or ideologies, they do have limitations. Latta (2007, p. 378), among others, suggests that
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Mitchell et al., 2003). Despite claims to universalism, concepts of citizenship have been drawn to a quintessentially male template so that women’s exclusion (and the chequered nature of their inclusion) was integral to both the theory and practice of citizenship’ (Lister, 2007, p. 52).

The critique involves a shift from a focus on the status of citizenship that many people fail to achieve – due to their age, sex, resources, political positioning and access to public space or institutions – to a focus on the experiences, acts and practices of being a citizen in both private and public spaces and with a range of scales.

These critiques relate to the spatial dimensions and scale of citizenship. Spatially limited understandings of citizenship are seen to align problematically with territorially defined nation states and the rights and duties of citizens that no longer match the global mobility of people and the border-crossing reach of environmental issues. Re-thinking the scales of citizenship has provided some insights to this problematic (for example, Hubbard, 2013; Staeheh, 2016). Among other critical citizenship scholars, we have developed in our own work transnational and relational understandings of citizenship, characterised by flexible and multiple notions of identity and connectedness beyond the nation state (Kallio et al., 2015; Kallio and Mitchell, 2016; Kallio, 2018a; Wood and Black, 2018).

Green studies, also, have played an important role in highlighting the global significance of citizenship issues, and the need for global actions. Evoking such ideas, Dobson (2003) argues for the necessity of post-cosmopolitan notions of green citizenship in which people see themselves as part of a wider, and indeed, global community, and are motivated by perceptions and actions which are based on virtue rather than self-interest (also Dean, 2001; Iun, 2012). In doing so, he re-frames the political space of citizenship to encompass not only other humans and societies known to an individual but also to strangers who have not yet been met. The networks of environmental connections and impacts which connect the human and nonhuman planet together are evoked through his post-cosmopolitan notion of green citizenship. Applying these ideas in research has significance for how we think about space, time, and citizenship, as it means we need to loosen our fixation on territories and their physical boundaries and widen our analysis of intersections, networks and relationships.

BEYOND STATUS AND PRACTICES: NOTicing ACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP

A further theoretical branch in critical citizenship literature draws from Engin Iun's (2008, 2012) influential work that distinguishes between three dimensions of citizenship. First, he identifies citizenship as status where the rights and responsibilities of people, as defined by the nation state or other established polities, hold the centre stage. Depending on their positions – be it birthright or gained – people hold different kinds of statuses and thus have more or less rights and responsibilities as members of the political communities where they live, including non-membership and very limited participation opportunities. Second, Iun defines practices of citizenship as formal or semi-formal activities that people can mobilize from their acquired positions in political communities, as collectives and individuals. These include various kinds of actions and customs, depending on the society and its political system, ranging from elections to demonstrations to public opinion statements. Third, a difference between practices and acts of citizenship is made by highlighting that all politically influential activities are institutional, public, organized, broadly recognized, or generally accepted. By associating citizenship closely with justice and liberal democratic ideals, Iun proposes that by negotiating, challenging and reworking the prevailing order – and thus calling into question the seeming naturalness of people’s differing positions in a polity and participation opportunities as members of a political community – we

Figure 15.1 Taxonomy of conventional moral discourses
Source: adapted from Dean (2001, p. 494)
can act as citizens beyond our given statuses and established practices. For example, as Bins (2008) argues, stateless people such as refugees often perform acts of citizenship whilst still failing to hold the status of citizenship (see also Haki, 2017).

This theoretical approach has been picked up by some scholars in the context of environmental citizenship, yet not extensively. In his attempt to locate democratic politics in ecological citizenship, Latta (2007) has offered an instance perspective as a critique of the dominating approaches that, first, tend to focus on narrow concerns for the environment and, second, have limited relevance to progressive change in practical terms. He argues that the critical literatures engenders ‘appreciation for the way that ecological citizenship does not provide a politics of nature, as a kind of framework for progressive socio-environmental change but instead is an emergent property of existing struggles for sustainability and political-ecological rights’ (Latta, 2007, p. 388, emphasis in original). Based on this idea, Latta suggests that, ‘democratic tendencies in green politics should direct far greater attention to the actual spaces in which ecological citizens are daily being born in individuals’ and communities’ efforts to become political vistas of nature’ (Latta, 2007, p. 390, emphasis in original).

While in his recent work Latta (2007) has developed his ideas with reference to new materialism theorists which does not fit unproblematically with Isinian thought that emphasizes strongly human subjectivity (for a critique, see Haki, 2017), others have taken them forward in more pragmatist and humanist manners. In her recent article on environmentally friendly food initiatives in Iran, Fadaee (2017) engages specifically with people’s mundane acts of environmental citizenship. Drawing attention to how the everyday life of citizenship unfolds beyond the West and the North, she sets out to shed light on the pluralities of people’s environmental engagements and subjectivities. Her analysis emphasizes the environmental 1990s. Individuals tended to place more responsibility on governments for pollution and environmental decline than on their own actions, and there were declining beliefs in the scarcity of resources. This led the research team to conclude that, ‘clearly, the average high school senior across the past three decades has not viewed him or herself as the first line of defense in protecting the environment’ (Wray-Lake et al., 2010, p. 82).

Amidst such fears, many Western nations have responded with a plethora of public policy initiatives to enhance environmental citizenship in youth. However, opportunities for young people to participate in environmental action through schooling and public programmes tend to be more cerebral and less experiential. This is despite the evidence suggesting that exposure to the natural environment itself is key to enhancing green citizenship (Chawla, 1998, 2007). In particular, prior lived experiences of environment have been found to be a crucial link in encouraging environmental awareness and action (for example, Bartos, 2013). Reflecting on this, Dobson (2003, p. 206, emphasis in original) surmises that:

If this is right, then environmental and ecological citizenship will not be learned in the confines of the classroom – but given that these citizenship acts us beyond environmental education, walks in the woods are not enough either. Ecological citizens are most likely to be created through what the French call le vieu, or ‘lived experience’.

There are also concerns that students are more likely to receive narrow (neo)liberal experiences of citizenship through their schooling and less likely to receive civic republican or post-cosmopolitan approaches to environmental education (Schall, 2016). Wentzinger and Kuhne (2004) suggest that most schools do well in creating such ‘personally responsible’ or ‘participatory’ citizens, but these are rarely ‘justice oriented’. Therefore, they create self-managing civic agents, neo-liberal consumers and citizen-workers but rarely critical green citizens (Wong and Stimpson, 2003; Hayward, 2012; Dimick, 2015). Youth citizens therefore are likely to experience a ‘thin
environmentalism' in which they learn to address some of the symptoms of the current sustainability crisis but leave the drivers of sociological and social injustice unchallenged (Hayward, 2012). These narrow experiences of environmental citizenship are compounded by conceptions of political and citizenship participation that are conveyed within many citizenship curricula is a delayed act, thus reinforcing a view that the role of schools is to provide people for their future participation as citizens. Researchers also question whether children and young people in such forums can express 'diverse' perspectives from those of involved adults (Matthews, 2001; Matthews and Limb, 2003; Kalliö and Hikki, 2011), thus reinforcing a view of children and young people as citizens/subjects-in-waiting (Skelton, 2010).

However, this critique on schools is only partially fitting as it does not adequately acknowledge the active roles that children and youth play in the processes of socialisation and social learning, and how their relational living environments form a part of these learning processes (for socialisation and learned citizenship, see Kalliö, 2018a). In contrast to the findings above, several studies confirm that children and young people remain interested in and concerned with environmental issues. Studies in Australia (for example, Seargeant, 2008; Harris and Wyn, 2010), England (Holden et al., 2008), and across the OECD (Schulte et al., 2010) confirm that climate change and environmental degradation are perceived by young people as some of the most significant issues they face today. There is also some international evidence that young people are increasingly taking part in community-based action and in some internet campaigns concerning issues such as the environment and ethical consumption (Sherrod et al., 2010).

When examining young people's everyday and lived citizenship in New Zealand, Finland and England, we have also found that young people had a significant interest and concern for environmental issues. In an open-ended interview about 'important issues in our place', in Wood's (2011) study (n=122, 14–18 years), the young participants most frequently nominated environmental sustainability and climate change issues. Similarly, in Kalliö and colleagues (Kalliö, 2018b; Rinne and Kalliö, 2017; see also Koelmans et al., 2017) studies in Finland and England (England n=134, Finland n=128, 10–12 and 14–17-year-olds), youth narratives about their lived realities brought up various connections with nature and environmental issues. Notably, both studies employed a specific focus on young people's lived and spatial experiences of being young citizens, as witnessed and experienced through their own lives and in this way developed a complex and inter-related understanding of green citizenship at the intersection of daily practices, relations and nature. Evidence presents a deeper and arguably more complex picture of green citizenship in the current and future generation and provides a way to break down the intractable positions accounted for in traditional moral discourses about the environment (Dean, 2001). It also speaks of the need for more in-depth research and flexible frameworks to account for the multiple expressions and spatial dimensions of green citizenship.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has established the inherently contested, political and debatable nature of green citizenship. It has argued for an approach to green citizenship which rests on deeper understandings of the spatial dimensions of environmental issues and environmental planning responses, and a greater recognition of the diversity of citizens represented in society, and their experiences and practices. Furthermore, the focus we have taken to spatial and lived expressions of green citizenship advocates for the importance of green studies to environmental planning, citizenship and political theory and the importance of trans-local and networked thinking when it comes to understanding the responsibilities, rights, activities, and lived experiences of citizenship. In turn, citizenship and political studies continue to shed light on the contested nature of green citizenship and have helped to highlight the importance of recognising the potential for wider political interpretations of this concept.
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Intermediaries and networks

Ross Beveridge

Introduction

In very simple terms an intermediary operates in between other actors, making connections and reordering relationships between institutions, individuals and even ‘things’, like buildings and waste. Decision to being an intermediary is the position within a wider network of actors: in the niche, at the meeting point between the boundaries. As in-between actors, intermediaries are seen to facilitate, broker, negotiate, and disseminate knowledge and other resources – all in the aid of other actors, or, more precisely, the relations between them. Looking across the literature any-ding can be an intermediary – it may be human or nonhuman, a business, a non-governmental organisation (NGO) or state actor. An intermediary can apparently operate in any field – energy efficiency, the chemical industry, participatory governance. And being an intermediary may be intentional, inadvertent, short or long term. Hence, intermediaries are defined by their relational and often difficult to discern work (Moss, 2009).

Why then the focus on intermediaries, given that they are rarely the most powerful or visible actors? They are seen as crucial to the functioning of wider networks of, for example, water management or eco-housing construction. They are involved in oiling the wheels on which networks depend. Their significance in environmental planning is bound-up with the rise of network governance as a new form of policy and network approaches with social science to understand how complex social and political organisations work. This empirical and conceptual move to more displaced, decentralised notions of agency, power and effect has thrown light on the spaces between actors which need to be bridged for network objectives to be decided, pursued and achieved. To fill these gaps, a variety of ‘intermediary’ functions may be required. As will be discussed, intermediaries do not only lie in between actors, they can be conceptualised as the points where structures and agency meet: where networks are animated and where intermediary agency has network effects (cf. Hermelin and Räinen, 2017). Hence, focusing on intermediaries throws light on those fields and crevices in networks, the points where agencies meet, where processes crucial to the entire functioning of the network take place.

This chapter will critically reflect on the notion of intermediaries. It provides an overview of the variety of intermediaries identified in the environmental planning and related fields, addressing: their roles, impact and influence on networks; their interests and motivations; and their